

Crysler Park /
Upper Canada Village

**THE HERITAGE INTEGRITY
STATEMENT**



HERITAGE INTEGRITY STATEMENT CRYSLER PARK

(Upper Canada Village)

**Morrisburg, Ontario
Final Report**

Submitted to

The St. Lawrence Parks Commission

Submitted by

Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited

MARCH 1998

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Forward	2
Acknowledgements	4
1. Chrysler Park Defined	5
2. Heritage Integrity Statement Defined	5
3. Commemorative Intent	6
3.1 Original Intent (1955-1961)	7
3.2 Site Development (1967-1987)	11
3.3 Current State (1987-1996)	12
3.4 Summary of Heritage Significance	14
4. Resources Symbolizing Primary Heritage Values	15
4.1 The Site	15
4.1.1 Buildings	15
4.1.2 The Cultural Landscape	16
4.1.3 Collections	17
5. Interpretation of Primary Resources	19
5.1 Primary messages regarding the heritage values of Chrysler Park	19
5.2 Supporting messages	19
5.3 Learning objectives for primary and secondary messages	20
6. Resources Representing Secondary Heritage Values	20
6.1 The Site	20
6.1.1 Buildings	20
6.1.2 The Cultural Landscape	21
6.1.3 Collections	21
6.2 Interpretation of Secondary Heritage Values	22
7. Conclusions and Next Steps	23
Bibliography	25

Forward

Each year thousands of people visit Upper Canada Village, one of North America's finest "living history" museums. Since 1961 visitors of all ages have been attracted by the Village's authentic animation of life in a small 19th century river community where they are immersed in the sights, sounds and smells of that era. The Village offers a "time capsule" experience that captures the mood, the spirit and the flavour of an inspiring past.

The site is owned and operated by the Province of Ontario, through its agency, the St. Lawrence Parks Commission. For many years, funding to operate public sector attractions has been greatly reduced. To continue offering high quality animation and to conserve heritage resources such as Upper Canada Village, both the Village and the St. Lawrence Parks Commission must become more financially self-sufficient. In response to this imperative, the Commission developed an ambitious 5-year Corporate Plan (1996-2001). The Plan is intended to achieve the goals of fiscal self-sufficiency, tourism growth, private sector partnership, job creation and new investment.

In the new Corporate Plan, Upper Canada Village and its surrounding lands (collectively known as Chrysler park) are identified for development as a major tourism destination attraction in which a mix of commercial, recreational and residential land uses would be built to attract significantly more visitors.

In order to address the potential impact of this proposed development, Commission initiated this Heritage Integrity Statement. The consulting firm of Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited was retained by the Commission in September, 1996 to undertake this work. The Statement was intended to address development impact by articulating what was historically significant about the site, to identify heritage values and to provide measurable objectives for site management to ensure ongoing conservation. The consultant was also asked to assess the proposed Corporate Plan development for the site and make recommendations for any required modifications to ensure that heritage values were respected. The main issues under review were impact on existing heritage resources of proposed new development, types of compatible new development that would be suitable, and the preferred location of new development on the site.

The Statement is closely modeled on a document known as a Commemorative Integrity Statement, which is prepared for National Historic Sites and Monuments. The document is termed a "Heritage Integrity Statement" to differentiate it from a National Historic site and to reflect the unique characteristics of the memorial sites and Upper Canada Village. These are the two main heritage components of Chrysler Park which, along with their associated artifact collections, were moved from other sites to escape flooding for the St. Lawrence Seaway.

The process of preparing the Heritage Integrity Statement provided the Commission with a unique opportunity to look back on the original planning principles of the Village. Much has changed in the four decades since the Village first opened, and the values of the early 1960s are not necessarily those of our day. In order to place the heritage resources in their historical context, the Commission's Board encouraged all key stakeholders (especially staff and local heritage groups) to work with the consultant in examining these founding principles, with the intent of reaching consensus on a direction for future conservation and development. The workshops conducted as part of the study process provided a forum for these discussions and resolutions. The resultant Statement reflects the consensus reached, namely, that the Village and its associated memorials are of central importance to the Commission's public mandate, and must be conserved.

In summary, it is hoped that the Heritage Integrity Statement will be a vital management tool, one which will be used to guide future development while ensuring the ongoing conservation of the site's heritage resources.

Acknowledgements

The St. Lawrence Parks Commission gratefully acknowledges the support and guidance provided by all those who have a special interest in the future of Crysler Park's heritage resources. Major contributors are listed below, by organization. Thanks is also due to representatives of the Ontario Museum Association.

Lost Villages Historical Society

James Brownell, President
Fran Laflamme, Past President

Stormont, Dundas & Glengarry Historical Society

Bob Gregory, President
Ian Bowering (Cornwall LACAC)

United Empire Loyalists (St. Lawrence Branch)

Doris Ferguson
Archibald MacDonald
Mary Van Ryswh

United Empire Loyalists (Col. Edward Jessup Branch)

Harold Clow
Norma Moug

Peter Stokes, Architect (participated in the first workshop)

St. Lawrence Parks Commission Board

Gary B. Clarke, Chairman
Shaune Lucas, Vice Chairman
William Code, Commissioner
Les Cruickshank, Commissioner
Mary Devine, Commissioner
David Farrow, Commissioner
John Simpson, Commissioner
Jeannine Roy-Poirier, Commissioner
Hugh G. Thorburn, Commissioner

Upper Canada Village Staff

Dave Dobbie, Supervisor (Farms and Domestic Interpretation)
Bruce Henbest, Supervisor (Mills, Trades and Heritage Programs)
Barry Hughes, Acting Manager and Project Resource Coordinator (Upper Canada Village)
Harry Pietersma, Coordinator (Heritage Programs)
Sylvie Savard, Supervisor (Customer Service, Sales and Events)
various members of the Upper Canada Village interpretive staff

Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited

Carl Bray, Project Manager and Heritage Planner
John Stewart, Principal and Heritage Planner

1. Crysler Park Defined

Crysler Park is an approximately 1214 hectare site owned and operated by the St. Lawrence Parks Commission, an agency of the Province of Ontario. Included in Crysler Park are the following:

- Crysler Park Marina
- Crysler Beach
- Upper Canada Golf Course
- Battle of Crysler Farm Memorial
- Queen Elizabeth Gardens
- Pioneer Memorial
- United Empire Loyalist Memorial
- Upper Canada Village

Of these components, those with heritage value for the purposes of this report include the Battle Memorial (and the associated Queen Elizabeth Gardens), Aultsville Station, the Pioneer and UEL Memorials, and Upper Canada Village.

2. Heritage Integrity Statement Defined

As mentioned in the Forward, the Heritage Integrity Statement is an adaptation of the Commemorative Integrity Statement prepared by Parks Canada as part of their Cultural Resource Management Policy. This model has been used here as the basis for assessment of a living history site – Upper Canada Village – and the associated memorial sites. By “heritage integrity”, the Commission means an assessment of the current site in terms of the core heritage values which characterize the site, the resources which represent these values, and the probable impact of development on these values and resources.

The Heritage Integrity Statement is a management tool and has the following common objectives:

- to articulate what is of historical significance (locally, regionally and nationally) about the site, including both material resources and interpretive messages, in one comprehensive statement and thus provide direction for all decision-making regarding the site;
- to identify the heritage values of the site, the whole and the parts that make up the whole, and so provide a means of ensuring that management decisions do not lose sight of what is most valued; and
- to provide measurable objectives or indicators to determine how successfully the site is being managed.

A site possesses integrity when:

- the resources that symbolize or represent its importance are not impaired or under threat;
- the reasons for the site’s significance are effectively⁶ communicated to the public; and
- the site’s heritage values are respected by all those whose decisions or actions affect the site.

There are two levels of resources having heritage value: those which are of national and provincial importance (primary), and those which are more regionally or locally significant (secondary).

Heritage integrity is defined quite strictly by government heritage agencies. In their definition, a material object has maximum heritage value when it is an original artifact, retained in its original context. Their views are based upon accepted international conservation standards which deem that an historic resource loses a significant amount of its heritage value when it is removed from its original setting, since the setting to a large extent defines the object's character. In these strict terms, therefore, Crysler Park is not an historic site; rather, it is a designed setting from the post World War II era. All of its components were added to land which was itself reshaped as the result of the flooding of the St. Lawrence Seaway. Historically speaking, the setting itself has a connection to the (now flooded) site of the Battle of Crysler's Farm, but otherwise it is an arbitrary location for the resources it contains.

But this strict definition of integrity does not suit the unique character of Crysler Park. Both the memorial sites and Upper Canada Village (U.C.V.) contain original buildings, gravestones and artifacts. They were moved to the site to save them; there was no other way of doing so at the time of the Seaway construction. They were handled carefully at each step of the process, from relocation through to restoration, with supervision by historians and architects, and restoration by trained craftsmen. Some, admittedly, have more of their original fabric left intact than do others, but all of the structures moved to the site retain a significant amount of heritage value because the fact of their being moved does not diminish their ability to function as educational tools, and education, as will be evident in the following sections, is along with commemoration and recreation one of the main reasons for Crysler Park's existence.

The original components moved to the site from various parts of Eastern Ontario have primary heritage value. Recreated landscapes, reconstructed buildings and historical reproductions have secondary value. Whereas historic objects - that is objects original to the historic period and geographical area - have *material* value, the landscapes, reconstructions and reproductions have *associative* value in that their main use is to support interpretation. There is also inherent value in the ensemble of Upper Canada Village. It is an example of a designed artifact of the 1950s, a prototypical Canadian example of a "living history museum". Taken as a whole, Upper Canada Village and the memorial sites are an excellent vehicle for commemorating and learning about the past, and have at their core a group of "real" historic objects. Since the Park was founded on the principles of commemoration, education, and recreation, all of which are values associated with material objects but not necessarily inherent in them, the focus on material and associative values seems appropriate.

3. Commemorative Intent

The only portion of Crysler Park having recognized national historic significance is the Battlefield Memorial monument and plaque. Here the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada designated over seventy years ago the (now flooded) battlefield as a National Historic Site. Thus the event and the place were commemorated. However, the monument was moved to escape flooding from the Seaway, and the plaque no longer has a direct relation to the site it commemorates, other than being located as closely as possible to its former site on the actual field of battle. Another connection may also exist. It is thought that the mound on which the memorial is elevated was intended to be constructed of soil excavated from the battlefield site, that there are material remains in the relocated soil, it is only the event which is now commemorated by the plaque and monument.

The plaque was originally erected in 1923 and its text reflects the government's commemorative intent at that time. The text is as follows:

Battle of Crysler's Farm/Here, on the farm of John Crysler, was fought one of the decisive battles of the War of 1812. On 11 November 1813 Lieutenant Colonel/Joseph Morrison, with 800 British and Canadian regulars, militia, and/Indians, engaged an American force of 4,000 under Brigadier-General/John Boyd. The open terrain was suited to the training (of) the well-drilled British regulars who, after two hours of heavy fighting, routed the/enemy. This victory ended a major American thrust at Montreal./(translation).

This commemoration is now only a part of the heritage values which Crysler Park is intended to preserve and convey. As a recreational site and a living museum, the park was established to tell a broader story. Accordingly, determinations of commemorative intent should start with the expressed objectives of the people responsible for planning, designing and building the Park in the 1950s, as part of the Seaway project.

Due to the speed with which the Park was created, these objectives are not necessarily explicit or in concert: gaps and contradictions are common. The following is a summary of comments made during the evolution of the park - from its inception to the present day - with the intention of identifying common objectives in the design and interpretation of the buildings and settings, and in so doing distilling the basic principles which make up the Park's commemorative intent. Much of the information has been taken from an excellent paper on the development of Upper Canada Village (Martin, 1989) in which members of the development team are quoted at length.

3.1 Original Intent (1955-1961)

Crysler Park exists for one reason: the St. Lawrence Seaway. This massive cross-border project, which created hydro-electric power and a navigable waterway for Canada and the United States, also necessitated the flooding of 20,000 acres of farmland and settlements. Construction of the Seaway began in August, 1954, and flooding commenced in July, 1958. In the process, eight towns were either obliterated or partially destroyed, and the resident relocated and compensated. At first, compensation was offered in kind or in cash, but once the issue arose of moving cemeteries, compensation of another sort was needed.

The problem was that heritage had not been addressed. The Seaway was a construction project above all, and commemoration was not an initial consideration. Yet the issue of compensation had to be faced regardless of the fact that the commission did not begin its work with heritage conservation in its mandate. The initial enabling legislation - the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission Act (1955), now the St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act (1990, as amended 1993) - describes the duties of the Commission as follows (Sect. 5(1): "to develop, control, manage, operate and maintain the Parks", with no elaboration. The only reference to history comes in the earlier Canada-Ontario Agreement (1952;Article XV): "Ontario will establish a Commission to supervise the execution of such works as may be appropriate consistently with the execution of the works, to safeguard and enhance the scenic beauty of and historic associations with the International Rapids Section."

The Hydro-Electric Commission began to deal with these “historic associations” first by relocating cemeteries and re-interring remains, but only on request of relatives. Even so, the problem of burial sites was the first recognition in the Seaway project of the importance of the past. But heritage preservation was still not mandated: it was the initiative of James Smart, a Brockville native and director of the National Historic Sites and Monuments Board, to approach the Hydro Commission with a proposal to create a memorial to the United Empire Loyalists using headstones from some of the relocated graves. His proposal, and another from the Ontario Historical Society (for an inventory of the area to be flooded), were ultimately the only aspects of the huge redevelopment project that involved heritage conservation. In the end, only Smart’s proposal was adopted, and by 1955 it had grown to include a pre-1850 pioneer memorial and a commemoration of the 1813 Battle of Crysler Farm. Thus one man’s initiative, rather than a government policy, was the origin of the commemorative content of Crysler Park.

Smart’s focus was on the commemoration of pioneers and the conservation of historic artifacts, as summarized in his report to the Commission (August 9, 1955):

The lands reserved would include a sizable area for the “Historic Centre” whereon will be located the Crysler Monument and buildings of historic interest to be moved and reerected and fitted out for museum purposes and in themselves serve as specimens of the construction of early days as well as perpetuating their association with the early history of Upper Canada.

A subsequent press release from the Commission (January 9, 1956) maintains his emphasis:

On this site of proposed park land it is intended that original and restored structures of period architecture will house items to be preserved for posterity and displayed as our heritage, such as agricultural implements, household items, military relics, original documents of literary and historical value and other such objects revered as a material link with our pioneering forefathers.

The key document, however, was the January, 1957 Development Plan for what was termed the “main park” in the Ontario-St. Lawrence Development Commission system. By this time, the government had accepted the need to commemorate the past, both the immediate past of the communities affected by the flooding and that of the distant past of the pioneers. Also accepted by this time was the idea of creating a village to house the salvaged structures and artifacts.

A planning and architectural consultant, Anthony Adamson, had been hired by the commission and was responsible for preparing the Development Plan. He remained the overall project manager, planner and promoter of the Park from 1957 to the completion of Upper Canada Village in the early 1960s, and it was his team of specialists which was responsible for the detailed design and construction of the Village. Adamson also traveled extensively to other “living museums” in the United States and made himself familiar with European examples. He and his team were thus well aware of precedents for the work they were about to undertake.

In the Plan, Adamson uses his background to provide explicit principles for Park development. The first of these are found in the Commission's covering letter to the Plan: "the major site, the Crysler's Farm Battle Memorial Park, will not only provide extensive out-door recreational facilities, but will also depict and record the sacrifices of the early pioneers and those things that affected their social and economic life". Adamson's report, however, describes the founding principles of the park development in more detail, and with a subtle shift of priorities away from recreation and towards commemoration and conservation. (1957, p. 8a):

"The principles underlying the design of the park may be stated briefly as follows:

1. To provide space, monument (sic) and a building memorializing the Battle of Crysler's Farm, and the history of the defense of the St. Lawrence frontier.
2. To provide a living monument to the way of life of Upper Canada's earliest settlers by the relocation and restoration in their original condition of some of their first buildings.
3. To provide memorial records of the names of these early settlers.
4. To provide a museum building to illustrate the history of St. Lawrence River transportation.
5. To provide all of these cultural and educational facilities within an attractive and beautiful landscape, and to add to the beauties of this landscape a complete complement of summer recreational facilities for visitors to enjoy."

These principles can be seen today as the equivalent of an initial statement of commemorative intent. Similarly, the 1957 Plan outlines what could now be termed the heritage values of the Parkway system, within which Crysler Park was considered the "centrally located major park".

These heritage values are:

- the heritage of the border (including the War of 1812 and the Battle of Crysler Farm);
- the heritage of transportation (including the early portages and canals around the rapids);
- the heritage of settlement (including the existing and "lost" villages); and
- the heritage of recreation (including the opening up of a formerly private shoreline to public use).

Whereas the Development Plan guided overall planning of the Park, the restoration team established to oversee construction of Upper Canada Village prepared no specific policies to govern acquisition and conservation of buildings, artifacts or documents. The lack of such policies was noted at the time by team members (Stokes, in Martin, 34), but seems to have been the result of lack of time and resources. In the end, the best professional judgment of the team members had to suffice.

This judgment was very good, however, and in most cases gave development of the Park and Village a solid basis in historic fact. Even in the absence of a clear conservation approach, the restoration team for the Upper Canada Village component of Crysler Park had a distinct advantage over those responsible for similar "living museums" in the United States, and that was the involvement of historians from the start of the project. Ronald Way, an historian, had been responsible for the restoration of Fort Henry and he gave the Upper Canada Village project academic credibility and provided a consistent emphasis on historical accuracy. His team included architects, interior designers and antique dealers, all of whom had specialist research and conservation skills. An advisory committee oversaw all decisions and it too contained some of the most experienced heritage experts of the day. Their combined expertise was better than that available to any other North American site at the time, and subsequent research has shown, in most cases, that their judgment was sound.

What the development process lacked, however, was consensus on the use of this judgment and time to resolve differences of opinion. Conflicts began early between the educational thrust of Way's work and the architectural and art history biases of some of his colleagues. Compromises over authenticity were made, some serious, at least in the eyes of the architects. These conflicts were not resolved at the time of the project's completion. As a result, the site benefited from the best advice available, but the use of this advice was haphazard and incomplete, leaving the end result a combination of careful research and actual artifact in some areas, and speculative reconstruction in others.

Comments made by Way and his wife (also on the team) near the completion of the project sum up the objectives of the team members and indicate the compromises which were necessitated by lack of time, money and knowledge. Way recognized that Adamson, the overall project director, had initially hoped to have authentic buildings, each with either historic or architectural value, and each carefully restored and furnished. In reality, Way and his wife concluded, one could not restore a village that had never existed, and felt that the Upper Canada Village project had become:

...a collection of separately restored structures, furnished and equipped to present a cross-section of social history in Eastern Canada during the first half of the nineteenth century. The village form provides not only a logical and attractive display medium but a common denominator for an assortment of buildings with varying terminal dates. Because the museum village layout had to be created to a planned design – but with units restored to the earliest terminal date – it was inevitable that conflicts should arise between the creative concept inherent in the Village design and restoration principles. Obviously there can be no perfect marriage between the creation of the new and the restoration of the old, for restoration is nothing but copywork and is the antithesis of creative design. Putting foremost the objective of teaching social history, this compromise evolved: first, individual structures would be restored in all that pertains to architecture and craftsmanship, as authentically as research and workmanship could make them; second, the creative concept of a museum village with an educational purpose would take precedence in the use to which each restored structure would be put. In other words, when the actual story of an individual house added nothing to the picture of a typical village, that building's history has been subordinated to the main theme, and its use amended for that purpose...Care was taken, in such a case as this, not to invent history, but to portray the typical rather than the specific (Way, 1961: 219).

The Ways also recognized that Upper Canada Village could not be simply a collection of buildings salvaged from the Seaway flooding:

Initial policy was that the museum village would be created entirely with salvaged material which was a by-product of the Seaway and Hydro projects, old houses and structures figuratively rescued from the flood. As work progressed and it was realized that certain essentials of a typical village were not available among the salvaged structures, this original concept was amended to the extent that some of the buildings were sought and acquired elsewhere in Ontario (Way, 1961: 219).

By the time of Village opened, therefore, the Park's objectives had evolved significantly. The Park went from being seen primarily as a Battlefield Memorial and summer day-use park with an associated collection of salvaged headstones, buildings and artifacts to being marketed as a destination tourist attraction and regional economic generator focused on a "living museum". This "typical" village became the centerpiece of the Park, using the buildings and artifacts as backdrops and teaching tools in the animated portrayal of everyday life in the early nineteenth century, and relegating the memorial sites and recreation grounds to a secondary role.

In summary, the original commemorative intent behind the development of Crysler Park heritage resources was:

- to add heritage commemoration and interpretation to the mandate of the Seaway development commission;
- to act as a living memorial to the early pioneers;
- to base all development upon historical research, and use wherever possible original buildings and artifacts;
- to complete the salvage of buildings and artifacts before the flooding, and to open the Village expeditiously, even in the absence of required funds, design guidelines and collections policies; and
- to portray the buildings in a village setting for interpretation as a "living museum".

3.2 Site Development (1961-1987)

Further changes were made to the original site in the quarter century following the Park's opening. The first of these involved subsequent buildings and site work. Some of the intended elements did not get built, such as the East Recreational Areas and the Loyalist Woods, and some of the initial educational objectives were modified as the Village became an increasingly popular tourist destination. The Village's sheer popularity led to rapid expansion of visitor support facilities (parking, restaurants, gift shop) and to the addition of large surface parking lots immediately outside the entrance. New buildings were also added to the Village to expand the range of activities portrayed; these structures were made either by moving in an existing historic building or by reconstructing replicas.

The heritage importance of the Village was recognized in 1961, when the American Association for State and Local History (A.A.S.L.H.) gave the site its Award of Merit.

Outside the Village, changes were undertaken gradually. While the West Recreational Area developed much as planned, with a marina, sports fields and picnic areas and the Aultsville Station and train, the memorial sites were augmented with gardens and monuments. The Loyalist Memorial joined the Pioneer Memorial in the area east of the Battlefield Monument mound, and the battle museum was built as its northern base. The formal mall linking the main Park entrance with the monument was altered in 1984 with addition of the Queen Elizabeth Gardens to its perimeter.

The only changes were programmatic, affecting the interpretation of the Village. The initial intent was to interpret the Village as a typical waterfront community in Upper Canada in the early nineteenth century. In 1957, the development team proposed a terminal date for interpretation of 1841, just before the railroad and industrialization supplanted the early pioneer life. The Village was to be divided into four thematic zone: earliest settlement (1783-1810); hamlet, farm; and transportation. Buildings and their associated landscapes were to be treated as "vignettes" and interpreted separately to the date and use most suited to their original state prior to being moved to the site.

These proposals had already changed by the early 1960s, however, and were to evolve further in the ensuing decades. In practice, some of the vignettes involved terminal dates that went beyond the 1840s and into the mid-1860s (the Chrysler Store, for example). Comments from staff and visitors on the site;s interpretation also seem to have led to further re-assessment of the vignette system. A growing strength of the Village was its interpretive guides and period craftspeople. Emphasis on animated interpretation appears to have sparked public demand for changes in the interpretive policy. A position paper prepared by Village interpretive staff in 1978 pointed out the serious restrictions imposed by the vignette system and what had become a series of various terminal dates. Instead, the paper advocated a shift to a single interpretive period for the whole Village, with a terminal date of 1866. Following internal discussion and market research, this new interpretive strategy was officially adopted by the Commission at their meeting of August 24, 1987, as part of a projected five year plan for upgrading Upper Canada Village. This new strategy was based on a renewed commitment to the goals of conservation, recreation and education, and included a greater emphasis on living history interpretation and participatory activities for visitors.

In summary, the changing commemorative objectives in the first quarter century of operation were:

- to shift the interpretative emphasis from “vignettes” to period interpretation, with the terminal date for all buildings consolidated to the mid-1860s, as the Village expanded and evolved;
- to strengthen the role of Upper Canada Village as the prime attraction in Chrysler Park, and as a key destination attraction and economic generator in Eastern Ontario; and
- to add further memorials and gardens to Chrysler Park.

3.3 Current State (1987-1996)

The new interpretive policy was augmented by first person interpretation, starting in 1990, but no other major changes were made. Special events have been added, and group visits expanded.

No major changes have been made since the mid-1980s, and the Village now contains approximately 45 buildings which recreate the early nineteenth century. A few new buildings were added to the Village in this period, most notably the Grist Mill and Tin Shop. The administration offices were created and the restaurant moved to a new building.

Some important components were never built. Most important of these was the visitor orientation centre, intended to be located near the entrance to the Park. Its purpose was to introduce visitors to the range of features available in Chrysler Park and to provide an initial interpretive display, especially for Upper Canada Village. Instead, the Visitor Centre at the Battle Memorial Area was built to partially meet this need, but it has since been closed (1993). Other buildings have also been closed in the last two decades due to cutbacks, such as the Aultsville Station, the Cheese Factory and the River Museum.

New legislation in 1993 gave the S.L.P.C. the opportunity for the first time to retain revenue from its operations. In anticipation of this, and as part of the regular planning cycle for the Park's operations, the Commission initiated a series of studies and development proposals, most important of which was the Waterfront Plan of 1993 in which Parks staff proposed a reorientation of the Village to the waterfront and the building of phased development of wharves, warehouses and related industrial buildings. This proposal was not implemented due to lack of funding. Most recently (1995), the St. Lawrence Parks Commission has prepared a Corporate Plan in which a comprehensive package of financial, organizational and development proposals is intended to meet the Ontario Government's requirement that the Commission, and its component sites, become largely financially self-sufficient by the end of the decade. Chrysler Park has been targeted as a major destination attraction in which intensive commercial, recreational and residential uses will be developed in order to capture the largest possible share of the potential visitor market. This heritage value statement is being prepared in response to these proposals.

Looking back, Chrysler Park was established in the late 1950s as a recreational park and a memorial site. The completion of Upper Canada Village in 1961 added a "living museum" which added a major educational component to the Commission's commemorative and recreational mandate, with restoration of buildings and landscapes as a supporting objective. What began as a series of static memorials and museums quickly evolved into a teaching device which brought to life the history of the pioneering era. By 1961, the Park became a secondary component to the Village, with different objectives and a different design.

In the quarter century following the opening, the recreational and memorial parts of the Park were expanded, but the Village also grew in response to visitor demand, and changed in response to visitor comments. The shift was from "living museum" organized around vignettes to "living history" organized around a period interpretation of ordinary life in a typical Upper Canadian waterfront community. The terminal date for interpretation of all buildings and settings was shifted to 1866, and the primary emphasis shifted from the pioneers and United Empire Loyalists to include an interpretation of the social, economic and political context of the pre-Confederation period. Policies have been prepared governing collections, interpretation and new development, the latter as part of an overall five-year development plan for Chrysler Park.

In the time since its opening, the Village has been judged a success both by the public and by the international heritage community. It has attained and kept an excellent interpretive program, founded on and sustained by historical research. The resulting accuracy of construction and description are a key factor in maintaining the illusion of "stepping back in time", an illusion which remains very popular with a worldwide audience. According to visitor surveys, the quality of interpretive and craft programs, and of the overall experience, continues to be rated highly, and Upper Canada Village has retained its three-star rating in the Michelin Guide, one of two historic attractions to be so rated in Canada. The threat of further budget cuts has galvanized staff and the general public to identify ways of preserving and enhancing the Village and the Park. Comments made during the workshops conducted as part of this study brought together key stakeholders in an attempt to reach consensus on heritage values and on compatible development.

In summary, the current state of Chrysler Park is as follows:

- the evolution of Upper Canada Village and the memorial sites has stalled, and new investment is needed to preserve and enhance the existing setting and operation;
- government cutbacks and declining revenues have put the future of Chrysler Park in jeopardy: new sources of revenue are required to sustain Upper Canada Village, the memorial sites, and the recreation areas;
- the current Corporate Plan is a first step towards providing the type of development which would be compatible with the Park's heritage values while financially sustaining the Park in the future;
- the Corporate Plan proposals, as modified in the revised Chrysler Park Mast Plan, generally reflect the Park's heritage values; and
- for the first time, future development of UCV and the memorial sites will be guided by specific conservation policies, to be detailed in a Conservation Plan prepared for all heritage resources in Chrysler Park.

3.4 Summary of Heritage Significance

The Heritage Integrity Statement is the means of marrying these twin objectives. Heritage values to be respected are specified and the role of heritage conservation and interpretation is strengthened within the Corporate Plan proposals for Chrysler Park.

Chrysler Park is of national and provincial heritage importance primarily because:

- buildings, memorials and artifacts which were moved to the site have retained inherent heritage value after being relocated;
- this site has strong associative value as a battlefield site of national significance, as a museum village of national significance, and as a commemorative response (towards the social and physical upheaval caused by the construction of the St. Lawrence Seaway) of national significance; and
- the site interprets and perpetuates traditional ways of life and craft techniques, supported by ongoing historical research and archival documentation.

Chrysler Park is of historic importance secondarily because:

- of the reconstructed buildings, landscapes and reproduced artifacts it contains; and
- the created cultural landscape of the Park is worthy example of 1950s "living museum" design.

Chrysler Park is of local and regional importance because:

- the recreational portions of the Park provided new public parkland as partial recompense to local communities for the effects of Seaway construction, within a new park system run by a Provincial agency.

4. Resources Symbolizing Primary Heritage Values

4.1 The Site

For the purposes of this report, the site refers generally to those lands defined as Crysler Park, and specifically to the heritage resources located within the Park. The heritage resources within the Park are concentrated in the area between Highway #2 and the St. Lawrence River. The western boundary is the edge of the Battle Memorial Mound, and the eastern boundary is the Commission land on the western edge of Ault Island. Included in this ensemble is the Aultsville Station and train, currently located west of the Mound near the Marina.

The primary heritage resources are the Memorial sites, the Aultsville Station, and Upper Canada Village. All buildings, landscapes, memorials and artifacts within these resources are considered to be the site of the Park's heritage values.

The Park site is evaluated below under the following cultural resource components: buildings, cultural landscapes, and collections of historic objects. There are no archaeological sites or remains of importance.

4.1.1 Buildings

The built resources that symbolize or represent the national significance of Crysler Park include the buildings within Upper Canada Village, and the Aultsville Station, all of which are from the commemorated period (terminal date 1866). In general terms, the buildings have been carefully restored or reconstructed, based on historical research, and using construction techniques appropriate to the period under interpretation. It should be noted, however, that the construction techniques used are primarily those of the pre-industrial era, and so reflect a terminal date of the early 1840s. Construction technologies of the 1840-1866 period have not been emphasized so far.

It is beyond the scope of this report to evaluate the integrity of each structure; for this, readers are referred first to the appendices of the 1978 report "The Community Concept: Proposals and Implications", in which the individual buildings are described in detail. Further assessment of the buildings will be undertaken as part of the Conservation Plan for Crysler Park.

The buildings are valued for their:

- material heritage, as representatives of typical buildings types, styles and construction techniques from the commemorative period;
- direct association with the communities affected by the Seaway flooding (the "lost villages");
- associative relationships with the lives of the Upper Canadians in the period being commemorated; and
- educational content as representations of building designs and construction techniques from the commemorated period.

The built heritage will be unimpaired or not under threat when:

- a Conservation Plan has been prepared and adopted by the Commission, for all the heritage resources in Crysler Park, including all buildings. The plan should be produced by professional heritage consultants in association with Commission staff, interpretive staff, and community representatives, and follow internationally accepted conservation standard;

- the massing, form and fabric of the buildings which were moved to the site from their original locations is safeguarded and maintained by technical and professional experts utilizing internationally accepted conservation standards;
- a regular monitoring and maintenance program is in place for all the buildings, both those which have been relocated and those reconstructed in situ, as an integral part of the Conservation Plan;
- any additions, repairs or interventions to the fabric of these buildings respect the identified historic values of the site, and follow techniques specified by the maintenance program in the Conservation Plan;
- original fabric in need of replacement is replaced in kind;
- original structural and architectural details are safeguarded and maintained;
- the historical village model, as reflected in the original village plan, is respected in any future location or re-location of buildings; and
- all interventions, whether they be repairs or new construction, are based on the policies contained in the Conservation Plan, and are supported by thorough historical research.

4.1.2 The Cultural Landscape

The cultural landscape of the site includes both natural and built features visible on the landscape. (The significant buildings have been dealt with separately above, but memorials are discussed here.) The site was created in the late 1950s and has evolved since then, but the original plan of 1957 has been largely followed. The memorial sites are substantially intact and reflect early twentieth century Beaux-Arts design principles.

In Upper Canada Village, the intended period landscape character of an early 19th century village has been preserved and enhanced.

Viewscapes within the site and projecting out from it also make up a significant component of the Upper Canada Village and memorial site landscapes. Almost all of the views are intact from the original plan and support commemorative intent. In the case of the memorial sites, the landscape is arranged to focus on axial views of the memorials themselves and of the river; the Pioneer memorial is also sited on axis with the church steeple (within Upper Canada Village). In Upper Canada Village, the village layout and landscape buffers ensure that the views outward exclude elements of the current age, and maintain the illusion, for visitors and interpreters, of being in an early 19th century setting. However, views created more recently, such as those from the second storey of the mill, must be respected if the illusion of being within the commemorative period is to be maintained.

In addition to the viewscapes noted above, specific landscape features of the site linked to the commemorative intent of the memorials and to the commemorative time period of Upper Canada Village include:

- the Battlefield Memorial Mound;
- the Pioneer Memorial;
- the Loyalist Memorial; and
- the Mall (leading from the entrance to the Mound).

The cultural landscape of the heritage resources within Crysler Park is valued for its

- Beaux-Arts landscape design of the memorial sites;
- period (early and mid-nineteenth century) landscape design of Upper Canada, and the gardens, signage, walls, fencing, and site furnishing integral to that landscape;
- unobstructed axial views within and between the memorial sites (e.g. linking the Loyalist and Pioneer Memorials);
- unobstructed panoramic views within Upper Canada Village and outward to Ault Island and the St. Lawrence River; and
- buffered views of any adjacent development, so that the illusion of being within the commemorative period is maintained.

The cultural landscape of the site will be unimpaired or not under threat when:

- conservation of the cultural landscape is addressed by policies and guidelines included in the Conservation Plan prepared for all of the heritage resources in Crysler Park;
- the existing landscape character of the memorial sites and Upper Canada Village is preserved and enhanced;
- the axial views in and between memorial sites are unobstructed and are preserved as such;
- the panoramic views within and out from Upper Canada Village are unobstructed and incongruous elements outside the Village are screened from view in a natural or historical fashion;
- modern sounds, noise and odours from elements outside the Village are minimized so that the illusion of being within the commemorative period is maintained; and
- any proposed interventions or additions to the landscape follow the policies and guidelines specified in the Conservation Plan for Crysler Park.

4.3.1 Collections

The collections which symbolize or represent the national significance of the site include a range of historic objects including furnishings, clothing, tools, and equipment, as well as archival material, all of which have direct connections with the commemorative period. Also included are the ordnance pieces associated with the Battlefield Memorial.’

The existing (1994) Collections’ Policy for Upper Canada Village notes that, since 1955, the Village staff have collected and assembled artifacts which are representative of the material culture of late 18th century and early-to-mid 19th century Eastern Ontario. These artifacts number over 60,000 items, and many of them were donated to the Commission by families affected by the flooding. They thus have strong associative and sentimental value, above and beyond their inherent historical value, although some of them are from outside of the commemorative period of the Village. Also included in the collections since the founding of the Village have been the so-called “living collections”, which include livestock and horticultural specimens. But issues relating to the acquisition, use, care and disposition of these artifacts have been present since the beginning and have not been fully addressed. The Collections’ Policy is an attempt to do so, and the Commission is currently updating this policy to fill some of the gaps.

The present situation is as follows. Approximately 80% of the items are on display and 20% in storage. Unlike a museum setting, however, Upper Canada Village is not well suited to the care of artifacts. Some of the items on display are subject to occasional handling by interpretive staff and the public. Most of the display areas are within living museum settings and are thus not climate-controlled. Storage areas are similarly unsuitable, with only the basement of Chrysler Hall air-conditioned, and other storage areas having varying degrees of heat and/or dehumidification, mostly because they, too, are located in the basements of old buildings. As a result, almost no display or storage areas within Upper Canada Village fully meet the Provincial standards for preservation and management of collections. However, it is possible for the collections to be managed according to generally accepted standards for living history museums.

Of the collections, the most important are those which directly support the interpretation of the commemorative period. All original artifacts related to the commemorative period are of primary (national) importance, while artifacts from outside the commemorative period are of secondary importance. Also of secondary importance are all re-creations made according to craft techniques of the commemorative period.

The Chrysler Park collection is broken down into a variety of smaller collections, each within its own function. These collections include:

- curatorial/interpretive collections (the bulk of the collection, mostly furnishings and tools);
- education collection (items supporting themes outside the U.C.V. main interpretation plan);
- research library, archives and rare book collection (primary and secondary source material supporting curatorial/interpretive collection);
- collections relating to the history of U.C.V. (documents in the library and archives charting development of the Village);
- archaeological collections (artifacts uncovered during site development at U.C.V.);
- living collections (plants and livestock, some rare species); and
- railway collection (artifacts, rolling stock and memorabilia).

The Chrysler Park collection is valued for its:

- original artifacts;
- direct association with the commemorative period; and
- contribution to an understanding of the site.

The collections will unimpaired or not under threat when:

- the 1994 Collections' Policy is revised and updated to include an inventory and condition assessment of the collections plus detailed conservation guidelines following accepted standards for living history museums for exhibit handling and storage practices, and to be in concert with the goals and objectives of the Conservation Plan;
- the revised Collections' Policy has been integrated into the Conservation Plan and adopted by the Commission;
- as part of this Policy, those parts of the collections which are deemed to be under threat are given conservation treatment and storage facilities consistent with living history museum standards, as outlined in the revised Collections' Policy; and
- as part of this Policy, the collections are stored, documented and handled in a manner which is consistent with current standards and practices for living history museums.

5. Interpretation of Primary Resources

Messages of national significance are based on the reasons for which the site is commemorated. Visitors will understand these reasons if an effective interpretation program communicates the intended messages in a variety of ways.

Since the heritage resources of Crysler Park were specifically designed as educational tools, interpretation has always been an important part of the site's national significance. As discussed earlier, however, the interpretive message has evolved over the years, from the "vignette" approach with a terminal date of 1841 to a period approach with a terminal date of 1866.

The vignette approach was integral to the initial development of Upper Canada Village. In the beginning, the development team for Crysler Park showed their preferences for architectural and Loyalist themes in the layout of the Village and in proposals for site interpretation. These ideas were presented by Adamson to members of the Architectural Conservancy of Ontario (March 15, 1957):

"The purpose of the village is to conserve and memorialize some of the early cultural heritage of the valley. Part of this heritage is architectural. Present plans are limited to the period of Upper Canada only, which ended in 1841. After 1841, great technical changes took place which revised both the way of life and architectural style."

Subsequent changes to the interpretive policy shifted the emphasis to social history from material, and expanded the commemorative period to the 1860s. The Village has been designed in large part to support this modified approach. The single, consistent interpretive approach adopted by the Commission in 1987 should guide planning for both interpretation and development of the Village, and the implications of this approach for the future of the Village must be specified. The Conservation Plan is the logical place for such a policy discussion and development guidelines.

5.1 *Primary messages regarding the heritage values of Crysler Park are:*

- to commemorate nationally significant events, namely, a battle, the Upper Canada period of settlement, and the construction of the Seaway and the resultant dislocation of local people and their communities;
- to display and interpret the nineteenth century architectural, economic, political and social history of Eastern Ontario using buildings, landscapes, artifacts, reproductions and living history methods; and
- to note that Upper Canada Village was one of the first living history museums of its kind in Canada.

5.2 *Supporting messages*

- the lives of the early settlers, principally the United Empire Loyalists, but also including aboriginal peoples and settlers of other national origin;
- the importance of the St. Lawrence River as a "highway" to the interior of Canada; and
- that the commemorative and educational messages are conveyed within a beautiful setting.

5.3 *Learning objectives for primary and secondary messages*

Where and why Crysler Park was built requires an understanding of:

- the role of the Seaway in the reshaping of the riverside landscape and the relocation of existing communities;
- the role of the St. Lawrence River in the development of Canada;
- the Commission's objectives in developing Crysler Park and in so doing commemorating the battle site, the lives of the early settlers, and the sacrifices of the local communities for the Seaway construction;
- the foundation of the memorial sites and Upper Canada Village using buildings from Eastern Ontario, some relocated from flooded communities, and stocked with historic artifacts, some of which were donated by local people;
- the location of Crysler Park in proximity to the 1813 battleground;
- the design of Upper Canada Village based on American and European models, but pioneering the role of historians as leaders of the development team;
- the construction of Upper Canada Village, using traditional craft techniques based on historical research; and
- the subsequent establishment of Upper Canada Village as one of the premier living museums in the world.

6. Resources Representing Secondary Heritage Values

While the primary values of the site relate to its national significance and the consequent commemorative intent, Crysler Park has secondary values, both tangible and intangible, that contribute to its character and to the sense of wholeness that it possesses.

6.1 The Site

In terms of broad themes, secondary values associated with the Crysler Park site include:

- Crysler Park as the central component in the parks system of the St. Lawrence Parks Commission; and
- Crysler Park as thematically associated with Fort Henry and with other living museums across the country where the lives of the early pioneers are commemorated and where relocated buildings and artifacts are used as part of an interpretive program.

6.1.1 Buildings

The site contains buildings of secondary heritage value, including:

- all buildings which were constructed on site and were not existing historic buildings relocated from elsewhere;
- the residential buildings to the north of the Village; and
- the Guest House (although a relocated house, it is not included in the Village interpretation).

These buildings have secondary heritage value because:

- of their association with Upper Canada Village; and
- in most cases their incorporation of construction methods which are appropriate to the commemorative period.

These resources will be respected when:

- their heritage character is defined within the Conservation Plan; and
- their heritage character within the larger context of Crysler Park is thereafter safeguarded.

Buildings with minimal heritage value include all buildings not constructed to support the interpretive programs within Upper Canada Village:

- the Battlefield Memorial building;
- the entrance kiosk; and
- the Administration and Maintenance Buildings.

6.1.2 The Cultural Landscape

The parts of the Crysler Park landscape which are not within the commemorative period of Upper Canada Village, or are landscapes associated with the memorials, are considered to have secondary value. Also of secondary importance are the newer memorials which deal with themes other than those of the battle memorial, the Loyalist memorial and the Pioneer memorial. The Queen Elizabeth Gardens are also of secondary importance.

While these components of the cultural landscape have been added since the initial Park development in an attempt to enhance the Park, it is clear that some of them dilute the core commemorative messages and obscure aspects of the original design. The Conservation Plan for the Park heritage resources must address this issue by setting out priorities for the future of these components. It is possible that some newer memorials should be relocated, either on or off-site, and some of the gardens redesigned to reflect original design intent or to accommodate new uses. In any event, the Conservation Plan should clarify the purpose of these later additions and set out objectives for their future use.

The Crysler Park cultural landscape has secondary value for its:

- direct association with the memorial sites;
- its additional memorials; and
- newer gardens, such as the Queen Elizabeth Gardens.

The Crysler Park cultural landscape of secondary value will be respected when:

- guidelines for its development and maintenance are included within the Conservation Plan prepared for the Park heritage resources;
- the components which support the commemorative intent of the memorial sites are identified, and those which are of peripheral or minimal relevance to the core commemorative themes are relocated, as directed by the Conservation Plan; and
- the Park maintenance practices reflect the commemorative intent of the memorial sites, and follow procedures mandated in the Conservation Plan.

6.1.3 Collections

The parts of the Crysler Park (Upper Canada Village) collection which fall outside of the commemorative period or are not specifically linked to the site (such as railway memorabilia) are of secondary importance. Also of secondary importance may be artifacts which are duplicates of ones used to support interpretation of the commemorative period, or are in other ways superfluous to the site's interpretation.

Specific mention must be made of two portions of the collection which are of long standing but have been judged by Park staff to have minimal heritage value. These are the Aultsville Train (locomotive and rolling stock) and the tour train (narrow gauge locomotive and passenger cars, plus track). The former is an historic artifact from the local area, moved to the site at the time of the Seaway flooding. The latter is an introduction with no local or other heritage significance. The Aultsville train is not of the commemorative period of Upper Canada Village and cannot be used to support interpretive themes in the Village itself. Similarly, the tour train has no relevance to the Village and under no circumstances should its route be considered for potential extension into the Village.

Future options for these resources remain open, pending discussion of the overall development of Chrysler Park. For the purposes of this report, we are recommending that both railway components be considered within new development plans (see Part Two for development options).¹

The Chrysler Park collection has secondary value for its:

- association with donors who gave family possessions to the Commission as part of Upper Canada Village's development.

The Chrysler Park collection of secondary value will be respected when:

- an inventory and record of the holdings is maintained;
- its role in the future of the Park is determined by the objectives of the revised Collections' Policy, and by the principles of the Conservation Plan prepared for the Park heritage resources; and
- the parts of the collection which are retained are given appropriate conservation treatment and storage facilities.

6.2 Interpretation of Secondary Heritage Values

Messages about secondary heritage values focus on associations with the cultural resources which provide the primary heritage values, such as the founding of Chrysler Park. Important secondary messages include:

- the role of local people in the construction, maintenance and interpretation of the Park's heritage resources;
- the donations made by local people, principally of material possessions, but also of historical knowledge and documents;
- the continuing role of the Park as a key part of the local and regional economy;
- the continuing role of the Park as a site for the installation of new commemorative elements; and
- the consistent links in the Park between education and recreation, via commemoration and living history interpretation.

7.0 Conclusions and Next Steps

Crysler Park can accommodate major new development because, unlike a national historic site, it continues to evolve. Historic commemoration of the site's heritage resources began in 1923, when the Park was seen solely as a battlefield memorial. It has since evolved into a new park created from the Seaway development, and has added an expanded memorial site and Upper Canada Village. Since the official opening of the Village in 1961, the Park has become synonymous with Upper Canada Village, now an international 3-star attraction; other commemorative and recreational aspects of the Park have been overshadowed. Yet threats to the integrity and preservation of the Village threaten the whole. As a result, there is no option but to ensure that all future development is based on respect for the site's heritage values.

Crysler Park is now at the crossroads. If the Commission is able to build on the Park's strength – its heritage values – while addressing weaknesses and threats, then it can make full use of the opportunities for future development which are now possible within the mandate of the 1995 Corporate Plan.

The recommendations of this report are the first step in realizing these opportunities. The Commission has revised the Corporate Plan proposals for the site guided by the heritage values described here, and incorporated them into the revised Master Plan for Chrysler Park. The revised Plan and the development guidelines outlined here will form the basis for the detailed planning of development proposals.

Specifically, development of Chrysler Park needs:

- to use the Heritage Integrity Statement and its development proposals as the basis for immediate and medium-term development of revenue-generating uses;
- a Conservation Plan which incorporates and updates the Commission policies for interpretation, collections management and site maintenance, and provides conservation strategies and design guidelines; and
- to rebuild links with other heritage sites, with the regional tourist industry, and with the local community in general, so that all are able to directly participate in the conservation and enhancement of Chrysler Park.

Bibliography

- Adamson, Anthony, and Dryden and Smith (1957). A Report on a Plan for the Development of the main park in the system of the Ontario – St. Lawrence Development Commission. Morrisburg: Ontario – St. Lawrence Development Commission.
- American Association for State and Local History. “Upper Canada Village: St. Lawrence River Town”. *History News*. Vol. 20 – No. 4, April, 1965: pp.83-85.
- Auld, James A.C. (1961). *Remarks, February 15, 1961*. (Speech).
- Canadian Heritage (1994). *Parks Canada Guiding Principles and Operational Policies*. Ottawa: Ministry of Supply and Services (see especially the Cultural Resource Management Policy, pp.99-116).
- Canadian Heritage/Parks Canada (n.d.). *Guidelines for the Preparation of Commemorative Integrity Statement*. Ottawa: Canadian Heritage/Parks Canada.
- Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited (1993). *A Cultural Heritage Inventory for the Management Board Secretariat, Phase I: Cultural Heritage Protocol Process, Final Report*. Perth: Commonwealth Historic Resource Management Limited.
- Department of Commerce and Development (1961?). Excerpts from speech given by Hon. Leslie M. Frost, Q.C., Prime Minister of Ontario, at the opening of Upper Canada Village.
- Ernst & Young (1995?). *Corporate Plan 1996-2001: The St Lawrence Parks Corporation*. Toronto: Ernest & Young.
- Government of Ontario (n.d.). *St. Lawrence Parks Commission Act, R.S.O., 1990, Chapter S.24, as amended by S.O. 1993, Chapter 16, S.4*. Toronto: Queen’s Printer.
- Lynch, Kevin (1972). *What Time is this Place?*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.
- Martin, Ann (1989). *Loyal She Began... The Beginnings of Upper Canada Village*. Unpublished paper, History Department, University of Waterloo. Waterloo: University of Waterloo.
- Ontario Historical Society (1956). “The Ontario Historical Society and the Preservation of Historic Values of the St. Lawrence Seaway Area”. *Ontario History*. Volume XLVIII, Number 2, pp. 81-85.
- Parks Canada (1996). *Fort Henry National Historic Site Commemorative Integrity Statement*. Draft, October 1, 1996. Cornwall: Parks Canada.
- Parks Canada (1996). *Rideau Canal National Historic Site Commemorative Integrity Statement*. Draft, May 31, 1996. Cornwall: Parks Canada.
- Patterson, William J. (1981). *Upper Canada Village*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.
- Porter, C.J.B.L., Pietersma, H. (1978). *The Community Concept: Proposals and Implications*. (Staff report, The St. Lawrence Parks Commission).
- The Ontario – St. Lawrence Development Commission (1962). *Report to December 31, 1961*. Morrisburg: The Ontario – St. Lawrence Development Commission.
- The St. Lawrence Parks Commission (1994). *Upper Canada Village Collections’ Management Policy*. Morrisburg: The St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

The St. Lawrence Parks Commission

- (n.d.). *Down The Front: The Story of the Mighty St. Lawrence River*. (Visitor's pamphlet, ca. 1990s).
 - (n.d.). *Pioneer Memorial: A Monument of History and a Tribute the "Lost Villages"*. (Visitor's pamphlet, ca 1990s).
 - (n.d.). *Upper Canada Village: "Ontario's Living Heritage"*. (Visitor's guidebook, ca. 1960s).
 - (n.d.). *Upper Canada Village: "Ontario's Living Heritage"*. (Visitor's guidebook, ca 1970s).
 - (n.d.). *Upper Canada Village: A Living Story*. (Visitor's guidebook, ca 1980s).
- The St. Lawrence Parks Commission (1993). *Waterfront Development at Upper Canada Village: Preliminary Management Plan*. Morrisburg: The St. Lawrence Parks Commission.

Thomson, Gary (1988). *Village Life in Upper Canada*. Belleville: Mico Publishing.

Upper Canada Village (n.d.). *Upper Canada Village, a Rural Riverfront Community Located in the Upper St. Lawrence Valley During the 1860's (sic): A Guide to Interpreting the Village*. (Staff report: guide for seasonal interpretive staff).

Upper Canada Village Historic Sites (1987). *5 Year Plan Presentation*. (Staff report, The St. Lawrence Parks Commission).

Way, Beryl W. "Upper Canada Village". *Canadian Geographical Journal*. Vol. LXII, No. 6. June 1961: pp. 218-233.

Way, Ronald L. "The Day of Crysler's Farm". *Canadian Geographical Journal*. Vol. LXII, No. 6. June 1961: pp. 185-217.

