

The Fortress of Louisbourg Archives: The First Twenty-Five Years

by **ERIC KRAUSE**

In the late 1950s, unemployment in the mines of Cape Breton rose dramatically as coal sales throughout Canada plummeted. The federal government therefore appointed the Honourable Ivan C. Rand as a one-man Royal Commission to produce specific measures for alleviating the crisis. One of Judge Rand's requests was that the Historic Sites Division of the National Parks Branch of the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources prepare a feasibility study for the restoration of historic Louisbourg, once the largest French fortress and naval base in North America, and a major focus for trade and the cod fishery.¹

Construction of the fortified town of Louisbourg began in 1719 and continued until its capture by New England and British forces in 1745. Returned to the French in 1748 by the Treaty of Aix-la-Chapelle, the fortress was recaptured by the British army under the command of Brigadier General James Wolfe and Major General Jeffrey Amherst in 1758 and systematically demolished in 1760 to prevent a French return.

In February 1960, the Engineering Services Division of the Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources issued a detailed report recommending that the restoration of the Fortress of Louisbourg and surrounding historically significant areas should be phased in over a twenty-year period at a cost of \$40 million, of which \$2 million was to be earmarked for archaeological and historical research by an information-gathering research team.² In August 1960, not long after receiving the Department of Northern Affairs' submission, Judge Rand issued his diagnosis of the plight of Cape Breton: the island's dependency upon coal mining was the reason for the region's unique socio-financial problems.³ To correct this, Rand urged the introduction to the island of new wealth and a new intellectual and spiritual awareness, through a variety of "alternative and supporting economic and cultural activities."⁴ "What," he asked, "could be more stimulating to the imagination or instructive to the mind, not only for the people of Cape Breton and Nova Scotia, but of Canada and the Eastern portions of the United States," than a partial reconstruction of the fortress as "a revelation of European life and ... of the vicissitudes of North America's development?"⁵

Rand's vision of a symbolic or partial reconstruction was a far cry from the complete restoration which the Department of Northern Affairs had recommended just six months earlier. Nevertheless, his suggestion to expend no less than \$1.5 million during each of the

following 15 to 20 years was still imposing.⁶ On 3 March 1961, the federal cabinet directed that the Department of Northern Affairs expend \$1.1 million before 31 March 1962 on a "crash" programme to begin the process of tooling up and stockpiling materials.⁷ Shortly thereafter, on 17 June 1961, Prime Minister John G. Diefenbaker rose in the House of Commons to announce the massive undertaking.⁸ Finally, on 20 March 1962, the Cabinet decided that Louisbourg was to be a twelve-year, \$12 million project that was to produce a substantial showing for Centennial year, 1967.⁹

On 9 November 1961, the Department signed a contract with Mr. and Mrs. Ronald Way as General Consultants to "advise the Director as to the overall and detailed means to be taken for a partial restoration of the Fortress of Louisbourg, ... as accurate as possible from an archaeological and historical viewpoint."¹⁰ An Ottawa-based Research Director was to make available all historical and archaeological data and reports required to meet this goal.¹¹ From the inception of the project, therefore, authenticity was clearly to be the engine for driving the rebuilding programme at Louisbourg, and primary evidence, both archaeological and documentary, the fuel. The appointments of F.J. Thorpe as Research Director and of B.C. Bickerton as Senior Historian were evidence of a firm commitment to "identify and collect as soon as possible all manuscript materials required for the restoration."¹²

The final scope and magnitude of the Louisbourg project was without precedent in Canada. Ultimately, sixteen acres or one-quarter of the original townsite would be developed. Included in the undertaking would be the reconstruction of 2.72 kilometers of perimeter fortification walls, 50 buildings, 2 bastions, 2 town gates, several wharfs, and the landscaping of 5 town blocks.

It is puzzling that despite the very substantial commitment of the Canadian nation to a large-scale project that was to be unique in the annals of reconstruction, and despite the very commendable commitment to authenticity, based in large measure on historical research, no consideration was given to the immediate creation of an archives for the secure storage, organization, and retrieval of vital documentary information. Apart from a strong lobby for a "librarian-cum-file clerk" by Ronald Way, the General Consultant, all reports of the period ignored the need to provide suitable arrangement for the proper care and dissemination of project research documentation.¹³ Strong evolutionary forces were nevertheless present to ensure the growth of a project archives. Researchers on the project immediately initiated the process of identifying and acquiring relevant historical documentation. Its rapidly accumulating bulk impelled them to analyze, describe, and classify their holdings and forced them to begin to think in terms of providing reference service for project historians and others. The need for archival staff gradually came to be accepted; holdings were centralized and consolidated; reference systems were constructed. As the project began to generate its own documentation — research reports, plans, administrative files — the archives increasingly assumed the function of institutional archives as well as research centre. Thus changing needs and perceptions led to an evolution from the simple notion of documentation as historians' research notes to the creation of a fully operational project archives. This transformation, however, would require time, and the initial focus was almost entirely upon the task of acquiring relevant historical documentation.

Until May 1966, the Historical Unit, including the Research Director, the Senior Historian, and the project documentation researchers would remain in Ottawa, to be as close as possible to major libraries and in particular to its prime source of information, the

Public (now National) Archives of Canada.¹⁴ The understanding was that the work of the Historical Research group might eventually move to Louisbourg.¹⁵ From its headquarters location the unit concentrated on “the gathering of material on all subjects related to the History of Louisbourg for later analysis,” including the reproduction of all the relevant documents in the Public Archives of Canada.

A 1960 departmental report lamented the fact that although there already existed a considerable number of original eighteenth-century Louisbourg sources providing general information on “the main character of most of the public buildings and their interior divisions,” many details were missing. Nonetheless, the report went on to speculate about new sources which might yet provide the building, landscaping, furnishing, shipbuilding, and socio-political-military details needed to produce an authentic representation of Louisbourg. Among these potential sources, archaeological findings and the observable features of extant buildings figured as the most promising, together with eighteenth-century manuscript materials dealing directly with Louisbourg, such as the French government’s records in the *Archives des Colonies*, Series E, G2 and G3.¹⁶ The report also recognized both the value of “not yet seen” documents supposedly in the *Archives des Colonies*, Series C11B, as well as the potential of “partly known sources” in Europe and in New England.¹⁷

In September 1961, prior to signing his contract as General Consultant to the restoration programme, Ronald Way submitted an initial report urging that “manuscript research ... [should] begin as soon as personnel [were] acquired” with the “assembling and co-relating [sic] [of] all manuscript material available in Canada,” then move on to an “investigation of all available material in England, France and New England.”¹⁸ Foreign research was necessary, according to Way, because it was his experience that the Public Archives of Canada rarely transcribed all the “relevant plans for a particular project,” since that institution was, understandably, less concerned with minute details than was a project devoted to authentic restoration.¹⁹ Furthermore, such documentary research should continue over the years, its emphases being controlled by the stages of work in hand and its pace sufficiently in advance of construction to avoid difficulties, errors, and unnecessary expense.²⁰

The primary records in the archives of France, Great Britain, and the United States which required long-term original research in the earliest days of the Louisbourg project fell into two broad categories: administrative, touching directly upon Louisbourg affairs for the period 1713-1758, and military, resulting from the successful New England Expedition of 1745. Way provided the names of researchers already stationed in Ottawa for a proposed fast survey of available primary manuscript sources known to exist in the various archives of Paris and London. In addition, they were to delve into published, secondary sources whenever possible.²¹

In the spring of 1962, the first survey team, consisting of F.J. Thorpe and J.R. McCartney, travelled to Paris and London, where they quickly confirmed Way’s assertion that the transcription and microfilming programmes of the Public Archives of Canada had indeed missed a rich harvest of Louisbourg materials, particularly in the area of maps and plans. Thorpe initiated the photographic duplication of urgently required documents. The archives of the newly formed Historical Research Section at Ottawa was not only to maintain the accumulated resources for research purposes but also to send copies to Louisbourg for the Project Manager in charge of construction.²²

Soon after his appointment in July 1962 as Research Director of both historical and archaeological research, Thorpe began the process of presenting the findings to Way. Not surprisingly, the Historical Research Section had initiated its programme by examining the existing French series at the Public Archives of Canada.²³ Then, in order "to reconcile historical research with the projected archaeological and reconstruction projects," Thorpe, along with Bickerton, the newly-appointed Senior Historian, decided to tie the examination of this French series (*Archives des Colonies* B, C11B, C11C, etc.), along with its English counterpart, to the pace of the project by grouping the sources in broad categories and then studying them in a predetermined sequence.²⁴ The Research Section then searched a variety of published guides and bibliographies of Louisbourg manuscripts existing in the United States, and in January 1963 signed a contract with Dr. M.C. Rosenfield for a survey of New England archives, libraries, and society repositories.²⁵ Together with Bickerton, Rosenfield examined material in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Connecticut, Maine, New Hampshire, and the Library of Congress, looking for documents which should be microfilmed.²⁶ Although this new material contributed little to the project's knowledge of construction history, it was nevertheless invaluable, providing many new insights into the 1745 campaign, its supply, organization, and political background.²⁷

Thorpe realized that the large amount of data being gathered was beginning to create a "serious problem of classification, recording, filing and retrieval" which threatened to slow down the pace of report production for the project.²⁸ No doubt too, he recognized that the results of his forthcoming survey/research trip to France, Belgium, and the United Kingdom, as well as that of Research Officer B.A. Pothier, who was about to spend nine months on documentary research in Paris and the French provinces, might serve only to intensify the problem.²⁹ Thorpe maximized the potential of these trips to add new knowledge while reducing the danger of information overload by restricting the search to manuscript materials not already at the Public Archives of Canada and by selecting for microfilming only those documents which met current research goals.³⁰

By 1963, the Research Section was actually engaged in two distinct types of research activities, each making a major contribution to the evolution of a Louisbourg archives.³¹ The first was the activity of "search," involving the identification, collection, usually by a photographic process, and the general indexing of relevant documents.³² The second was the process of "analysis," the indexing of accumulated material point by point and its classification by subject according to the broad categories and order of importance enunciated in 1962.³³ While the immensity of the task ultimately postponed the completion of classification, the final analytical step remained the work of producing a report in a form useful to the project.³⁴ By 1963, the Ottawa research staff began to refer to its acquired documentation as forming an archives.³⁵

Although the Section had now admitted to the existence of a project archives, it did not immediately appoint personnel from its own research staff to operate it. No doubt this lack of direct action resulted from the difficult deadlines and heavy work loads the staff were encountering in the process of collection and analysis. Instead, Thorpe decided to advertise for an "archivist-librarian ... to work initially in Ottawa and then to move to Louisbourg when the whole research section is combined there."³⁶ The strategy was that the "historical unit under Mr. B.C. Bickerton ... [would remain] responsible for the collection of copies of manuscript material, chiefly on microfilm ... [but these copies will come into the librarian's] general custody eventually."³⁷

The possibility of an immediate move to Louisbourg also prompted some discussion about the size of the archival collection, its nature, and its storage. For example, “with instructions [in 1962] to move to Louisbourg, it became necessary to organize a vast copying operation which would permit us to have in our Louisbourg archives all the documents we would require for future use.”³⁸ By August 1963, that meant 32,000 pages of documents on microfilm, another 2,000 in larger photocopied format, and numerous cards containing extracted information.³⁹

On 12 November 1963, E.M.A. Riley became archivist-librarian. Shortly thereafter, Thorpe proposed the creation of the position of research clerk “to draw and put away research documents, maps and plans, and reports, being used by research director, historians, archaeologists, conservator, etc.”⁴⁰ However, as late as September of 1964, Thorpe had not yet filled the position.⁴¹ Early in 1964, there was “a fair amount of discussion on the subject of the development of an historical and archaeological research centre at the Fortress of Louisbourg after the main construction work ha[d] been completed ... because there ... [would] be in the Louisbourg Library a vast amount of research material collected from Canada, the United States, England and France.”⁴² Asked for his views, Way reported that “divorcing the library and archival material from the archaeological findings would do much to destroy the effectiveness of the Louisbourg research centre ... I doubt there would be much point to the research centre *without* the library.”⁴³

It was inevitable that the House of Commons would discuss the restoration work on several occasions. For example, on 13 October 1964, M.P. Douglas Fisher asked:

What are the plans for the establishment of an archives and library at Louisbourg, Nova Scotia, including an estimated cost, the estimated space proposed, the number of books and documents to be housed, the scale and qualifications of the staff, the number of exhibition cases and tables, the kind of provisions made for the use of scholars and the structure of the management in relation to other Government departments?

The government’s reply was as follows:

There are no definite plans for the establishment of an archives and library for the use of scholars at Louisbourg during the restoration phase, although such a project has been suggested as a possible desirable development subsequent to reconstruction. Any eventual implementation of this proposal is so far in the future that no detailed estimates of cost, space required, staff, etc. have yet been considered. What books, plans and documents have already been acquired were secured solely to assist in the production of a valid restoration.⁴⁴

This answer might appear evasive in light of the longstanding intention to move the Historical Section to Louisbourg. Meanwhile, in 1964, rumours had begun to circulate in Ottawa that if the Section remained yet another year in the capital city, the research library, archives, and map collection would be in danger of transfer to a central branch library because of space problems.⁴⁵ Estimates were that the growing archival research collection would require 600 square feet of floor space.⁴⁶ Late in 1963, Thorpe and Bickerton argued most convincingly that the restoration could not progress unless archival research was accelerated by means of a substantial staff increase.⁴⁷ In January

1964, Wayne Foster and Chris E. Thomas surveyed the holdings of the Nova Scotia Archives; in June, Pothier went to New Hampshire and Vermont; then, beginning in July and October respectively, Julian Gwyn in England and Louise Miville-Dechêne in France embarked upon fresh collection sorties into the archives of Europe.⁴⁸

It was also in 1964 that C.G. Lucas was appointed as Archivist and Acting Collections Historian in the Research Section, marking the assignment of archival duties to the full-time attention of a single individual.⁴⁹ Subsequently, in 1965 Lucas undertook a fresh American collection trip to the William Clements Library in Michigan, the City of New York, and a number of New England societies and libraries.⁵⁰ In September 1965, he issued the project's first comprehensive inventory of its archival holdings, a forty-two page report which provided brief descriptions of the collections and also noted the policies that had been followed in gathering and reproducing material.⁵¹

Some time in late 1965 or early 1966, the department finally set the spring of 1966 as the date for the transfer of the Research Section.⁵² Unfortunately, only one staff member in Ottawa, Blaine Adams, decided to move to Louisbourg, while the others sought employment elsewhere. Adams arrived in Louisbourg as "Custodian of the archives and maps" on 16 May 1966. His immediate work was to reconstitute the archival and library collections from Ottawa and to organize the books and periodicals that were already in Louisbourg.⁵³ In addition to his duties as Administrative Historian, he was to be responsible for the security, operation, and supervision of the library and its staff, the purchase of books and archival materials, the proper deposition of reports in the project's vault, and the "manuscript and cartographic holdings and other historic material" of the archives.⁵⁴

The material from Ottawa that Adams was to sort and organize consisted of 250 reels of microfilm and 43 boxes of photocopied documents from the archives of France, England, the United States, and Canada.⁵⁵ Another 181 reels of negative microfilm still at headquarters would be transferred to the Public Archives Records Centre in Ottawa, and would not be sent to Louisbourg until 1968.⁵⁶ In addition, he received a number of bound guides as well as 36 drawers of index cards required for locating information and 527 maps and plans relating to Louisbourg.⁵⁷ So extensive was this collection that, according to Lucas, failure to read his inventory would result in a researcher becoming "quite lost in a maze of drawers, boxes and cabinets whose contents ... [would] remain a mystery to him."⁵⁸

In the summer of 1967, Adams left his dual administrative-archivist position.⁵⁹ He emphasized on his departure that there should be an evaluation of the archives, keeping in mind the possibilities of reorganization, systemization and additional indexing in order to lead researchers to possible sources of information.⁶⁰ Making the matter even more urgent were two factors indicating that the collection had still considerable potential for growth. First, Dilys Francis, a researcher, had, during 1965 and 1966, conducted a survey of remaining sources in England, and had enumerated a wide variety of manuscript documents which the Research Section should acquire.⁶¹ Second, sections such as Engineering or Interpretation were producing a growing body of research-like data, including architectural drawings, background studies and photographs designed to meet their own particular in-house project requirements.⁶² Circulation controls were loose, however, and some began to express concern that there would be a loss of important data unless there was a tightening up of procedures.⁶³

There being no immediate replacement of Adams as archivist, once again there was “no one who ... [was] sufficiently familiar with the archives ... able to direct the others to possible sources of information.”⁶⁴ Yet the necessity for proper archival control was becoming increasingly critical in view of the collection’s obvious potential for growth. A report by Adams himself in 1967 stressed that there was still plenty of Louisbourg material in the provinces of France.⁶⁵ In the same year, too, Superintendent John Lunn pointed out that keen appreciation of the holdings of the archives would be essential to produce the historical reports necessary to Louisbourg’s interpretive programme.⁶⁶ Meanwhile, the research staff continued to amass numerous copies of documents.⁶⁷

Shortly after his arrival in 1968, the project’s new Research Director, John Fortier, addressed the problem directly:

One of the two positions urgently required by Research is that of Archivist. It is inconceivable that a Project of our magnitude should not have someone to organize our archives and continue to search for source material in other repositories. This position was filled while the History Unit was in Ottawa, but it has been vacant since early 1966 [actually 1967]. The understandable inability of our present staff to organize our archival holdings at the same time as they use them is a serious liability to our operations and a cause of much duplicated effort.⁶⁸

As a result of Fortier’s lobbying, Paul Rose began work as contract archivist on 25 November 1968.⁶⁹ His *Guide to the Louisbourg Archives: A Preliminary Inventory of Holdings*, published in February 1970, included all the previously mentioned records copied from the archives and/or historical societies of France, Great Britain, the United States, and Canada; information found in both contemporary and modern periodicals, newspapers, pamphlets, maps and photographs; additional material produced by the work of follow-up research trips such as that of Peter Bower to Massachusetts in 1967-68 and fresh documentation resulting from new discovery trips such as those of Nicole Durand and H. Paul Thibault to the Province of Quebec in 1969.⁷⁰ Rose also included inventories of the map collection and a number of original compilations in reader-printed, bound, and file box formats.

When Rose conducted his survey of the holdings at the Fortress, the Louisbourg Archives was responsible only for the deposits made by the Research Section. As a result, most of the material it was protecting consisted of eighteenth-century manuscripts reproduced on microfilm, a medium which reflected the Research Section’s pioneering use of film in the 1960s as a relatively inexpensive and rapid means of copying selected documentation.⁷¹ Microfilming was also a procedure that did not require large teams of researchers abroad as would have been the case with the more traditional time-consuming method of manual recording and indexing of material.⁷²

After Rose left the project, his replacement, Gilles Proulx, undertook to produce an enhanced, descriptive inventory of the map collection and to create a new architectural reference collection by assimilating non-Louisbourg plans, photos, and drawings which staff had been hoarding in their offices as a result of confusing “organization with physical location.”⁷³ As Fortier pointed out, the archivist, rather than individuals exercising rights of possession, was the appropriate person to organize architectural drawings as a normal part of his job function.⁷⁴ His comments, however, reveal that project personnel did not

yet regard the archives as the proper deposit and retrieval agency for all of the Louisbourg research materials.

The next people from the project to examine European holdings were researchers John and Brenda Dunn, who went to England in 1970, and graphics supervisor Paul Jeddrie, sent to France in 1972.⁷⁵ The purpose of the Dunns' trip was to review newly discovered material at the Public Record Office. The result of Jeddrie's expedition was to update substantially the project's historical Map and Plan Collection, and to confirm that between 30 and 40 per cent "of the relevant maps and plans, and doubtless a similar proportion of the documents, have never been seen on this side of the Atlantic ... missed in the [major] copying efforts that were suspended in 1966."⁷⁶ As a result of Jeddrie's work and of a service contract with Raymonde Litalien, Proulx flew to France in 1974 to extend the project's archival holdings.⁷⁷

Up to this time, the Fortress had emphasized "research, Re-construction and the Administration of the Project."⁷⁸ However, the Fortress was beginning to move from a reconstruction project to the status of an operational park of National Historic Site significance. This future role was particularly apparent in light of plans for an accelerated park interpretive programme.⁷⁹ As this changed purpose gained momentum, support grew for an operational organization that included a permanent archival component. In 1973, a Louisbourg Task Force recognized that the size of both the documentary and artefactual collections made them "the most important repository of 18th century culture outside France itself," and concluded that "a continued small archaeological/historical establishment" at Louisbourg was virtually inevitable.⁸⁰ As a result, the Task Force recommended the creation of one permanent archivist/librarian position.⁸¹

Proulx left the project in 1975, and Eric Krause unofficially assumed responsibility for the day-to-day operation of the archives in addition to his regular duties as historian.⁸² Later, in February 1977, one result of the "growing awareness of the conservation maintenance requirements of the project" and future operational park was the proposal to create the permanent position of Historical Records Supervisor, with a support staff consisting of one librarian/archives technician and, later, one part-time archives clerk to deal exclusively with the extensive photo collection.⁸³ Appointed in an acting capacity in 1977, Krause became Historical Records Supervisor on 6 June 1978.⁸⁴

In 1982, the Fortress of Louisbourg became a fully operational National Historic Park. Final development costs had escalated from the original allotment of \$12 million in 1962 to \$26 million in 1982. The estimated book value of the reconstruction was \$45 million.⁸⁵ This change from fortress reconstruction project to National Historic Sites park enhanced the value and image of the Louisbourg archives for a number of reasons. The early 1980s witnessed a tremendous expansion of the programme of interpreted authenticity, as well as a recognition of the financial and ethical obligation inherent in the faithful maintenance of reconstructed buildings, properties, streets, and military features. As a result, such programmes increasingly began to turn to the archives for information, and in return, the archives came to be more generally regarded as the safe place where sections like Exhibits, Engineering and Works, and a revamped multi-disciplinary Historical Resources Section could store their valuable documents for future recall. Beginning in 1983, a five-year programme of acquisition, description, and conservation intensified the movement of this type of documentation from all sections to the archives.⁸⁶

By 1984, the archives was directly responsible for a collection estimated at 3,000 cubic feet.⁸⁷ Because of the limited space available, additional deposits were accepted on an as-needed basis rather than according to any predetermined systematic schedule. As a result, an even larger physical collection, including the extensive reconstruction drawings collection, remained outside archival protection, conservation, or control. In 1988, the state of this outside material remains much the same as it did in 1984, although a recent increase in the physical size of the archives has allowed for some major new deposits from sections other than Research.⁸⁸ So large and so important was the Historical Records Collection to the various park programmes that the archives was able to convince the department of the need to purchase a computer for the creation of "an archival/library catalogue data base to meet operational maintenance, research and interpretive demands from within and without the park, including other National Parks and Historic Sites."⁸⁹ The extent of the collection which will ultimately form this data bank is indicated by the archives' manually produced descriptive entries which, in 1984, inventoried some 54,000 negatives and transparencies, 6,100 photoprints, a variety of documents including an approximate 750,000 pages on microfilm, 150,000 genealogical name cards, and 4,900 picture file cards.⁹⁰

Since 1961, the archives has followed a shifting path in its growth to meet the changing goals, first of a reconstruction project and now of an operational historic park. The research sortie which Proulx had undertaken in 1974 was to be followed by others, including those of A.J.B. Johnson to Montreal and Quebec in 1979; of Ken Donovan to Massachusetts and Montreal in 1980; and of Johnson to France in 1985.⁹¹ Given the range of unexplored documentation, the future will undoubtedly witness yet further trips. Just as certainly, the archives will continue to accept important new depositions of internally-generated records, such as the central registry files and structural design team minutes of the Fortress, both of which contain historical information critical to the success of Louisbourg's authenticity-oriented interpretive and maintenance programmes. The archives serves not only as a repository of the memory of those who originally built and inhabited Louisbourg, but also as guardian of the records which document an endeavour unique in the annals of historical reconstruction.

Notes

- 1 I.C. Rand, *Report of Royal Commission on Coal* (Ottawa, 1960), pp. ix, 74, Appendix G.
- 2 G.L. Scott *et al.*, "A Plan for the Restoration of the Fortress of Louisbourg and the Area Surrounding the Fortress which has Historical Significance," unpublished report PD-34 (Ottawa, 1960), pp. 2, 33-34. See also, Fortress of Louisbourg (hereafter FL), Record Box 6/7, Anon., "Material in Ottawa Relating to the Fortress and Town of Louisbourg, Preliminary Inventory — April 1961," n.d.
- 3 Rand, *Report*, p. 46.
- 4 *Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.
- 5 *Ibid.*, p. 47.
- 6 *Ibid.*, p. 53.
- 7 R.G. Glencross, September 1963, quoted in "Interpreting 18th Century Louisbourg: A Compilation," unpublished report PD-34 (FL, 1985-86), n.p.
- 8 *Hansard*, 17 June 1961, p. 6481.
- 9 Glencross, September 1963, in "Interpreting."
- 10 FL, Central Registry, file 50, E.A. Côté, 27 October 1961.
- 11 *Ibid.*
- 12 B.C. Bickerton to Research Director, 13 May 1963, quoted in "Progress Reports," unpublished report PD-7 (FL, n.d.)

- 13 Ronald L. Way to J.R. Coleman, 10 August 1961, quoted in "Recommendations Concerning the Louisbourg Restoration Project," unpublished report R-6 (FL, 1961), p. 4; R.G. Glencross, "Fortress of Louisbourg Restoration Project Documentation," unpublished report R-6 (FL, 1961), p. 16.
- 14 FL, Central Registry, file 36, Blaine Adams, 2 June 1966; Way to Coleman, 7 May 1964.
- 15 FL, Work/Research Files, John Lunn Files, file R-2, Competition Posters, 61-2428, 61-499, and 61-500, n.d.
- 16 Department of Northern Affairs and Natural Resources, National Parks Branch, "Fortress of Louisbourg: Historical Background," unpublished report R-17 (Ottawa, 1960), pp. i-iii.
- 17 *Ibid.*, p. iv.
- 18 Way, "Recommendations," p. 22.
- 19 *Ibid.*, Ronald L. Way, "Research — Fortress of Louisbourg Restoration," unpublished report H-H1 (FL, 1962), p. 3.
- 20 Way, "Recommendations," pp. 27-29, 31, Appendix A, p. 2; Way, "Research," p. 5.
- 21 Way, "Research," pp. 3, 5, 7.
- 22 FL, Central Registry, file 22/3-M1, A.D. Perry to the Director, August 1962; *ibid.*, file 325-5, A.D. Perry to F.J. Thorpe, 24 September 1962.
- 23 FL, Work/Research Files, History files, David Perry to F.J. Thorpe, 13 July 1962; FL, Central Registry, file 288, F.J. Thorpe to A.D. Perry, 1 October 1962; F.J. Thorpe, 31 October 1962, quoted in "Progress Reports."
- 24 *Ibid.*, F.J. Thorpe to A.D. Perry, 7 December 1962; *ibid.*, B.C. Bickerton to Research Director, 13 May 1963.
- 25 James R. McCartney, "Reports on Manuscripts Pertaining to Louisbourg in the United States," unpublished report H-H49 (FL, 1963), pp. 1-21; F.J. Thorpe, 4 February 1963, quoted in "Progress Reports."
- 26 F.J. Thorpe, 25 October 1963, quoted in "Progress Reports;" F.J. Thorpe, "Research Report for July, 1963," n.d.
- 27 FL, Record Box 6/24, M.C. Rosenfield, "Research Report of New England Archives," ca. January 1964.
- 28 F.J. Thorpe, 4 February 1963, quoted in "Progress Reports."
- 29 R.G. Robertson to N.A. Robertson, 4 March 1963, quoted in "Interpreting;" FL, Record Box 5/14, Bernard Pothier to B.C. Bickerton, 9 January 1964.
- 30 FL, Central Registry, file France: Correspondence on Trip; F.J. Thorpe to Director, 5 March 1963; Bickerton to same, 13 May 1963; Pothier to same, 9 January 1964.
- 31 FL, Central Registry, file 36, F.J. Thorpe to A.D. Perry, 11 June 1963; see also B.C. Bickerton to A.D. Perry, 3 June 1963, quoted in "Progress Reports."
- 32 Central Registry, Thorpe to Perry, 11 June 1963.
- 33 *Ibid.*
- 34 Bickerton, 3 June 1963 in "Progress Reports."
- 35 FL, Central Registry, file 36, F.J. Thorpe to A.D. Perry, 24 June 1963.
- 36 FL, Record Box 8/73, F.J. Thorpe to William H. Whitely, 11 January 1963; *ibid.*, F.J. Thorpe to Alberta Letts, 28 January 1963.
- 37 *Ibid.*, F.J. Thorpe to Miss A. Riley, 12 November 1963.
- 38 FL, Record Box 10/30, F.J. Thorpe to A.J. Reeve, 26 August, 1963.
- 39 *Ibid.*
- 40 FL, Central Registry, file 36, F.J. Thorpe to A.D. Perry, 29 November 1963.
- 41 FL, Record Box 8/77, A.D. Perry to the Senior Historian, 25 August 1964; FL, Record Box 9/47, B.C. Bickerton to B. Payette, 10 June 1964.
- 42 FL, Record Box 10/30, J.R. Coleman to A.D. Perry, 24 June 1964.
- 43 *Ibid.*, Ronald L. Way to A.D. Perry, 8 October 1964.
- 44 FL, Central Registry, file 36, A.D. Perry to the Director, 16 October 1964.
- 45 *Ibid.*, A.D. Perry to Acting Research Director, 29 October 1964.
- 46 *Ibid.*, B.C. Bickerton to Mr. Nicol, 30 October 1964.
- 47 FL, Central Registry, file 36, F.J. Thorpe to A.D. Perry, 29 November 1963; B.C. Bickerton to Research Director, "Overseas Collection Program," unpublished report H-H4 (FL, 1965), p. 6.
- 48 FL, Record Box 6/6, Wendy Stevenson, 16 December 1963; *ibid.*, 6/7, Chris E. Thomas to Mr. Bickerton, 10 January 1964; *ibid.*, 6/24, B.A. Pothier to B.C. Bickerton, 22 June 1964; FL, Central Registry, file 32-51, B.C. Bickerton to Mr. Perry, 13 January 1965; FL, Ottawa Files, file Progress Report, Ronald L. Way to Project Manager, 23 June 1964; FL, Central Registry, file 51 (sub), Ronald L. Way to Project Manager, 14 April 1965; FL, Record Box 5/14, Louise Dechêne, 25 July 1965.

- 49 Perry, 16 October 1964 and 27 October 1964; FL, Record Box 8/77, "Regulations" [6 November 1964].
- 50 FL, Record Box 8/77, Glen Lucas, July-August 1965; B.C. Bickerton to Ronald L. Way, 4 May 1965, quoted in "Interpreting."
- 51 G. Lucas, "Preliminary Inventory of Holdings — Archives Louisbourg," unpublished report H-H5 (FL, 1965), pp. [1-42].
- 52 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit Files, R.P. Malis to Director, 5 January 1966; *ibid.*, B.C. Bickerton to Staff, 24 January 1966.
- 53 Adams, 2 June 1966.
- 54 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, Ronald L. Way to Blaine Adams, 27 June 1966; see also *ibid.*, Ronald L. Way to Blaine Adams, 7 October 1966; *ibid.*, Blaine Adams to Park Superintendent, 4 April 1967.
- 55 FL, Central Registry, file 5 (sub) programming, John Lunn to Director, 14 October 1966.
- 56 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, L. LaClare to Blaine Adams, 25 October 1966; *ibid.*, Peter Bureau to R.S. Gordon, 4 April 1968 and 24 May 1968.
- 57 Lunn, 14 October 1966.
- 58 Lucas, "Preliminary Inventory," foreword.
- 59 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, Blaine Adams to Park Superintendent, 4 April 1967.
- 60 *Ibid.*, FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, Linda Hoad to Park Superintendent, 16 August 1967; *ibid.*, Peter Bower to John Lunn, [1967].
- 61 FL, Record Box 6/26, Dily Francis, 29 September 1966.
- 62 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, Blaine Adams to File, 8 July 1966.
- 63 *Ibid.*, John Lunn to Section Heads, 17 November 1966; FL, Central Registry, file 22/3-M1, 19 September 1966.
- 64 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, Linda Hoad to Park Superintendent, 16 August 1967.
- 65 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, file Research Abroad, Blaine Adams to Research Director, 21 August 1967.
- 66 FL, Central Registry, file 28-5, John Lunn to Regional Director, 16 August 1967.
- 67 *Ibid.*, file 22/1-A, Peter Bureau to Park Superintendent, 26 July 1968; *ibid.*, Peter Bureau to Research Director, 22 August 1968.
- 68 John Fortier, 16 September 1968.
- 69 FL, Central Registry, file 22/1-A1, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 25 November 1968; *Ibid.*, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 13 May 1969; file 22/6-1, Anon., "Fortress of Louisbourg National Historic — Organization Chart," 19 June 1969; FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 23 June 1969.
- 70 Paul Rose, "Guide to the Louisbourg Archives: A Preliminary Inventory of Holdings," unpublished report H-H8 (FL, 1970), pp. [1-77]; FL, Central Registry, file 22/1-P13, Peter Bower to Park Superintendent, 19 January 1968.
- 71 FL, Ottawa Files, file Archaeology, Edward McM. Larrabee to B.C. Bickerton, 14 November 1964; B.C. Bickerton to Ronald L. Way, 4 May 1965, quoted in "Interpreting;" Lunn, 17 April 1967.
- 72 Bickerton, "Overseas Collection Program," p. 3.
- 73 FL, Central Registry, file 22/1-S4.2, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 14 October 1970; see also Gilles Proulx, "Archives de la Forteresse de Louisbourg/Collection Cartographique/Map Collection," unpublished report H-H9 (3 vols., FL, 1970); FL, Central Registry, file 22/3-M1, Gilles Proulx to Section Heads, 4 February 1971.
- 74 *Ibid.*, file 22/1-S4.2, Fortier to Superintendent, 14 October 1970.
- 75 FL, Central Registry, file 22/7-R1, L.H. Robinson to Superintendent, 24 August 1970; *ibid.*, file 22/7-A1, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 3 August 1972; FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, Paul Jeddrie to Head of Research, 8 December 1972.
- 76 *Ibid.*, file Research Abroad, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 27 February 1973; FL, Central Registry, file 22/1-78, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 16 March 1973.
- 77 *Ibid.*, John Fortier to Senior Historian, 19 February 1974; *ibid.*, file 22/4-C2, Raymonde Litalien to Robert J. Morgan, 22 September 1972; Gilles Proulx, 8 August 1974, in "Historical Records Series," unpublished report H-H15 (FL, 1978), item 11.
- 78 Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, "Management Improvement Study for National and Historic Park Branch: Fortress of Louisbourg," unpublished report PD-10-S ([Ottawa], 1969), p. 4; see also the "Preliminary Report," PD-10.
- 79 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, John Fortier to Park Superintendent, 2 July 1969.

- 80 Louisbourg Task Force, "Recommended and Reduced Postures Development and O & M (Plus Long-Range Development Costs)," unpublished report I-25 (FL, 1973).
- 81 *Ibid.*
- 82 FL, Work/Research, History Unit files, file Personnel Records — Proulx, n.d.
- 83 Bill O'Shea, "Park Organization, Operational Period," unpublished report PD-53 (FL, 1979); see also Anon., February 1977, quoted in "Interpreting."
- 84 FL, Work/Research Files, History Unit files, P.A. Thompson to E. Krause, 22 August 1978.
- 85 Susan Cann *et al.*, "The Fortress of Louisbourg: A Development Project," unpublished report PD-64 (Halifax, 1983), pp. 12-14.
- 86 FL, Central Registry, file 1730-1 (84/89), Parks Canada "Multi-Year Operational Plan (MYOP), F.Y. 1984-1989, Capital, Fortress of Louisbourg," 12 November 1982.
- 87 *Ibid.*, file 1730-1-1, Eric Krause, 19 November 1984.
- 88 *Ibid.*, file 1732-1, Eric Krause to John Johnston, 15 February 1985.
- 89 *Ibid.*, file 1730-1-1, attachment to Eric Krause, 19 November 1984.
- 90 *Ibid.*
- 91 *Ibid.*, file 8440-1, A.J.B. Johnson to Franciscan Fathers, 18 December 1978; *ibid.* Ken Donovan to Terry MacLean *et al.*, 15 September 1980; *ibid.*, Ken Donovan to Bill O'Shea *et al.*, 14 October 1980; *ibid.*, A.J.B. Johnson to Valerie Hunt, 10 May 1984.