

# **Charting a Course: A Study of Heritage in Prince Edward Island**

## **Draft Report**

***Prepared for:***

Prince Edward Island Department of  
Communities, Cultural Affairs & Labour

***Prepared by:***

The IRIS Group



*In association with*  
A.L. Arbic Consulting

**August 7, 2008**

This draft study report is being circulated for the purposes of seeking additional feedback from stakeholders before the final report is prepared. Please send comments to [Yvette@theIRISgroup.ca](mailto:Yvette@theIRISgroup.ca) by August 17, 2008.

Funding for this project has been provided by the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour, Province of Prince Edward Island.

We thank the staff of the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour, and to the Heritage Study Steering Committee members. We express our appreciation to the many private citizens who gave of their time to provide information and guidance to the project team. We also thank those who provided research support, including the librarians, archivists, conservators, genealogists, scientists and educators, as well as their respective organizations. We are grateful to representatives from the Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI, the Native Council of PEI and Keptin John Joe Sark who lead us in a Speaking Circle. To those who provided space and facilities for public and stakeholder consultations, thank you. To all of you, and to those Islanders who have contributed to heritage over the years, we are deeply indebted. We have made every effort to work in good faith with what you have shared during the course of this study.

The opinions and interpretations contained in this report are those of our participants and of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Government of Prince Edward Island.

**The IRIS Group**

Diane Griffin, Team Leader

Harry Baglole

Yvette Doucette

&

**A.L. Arbic Consulting**

Andrea Arbic

**Study Associates**

Monica MacDonald, Ph.D

Ann Howatt, Ph.D

Terry Ruddell, Ph.D

Robert Frame

Georges Arsenault

Translation by Françoise Enguehard

## Table of Contents

### Executive Summary (English et française)

(to be finalized after public feedback on draft report)

<b>I. Introduction .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>II. Literature Review (Summary) .....</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>III. Environmental Scan.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>IV. SWOT Analysis and Recommendations</b>	
<b>Strengths.....</b>	<b>12</b>
• Volunteers and community support	
• Collections of tangible heritage	
• Intangible heritage	
• Natural landscape	
• Built heritage	
<b>Weaknesses.....</b>	<b>16</b>
• Position of heritage within government	
• Insufficient funding	
• Protection of natural and cultural landscapes	
• Protection of archaeological resources	
• Institutional stewardship	
a. Institutional structure, organization and governance	
b. Human resources	
c. Care of collections	
d. Support for intangible heritage	
e. Natural heritage	
f. Research	
g. Education	
h. Exhibition and programming	
<b>Opportunities.....</b>	<b>38</b>
• The Island diaspora	
• Enhancing knowledge about heritage	
<b>Threats .....</b>	<b>39</b>
• Loss of resources and information	
• Threats to natural landscapes	
<b>V. Prioritization of Recommendations.....</b>	<b>41</b>

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Appendix B: Literature Review (complete version)

Appendix C: Public Consultation Process

Appendix D: Summary of Public Meetings

## **I. INTRODUCTION**

Heritage is a vital element in personal experience and is an important part of the public discourse about the past, present and future. Islanders believe that the responsibilities of the provincial government in heritage, for example the programs and activities of institutions like the Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation (PEIMHF) and the Public Archives and Records Office (PARO), have the potential to educate and make Islanders more aware of the contemporary world. These programs and activities can also support social cohesion, and a sense of place and collective identity. In addition, heritage attracts tourists and other visitors to the province.

Current standards in the amount, quality and accessibility of PEI heritage resources, however, lag behind provincial and international counterparts. Historical interpretation and exhibitions, for example, have largely ignored substantial treatment of Aboriginal society, women and many ethnic and cultural communities; the same is true for organized labour, science, technology, and the natural environment. Archaeological work is sporadic, allowing looters ready access to sites of potential great interest, including those of spiritual value. Tangible and intangible archival collections and documentation, museum-quality objects, and the built and natural heritage are succumbing to neglect, indifference or ignorance. Professional support in key areas is either lacking or seriously compromised. This situation amounts to a provincial heritage deficit.

This state of affairs presents, on the other hand, an opportunity for the provincial government to raise institutional standards to an acceptable professional level. A fresh and innovative approach is needed – one that will surmount the weaknesses and capitalize on the strengths in areas like volunteerism, in extant collections and in the traditional knowledge, skills and oral histories that are familiar to many who live here. Such an approach will not only satisfy institutional and departmental mandates, but also reassure Islanders that their government is committed to providing the leadership and resources necessary to do justice to its heritage responsibility.

### **A. Purpose, Scope and Organization of Report**

---

The provincial government has a vital role to play in the stewardship of heritage in PEI through managing institutions, preserving collections, delivering programs, and supporting related organizations and their activities. It has been in need of a strategic framework, however, to allow it to fulfill this role more effectively. To this end, in December 2007, the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour issued a Request for Proposals for a comprehensive study of PEI heritage, the aim of which was to help create a policy foundation for future governmental decision-making in the sector. The selection committee chose a team led by The IRIS Group and A. L. Arbic Consulting.

The **objectives** of the study:

- To undertake a comprehensive review of the heritage sector
- To conduct public consultations to gather Islanders' views on heritage issues
- To identify the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats (SWOT) in the system of heritage institutions, organizations, programs and activities
- To make recommendations to the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour to address the issues raised
- To recommend the appropriate role to be played by the provincial government in responding to the needs of the sector

The **scope** of the study:

- Cultural and natural heritage
- Tangible heritage resources (such as specimens, archival records, artifacts, buildings, heritage sites, and natural and cultural landscapes)
- Intangible heritage resources (such as folklore, oral history and customs)

The **organization** of the study:

Is largely in accordance with the analysis of:

- Strengths
- Weaknesses
- Opportunities
- Threats

## **B. Methodology**

---

### **Literature and Program Review**

Our team began by conducting a review of the literature concerning heritage in PEI – government-generated and related reports, policies and documents – issued over the past 35 years. We also conducted a review of existing provincial heritage legislation, policies, programs and activities, and considered the same in neighbouring jurisdictions. The purpose of this research was to establish an understanding of the overall environment, of the interconnections within government, and the relationship of governmental actors with other heritage partners and stakeholders.

## Public Consultation

The consultation process, with over 500 participants, was a key component of our approach, providing a wide range of Islanders with an opportunity to bring forward relevant issues of concern. The consultative techniques listed below were used to gather input to assist in the identification of strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats, as well as in development of proposed recommendations.

- A **questionnaire** soliciting input on six central questions was distributed broadly through hard copy, by e-mail, and on the website of The IRIS Group at [www.theIRISgroup.ca](http://www.theIRISgroup.ca). The questions were meant to guide, not limit discussion. See Appendix One for a copy of the questionnaire.
- **Public Meetings** to provide input and discuss issues were well advertised and held in seven locations: O’Leary, Miscouche (in French), Summerside, Hunter River, Charlottetown, Montague and Souris. A summary is provided in Appendix Four.
- Twenty-five **key informant interviews** were held with a cross-section of individuals holding decision-making and leadership positions and/or who have depth or breadth of knowledge of the issues at hand. Key informants are listed in Appendix Three.
- **Stakeholder sessions** were held with representatives of key heritage groups, organizations, institutions and individuals. The eight sessions brought together stakeholders to create a dialogue on a variety of key issues and themes. See Appendix Three.
- A study **Blog** was created ([www.islandheritagestudy.wordpress.com](http://www.islandheritagestudy.wordpress.com)) which featured reports from the public meetings and invited reader comments via on-line submissions. The online questionnaire, public meetings and blog were advertised through media ads, listservs and newsletters of natural and cultural history organizations, as well as public service announcements.

## Selected Site Research

Team members made a site visit to the West Royalty Business Park to view the provincial collection of artifacts of the PEI Museum and Heritage Foundation and the building (the Artifactory) in which it is housed. Team members also made a site visit to the Public Archives and to the PEI Collection at the Robertson Library of the University of Prince Edward Island.

## II. LITERATURE REVIEW (SUMMARY)<sup>1</sup>

A necessary step in understanding the contemporary situation concerning heritage in Prince Edward Island is a review of past literature on the topic – government-generated and related reports, policies and other documents. A review provides a picture of the sector as it has evolved, outlining past questions and answers, limitations and developments, and problems and solutions. Past literature also makes evident the recurring issues that continue to impede progress in provincial heritage development.

In a review of 35 years of this literature, museums emerge as a particular area of concern. Beginning with the documentation produced by the PEI Heritage Foundation (PEIHF: not to be confused with the later PEI Museum and Heritage Foundation) in its third year (1972), among the areas outlined as being in particular need of support were archaeology, history and architectural history, local Island museums, and oral history. Also in need was proper storage for the collections, and in terms of staff, a curator/educator and a conservation technician.

Local museums existed before the establishment of the PEIHF, and evolved independently. In 1974, the provincial government commissioned Wayne MacKinnon to make a series of recommendations on these entities and the responsibility the provincial government should have toward them. MacKinnon described what then existed as the poor result of unplanned processes and unprofessional personnel, created chiefly for tourism purposes. The year after the submission of this report, the PEIHF began administering to these museums a small grants program, totaling \$3,000, and a \$1,000 training program to improve professionalism.

In 1976 the provincial government engaged George MacBeath and his colleagues from Historical Resources in New Brunswick to make recommendations on all heritage resources in Prince Edward Island. In particular, the consultants were to comment on the specific responsibilities of the main departments and institutions involved in heritage – the PEIHF, the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, and the Department of Tourism. Few of MacBeath's recommendations – which included a department and minister for heritage resource management, a sole Museums Division within it, and another just for historic sites – came to fruition. Neither did what was perhaps the key recommendation: that the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum become the main component of a provincial history museum. Instead, the provincial government expanded the role of the PEIHF.

In 1977 Donald Nemetz was to explore and report on how this expansion might work. Among his suggestions were the creation of a series of plans with clear priorities, including an acquisitions strategy, a plan for better storage and exhibition purposes, and a plan for the management of the branch sites. Nemetz also identified a need for more funding from governmental and private sources, and a need to sort out the museological mandates of the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, and the Foundation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Please see Appendix Two for the full literature review.

As for the community museums, in 1979 the PEIHF commissioned Robert Frame, of the Nova Scotia Provincial Museum, to evaluate the four community museums then receiving grants from the Foundation: those in Alberton, Montague, O'Leary, and Miscouche. Frame reported that overall, the museums were not in a good state. Regarding their exhibits, they were not well organized, well informed, or well interpreted or displayed. Frame saw that at least a partial solution would be to establish standards of practice and raise overall knowledge levels, and that funding would be well spent in incentive grants with the aim of permanent upgrades to facilities or programs. Each museum should receive the same amount of operational funds providing that the local community matched the grant with equal amounts of funds or the equivalent in volunteer time.

In 1982 the University of Prince Edward Island's (UPEI) Island Studies Committee, on behalf of and with funding from the provincial government, engaged museologist Barry Lord to conduct a comprehensive study of all museums in the province. Lord had five points of reference on which he was to report: A history of the development of all Island museums, including the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, an assessment of these museums, an analysis of the overall Island museum system, recommendations for improvement "without recourse to major structural changes or capital initiatives," and the feasibility of creating a new "provincial museum of man and nature."

Lord made 75 recommendations. Like previous analysts, he observed that the existing museums needed to establish higher standards in museum practice in general, and in particular, clearer policies for research, acquisitions, loans, gifts, conservation, public programs and security. For the community museums, Lord recommended more assistance and advice should be provided, in part by creating a provincial association to develop training programs.

Regarding the existing provincial museum system under the PEIHF, Lord saw the recently-inaugurated Artfactory as an improvement, but noted that the building needed to be connected to a strong, centrally-located display facility, perhaps adjacent to and collaborating with UPEI. This new "museum of man and nature" should assume the museological role from the Heritage Foundation. The remainder of Lord's 75 recommendations dealt mainly with the organization, staffing and operations of the proposed new provincial museum.

Further to the idea of establishing a new provincial museum system, in 1983 the PEIHF asked J. Lynton Martin, Director of the Nova Scotia Museum, to study and make recommendations on its potential structure and organization. Martin envisioned a structure with a third, Natural history Division, adding to the existing two in History, and Exhibits and Programs. The Natural history Division would be associated with the Natural History Society, the Island Nature Trust, and UPEI. The existing Exhibits and Programs Division Martin suggested could do more in developing both permanent and traveling exhibits, and work more closely with provincial departments of education. In terms of staffing he saw a situation where non-professionals could be employed in much greater capacity, either as volunteers or paid small honoraria as research associates.

In 1983 the provincial Museum Act established the provincial museum system and the Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation (PEIMHF). This continued the existing model of a headquarters and branch sites (six at this time; the Musée acadien

joined in 1996), with no new facility such as Lord had recommended. The PEIMHF then commissioned Dr. Louis Lemieux and Heather Lemieux (Diomedia Consultants) and their colleagues to conduct a planning and development study of the new entity. The consultants noted that most of the existing problems could be overcome with sufficient funds. Recommendations included the creation of an overall museum structure and plan, as well as suggestions for organization, staffing, costs, funding and overall development. The addition of a natural history museum was considered essential.

In 1988 the provincial government appointed a Ministerial Committee in the Cultural Affairs Division, primarily to outline a proposal towards the creation of “a comprehensive provincial heritage and museum policy.” The final fifteen recommendations of the Ministerial Committee covered most areas of heritage: landscape and natural history, archaeological remains, built environment, material history, folklore/oral history, social and cultural history, the arts, and archival records. Among other points, the Committee recommended that a provincial heritage council be created for the implementation of policy goals, that an overall conservation strategy be developed for tangible heritage, that a centre for oral history and folklore be created, and that the PEIMHF do more in the way of architectural conservancy. It also reiterated the need for the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum and the PEIMHF to collaborate in respect of their collections responsibilities.

Early in 1998 two governmental documents on culture and heritage appeared: “Culture...Itself a Treasure,” by the Ministerial Committee on Culture of the provincial Department of Education, and the final report, “Culture and Heritage Integrated Service Delivery,” by the Matrix Consulting Group, funded by the provincial Department of Education, the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Knowledge Economy Partnership. In the first report, culture was defined as including three key elements: heritage, the arts, and language. Most of the seventeen recommendations dealt with matters concerning the arts, but the interview and consultation process also raised pertinent issues about heritage. These included the level of cooperation between the community museums and the PEIMHF, the unfulfilled mandate of the latter regarding natural heritage, the “replacement and use of the Artifactory,” and questions about traveling exhibits and the relationship between the museum and the heritage activities of the Island Mi’kmaq. The main theme overall, indicated by the title, was that culture should be valued for its own sake first, then second, as a benefit to the economy.

The mandate of the Matrix Consulting Group was to examine integrated service delivery in the new “knowledge economy” in the field of culture and heritage (treating them as one sector). The consultant focused on the use of information technologies in the delivery of services, as well as formulating strategies “for further economic growth and development.” The final recommendations came under three general headings: fostering partnership, the knowledge economy, and “capitalizing on the economic potential of the sector.”

Following the creation in the mid-1990s of provincial cultural policies across Canada, the PEI government created its own cultural policy in 2002. The heritage and museum policy proposed in 1988 had never materialized, but the new cultural policy was intended as a set of principles to guide government action in the “arts, cultural industries and heritage.” No specific programs or initiatives were defined; however, a series of provincial commitments were outlined including high standards of achievement in the cultural

institutions, recognition of the benefits of cultural initiatives in the education system, and community involvement in cultural decision-making.

In the wake of this policy, the provincial Inter-departmental Committee, established in 2002 to coordinate governmental cultural activities, commissioned the MacArthur Group Inc. to propose a strategy to build upon it. Guided by the policy and the 1998 Ministerial Committee report, the final 25 recommendations were grouped into five overall goals: the building of a creative environment to encourage the development of arts and heritage, the development of cultural awareness, the investment in culture at all governmental levels, the improvement of human resources and representative associations, and better marketing, branding and communication strategies.

In 2006 a controversy erupted over the fate of the Artifactory, the storage building used to house the provincial collection of museum artifacts. Upon the announcement by the then-government of plans to create a new storage facility in Murray River, the Institute of Island Studies (IIS) at UPEI instigated a series of public meetings on the issue, the results of which were compiled and published in 2007. In addition to specific comments on the Artifactory, the report outlined that the majority of participants favoured an overall system whereby a new central provincial museum would form the “hub” and the existing museums and sites would form the branches or “spokes.” This new provincial museum would help ensure the retention and preservation of tangible heritage, provide educational services in cultural and natural history, and be adequately staffed with professional museum personnel. Included in the final “participants’ advice” was the suggestion that the government undertake a study of “museum policies and operations,” expanding on the public consultations initiated by the IIS.

Several persistent themes emerge from this review. Three are the weak commitment to heritage on the part of the provincial government, a dichotomy in thinking about heritage in terms of it for its own sake, as opposed to in terms of tourism or its economic benefits, and most emphatically, questions about the structure, organization and function of the provincial museum system.

This latter issue has caused much hand-wringing. One aspect of it, perhaps more difficult in earlier years, has been the relationship of the PEI(M)HF with the community museums. Following the establishment in 1983 of the Community Heritage Foundation (now the Community Museums Association), however, their affairs have been managed largely apart from the provincial museum, though funding remains a key problem. Another aspect of the museum question has been the overlapping (in principle) museological mandates of the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, and the PEIMHF.

Perhaps the most evident deficiency, recognized by most of the consultants looking at the provincial museum system over the years, is the lack of a lead facility. The provincial museum has never been able to consistently perform the key museological functions of research, collection, preservation, exhibition and programming, and education. The Lord Report, for one, outlined a solution in detail. Indeed, the majority of the author’s 75 recommendations concerned the creation and operation of “a provincial museum of man and nature” that would continue the decentralized model, but include a new centrally-located facility able to perform all of the above functions. As no steps had been taken toward this end since Lord reported in 1982, the IIS meetings 25 years later were largely taken up with the same issue.

Related to the lack of a lead facility, and again recognized by most of the museum consultants, has been the neglect of the “natural heritage” part of the provincial museum’s mandate. In response to Dr. Lemieux’s recommendation for the creation of a natural history museum, in 1987 Barbara MacDonald and the Natural History Museum Advisory Committee made fourteen recommendations on the subject to the PEIMHF. None was realized, and today the state of our natural heritage remains a major concern.

### III. ENVIRONMENTAL SCAN

This environmental scan reviews key legislation that provides the legal context for heritage on the Island and the role and interaction of government and non-governmental organizations in the management of PEI's heritage.

The role of the provincial government in heritage is to provide overall stewardship and management of its resources and institutions, and to ensure public access to and enjoyment of them. It includes the acquisition, preservation and exhibition of tangible and intangible collections, the documentation and protection of both cultural and natural places of heritage interest, and the encouragement of public participation in programs and activities.

#### A. Legislation

---

Some legislation is obviously central to the management of heritage, such as the *Museum Act*, *Heritages Places Protection Act*, *Archaeological Sites Protection Act*, the *Archives and Records Act* and the *Archaeology Act*. Other legislation and pertinent policies concerned with cultural and natural heritage issues include:

**Federal:** *Cultural Property Export and Import Act*; *Constitution Act*; *Indian Act*; *Migratory Birds Convention Act*; *Species at Risk Act*; *Fisheries Act*; *National Parks Act*; and the Museums Assistance, Canadian Heritage Rivers, and National Historic Sites programs.

**Provincial:** *Cemeteries Act*; *Ancient Burial Grounds Act*; *Environmental Protection Act*; *Fisheries Act*; *Forest Management Act*; *French Language Services Act*; *Fathers of Confederation Buildings Act*; *Recreation Development Act* (Provincial Parks); *Planning Act*; *Trails Act*; *Trespass to Property Act*; *Wildlife Conservation Act*; and *Natural Areas Protection Act*. Scenic heritage roads are covered under the *Roads Act*.

**Municipal:** Charlottetown and Summerside have heritage policies and bylaws.

The above legislative mandates indicate the variety of involvement by all three orders of government. While Parks Canada and the federal Department of Canadian Heritage are major contributors to the protection of Island heritage for the benefit of all Canadians, this report is not about them; the focus here is primarily on the role of the Government of Prince Edward Island. However, federal-provincial agreements are an important tool and must be in the best interest of Islanders and maximize their access to heritage resources, including the landscape.

#### B. Culture, Heritage and Libraries Division (Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour)

---

The Culture, Heritage and Libraries Division is relatively small, overseeing most facets of governmental heritage institutions and programs in PEI. The Culture and Heritage

section also relies on a number of non-governmental organizations and associations to deliver programs.

According to the 2008 provincial budget estimates, CCA&L allots \$4,353,400 for Culture & Heritage with \$1,025,800 of this devoted to the PEIMHF. This amount to the PEIMHF is substantially more, relatively speaking, than the 2007 allotment (\$824,914).

## Heritage Officer

The position of Heritage Officer is the sole full-time permanent one in government that is dedicated to heritage. This position is responsible mainly for the following:

- Archaeology – grants survey and excavation permits, registers sites, provides information, manages contracts
- PARO – provides public archival service approximately 20% of employee's time
- Heritage Places Advisory Board – acts as Board secretary, manages its activities, prepares background information, undertakes research, provides public information
- Built heritage – manages incentive program
- Other – manages annual provincial Heritage Fair

## Archaeology

In terms of legislation, the *Archaeological Sites Protection Act* is scheduled for repeal and replacement with the *Archaeology Act*. The new Act was passed in late 2006 but has not been proclaimed pending development of the necessary regulations.

There is no staff position dedicated to archaeology. From the 1970s to the 1990s coastal surveys were conducted on a contract basis but the funding was discontinued before one-third had been completed. For 2008-2009 the Province has provided \$25,000 to continue the surveys. The estimated date of completion is five years.

The Province relies on the staff and resources at the Canadian Museum of Civilization (CMC) in Gatineau, Quebec, to maintain the database information on PEI archaeological sites. CMC has long provided this service, although for a short time it devolved to a staff person working for the PEI Provincial Government.

## Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation

The PEIMHF, governed by the *Museum Act*, is a provincial Crown Corporation as well as a registered charitable corporation. Its purpose, outlined in the Act, is “to study, collect, preserve, interpret and protect the human and natural heritage of the province.” It is governed by a board, to which the Director reports, that consists of six to eight members, and it operates seven museums and historic sites across the province. Much of the provincial collection (approximately 80,000 artifacts) for which the PEIMHF is responsible is housed in a storage facility known as the Artifactory (which is not considered as part of the seven sites). The PEIMHF also distributes annual heritage awards, organizes public lectures, and operates a publishing program which includes *The Island Magazine*. Staff consists of twelve full-time, five part-time, and fifteen

seasonal employees, as well as 31 summer students hired under job creation programs (in 2008).

**Funding** – and other support is provided to the PEIMHF by the following government departments, with amounts below:

- Provincial Treasury, via the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour – an appropriation for salaries and benefits of casual and classified employees; and most recently provides information technology support
- Innovation and Advanced Learning – employment development programs
- Tourism PEI – marketing under the Tourism Investment Fund
- Transportation & Public Works – building maintenance and repair
- Federal government – student job programs and museum assistance programs

**Government of PEI Support to PEIMHF**

<b>Department/Program</b>	<b>2007</b>	<b>2006</b>
Dept of Communities & Cultural Affairs – Operating Grant	\$824,914	\$855,215
Dept of Communities & Cultural Affairs – Other Grants	\$50,427	\$48,896
Employment Development Agency	\$71,309	\$49,212
Tourism PEI	\$24,607	\$20,000
PEI Business Dev. Inc. (Innovation PEI)	\$20,000	-
Transportation and Public Works	\$12,045	-
Public Service Commission	\$315	-
<b>total</b>	<b>\$1,003,617</b>	<b>\$973,323</b>

All other PEIMHF operating costs including maintenance and repair, property taxes, energy costs, student wage top-ups, publishing and general administration costs must be covered by self-generated revenue which includes site and event admissions, conservation services, retail and book sales, memberships, donations and revenue generated from endowment revenue. In the past, the Executive Director's salary was included in this, but it is now covered through an increased allotment to the PEIMHF, announced in the 2008 Provincial Budget.

**Capital Investment** – has been limited since 1973, though in the past five years the Province made some new investments including:

- An Agriculture Museum at Orwell Corner in 2004-5
- A miniature railway at Elmira in 2004-5
- An allotment of \$115,000 for capital improvements in 2007; and \$80,000 in 2008
- A special fund of \$144,000 for improvements to the storage facility housing the provincial collection: a new roof, furnaces and expanded storage space, in 2007
- An additional \$125,000 for storage and collections in 2008-09 and \$100,000 over three years to upgrade exhibits at various sites; and funding for a new PEIMHF vehicle

**Visitation** – the total visitation of the seven museum sites in 2007 was approximately 65,000 – down from the 72,763 visitors in 2004 and a marked decrease from the 81,075 visitors in 2002. One result of this decline is a drop in operating revenue.

---

## The Public Archives and Records Office

The Public Archives and Records Office (PARO) operates within government under the provisions of the *Archives and Records Act*. It collects, maintains and makes publicly available textual and alternate media records from public and private sources. The PARO is still developing online capacity; substantial resources are required for the digitization and online management of materials. Full-time staff consists of two archivists (soon to be three) and two administrative assistants. The conservation technician is based in the PARO, but contracted to the Archives Council of PEI.

## Heritage Places

The *Heritage Places Protection Act* provides for the recognition and protection of both natural and cultural places of historical significance. The Heritage Places Advisory Board, with the assistance of the Heritage Officer, advises the Minister regarding the registration and designation of heritage places. Registration is largely honorific, while designation offers a higher level of protection for the property. Some financial aid for renovating exteriors is available for owners of designated properties. Where the Minister believes that a municipality has created a system that would provide a similar level of protection, authority may be delegated. Charlottetown and Summerside have developed this capacity so the provincial procedures apply mainly to areas outside the two cities.

## Heritage Places Initiative

The Heritage Places Initiative (HPI) is a federally-funded program designed to heighten awareness of the importance of Canada's historic places. Under it the Province has established a PEI Registry of Heritage Places, corresponding to the larger Canadian Register of Heritage Places, to which it provides provincial data. Funding for this program will cease at the end of the next fiscal year; and if it not renewed, the Registrar's responsibilities will possibly be taken up by the Heritage Officer.

## Community Museums

Community museums carry out a great deal of important work in the heritage sector and Prince Edward Island is home to over thirty community museums, ranging from small, volunteer-run seasonal museums and heritage sites, to year-round museums with paid staff. Through the Museum Development Program, the Province provides \$30,000 to community museums for improvements in areas such as security, facilities, collections management, exhibits and online activities. Operating funds, seen to be a community responsibility, are not included though the Province provides some support through programs such as Jobs for Youth. Individually, most community museums are not eligible to apply for federal programs because of their seasonal nature and lack of paid staff.

## Non-governmental Organizations

Prince Edward Island is heavily dependent on NGOs to deliver heritage services and raise awareness of the importance of the sector. The following is a brief sampling:

## **Community Museums Association**

Historical societies and community museums are important actors in the Island's heritage system. The Community Museums Association (CMA) was created in 1983, following the Lord Report on museums. It is the main support for PEI historical societies and non-governmental museums and sites as well as local archives and related organizations including the Archives Council of Prince Edward Island (below). Its activities include mentoring, training and professional development of museum/archival/heritage personnel. The CMA engages in public outreach and acts as a liaison between these museums and archives and government, as well as between these museums and other organizations. Its main goal is to increase the quality and professional standards of its members which number about 31 museums and heritage sites in PEI. Some of these sites, notably the Musée acadien and its archives, are bilingual in French and English.

The Province provides \$60,000 core funding to the CMA which allows it to apply for additional resources through other governmental programs like the federal Museums Assistance Program.

## **The Archives Council of Prince Edward Island**

The Archives Council of Prince Edward Island was founded in 1987 to provide a network for archival cooperation across the province in such areas as funding, liaison, archives and project development, and conservation of collections. It also raises public awareness and supports increased access to, and contemporary standards for, archival collections.

The fourteen-member Archives Council provides online links to local and national archival organizations and resources, and hosts virtual theme exhibits drawn from the collections of its members.

## **Natural History Society**

The current Natural History Society of Prince Edward Island was formed in 1969 but its roots can be traced in part to the PEI Natural History Society that existed from 1889-1903. Among the achievements of the nineteenth century group was the creation of a petition, in the end with 131 signatures of many prominent Islanders of the day, calling for a provincial museum of natural history. For the contemporary Society, inclusion of natural history as part of the provincial museum system is still a key objective.

Other aims are: the collaboration of nature lovers in the exchange and maintenance of information; the protection of flora and fauna; the promotion, encouragement and enjoyment of the study of natural history; and the building of public awareness and knowledge. To meet these ends, among other things the Society conducts public meetings and field trips, publishes a newsletter, coordinates the Christmas bird counts and documents plant and animal sightings.

## **Genealogical Society**

The Prince Edward Island Genealogical Society (PEIGS) was formed in 1976. The Society was originally based at the PEIHF, with which it partnered on various projects. The Society also helped to build a collection with the Foundation's Genealogy Department, but upon the closure of that Department the collection was moved to the PARO. That part of the collection belonging to the PEIGS is held at the PARO on loan.

The primary goal of the Society today is to promote research and education in family history and genealogy. One of its main activities is to publish research aids, a quarterly newsletter, and other types of information of interest to genealogical researchers. The PEIGS also conducts workshops and holds seminars, acquires family histories and donates them to public repositories, and supports the genealogical activities of other organizations like the PARO, the Garden of the Gulf Museum in Montague, the MacNaught History Centre and Archives in Summerside, and the Musée acadien. There are several hundred active members.

## IV. SWOT ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The team gathered data and information in order to identify findings related to key strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats in the heritage system in Prince Edward Island. The information is based upon the input received from key informant interviews, stakeholder sessions and public meetings as well as the literature review and the experience of the project team.

This section of the report is organized in the same order as the SWOT analysis. Our recommendations follow that sequence and are found in the Weaknesses and Opportunities sections. Where they occur under the latter category, they are intended to further or broaden existing programs or initiatives. In the *Threats* section are two wide-ranging issues covering recommendations already put forward under more specific areas.

It should be noted, therefore, that the recommendations are not in order of importance.

### Strengths

---

#### Volunteers and Community Support

In Prince Edward Island, as elsewhere, volunteers and non-governmental organizations conduct much of the work in areas such as museum and archival collecting and exhibitions, and local and national historical and genealogical research. The work of the Community Museums Association, for example, is fundamental to the operation of independent museums here. The Archives Council of PEI, in the absence of any provincial archival conservator, administers the only such conservation services. The Genealogical Society, with its publications and online search tools, including digital versions of past censuses, is an essential component of provincial family history research. Natural History Society volunteers contribute to data collections; and many users of Island trails and heritage roads have advocated successfully for the preservation of these natural heritage resources.

The work of all these organizations is accomplished largely by volunteers. This is not unusual in the heritage sector, but in PEI volunteers are indispensable: many community museums, recreation areas, and natural heritage areas would likely not exist without them. The importance of volunteers has long been obvious, and this was demonstrated quite openly in the public meetings. Aptly described by one participant as “an incredible network of people doing a lot with a little,” these individuals demonstrate a passion for the work as well as a commitment to their communities, and for the Island as a whole.

Not all volunteers work under the auspices of formal organizations. For example, *The Island Register*, a website produced largely by one individual, has become an important

online destination for anyone researching Island family history. The time and generosity of private citizens has also resulted in the protection of numerous heritage buildings that would otherwise have been destroyed, such as the Sir Andrew Macphail Homestead in Orwell, St. Andrews Chapel, and St. Mary's Church in Indian River, and important heritage landscapes, such as Boughton Island. Dedicated authors have also volunteered their time and expertise to write books on heritage topics, including several publications on natural and cultural history produced by the Institute of Island Studies. The two recent books on Island heritage architecture were written by members of another volunteer organization, the Institute for Island Studies in Architecture and Conservation.

In light of these volunteer contributions, the consultants agree with the comments of many participants who advocated that government make more effort to show its appreciation for heritage volunteers and to sustain stronger bridges to them. It is not an overstatement to say that the future of Island heritage will depend on volunteer goodwill and engagement.

## **Collections of Tangible Heritage**

Participants reported that tangible heritage is a strength for PEI. This includes public and private collections of historical objects, archaeological artifacts, archival material, and the built heritage.

There are also pertinent collections at academic institutions, such as the PEI Collection at the Robertson Library on the UPEI campus, the Samuel Holland collection at Holland College, and those maintained by community museums, historic sites, and archives. Some examples here are the holdings of the Alberton Museum, the Macphail homestead, and the MacNaught History Centre and Archives in Summerside. In addition to these, there are considerable collections maintained by private individuals and historical societies across the province. In sum, these objects are physical evidence, the irreplaceable primary resources that help us understand and interpret the past.

These types of primary resources can potentially yield collections even richer than those already in public institutions. Greater awareness of gaps can help build new collections and prevent further loss of individual items. These gaps exist in many areas including collections pertaining to natural heritage, Aboriginal peoples, women's history, non-dominant cultural communities, folklore, and the technological innovations that mediate interactions between people and their environment.

## **Intangible Heritage**

The general term "intangible heritage" has recently gained much international currency. As expressed by UNESCO in its *Convention for the Safeguarding of Intangible Cultural Heritage* (October 2003), it is "transmitted from generation to generation, is constantly recreated by communities and groups in response to their environment, their interaction with nature and their history, and provides them with a sense of identity and continuity, thus promoting respect for cultural diversity and human creativity." Intangible heritage is manifest in language, oral traditions, performing arts (traditional music and dance), social practices, traditional craftsmanship, and knowledge and practices concerning nature and the universe.

Prince Edward Island folklorist John Cousins has provided an illustrative example of the distinction between tangible and intangible heritage. While he lauded the collection and preservation of domestic and agricultural artifacts that represent traditional urban and rural life, he maintained that their meaning is reduced without “the living memories of the people who used them” (*personal communication*). This underscores the vulnerability of intangible heritage in that its survival typically depends on memory and personal transmission.

Intangible heritage is often transmitted unconsciously in day-to-day activities, through certain spoken expressions, in particular methods of preparing food, or in the performance of small rituals. It is also evident in the more conspicuous ceremonial or celebratory activities, some new to PEI and others long supported by individual Island communities.

During the course of this study, representatives of various cultural communities commented on the importance of intangible heritage. The maintenance of language, customs, traditional skills and practices facilitates social cohesion and helps both long-established and more recent cultural communities maintain their sense of collective identity. In terms of the latter group, recent Canadian research has demonstrated that new immigrants enjoy better emotional health and are more inclined to remain in areas where they can enjoy a sense of cultural community.<sup>2</sup>

## Natural Landscape

During the public meetings it became clear that many Islanders consider the landscape, both its natural and cultural elements, to be one of the greatest assets of the province. We also heard that the physical characteristics of the Island setting are intimately tied to Islanders’ sense of place and identity.

Most of PEI can be described as being a working rural and pastoral landscape, which is expressed by one of its early nicknames: “The Garden of the Gulf.” Agricultural land, mixed with woodland and coastal landscapes, along with national and provincial parks and areas designated under the *Natural Areas Protection Act*, are key distinguishing elements. In the 2007 Tourist Exit Survey, 36.7% of first-time visitors indicated that “natural beauty and pastoral settings” were primary features that attracted them to PEI.<sup>3</sup>

Non-governmental organizations such as the Natural History Society, the Island Nature Trust, the Nature Conservancy of Canada and the L. M. Montgomery Land Trust, along with the federal and provincial governments, are working to preserve important parts of this landscape. As in other parts of the world, the landscape of Prince Edward Island is changing due to various factors, including pressures from development and the crisis in the agricultural industry. For now, however, much of its traditional character and quality remain.

---

<sup>2</sup> Samuel Noh et al, *Social Support and Quality of Life: Social Support among Korean Immigrants*, **Advances in Medical Sociology**, Vol. 5, Pp 115-137, 1994.

<sup>3</sup> Tourism Research Centre (January 2008). *Overall Results of the 2007 Prince Edward Island Exit Survey: Results for the Main Season: From June 27 to September 30*. Charlottetown, PEI: School of Business, University of Prince Edward Island.

## **Built Heritage**

Islanders identified PEI's built heritage – domestic, agricultural and marine architecture as well as archaeological sites (see below) – as a particular strength. Built structures create an immediate impression and domestic, agricultural and marine architecture are among the most visible and characteristic aspects of Island heritage. Many areas still reflect the early settlement and subsequent growth patterns arising from the original 67 lots laid out in 1764-65, by surveyor Samuel Holland.

Built heritage draws value from its various forms and structures, as well as from its socio-cultural and historical associations. Found in a multitude of environments – rural, urban and marine – it includes a wide range of styles and structures such as monuments, churches, residential homes, farm complexes, former commercial buildings, boats, and harbours. Across the Island many of these structures have been preserved or renovated by owners sympathetic to their heritage value. They range from the grand to the modest; some examples are:

- Commercial buildings, some still serving their original purpose, like the Rodd Charlottetown Hotel renovated with interior and exterior finishes of high quality.
- Lighthouses, such as those at West Point and Point Prim, the former the first of the wooden tapered lighthouses in PEI, preserved and adapted as part of a tourism development, and the latter the only round brick lighthouse in Canada (although now sheathed in wood).
- Former railway stations like the one in Elmira, adapted for new use as a museum.
- Church architecture, which is particularly striking. Some of the most impressive Island churches were designed by William Critchlow Harris, a PEI architect of national reputation.
- Former government buildings including the Customs House and Post Office in Montague, the Farmers' Bank in Rustico and the former Court House in Alberton, and Province House and the George Coles Building in Charlottetown.
- Former commercial and residential buildings, now owned by the Province, that include representative examples of important aspects of Island life, including the properties operated by the PEIMHF like Beaconsfield (grand Victorian, a Harris-designed house); Basin Head (old cannery); and Orwell Corner (once an agricultural community, still with farm buildings, store, hall and school).
- Historic streetscapes such as Great George Street in Charlottetown.
- Residential homes restored by their individual private owners.

---

## Weaknesses

---

### Position of Heritage within Government

The public consultations indicated that heritage does not have a strong, clearly defined mandate, or a prominent role within government, or the necessary resources to fulfill its responsibilities. Concern was also expressed that heritage issues have subsequently had little impact on the political decision-making process. In the consultants' opinion, much of that perception is justified. Heritage needs to have greater authority and more resources for a more integrated, strategic and effective approach.

One example frequently cited during the public consultations is the scant consideration given to heritage when government departments plan projects such as the construction of highways and other public works. Among the recent cases mentioned is the proposed widening of Highway 2 through the community of Hunter River. Several heritage houses were purchased with the aim of demolition to enable a road re-construction. While a better plan has since been proposed and only two houses will be removed, as we heard from the public, the problem remains that throughout this process there was little input from the heritage unit of the Department of Culture, Community Affairs and Labour. Another problem raised during public consultations was that this community lacks a municipal official plan. Therefore, it has no avenue for a formal approval process for projects proposed for Hunter River. The Province makes such decisions on its behalf.

This weakness is also apparent in the lack of consideration given to the protection of archaeological resources within government decision-making processes. According to the Environmental Impact Assessment Guidelines under the *Environmental Protection Act*, sites of significant cultural or heritage status can be reviewed as part of the "human environment." This is rarely done, however, because there is no provincial archaeologist and the Heritage Officer works on archaeological matters only a small percentage of her time. This problem is further exacerbated by the increasing amount of real estate development as well as land erosion in coastal areas. In short, the in-house expertise is simply not present to participate in the environmental review process as thoroughly as it should be. This adds to the problem of weak protection for archaeological resources.

In considering options to address this weakness of the position of heritage issues on the government agenda, the consultants considered a number of alternatives, including:

- The creation of a new department combining heritage and culture, with its own minister. In a small government with only eleven members in the Executive Council, however, the consultants did not consider this to be a feasible option.
- The movement of heritage to another existing department, possibly Tourism or Education. With the current benefits of heritage and "communities" within the same department, and the danger that heritage might weaken in another department, the consultants did not consider this to be a desirable option.
- The creation of a separate heritage division within the Department of Communities, Culture Affairs and Labour. Given the size of PEI and its government departments, this may not be necessary or feasible.

- Leaving responsibility for heritage within the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Division, but strengthening it. Under this option, the heritage unit within the Culture and Heritage Section would stay where it is, but receive the additional human and financial resources required to fulfill the heritage responsibilities and mandate of the Province more effectively. This option has the advantage of requiring no administrative structural change and providing greater continuity.

Based on this assessment of options,

1. **We recommend that responsibility for heritage remain in the Culture, Heritage and Libraries Division, that it be strengthened by giving it greater clarity and profile of mandate, that it be given sufficient resources to realize its mandate and provide leadership and expertise on heritage matters provincially.**
2. **We recommend that heritage concerns be given greater consideration in the decision-making of the Province by:**
  - **Tasking the Council of Deputy Ministers with the development of measures to give heritage concerns a higher profile in the decisions of the Province**
  - **Making heritage impacts become more prominent in the Environmental Impact Assessment process**
  - **Requesting that the Commissioner on Land and Local Governance (announced in the April 4, 2008 Speech From the Throne) develop mechanisms for the protection of heritage features in unincorporated areas as well as in communities that do not have official plans**

## **Insufficient Funding**

During our public meetings, stakeholder sessions, and key informant interviews, the consultants heard frequent reports on the acute shortage of funding in support of the operations of provincial and community heritage institutions. There has been a corresponding lack of long-term planning, which leads to further problems like opportunities missed from alternative sources of funds, the loss of archaeological resources (see below), and deteriorating conditions of collections, facilities and services (see below). The following subsections explore the effects of this on the PEIMHF, the PARO and the community museums.

- **Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation**

The majority of funding for the PEIMHF is provided by the Government of Prince Edward Island. Our research suggests that this base level funding is clearly not sufficient to allow the institution to fulfill its mandate. This lack of adequate funding applies to the natural

heritage part of the mandate in particular, but it also generally affects acquisitions, proper care of collections, research, interpretation, exhibition, and programming. The PEIMHF's staff level is about one-half of former full-time staff levels and most staff are covering multiple responsibilities beyond what can be reasonably expected. Deficiencies in operating funds force a reliance on unpredictable grant-based summer employment programs; this situation leaves many of the provincial museum staff unable to plan ahead for key curatorial activities and public programs.

Insufficient funding for the renewal of programs and exhibitions has led to a lack of a dynamic visitor experience at provincial museum sites. We heard that these factors have led to public dissatisfaction with the quality of the visitor experience; as a result, the sites are failing to attract visitors in sufficient numbers to build public support or generate revenues needed to supplement the costs of operation. As many sites are open only during July and August, the abbreviated visitor seasons compound the problem

Funding challenges are exacerbated by the demands of running a provincial museum system with multiple sites. Although this is an effective way to deliver diverse heritage experiences and programs in communities across the province, financial efficiency is lessened by the need to staff these multiple sites. The operation of multiple sites is also capital-intensive, and many of the decentralized sites operate in multiple buildings. This has led to the deterioration of facilities and collections because of the need for maintenance and repair of facilities and structures. Some de-centralized sites, such as Orwell Corner, operate in multiple buildings.

Funding shortages have led to a deterioration of facilities and collections. One clear example of the lack sufficient capital investment in the Island's heritage facilities is the Artifactory, which is the main collections storage facility of the Province. While some recent improvements have been made to the building such as a new roof to stop leaking (a decades-old problem), it still has insufficiencies and the fabric and fittings of the structure expose the interior to pests, dirt, and the weather. The facility remains unsuitable for long term museum storage according to current museum standards for most collections.

Based on the foregoing analysis,

- 3. We recommend the development of a three-to five-year capital funding program to improve the condition of the buildings at the seven Provincial Museum sites and to invest in new, high-quality exhibitions at the sites. Further, a budget and plan should be established for ongoing operations and annual site maintenance for these Provincial sites.**
- 4. We recommend that the Government provide sufficient base-level funding to Provincial Museum sites to enable all of them to remain open a minimum of two months longer to accommodate school visits and the tourism shoulder seasons.**

- **Public Archives and Records Office**

Similar to the PEIMHF, funding for the PARO is not sufficient to support the basic archival functions of acquisition, preservation, research, arrangement and description, providing for public access, and outreach. On an operational level, PEI's per capita spending on public archives is approximately one-third that of Newfoundland and Labrador, and one-sixth that of both Nova Scotia and New Brunswick; and at the same time, the PARO has the lowest staff to visitor ratio in Canada. This means that the PARO has the fewest staff helping the highest number of visitors of any provincial archives (National, Provincial, and Territorial Archivists Conference, Whitehorse, June 15, 2007). This situation is very taxing for the PARO staff and makes it difficult to meet the needs of the public.

Among other things, the PARO is responsible for receiving and preparing for public access the archival documentation of the government of Prince Edward Island. Though provision has been made in the recent provincial budget to hire a Government Records Archivist who will help to ease the problem, this deposition program currently has a backlog of approximately 2,000 boxes. Other than these government records, there is no acquisition program, so little means for staff to solicit potentially important historical material from individuals or from industry or other non-governmental organizations.

And many potential donors may be wary of the PARO capacity to care for their materials. The archives also lacks the resources to preserve its various types of textual, audio-visual and other electronic holdings, and for these services must rely on a preservation technician contracted by the Archives Council of Prince Edward Island. A recently-installed and much-needed computer system was acquired, but funded largely by the federal government. Finally, due to a lack of resources, PARO has limited public hours – not fitting for a governmental unit created to serve the public interest.

- **Community Museums and Archives**

According to what we heard during the consultation process, the community-operated institutions have also suffered under financial constraints similar to those above. By the time seasonal employment grants have been awarded and budgets are determined, the availability of the best-qualified staff is often restricted, marketing and promotional opportunities are missed and the time available for staff training and program development is limited.

The Province offers operating support to community museums through a \$60,000 operating grant program administered by the Community Museums Association of PEI. We heard that the size of this program is seriously inadequate to meet the needs of the Island's community museums. By contrast, the Province of Nova Scotia's Community Museums Assistance Program (CMAP) has a budget of \$975,000 and is administered by a full-time staff person. Participating museums are eligible to receive grant of up to 50% of their operating budget. On a per capita basis, this translates to \$0.44 cents per person spent on community museums on PEI, versus \$1.07 per person in Nova Scotia.

If the Government of PEI maintains the status quo with respect to support for community museums, the Province runs the risk of seeing the closure of some of these museums, which are among the main community institutions in many rural areas. The government

would also fail to capitalize on the enormous amount of volunteer time that is dedicated to the preservation of Island heritage by members of the community.

On the other hand, even modest increases in the operating grants program can have a tremendous impact on community museums, can leverage increased investment from other levels of government, and if tied to performance measures, would strengthen standards and maximize government investment.

The further development of performance standards and the administration of the expanded operating grants program, if continued in collaboration with the Community Museums Association, would build on the Association's existing knowledge of, and relationship with, the Island's community museums and strengthen the position of the Association itself.

Based on the foregoing analysis,

- 5. We recommend that the provincial government increase support to the community museums by expanding the standards-based community museum operating grant program and administer this program in partnership with the Community Museums Association.**

## Protection of natural and cultural landscapes

Public consultations revealed a deep concern about the protection of the landscape. This includes both natural and cultural aspects like coastlines, forests, built heritage and traditional scenic roads. In terms of the natural aspects, several factors contribute to this concern: lack of a strong provincial vision for land management, economic influences like changing farm practices and trends in the agriculture industry, urbanization, cell-towers and windmills. Also worrisome to Islanders is restricted access to lands, viewscales, waterfront and beach areas, often as a result of poor planning or unsympathetic property owners. This is an increasing concern given that Prince Edward Island is the most densely settled Canadian province, with much of its land privately owned.

As reported in *Cultivating Island Solutions*,<sup>4</sup> the report of the Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship in 1997, the public requested the following categories of actions:<sup>4</sup>

- Better provincial legislation and enforce it to protect important landscapes and built heritage
- Government support the preservation of important landscape features
- Encourage communities to develop and implement better land use plans

---

<sup>4</sup> Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship (1997). *Cultivating Island Solutions*. Charlottetown, PEI; Round Table on Resource Land Use and Stewardship.

As a result, the Round Table made a recommendation to amend current legislation in order to make it easier and more financially attractive for landowners to donate development rights. This means that landowners would still hold title to their land and conduct current activities like agriculture but could not change to another land use such as housing or recreational development. There are many important Island landscapes that would qualify for this protection. The L.M. Montgomery Land Trust, for example, has identified thirteen kilometres of shoreline on the north shore, from French River to Seaview (3,000 acres), as scenic agricultural and coastal landscape that the Trust is working to protect through the acquisition of development rights. While the concept is laudable, the challenge is that the Trust has few financial resources to buy these rights, which can be up to 80% of the land's value.

For examples of successful methods of landscape protection, we can look to other countries such as Denmark. 50 years ago the Danish government enacted legislation to preserve important environmental and scenic areas – in effect, it zoned the whole country. Owners were compensated and farming was allowed to continue, with a preservation clause attached to each deed. “Growth centres” were identified, usually within existing towns, so that schools, hospitals and business activity were concentrated in one area, reducing public service costs while protecting the landscape and stimulating cohesive communities. (Preservation Acts, 1973, 1977, 1983, cited in K. Connor online submission).<sup>5</sup>

With respect to cultural landscapes, Islanders are concerned that their built heritage in PEI is in danger of being lost to neglect, to economic pressures, and even to well-intentioned but sometimes misguided efforts to “restore” built structures. Existing mechanisms, such as the provincial environmental impact assessment and approval process, could be more fully utilized to protect architectural heritage, along with other aspects of the cultural landscape. Incentives that could potentially be useful include tax accommodations, low-interest loans, grants, and heritage policies and programs. The benefits to protecting heritage places are social, environmental, and economic.

Some of these incentives are already in place, connected to provisions for architectural heritage under the *Heritage Places Protection Act*, which has jurisdiction over places of both cultural and natural heritage interest. The Heritage Places Advisory Board advises the Minister of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour on the registration or designation of these places. Registration is largely honorific but designation offers a higher level of protection, prohibiting the owner from altering the exterior of the property without permission from the Province. Though the legislation does not *require* property-owner consent, the only designations thus far have been voluntary.

The consultants are of the opinion that the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour should re-examine its practice of requiring agreement from property owners before the designation of a heritage place. While this process may be contentious, we suggest that it remain a topic for discussion in future heritages places protection planning.

The protection and maintenance of built heritage depends on the knowledge and interest of government staff, architectural historians and private and corporate citizens. In PEI,

---

<sup>5</sup> Denmark, the Miljø Sekretariat (1973, 1977, 1983). *Preservation Acts*.

however, one key element is missing. We do not have the necessary professional expertise in architectural preservation in government or our places of education.

In terms of managing the information about heritage buildings, the Historic Places Initiative, a pan-Canadian program that works to build awareness and create a culture supportive to heritage conservation, is similarly limited. With 490 Island properties listed so far, the program is due to end next year and while there is a sunset provision for federal participation, when the federal funds cease, management of the inventory will be in question.

For built heritage, stakeholder participants suggested that we consider recommending the establishment of a trust, like the highly successful Island Nature Trust, a non-governmental organization which buys and holds land to protect natural areas. They imagined the new "Island Trust" as an advocacy organization with modest public funding and community-based governance. However, the consultants were concerned that the creation of another organization would further fragment and thus weaken heritage protection. Thus, for the protection of the built environment, we favoured consolidation of actions as part of a larger, more sustainable effort.

In order to address these weaknesses in the protection of PEI's natural and cultural landscapes:

6. **We recommend that the Province make greater use of existing landscape protection legislation; include more public education, building local capacity and heritage expertise in related areas; and develop new mechanisms to encourage owners in heritage preservation, including better financial incentives such as tax accommodations, loans, grants, and outright compensation.**
7. **We recommend that the powers of the *Heritage Places Protection Act* be used more effectively to promote and regulate the protection of heritage property, especially in the designation of places, and coordination of the Act with enhanced planning and development control legislation.**
8. **We recommend the appointment of at least one full-time Heritage Officer within the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour.**
9. **We recommend, in light of the pending discontinuance of federal government funding, that a plan be developed for future management of the Historic Places Initiative.**

## Protection of Archaeological Resources

Prince Edward Island has legislation in place that protects moveable and immoveable cultural and natural heritage. This legislation includes the above-mentioned *Heritage Places Protection Act* and the new *Archaeology Act* (pending proclamation).

Archaeological excavation alters forever the environment of *in situ* artifacts. It must therefore be controlled and permitted only where appropriate and by qualified

professionals. All excavated artifacts removed from the soil or waters of Prince Edward Island are the property of the Province and may be retained by the PEIMHF.

Archaeological objects and associated information are vulnerable to damage and loss. The *Archaeology Act* (this new Act will not be proclaimed until the regulations are prepared) and its predecessor, the *Archaeological Sites Protection Act*, prohibits the removal of artifacts from the soil or waters by anyone who does not possess a permit obtained from the provincial government. This has not prevented the disturbance of archaeological sites, the removal of artifacts by unauthorized persons and the loss of associated information. This not only deprives Islanders of artifacts, but destroys valuable information about the provenance of those artifacts. The loss of Aboriginal objects is particularly grave because of their comparatively high and unique informational value. Though the penalty is substantial, few transgressors have received anything more than a written reprimand.

The new Act prescribes that sites or artifacts must be 150 years old to be designated. Under the previous Act, archaeological sites were designated at the discretion of the minister.

Largely due to lack of human resources in archaeology and in archaeological collections' database management, much of the information is associated with archaeological sites is currently collected and/or maintained by off-Island agencies like Parks Canada and the Canadian Museum of Civilization in Gatineau, Quebec.

Archaeological sites, especially coastal sites, are increasingly vulnerable to threats like erosion and development, especially when in private hands. One example is the purported site of the cemetery and church of Havre Saint-Pierre, the largest settlement on the Island during the French regime. This site is on private lands and has never been the subject of any formal archaeological investigation, but faces potential threats from encroaching recreational development.

Under such circumstances, the Minister may temporarily designate a site as protected in order to undertake archaeological investigation; however, this action is rarely taken.

**10. We recommend the following actions regarding administration for archaeology:**

- **Immediate proclamation of the *Archaeology Act*, preparation of the necessary regulations and the undertaking of adequate publicity and enforcement**
- **Reconsider the 150-year BP (Before Present) time limit as a qualifier for designating sites and artifacts, so that the natural and cultural historic importance of the site or source is the deciding factor**
- **Greater use by the Minister of the power to designate or temporarily designate archaeological sites in peril, and a reconsideration of the legislation to allow the Minister to extend the initial stop-order period if necessary**

- **Specification in the Regulations for Permit Applications that the applicant is obliged to carry out a conservation evaluation of the site prior to excavation, and to demonstrate that appropriate conservation support can be provided for excavated materials**

## **Institutional Stewardship**

One of the more serious weaknesses of the heritage system in PEI and one of the most pressing concerns emerging from the public consultations, as well as the literature review, is the lack of a strong, centrally-located provincial museum. There is simply no year-round central facility on the Island that is capable of properly fulfilling the basic museum functions of collection, research, conservation, exhibition and public programming, and education.

The Public Archives and Records Office, though it has a mandate and purpose distinct from that of the PEIMHF, shares a general responsibility for Island heritage, as well as similar space requirements. Moreover, there are particular areas of activity, such as the research, conservation, acquisition and management of collections, exhibition and administration, where a combined museum and archives facility might be both more effective and more efficient.

Before arriving at this conclusion, the consultants considered a variety of options, including:

- The creation of several new provincial museum sites, at various locations in the province, dedicated to interpreting particular aspects of Island history that are not currently addressed at existing sites. Two examples are natural heritage and Aboriginal history.
- The closing of the existing provincial museum sites and creation of a new provincial museum that would allow for the incorporation of the interpretive focus of those museums, and fill in existing gaps, such as natural heritage and Aboriginal history. It would also provide suitable collections storage, educational, public meeting and administrative spaces.
- Leaving existing provincial museums sites open and creating a new, centrally-located Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives complex that would have adequate space for storage, for conservation, for exhibition and for educational and public programming activities. Such a facility would allow for the interpretation of a wider range of Island topics and for the exploration of themes not addressed at existing sites, such as natural heritage and Aboriginal history. This complex would ideally act as an ambassador to the existing museums, archives and related natural and cultural sites.

In option one, the capital and operating costs associated with building and running multiple new branch sites of the provincial museum would likely be very high. As such, the consultants considered this an undesirable option.

The second option would have the benefit of increased efficiencies by eliminating the costs associated with operating multiple sites. It would also allow for the creation of suitable exhibition, collections storage, educational and administrative spaces. However, we do not believe that these efficiencies would outweigh the advantages of the current system, which include the varying economic benefits to the communities in which the branch sites are located, as well as the educational benefits of interpreting particular aspects of Island history in their original context, such as the fishery at Basin Head or shipbuilding at Green Park.

The third option of a creating a new, centrally-located provincial museum and archives facility, which includes shared exhibition space and suitable collections storage, educational and administrative spaces, would require a significant capital commitment. At the same time, however, the creation of a new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives facility would have the advantage of satisfying both the museological and archival physical requirements. The central location would make the facility accessible to the highest percentage of residents and visitors, and would provide PEI with an important new heritage attraction, much like The Rooms, in combining a new provincial museum, archives and art gallery, has done for Newfoundland and Labrador. Locating the museum and archives within the same building would result in both capital and operating cost efficiencies, and also enable staff and the public to benefit from the synergies of having ready access to both.

On the basis of this evaluation of options,

**11. We recommend that the Government of PEI undertake a professionally-led study that:**

- **Identifies the functional requirements for a new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives**
- **Projects the financial costs associated with building and operating a new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives**
- **Assesses potential locations and recommends a preferred site for the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives**

## **a. Institutional structure, organization and governance**

### **PEI Museum and Heritage Foundation**

The current PEIMHF is a crown corporation. The Minister responsible for Cultural Affairs, or his or her public service member delegate, is a member of its Board.

We heard concerns about the PEIMHF with respect to weak communication and coordination, and overlapping mandates in the delivery of programs. For example, although the PEIMHF has the legislative authority for matters concerning built heritage, in practice that responsibility has been undertaken by the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour. For a number of reasons, also evident from the literature review, this aforementioned lack of leadership in the PEIMHF has been allowed by government to persist over a long term, resulting in a loss of public confidence, flagging donations, and an apparent failure to attract younger members. Combined with an

unclear mandate and chronic underfunding, this has created a difficult and demoralizing situation for its board and staff. The corporation is in a survival mode rather than a visionary mode.

In examining possible solutions to address the weakness of the PEIMHF and its role as the provincial museum, the consultants considered the following options:

- Create a new crown corporation to replace the PEIMHF
- Make changes to the existing crown corporation to clarify and renew its mandate
- Dissolve the PEIMHF crown corporation and move all heritage activities into government as a line department or part of a line department

In considering the first option, the consultants concluded that weaknesses with the PEIMHF could be resolved without creating an entirely new crown corporation. Therefore, the legal and administrative efforts required to create a new crown corporation would not be justified.

The second option of clarifying and renewing the mandate of the existing crown corporation offers the advantages of continuity. A crown corporation for heritage also has advantages over it becoming part of a government department; it has the potential to be more entrepreneurial, more responsive, and more appealing to sponsors. It can more easily recruit volunteers and solicit donations than can a line department within government.

The third option of moving the PEIMHF function directly into a government department has the advantage of consolidation of efforts into one administrative place. However, as noted above, it loses the advantages that can be associated with being a crown corporation.

**See Recommendation 12.**

### **Public Archives and Records Office**

Our consultations and site visits clearly indicate that the Public Archives and Records Office faces significant challenges caused by inadequate facilities and resources. The PARO has experienced tremendous collections growth and has almost reached its collections storage capacity. This has necessitated that archival materials be stored in no fewer than four locations, none of which meets archival standards. The PARO also lacks dedicated records processing space, fully functional conservation facilities, adequate public space for resources (including the popular genealogical research), office space and exhibition areas.

In addressing the facilities needs of the Archives, the consultants considered a number of options:

- Renovation and expansion of the existing PARO building: The inadequate space, layout and infrastructure of the George Coles building, a heritage designated structure, does not allow for the required extent or types of retrofit necessary to meet current standards for the collection.

- Relocation of PARO to a new, stand-alone facility: While the creation of a new public archives facility would have the advantage of securing additional and high quality physical space, in light of our recommendation for the construction of a new, centrally-located provincial museum, we concluded that the construction of two new separate provincial facilities would be inefficient and costly, and not likely to receive the necessary support.
- Creation of a new shared Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives: This option has the advantage of allowing PARO to secure the additional size and quality of space that the PARO requires, while at the same time by combining it with a new provincial museum, achieving capital and operating efficiencies, and functional synergies. For example, the infrastructure required for environmental controls in collection storage and exhibition areas for both archives and the museum can be shared, as can the conservation/preservation laboratory facilities and exhibition spaces. Staff can better collaborate formally and informally as colleagues in interdisciplinary teams; and the entire facility will better serve Islanders and other visitors by providing increased and user-friendly space and access.

Based on this analysis of choices, the consultants concluded that the third option, the creation of a new, combined provincial museum and archives facility, is the preferred one for addressing the PARO's facilities needs.

By uniting the Provincial Museum and the PARO to form a new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives, there is an opportunity to renew and enhance the mandate of the existing crown corporation model for the administration of heritage. The current corporate model itself is not inherently flawed; and it is intended to operate at arm's length from government. In the case of the PEIMHF, however, it has suffered from inadequate financial resources, an erosion of its mandate and influence, political interference, and a consequential decline in public support. A restructuring, expansion and renewal of its mandate, together with a commitment to supply adequate resources, will send a strong message to the public of Prince Edward Island that their heritage is of great value.

- 12. We recommend that changes be made to the existing crown corporation, renaming it the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives (PMA); that the corporation be governed by a Board of Governors that includes the minister (or representative); that the board report to the minister; and that the corporation be given clear responsibility for management of endowment funds, governance of the provincial museum sites and management of tangible and intangible provincial collections of archival, natural, and cultural history materials.**

## **Board of Governors**

In the new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives, the method of choosing and appointing the members of the Board of Governors should be changed to allow for the membership of the new PMA to be involved in a nomination process. Provision was

made in 1983 in the *Museum Act* for the PEIMHF membership to recommend candidates to the Minister for appointment to the board, but this provision was repealed in 1994.

Regarding current membership, the *Museum Act* provides that anyone who pays a prescribed membership fee may become a member. A similar provision for membership in the PMA should apply. Regarding representation of the new PMA membership on the board, there needs to be a mechanism in place for the combined (museum and archives) membership to nominate one board member per year to serve a three-year term, possibly alternating people with interests in museums and archives each nominating year.

It will be important to clearly define the following with respect to the powers of the Board: appointment and reporting relationship of the museum's Chief Executive Officer; the role of the members of the PMA; and the relationship between it as a crown corporation, and the Department of Communities, Cultural Affairs and Labour.

- 13. We recommend that the Board of Governors of the re-mandated corporation, drawn from the various communities of interest, should be a policy board and would be responsible for administering endowment funds, including those to be transferred from the PEIMHF. The Chief Executive Officer of the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives should report to the minister through the Board.**

## **b. Human Resources**

During the consultation process, stakeholders frequently cited gaps in human resources as a serious weakness of the PEI heritage system. In organizations that are fortunate enough to have paid staff, these employees often struggle to fulfill their obligations despite inadequate support. At the provincial level, particular staffing gaps identified during the course of this research include museum curatorial staff, archivists, conservators, educators and marketers.

Other key weaknesses related to human resources include insufficient expertise and leadership, lack of opportunity for professional development and advancement, and lack of succession planning or time and resources for intern/student-training. A decreasing number of volunteers, largely due to an aging population, is also an issue for serious consideration. The results of inadequate attention to human resources include a loss of volunteers, or at least their disillusionment; decline in the quality of essential duties such as collections care, security, public programming, interpretation and facility maintenance; and poor working conditions.

At the branch sites of the PEIMHF, respondents noted that the lack of adequate and consistent human resources has resulted in:

- Inability to perform essential duties such as collections care, security, public programming, interpretation and facility maintenance
- Staff and volunteer burnout and decline in quality of the performance
- Poor and sometimes hazardous working conditions

- Decline in the quality of the visitor experience and in public confidence

Our consultations and research identified major inadequacies in the human resources devoted to heritage at the provincial level. The filling of these human resources gaps is necessary to fulfill the Department's legislative mandate. Sufficient human resources would also provide a valuable service to provincial museum sites and community museums throughout the province as well as to the public. The gaps include the following professional functions:

- Curatorial
- Conservation
- Archival
- Education

To more clearly explain some of the priority functions that are not adequately fulfilled, we describe below what we believe to be the functional gaps in the heritage system in PEI and provide examples of how such needs are typically met in museums and archives meeting current standards. These may be adapted to the needs of Prince Edward Island.

***Curation of Natural History:*** Curatorial, educational, and interpretative functions related to natural history collections and natural heritage resources are needed within the entire provincial museum system.

***Curation of Architectural History (Built Heritage):*** Expertise in heritage buildings is needed to conduct research and advise in such areas as rural and urban planning, and related legislation, and protection and restoration of historic exteriors and interiors. Curatorial and outreach programs related to architecture and built heritage resources are important parts of this function.

***Curation of Archaeology:*** Threats to land-based and marine sites make it imperative to have the capacity to identify and protect these endangered sites and resources. Building of collections here, possible repatriation of the Island's archaeological heritage from elsewhere, and development of local capacity and partnerships (for example, with Aboriginal representatives with respect to Aboriginal sites) are activities that need to be undertaken.

***Museum Conservation:*** With about 80,000 objects in the provincial museum system and countless others requiring support throughout the province, a permanent full-time conservation service must be provided to protect and preserve the tangible heritage collection. Preventive and treatment conservation, advice on collections care and standards, development of local capacity, planning of new facilities, and development of policies in areas effecting collections care are essential.

***Preservation of Archival Materials:*** Archival preservation is a different specialty from artifact conservation and requires different training. There is no full-time, permanent preservation support for archival collections. Contractual conservation service is funded by a program administered through the Archives Council of PEI and is shared with other organizations. Preservation services are needed to provide care for a wide range of archival materials, to apply professional, current standards to archival conservation, and to help plan new facilities and policies in areas effecting collections care.

**Archival:** There are areas of deficiency at the PARO. In the new facility, greater capacity will be needed to assess, maintain and provide public access to alternate-media records, such as sound recordings and film. The position of Government Records Archivist has been provided for through new recent funding, which may help address the problem of the backlog of government records waiting to be transferred. But additional archival capacity is needed to work in private historical records and public consultation.

**Education:** To maximize the contact between Islanders and Island heritage at the community and school levels, education is an important function. This will require cooperation between the PMA, the Department of Education and educational institutions, and related organizations with educational mandates. It must be borne in mind that non-government organizations and the general public are also to benefit from the educational opportunities offered by the new PMA.

According to our consultations, bridging the gap in human resources in heritage in PEI would include some capacity to serve the public in both of Canada's official languages. Strategies for achieving this should be considered in the Human Resources plan.

In response to the gaps identified in this study, if the Government of Prince Edward Island maintains the status quo, there will continue to be a lack of professional expertise in a number of essential areas, some of which are directly related to legislated mandates. The Government risks further deterioration of precious heritage resources, thereby increasing risk to itself in respect of its fiduciary role as guardian of these same resources. By hiring staff to fill the identified human resource gaps, the government will meet its legislated responsibilities; and put in place the expertise required to safeguard and capitalize on the full spectrum of the Island's heritage resources.

Based on this analysis,

14. **We recommend that the Government of PEI develop a human resources plan that gives priority to and sets out timelines for filling the need for additional capacity in the following areas: curatorial (natural history, archaeology, and architectural history), conservation (artifact and archival), archives, and education.**

### **c. Care of Tangible Collections**

As discussed earlier, a heritage strength identified during the consultation process is the existence of many and various types of collections. A weakness, however, is the ability of the Province to care for these collections. This is manifested in inadequate collections management, documentation, conservation, storage facilities and equipment, exhibition and transit. The level of care in these areas is not in keeping with professional standards. This problem has been longstanding and noted in various museum reports and documents.

#### **Lack of a Coordinated Approach to Collecting Across Institutions**

The lack of clear and distinctive collections mandates among the major heritage institutions on the Island, such as the PEIMHF, PARO and the Confederation Centre of

the Arts, has led to ambiguity around the appropriate repository for certain collections. As a result, some collections of art, artifacts and archival material may not be housed in the institution that is most suitable to care for or interpret them.

### Conservation Staffing and Support

The conservation needs of the provincial collections far exceed the available professional and technical conservation capacity within government. The Province has only one half of a position for museum conservation, and that is allocated to doing private work to generate revenue for the PEIMHF, rather than caring for in-house collections. There are limited resources to support the Community Museums Association to train volunteers in proper collections management policies and procedures, or to ensure that they have the resources to implement this training.

### Space and Facilities

The Artifactory, at approximately 8,500 square feet, is only half the estimated space needed to accommodate the existing provincial collection. This former bus storage building is not suitable for most museum purposes. Environmental conditions including uncontrolled summer temperatures and dust pollution within the building remain unacceptable, and are contributing to the degradation of important cultural resources. The overcrowded situation necessitates that artifacts be stacked and stored in a manner that is hazardous for both collections and personnel.

Likewise, the PARO has almost reached its storage capacity. Collections are at risk from overhead plumbing and sprinkler systems. The main building is not capable of maintaining archival-standard environments, and this is hazardous for many materials, especially film-based media. A conservation report was conducted about ten years ago, but only the policy aspects were implemented (*cite this report*)

For the provincial collections, there is a lack of specialized equipment and supplies for conservation and other collections care duties. The PARO, for example, has no solvent extraction system or proper washing and treatment facilities for oversized documents and maps. The consequences of these deficits include:

- Potentially hazardous conditions for collections and staff
- Serious, and sometimes irreversible, physical damage to provincial collections
- Loss of public confidence in the government to care for the provincial collection, resulting in a decrease in donations of potentially important collections
- Loss of interpretive/educational opportunities resulting from the loss of resources
- Potential government liability for neglect of fiduciary duty for collections

15. **We recommend an updated provincial museums and archives collections policy to meet professional standards and broaden cultural representation in collections; as well as an acquisitions policy to delineate collections mandates among the provincial heritage institutions with criteria to ensure each collects according to its mandate.**

16. **We recommend that the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives curatorial and conservation staff meet with Aboriginal representatives to determine how best to assist in building capacity for care of and access to Aboriginal collections, both in provincial collections and in their communities.**
17. **We recommend that a provincial conservation policy be developed, and that assessments be prepared by conservators for each provincial museum site and the Public Archives to identify critical collections care needs. We further recommend that the Government provide the necessary support to address these needs.**
18. **We recommend that purpose-built museum and archival storage facilities for the provincial collections be provided to replace existing storage. We further that recommend conservation facilities and equipment be provided as part of the new PMA.**

## **Support for Intangible Heritage**

Much of what is rich and original in our culture is intangible: folklore, oral history, songs, language and other aspects often encompassed by the broader category of intangible heritage. The only – or the most compelling – historical record of some cultural groups may be intangible.

A particular concern expressed throughout the public consultations was the paucity of the recording, collection and preservation of material in these areas. One of the main reasons for this was suggested to be the lack of a provincial institution with clearly designated responsibility for the collection and management of intangible resources. In our neighbouring provinces, the recording and collecting of oral history, songs and language is part of the mandate of university-based archives such as the Beaton Institute at Cape Breton University and the Centre d'études acadiennes at the University of Moncton. The latter facility, for example, holds the important collection of French-language recordings collected by Island folklorist Georges Arsenault.

Songs are another aspect of intangible heritage. American folklorist Edward “Sandy” Ives, who came to the west Prince area in the 1950s while doing research for his Ph.D. thesis, was amazed at the richness of the Island oral tradition. He wrote four books based on Island songs and songmakers, including one on Larry Gorman. Fortunately, his field recordings are preserved at the Maine Folklife Centre at the University of Maine.

We heard that the survival of the Island's earliest languages – Mi'kmaq and Acadian French – is also of concern to Islanders. These languages reflect culturally specific world views and experiences of Prince Edward Island. Maintaining them as lived heritage is a primary concern for some who attended our public meetings and stakeholder sessions. While French is one of Canada's two official languages and is thus supported by the Federal and provincial governments, we heard that more could be done to encourage its use as a living language and also to ensure that it is recorded for posterity. We were told that the Mi'kmaq language, which has begun to receive some federal support in other provinces like Nova Scotia, in Prince Edward Island is struggling to survive. Other

languages, like Gaelic, have indeed become lost to the province. The two people believed to be the last two native Gaelic speakers on the Island passed away in the 1980s; fortunately they were captured on audio and videotape before they died.

A foundational chapter of Island history that has yet to be featured at any major site or exhibition is that of the Island's Aboriginal peoples, especially the Mi'kmaq community. It is imperative for youth and for Prince Edward Island generally that this history be respected and their stories represented appropriately.

The history, folklore and languages of smaller or more recently arrived cultural groups in PEI are important elements in Island heritage; any efforts to record, collect and preserve oral tradition should include interviews with these citizens. There is a social purpose for intangible culture, especially in supporting community and identity for recent immigrants. Canadian research has demonstrated that new immigrants enjoy better emotional health and are more inclined to remain in areas where they can enjoy a sense of cultural community. (Samuel Noh et al, *Social Support and Quality of Life: Social Support among Korean Immigrants*, Advances in Medical Sociology, Vol. 5, Pp 115-137, 1994.)

Living traditions such as the activities mentioned above often require venues for social interaction. They benefit from supportive policies in the community and workplace. One of the submissions to our study made a case for government to revisit earlier plans to establish a government office for multicultural affairs and policies.

19. **We recommend that the proposed new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives take the lead to develop joint action with UPEI, to collect, preserve and make accessible to the public the intangible heritage of the Island, including the creation of a sound and film/video recordings archives.**
20. **We recommend that the Province review and develop provincial cultural policies and programs in consultation with cultural communities to help promote PEI's intangible culture by:**
  - **Improving co-ordination among cultural programs, and including diverse cultural perspectives into mainstream projects, such as heritage sites, landscape and architectural conservation.**
  - **Liaising with representatives of the two main Aboriginal organizations in PEI, the Mi'kmaq Confederacy of PEI and the Native Council of PEI, to ensure equitable representation of Aboriginal culture.**
  - **Increasing support to community programs for recording and preserving intangible heritage in areas like traditional knowledge, arts, dance, music and languages of diverse Island cultural communities like Mi'kmaq, Francophone, Lebanese, Scottish, Irish and recent immigrants.**
  - **Supporting cultural venues, such as those provided by the rural community halls, and Aboriginal and Francophone and other**

**communities; and in consultation with cultural communities, explore the possibility of a government office for multi-cultural affairs and policies.**

## **e. Natural heritage**

Our consultations revealed a concern that natural heritage, as an integral part of Island heritage and outlined as part of the mandate of the PEIMHF in the 1983 Museum Act, is grossly neglected. Many presentations to the study group noted, and seven past museum and university-generated reports have stressed, that the natural heritage part of the museum mandate has not been addressed.

Beyond this, the consultation participants had two main bodies of opinion: one called for an integrated central museum – possibly in a natural setting – where natural heritage would be integral to Island heritage overall; and the other pushed for the early creation of a natural heritage branch museum, possibly in the Orwell Corner/Macphail Homestead locale.

To fulfill the natural heritage aspect of the museum mandate, there were several possible approaches considered by the consulting team, including:

- Developing a natural heritage-themed branch museum
- Expanding the interpretation at existing PEIMHF sites to include natural heritage
- Integrating a natural heritage section within the proposed Provincial Museum and Archives central facility
- Interpreting and promoting natural heritage, through the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives, as well as in protected sites of natural heritage interest

The first option, of developing a stand-alone natural heritage museum in addition to the proposed new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives, would not only be more expensive from a capital and operating perspective, but would separate the interpretation of natural heritage and cultural heritage.

In the second option, it would be difficult to integrate natural heritage into the interpretive framework of some of the existing sites and would result in only a fragmentary interpretation of Island natural heritage. In some sites, however, it could work well.

The third option would allow for interpretations of the Island's natural heritage to be integrated with the interpretation of the Island's cultural history, in a central location.

The fourth option is one that could complement any of the three other options. Protected natural areas would make fine 'satellite' sites for natural heritage interpretation as part of a larger unit. They could be scattered throughout the province in a variety of locations aimed at protecting flora and fauna.

Based on our assessment of these options,

## **21. We recommend that:**

- **Natural heritage be more fully integrated into the seven sites of the existing provincial museum system, as well as the proposed new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives**
- **The provincial natural heritage collection be expanded**
- **Natural heritage curatorial expertise be added as a priority as noted in the Human Resources section of this report**

## **f. Research**

Research is one of the core functions carried out by museums, archives and other heritage institutions and organizations. Research aims at discovering, interpreting and revising knowledge and includes both pure and applied activities. In museums, for example, usually as part of the curatorial function, researchers acquire and analyze objects, specimens and documents, and interview people to develop a framework for understanding aspects of nature and culture. In archives, usually as part of an archivist's responsibilities, the research provides what are often original text and image documents as background for the acquisition or authentication of materials, and as the context for describing them. In all instances, professional research is needed to prepare the thematic content for displays and participate in the planning, implementation and evaluation of exhibitions.

In order to understand the cultural and natural heritage of Prince Edward Island, it is necessary to understand the multiple forces that shaped it. Creating that understanding depends on research into fields such as archaeology, cultural anthropology (or ethnography), the natural sciences and human history in such areas as science, industry and technology.

The resulting information is used to develop exhibitions, as well as scholarly and general publications in a variety of media for educators, learners, the public, and research colleagues in related fields. The effective sharing of local research and information within PEI was frequently reported by study participants. Curators and archivists, for example, often commented on their strong sense of collegiality in this regard. They cited their close proximity as a positive factor in their interpersonal communications. However, participants also told us that it is difficult to build new professional networks, to participate in debates, and to remain current in heritage development beyond Island shores, because the means are insufficient for them to participate personally in events such as conferences and symposia. This professional isolation negatively affects potential professional collaborations. While the internet offers access to certain types of research and information, it is no substitute for personal interaction among colleagues, for example, when developing partnerships. Therefore, improved research support is necessary to expand knowledge about the Island within a larger, global perspective and to develop relevant learning resources and innovative heritage experiences, especially for youth.

- 22. We recommend that the Province mandate the proposed Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives to conduct research necessary for exploring, interpreting and revising knowledge about Prince Edward Island and to tell a more complex version of the Island story. We also recommend that the PMA pursue opportunities to establish partnerships with individuals and**

**institutions to conduct research that contributes to the objectives and programs of the PMA and other similar institutions.**

## **g. Education**

Education is one other of the key responsibilities of museums and archives. Collections are the raw materials used to educate visitors, the community at large and especially schoolchildren, but they need to be interpreted and made accessible through the research, exhibition and educational process to the school curriculum. This increases and enhances student visits.

In our consultations we heard a common refrain that not enough is being done to teach the cultural and natural heritage of Prince Edward Island. This applies to both formal and informal education, to school and post-secondary institutions, to learning opportunities at the community level, and, of course, to heritage institutions. The PEIMHF, for example, is no longer as involved in schools as it once was. Only two of its seven branch museums operate year-round at regular hours, and neither one is central, resulting in an inaccessibility to schoolchildren in many areas of the Island.

- 23. We recommend that the provincial government mandate a role for education in the new PMA, so that for the benefit of students and the wider community, contact is maximized between institutional educational representatives, Island schools and the community at large.**

## **h. Exhibition and programming**

Exhibition and programming is perhaps the most visible of the key museum functions, and is also an important responsibility of a provincial archives. In a purpose-designed museum and archive facility such as the proposed Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives, it is imperative to have new, up-to-date permanent and temporary exhibition galleries with associated visitor amenities like rest areas, washrooms and dining facilities. At the moment, the PARO has no such capability. At the provincial museum sites, in many cases the existing permanent exhibitions and associated spaces require extensive refurbishment.

Regarding exhibition practice, the material culture of which exhibitions are comprised are often original, sensitive objects that require proper cases, frequent rotation and controlled environments to protect them from irreversible damage. Without the proper space or facilities to exhibit and rotate collections, museums and archives are either forced to keep them perpetually in storage, or put them at risk by exhibiting them in unsuitable, insecure areas.

The Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives will need to develop its interpretation, exhibition and public programming policies in accordance with contemporary museological and national standards. This is especially true in the representation of, and collaboration with, non-dominant cultural communities.

## **Expanding the Island Story**

In terms of content, some study participants suggested that exhibitions should be authentic, interactive and meet the needs of Islanders first; tourists second. The current paucity of exhibitions in natural and cultural history, to give two broad examples, has been long identified as a major problem in the Island heritage system. Only a fraction of natural features, sites and collections have been interpreted and exhibited. And relative to other jurisdictions, the same holds true for the cultural history of PEI: of women, of Aboriginal peoples, of other non-dominant cultural communities, of technology, and of many other areas.

The proposed Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives could begin to address this deficiency, but it will require work in all key museum and archival functions including research, collection, education and exhibition. Versions or aspects of the Island story should be inclusive and integrative, and facilitate participatory experiences. Gaps include the Island's geological, mythical and historical origins, and the portrayal of its peoples and environment so that diverse aspects and perspectives emerge, and a balanced view is presented of aspirations and achievements, struggles and failures.

Some parts of the Island story are now interpreted in museums – like shipbuilding at Green Park, fisheries at Basin Head, agriculture at Orwell, railroad history at Elmira and potato culture at O'Leary. Further specific themes can be explored at other provincial sites, including the Island's many sites of natural heritage expanding, for example, on the work done by Parks Canada at the interpretation center at Greenwich.

Islanders told us that this new provincial museum site should show visitors “the big picture” of Island history, and to encourage them to visit those wide array of other sites and organizations across the Island. In describing how this system might work for the benefit of all, one key informant urged, “adopt the circulatory system as a guiding metaphor: in a circulatory system – blood goes in two directions. Not everything gets pulled into the central core. There is no numbness at extremities [when there is a strong heart].”

- 24. We recommend that the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives provide permanent and temporary exhibition space and support facilities for the provincial collections to meet the highest professional standards and practices in exhibition concepts and design.**
- 25. We recommend that an interpretive master plan be developed to identify the key natural and cultural themes that constitute the 'Island story'; and that protocols are established to ensure appropriate cultural representation and collaboration so that the story is inclusive.**

---

## Opportunities

---

### The Island diaspora

For a tiny Island, Prince Edward Island has a remarkable diaspora – descendants, dispersed worldwide, of the multitude of Islanders who joined the steady stream of out-migration from our shores, beginning in the mid-nineteenth century. Unfortunately, research on this subject has been scant, both in academia and government tourism departments. But some idea of the size of this group can be imagined by considering that, in spite of succeeding generations of typically large Island families, the total population remained static at about 100,000 for the century between 1860 and 1960. The rest simply left – in the tens of thousands – often for the Boston States and other parts of Canada, but also to all other corners of the world. Many still fondly think of themselves as ‘Islanders’ and they and their descendants frequently come “home” to visit.

This diaspora is partly responsible for the popularity of genealogy in PEI, and better services for genealogical research could be attractive to it. In the past, this interest was served in part by the Genealogist and the Genealogy Room at the PEIHM, but this service was discontinued in early 1990s. The proposed Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives could allow for a comparable space and some resources. For support of family reunions the Province could do more along the lines of Tourism PEI’s Reunion Assistance Program. Such measures could mobilize and engage the latent power of the Island diaspora, making “returning” Islanders and researchers not only partners and clients for genealogy research, but should provide a major funding source for the PMA and its programs.

26. **We recommend that the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives expand its resources and services to serve the public interest in genealogical research by establishing a Family History Room, and by collaborating with non-governmental genealogical organizations to the same end.**
27. **We recommend that the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives, the Department of Tourism, and the heritage community work together to target the Island diaspora in promotion and programs.**

### Enhancing knowledge about heritage

Mention must be made of positive developments in enhancing knowledge about, and appreciation of heritage. This pertains especially to programs and courses in our educational institutions like the annual Heritage Fair program in schools; new courses at Holland College that include wildlife conservation and traditional cabinet making; the reinstated funding to the Community Schools program; the revamping of the grade six and high school curriculum related to Island history; and perhaps most significantly, the recent promise in the Speech from the Throne to develop an Island Studies course for schools.

Much more can be done. Islanders preparing to enter the workforce who want to work in traditional or primary industries like farming and the master trades have suggested that apprenticeship programs be developed at the post-secondary level to increase access to learning in these areas that require both theory and hands-on learning in non-school settings. The transmission of such accumulated knowledge is best accomplished on-site. Holland College and UPEI have an opportunity to develop such programs, such as the university did in the past with courses in Island natural history and land-use.

The proposed Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives will provide many opportunities for informal learning through its exhibition and public programming. It will also provide the same for formal learning, but this is best optimized in conjunction with established educational institutions.

28. **We recommend that the “Island Studies” course mentioned in the Speech from the Throne (April 4, 2008) include environmental awareness and the importance of local citizenship and the global community. It should be offered in all high schools.**
29. **We recommend that the Province encourage Holland College and similar educational centres to explore providing training in traditional trades in order to make such occupational options more available and to ensure succession in areas that are part of Island heritage.**

## Threats

---

The many threats to Island heritage have already been discussed. Particularly pressing is the need to address the following two general areas of concern:

### Loss of resources and information

The loss of our heritage resources – artifacts, archival records, historic places, people – is a continual and cumulative process that has already greatly contributed to what we are calling the Island ‘heritage deficit.’ If not arrested or at least slowed, this process will severely affect the ability of future generations to appreciate and use these resources for the purposes of education, social cohesion, well-being and general enjoyment.

Please see recommendation numbers 10, 14, 17 and 19 in particular.

### Threats to natural landscapes

One of the most pervasive concerns identified in the public consultations was the deterioration of the natural landscape. Unlike some areas of concern in this study, this one is readily obvious even to people who may not have interest in heritage preservation *per se*. Though due in part to factors outside of government control, like erosion and other problems resulting from natural forces, there are measures within the purview of the provincial government that could ameliorate this situation. These include working

with communities to encourage and develop better land-use planning, and creating new policies and legislation or strengthening and enforcing those that exist.

Please see recommendation numbers 6 and 7 in particular.

- 30. We recommend that the Province create a provincial heritage strategy; take immediate steps to address some of the most pressing needs recommended in this report; and prepare annual reports on the progress in implementing the new provincial heritage strategy during its first five years.**

## V. PRIORITIZATION OF RECOMMENDATIONS

The following is a selection of abbreviated recommendations most representative of the recommendations contained in this report. They are organized according to four phases: immediate, short, medium, and long term.

Some recommendations need to be addressed almost immediately (within eight months); others need to be undertaken within the short term, that is, within two to three years. These recommendations set the stage for major actions for the management of Prince Edward Island's heritage resources, and include those related to capacity-building, funding and planning. The medium term, that is, within three to five years, involves infrastructure development and long-term planning. The long-term phase includes the ongoing development and maintenance of the existing and new infrastructure as well as the operations of the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives system. A synopsis follows:

### **Immediate (within eight months):**

---

- Develop a heritage strategy to guide government action
- Make more effective use and enforcement of existing legislation (e.g., *Heritage Places Protection Act* to protect heritage places; proclaim the *Archaeology Act* and develop regulations)
- Strengthen and clarify the mandates regarding administration of provincial heritage resources
- Give more prominence to heritage concerns within government as part of the decision-making process
- Establish the Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives as a re-mandated and enhanced heritage crown corporation

### **Short-term (one to two years):**

---

- Build capacity throughout the system -- which involves developing a human resources plan, and hiring professional curators, archivists, conservators and an educator. These professionals will initiate programs within the existing infrastructure and plan future facilities, programs and policies
- Undertake a study for the proposed new PEI Museum and Archives facility to identify functional requirements and financial costs, and to recommend a preferred site
- Increase the operating funding to the seven provincial museum sites to expand their operating season and improve programming
- Increase support for community museums through the Community Museums Association
- Develop collections policies
- Develop mechanisms to protect natural and cultural landscape and built heritage through the use of economic instruments
- Develop an inclusive interpretive master plan integrating natural and cultural themes in consultation with cultural communities

**Medium-term (three to five years):**

---

- Develop a capital funding program for the seven provincial museum sites
- Ensure the new PMA fulfills the natural heritage mandate of the *Museum Act*
- Move personnel and stored collections into the new Prince Edward Island Museum and Archives facility

**Long-term (six to ten years):**

---

- Continue to build, conserve and manage collections, while developing exhibitions, programming and educational resources
- Maintain the physical infrastructure

## **APPENDIX A. – QUESTIONNAIRE**

These questions were meant to guide the discussion in the various forms of public consultation and interviews. They were also in a questionnaire that was available in hard copy and online.

**Is heritage important to PEI? Why or why not?**

**What do you consider to be the main strengths and assets of the Island’s heritage resources, institutions, organizations and programs?**

**What do you consider to be the major gaps or weaknesses in the Island’s heritage resources, institutions, organizations and programs?**

**What should PEI be doing to build on its heritage assets and address any existing weaknesses/gaps?**

**What is your vision for a healthy and dynamic future for the heritage in PEI?**

**What role do you think the Government of PEI should play in helping to achieve this vision?**

## **APPENDIX B. – LITERATURE REVIEW**

### **Introduction**

For the purposes of this study, heritage in Prince Edward Island refers to resources like the tangible and intangible remains of our past, institutions like the Public Archives and the Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation (PEIMHF), and the activities of these institutions, like collection, preservation and exhibition.

Many government-generated and related reports have been written that touch upon matters of provincial heritage. A necessary step in understanding the current situation is a review of this literature as it provides a picture of past questions and answers, limitations and developments, and problems and solutions. It also makes evident the recurring issues that continue to impede progress in provincial heritage development.

This review does not include general works on heritage, museums or related areas. It is confined to a selection of reports, policies and other documents, generated from 1972 to 2007, that pertain specifically to heritage in Prince Edward Island or to heritage as part of larger studies of Island culture or of tourism. The Special Collections division at the Robertson Library holds much of this material but some has been supplied from personal holdings. For this and for their comments we thank Catherine Hennessey and David Webber, and for his comments, Ian Scott.

Following the chronological summary is an analysis of its key themes. This section makes additional use of material concerning more specific areas of heritage like natural history, tourism, and the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum.

## Chronological summary of literature on heritage in Prince Edward Island

In a review of the literature on heritage in Prince Edward Island, museums stand out as a particular area of concern. The first museum in the province was established with the inauguration of the Garden of the Gulf Museum in Montague in 1958. The Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, with a national mandate, was created by federal legislation and opened in 1964. The provincial museum system began in 1970 with the founding of the Heritage Foundation (PEIHF) and the amalgamation of its headquarters at Beaconsfield with three regional sites at Green Park, Orwell Corner and Basin Head. All were created largely with the assistance of federal funds connected to the 1973 centennial. The railway station at Elmira and the Eptek exhibition centre opened later in the decade, and the Acadian Museum in Miscouche joined in 1996.

In a document dated 1972, the PEIHF outlined its aims and policies. The general guide for this ambitious document was the Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation Act, legislated the same year. The Board of Directors and the Executive Director identified the following priorities: community responsibility, research and documentation, publication, acquisitions, preservation and acquisition. Noted as areas being in particular need of support were archaeology, oral history, history and architectural history documentation. Other activities identified as pertinent to the Foundation mandate were to assist in the publishing or community histories and in the writing tourist brochures, and for the purpose of acquisitions, to keep aware of the antique and auction market and of the “whole picture” of Island architecture. Also, as the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum had primarily a national mandate, the collection of fine art “by Islanders and of Islanders” was then viewed by the Foundation as one of its responsibilities.<sup>1</sup>

At the time of writing, the PEIHF had only a small collection space “in the old Vital Statistics vault on Prince Street”: underlined as necessities were a proper facility with adequate space, fire and humidity control, and a conservation technician. Also deemed necessary in the area of interpretation was the hiring of a staff person in the role of curator/educator, a program of history “markers” for historic sites, a series of nineteenth century buildings scattered around the Island (a sort of decentralized period village), and the support of local museums. In terms of natural history, the Foundation endorsed the idea of a science and natural history complex as put forth by André Lavoie (see below).<sup>2</sup>

Local museums – not all were ‘museums’ *per se* or were supported by their communities, rather some were the results of individual efforts – existed before the establishment of the PEIHF, and evolved independently. In 1974 the Minister responsible for Cultural Affairs, Earle Hickey, asked the Foundation to make recommendations on these entities and what the responsibility of the provincial government should be towards them. The report, written by Wayne MacKinnon, made a series of observations on the situation. Maintaining that the contribution of any museum should be made “in light of their contributions to preservation, research and education,” he described the existing sites as the poor result of unplanned processes and unprofessional personnel, created chiefly for tourism purposes. In addition to recognizing the need for an artifact storage facility, MacKinnon suggested that while the sites should remain autonomous and maintain their position in the communities, their organizational and professional situations should improve before any governmental funding was

committed to them. The year after the submission of this report, the PEIHF began administering to these museums a modest small grants program, totaling \$3,000, and a \$1,000 training program to improve professionalism.<sup>3</sup>

In 1976 the provincial government requested George MacBeath and his colleagues of the Historical Resources Administration of New Brunswick to carry out a study and report on problems in the administration of all historical resources in Prince Edward Island. The primary issue at this time was the lack of coordination in the various bodies involved in the field. According to Barry Lord, the impetus for this was the overlapping jurisdictions concerned with heritage resources, especially as it pertained to the PEIHF, the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, and the Department of Tourism.<sup>4</sup>

The recommendations of MacBeath et. al. began with changes at the government departmental level, calling for a minister to be responsible for all heritage resource management on the Island. This department would include the provincial archives and the PEIHF, in a somewhat more refined role. A Museums Division would be created to assume responsibility for all museums and galleries, and a Research and Development Division would both “develop and operate designated historic sites” as well as coordinate heritage activities in other governmental agencies and in the private sector. Significantly, MacBeath envisioned the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum as the key component of a provincial history museum. A second unit of this museum would be located in Summerside and a third in Montague, developing from the existing Garden of the Gulf Museum.<sup>5</sup>

These recommendations never came to fruition; the provincial government decided that the responsibilities of the PEIHF should be expanded instead. In order to examine how this would work, a study was undertaken by Donald Nemetz in 1977. Among the recommendations: that the roles of the board members and of the salaried positions and their relationships be better defined, that the Foundation needed to put in place program plans with clear priorities including an acquisitions strategy, a plan for better storage and exhibition purposes, and a plan for the management of the branch sites, and that more sources of funding be sought from governmental and private sources. Final recommendations related to sorting out the museological mandates of the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, and the Foundation.<sup>6</sup>

As for the community museums, in the fall of 1979 the Executive Director of the PEIHF asked Robert Frame, at the time Assistant Director of the Nova Scotia Provincial Museum, to evaluate the four community museums then receiving grants from the Foundation: those in Alberton, Montague, O’Leary, and Miscouche. Frame reported that, in general, while his was not a full study or analysis, the museums were not in a good state. Regarding their exhibits, they were not well organized, well informed, or well interpreted or displayed. Since for artifacts they relied on donors or lenders who expected to see their treasures displayed, there was no clear collecting policy and a tendency existed to attempt to display everything in the collection. This resulted in a series of what Frame referred to as homogeneous “Community Attics,” rather than individual museums interpreting the unique characteristics of their own communities.<sup>7</sup>

Reminiscent of MacKinnon's report, Frame saw that at least a partial solution would be to establish standards of practice and raise overall knowledge levels. Instead of training programs, however, the author suggested that an advisory service based at the PEIHF headquarters could serve this purpose, along with the museums' participation in the Canadian Museum Association (CMA): this connection would bring access to further advice as well as to pamphlets and other publications on various topics of museum practice. Frame saw that further funds would be well spent in incentive grants with the aim of permanent upgrades to facilities or programs, and that each museum should receive the equal amount of operational funds providing that the community match with equal funds or the equivalent in volunteer time.<sup>8</sup>

The status of the community museums still an issue, at the end of 1981 the Executive Director of the PEIHF, Catherine Hennessey, reported to the board of directors on their status. She cautioned that greater attention needed to be paid to museum quality and standards, adding that the establishment of a community museum was not always the answer to communicating the history of a place – preservation of landmarks and structures, and other community-minded ventures might be worth more or as much attention. Also, communities had to do their best to engage everyone in matters of heritage interest: "history/heritage should not be put on display by the 'history buffs' and forgotten by the town councils!" At this point the provincial government owned a number of properties (only one, the Macphail homestead, is still owned by the Province), seven of which Hennessey deemed necessary to receive further government attention. Other suggestions dealt with staffing.<sup>9</sup>

Hennessey also gave a synopsis of the situation of most community museums then extant, stating that with such limited funds grants should be given to them only for specific activities. Though a Heritage Endowment Fund then existed, which might have been tapped to slightly increase the contribution that the PEIHF was able to provide, with a couple of exceptions Hennessey did not believe that the facilities as they then existed were justified to receive it in terms of "service to Islanders, the educational system, or to the researchers in the province."<sup>10</sup>

In 1982 the University of Prince Edward Island's (UPEI) Island Studies Committee, on behalf of and with funding from the provincial government, commissioned museologist Barry Lord to conduct a comprehensive study of all museums in the province. Lord had five points of reference on which he was to report: A history of the development of all Island museums, including the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, an assessment of these museums, an analysis of the overall Island museum system, recommendations for improvement "without recourse to major structural changes or capital initiatives," and the feasibility of creating a new "provincial museum of man and nature."<sup>11</sup> Lord made 75 recommendations; a synopsis follows.

As had previous analysts, Lord observed that the existing museums needed to establish higher standards in museum practice in general, and in particular, clearer policies for research, acquisitions, loans, gifts, conservation, public programs and security. Regarding the community museums, more assistance and advice should be provided, for example in the position of a Museums Advisor connected to the existing PEIHF or to the new museum, in addition to the creation of a provincial association to develop training sessions and provide general assistance.<sup>12</sup>

Regarding the existing provincial museum system under the PEIHF, Lord saw the recently-inaugurated 'Artifactory' as a significant improvement, but that the building needed to be connected to a strong, centrally-located display facility, perhaps adjacent to and collaborating with UPEI. This new "museum of man and nature" should assume the museological role from the Heritage Foundation, whose mandate should be redefined to be one of a center dealing chiefly with architectural conservancy.<sup>13</sup>

The remainder of Lord's 75 recommendations dealt mainly with the organization, staffing and operations of the proposed new provincial museum. The branch sites would remain as parts of the provincial museum, with the addition of the Holman Homestead in Summerside (then owned by the Foundation). Each of these sites would retain their own boards, with the chairs ex-officio members of the provincial museum board. The Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum would allocate 50% of its space to the new museum until such time as a separate facility was prepared. The new museum would pay more attention than had the Heritage Foundation in the past to marketing, education, publishing, bilingual services, craft demonstrations towards the end of selling traditional products, and working with various government departments.<sup>14</sup>

Further to the idea of establishing a new provincial museum system, in 1983 the PEIHF Board of Directors asked J. Lynton Martin, director of the Nova Scotia Museum, to study and submit, within the limitations of no new substantial funding, recommendations on its potential structure and organization. Martin envisioned a museum structure with a third, Natural History Division, adding to the existing two in History, and in Exhibits and Programs.<sup>15</sup>

The Natural History Division Martin saw as building on the work of Kathy Martin and her inventory of natural science specimens (see below), and where the Natural History Society, the Island Nature Trust, and UPEI would be closely associated. Like the History Division, this one would be responsible for its own collections, and therefore a detailed acquisitions policy would be required. The existing Exhibits and Programs Division of the PEIHF Martin suggested could do more in developing both permanent exhibits and traveling exhibits, and work more closely with provincial departments of education. In terms of staffing he saw a situation where non-professionals could be employed in much greater capacity, either as volunteers or paid small honoraria as research associates.<sup>16</sup>

In 1983 the provincial Museum Act established the provincial museum system and the Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation (PEIMHF). This continued the existing model of a headquarters and branch sites, with no new facility such as Lord had recommended. With funding from the Museum Assistance Program (MAP) of the National Museums of Canada, the board of directors of the new entity engaged the former director of the National Museum of Natural Sciences, Dr. Louis Lemieux, and Heather Lemieux (Diomedia Consultants) and their colleagues to conduct a planning and development study of it. The consultants noted that most of the existing problems could be overcome with sufficient funds. Recommendations included the creation of an overall museum structure and plan, as well as suggestions for organization, staffing, costs, funding and overall development. The decentralized model of the former PEIHF could remain, with affiliated branch sites, though Lemieux et. al. envisioned the expansion of Beaconsfield into a full-fledged branch museum with headquarters relocated to another location. The authors considered the addition of a natural history museum as essential.<sup>17</sup>

In one of the comparatively few studies undertaken on a specific area of heritage outside of museums, in 1988 folklorists John Shaw and Jim Hornby conducted an analysis for the Institute of Island Studies (IIS) on the possibility of establishing a provincial oral history archive. The terms of reference were to provide a brief inventory of oral history records then extant in Prince Edward Island, to develop a rationale for such an archive, and to make recommendations as to its location, initial organization and operation, and possible sources of funding. The authors concluded that such an entity was of immediate necessity and that it be housed in one of two institutions: the Public Archives of Prince Edward Island or the Robertson Library at the University of Prince Edward Island (UPEI). Hornby and Shaw considered the latter to be more appropriate due to its greater potential in the creation and collection of oral history records, as well as in its educational mandate.<sup>18</sup>

Also in 1988 the provincial government appointed a Ministerial Committee in the Cultural Affairs Division to outline a proposal towards the creation of “a comprehensive provincial heritage and museum policy.” The Committee, chaired by the Director of Cultural Affairs, Allan Rankin, was comprised of representatives from the PEIMHF, the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, the Community Heritage Federation, and the Public Archives. In addition to the policy outline, according to the terms of reference the report was to include suggestions regarding the mandate of the various bodies concerned with heritage, a framework for inter-organizational cooperation, and a Ministerial advisory function. The mandate of the Committee did not include analysis of development possibilities or of funding.<sup>19</sup>

The final fifteen recommendations of the Ministerial Committee covered most areas of heritage: landscape and natural history, archaeological remains, built environment, material history, folklore/oral history, social and cultural history, the arts, and archival records. Among other points the Committee recommended that a provincial heritage council be created for the implementation of policy goals, that an overall conservation strategy be developed for tangible heritage, that a centre for oral history and folklore be created, and that the PEIMHF do more in the way of architectural conservancy. It also reiterated the need for the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum and the PEIMHF to collaborate in respect of their collections responsibilities.<sup>20</sup>

Early in 1998 two governmental documents on culture and heritage appeared: “Culture...Itself a Treasure,” by the Ministerial Committee on Culture of the provincial Department of Education, and the final report, “Culture and Heritage Integrated Service Delivery,” by the Matrix Consulting Group. The first report was the result of the study and consultations by the Committee chaired by former UPEI President Dr. William Eliot. The Committee included six other members in addition to a consultant – the managing partner of the Matrix Consulting Group – who assisted in gathering the material and drafting the final report. For the purposes of its mandate, culture was defined as including three key elements: heritage, the arts, and language.<sup>21</sup>

The terms of reference for “Culture...Itself a Treasure” were similar to those set out for the 1988 study but with the inclusion of the arts and language, this one had a larger scope. The organizations reviewed were the Community Museums Association of PEI, the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, Le fédération culturelle de l’Île-du-Prince Édouard, the PEI Council of the Arts, the PEI Multicultural Council, the PEIMHF, regional arts councils, and Theatre PEI. Most of the seventeen recommendations dealt with matters concerning the arts, but the interview and consultation process also raised

pertinent issues about heritage. These included the level of cooperation between the community museums and the PEIMHF, the unfulfilled mandate of the latter regarding natural heritage, the “replacement and use of the Artifactory,” and questions about traveling exhibits that could be used in schools and other sites, and the relationship between the museum and the heritage activities of the Island Mi’kmaq. The main theme overall, indicated by the title, was that culture should be valued for its own sake first, then second, as a benefit to the economy.<sup>22</sup>

The study by the Matrix Consulting Group, conducted roughly simultaneously with the Ministerial Committee study, was funded by the provincial Department of Education, the Department of Canadian Heritage and the Knowledge Economy Partnership. Its mandate was to examine integrated service delivery in the new “knowledge economy” in the field of culture and heritage (treating them as one sector). Out of the eight “disciplines” identified in the report, heritage comprised only two: heritage resources (archives, museums, historic sites, libraries and art galleries) and festivals of a heritage nature. The consultant focused on the information technologies in the delivery of “services” as well as formulating strategies “for further economic growth and development.” The final recommendations came under three general headings: fostering partnership, the knowledge economy, and “capitalizing on the economic potential of the sector.”<sup>23</sup>

Following the creation, from approximately the mid-1990s, of provincial cultural policies Canada-wide, in 2002 the Prince Edward Island government created its own cultural policy. While the provincial heritage and museum policy proposed in 1988 had never materialized, the new cultural policy included heritage, in that the policy was intended as a “framework of broad principles” to guide government action in the “arts, cultural industries and heritage.” While not defining specific initiatives, the document stated that its commitments in the area included “consistently high standards of achievement” in the cultural institutions, and that the provincial government would “recognize the benefits of cultural initiatives in the education system” as well as “involve the community in cultural decision-making through consultation and arms-length mechanisms.”<sup>24</sup>

In the wake of the policy, the provincial Inter-departmental Committee established in 2002 to coordinate governmental cultural activities commissioned the MacArthur Group Inc. to propose a strategy to build upon it. The consultant relied heavily on the cultural policy and on the 1998 Ministerial Committee on Culture report for guidance. The final 25 recommendations were grouped into five overall goals: the building of a creative environment to encourage the development of arts and heritage, the development of cultural awareness, the investment in culture at all governmental levels, the improvement of human resources and representative associations, and better marketing, branding and communication strategies.<sup>25</sup>

In 2006 a controversy erupted over the fate of the Artifactory, the storage building used to house the provincial collection of museum artifacts. Upon the announcement by the then-government of plans to create a new storage facility in Murray River, the Institute of Island Studies (IIS) at UPEI instigated a series of public meetings on the issue, the results of which were compiled and published in 2007.

The “Public Consultations on the PEI Museum System” revealed that Islanders were concerned not just about the proposed move of the Artifactory. The report outlined that

the majority of participants, prompted by a set of precise questions, favoured an overall system whereby a central provincial museum would form the “hub” and the existing museums and sites would form the branches or “spokes.” This new provincial museum would help ensure the retention and preservation of tangible heritage, provide educational services in cultural and natural history, and be adequately staffed with professional museum personnel. Included in the final “participants’ advice” was the suggestion that the government undertake a study of “museum policies and operations,” expanding on the public consultations initiated by the IIS.<sup>26</sup>

## **Thematic analysis**

### **1. Weak provincial commitment to heritage**

Several themes emerge from this literature review. Perhaps the most prevalent is the relative unimportance attached to heritage matters by successive provincial governments. Though several pertinent analyses have been commissioned concerning heritage overall (MacBeath, Ministerial Committee on Heritage and Museum Policy), specific areas of heritage (K. Martin, Hornby and Shaw), as well as heritage as part of culture (Ministerial Steering Committee on Culture, Matrix), most of the key issues remain either unaddressed or unresolved.

Prince Edward Island has no heritage policy or strategy – even the 2002 document issued as the provincial cultural policy largely replicates that created for Nova Scotia. And heritage in PEI has only ever come under the jurisdiction of other departments, for example those responsible primarily for tourism, education, and community and cultural affairs. MacBeath suggested that a minister of the crown be placed in charge of historical resource management, and that this department include a Museum Division and a Research and Development Division, but this was never realized.

A constant refrain is the difficulty of even making recommendations, let alone outlining strategic practical solutions, with such limited resources. Barry Lord, for example, was to make recommendations for improvement of the museum system “without recourse to major structural changes or capital initiatives.” Lynton Martin was to study possibilities in the creation of a new museum system within the limitations of little additional funding. Several consultants, like Lemieux, noted that most of the existing problems, at least in the museum system, could be properly addressed with more funding. And the PEIMHF itself, in a 1986 statement of intent, noted that since they had been “starved for funds” they were not able to respond to the responsibilities outlined for it in the 1983 Museum Act.<sup>27</sup>

Even with the attention on history and heritage in the years bracketing the centennials, for example, Island provincial governments have relied largely on outside funds. These monies came chiefly from the federal government. Indeed, they laid the groundwork for most of the provincial heritage institutions and have initiated and helped to maintain a range of heritage activities in the province. In the 1970s, for example, funds from the Centennial Commission and other federal sources created the basis of the Prince Edward Island museum system. Community museums have long received assistance from MAP, federal employment programs made it possible to hire students and other workers, and programs like the recent Heritage Places Initiative are also federally sponsored.

On the other hand, as noted in several reports like MacBeath's, further possibilities for federal funding, at least for museums, were not sought due to the limitations of the provincial museum system.<sup>28</sup> In order to access grants offered by the National Museums Program, for example, institutions had to achieve 'associate' status by way of meeting certain criteria. The only facility assigned such status in Prince Edward Island was the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, but it was functioning primarily as an art gallery and not as a museum of history or science.

Though instrumental in provincial heritage operations, government is not its only source of support. The survival of the community museums and other heritage activities depends heavily on a network of dedicated volunteers, and donations in the form of artifacts and monetary gifts have long supplemented Island heritage activities. The Nemetz report, for example, in 1977 outlined a strategy for the PEIHF to do more to solicit funds from private sources. These included the establishment of multiple levels of membership in order to recognize those who were able to contribute more, better promotional efforts to seek contributions to the Foundation's Endowment Fund, and continuing efforts to seek donations of artifacts and heritage properties.<sup>29</sup> 30 years later the IIS reported that one of its discussion groups stressed the need for the provincial museum to solicit more corporate sponsors and be more "business-like."<sup>30</sup>

## 2. Heritage "for its own sake" vs. heritage for economic or tourism purposes

In Prince Edward Island, as in most other jurisdictions, ideas of heritage resources as a public good, heritage institutions as public spaces and as providers of public services, and heritage activities as benefiting residents of a given area have coexisted with the idea of heritage as a generator of economic wealth. Most of the more general studies reviewed here have recognized this dichotomy and have encouraged the primacy of the former; others have highlighted the latter.

The literature focusing on the economic aspects of heritage includes economic impact studies of culture in general, analyses of the cultural industries, and reports generated for tourism purposes.<sup>31</sup> Even the 1998 report of the Ministerial Committee on Culture, "Culture...Itself a Treasure," was created seemingly in conjunction with the Matrix Group study, which looked primarily at culture as an aid to economic growth. More recently, as indicated in one of the public meetings organized by the IIS on the museum system, the importance given to each approach needs to be carefully weighed. While one group

suggested that museums be more business-like in their pursuit of funds, others held that other indicators of success were equally as significant.<sup>32</sup>

In Prince Edward Island the focus on tourism has had strong implications for the heritage sector and this has generated several recent studies.<sup>33</sup> As elsewhere, due to its unique economic benefits 'heritage tourism' has had a long history here; indeed it was established in the province well before the provincial government became seriously involved in the field. In the literature, as far back as 1972 the Board of the PEIHF urged that a curatorial position be created for a professional whose primary aim would not be to cater to tourists: "Let us interpret our history for Islanders primarily, the bonus will be that it will be the best way of interesting the tourist."

Similarly, André Lavoie noted that same year that his proposed creation of an outdoor nature centre should be chiefly for the benefit of the people of PEI: "Tourism is big business on Prince Edward Island, I realize this fully, but this must not interfere with our duty to serve our citizens first." Later, in the IIS meetings the economic benefits of heritage tourism were acknowledged, especially regarding its potential for helping to revitalize downtown Charlottetown. But in terms of a central museum the main focus of this institution was to be the people of the Island.<sup>34</sup>

### 3. Structure of the provincial museum system

The literature on heritage in Prince Edward Island, while covering areas like archives, archaeology and genealogy, has overwhelmingly centred on museums. As mentioned, the first museum in the province was established in 1958 in Montague. The provincial system began in earnest with the founding of the PEIHF in 1970. Continually at issue has been the relationship between the two (the community museums and the provincial system), the lack of a lead facility and a natural history facility in the provincial system, and the status of the museum mandate of the Confederation Centre.

#### ***The community museum network and its relationship with the provincial museum system***

During the past 35 years heritage consultants like Robert Frame have reported specifically on community museums and the relationship between them and the provincial museums system operated by government. Most others, however, have addressed this issue in the course of analyzing museums, heritage or culture in general.

The separate systems were created by the fact that several local heritage efforts already existed upon the founding of the PEIHF in 1970, and these were not absorbed by the Foundation. Rather, the Foundation encompassed seven newly-created branch sites of its own. In the early years a key question was of the duty of the PEIHF to these other entities. In its 1972 "Aims and Policies," the Board expressed the desire to follow the Nova Scotia model, which was to provide assistance by way of advice and operational grants providing that certain criteria were met. Wayne MacKinnon's study of all Island museums generally supported this view. Also, while his definition of museum was very broad, he found that what he called the community museums were, in general, unprofessional and operating "almost solely to serve the tourist trade."<sup>35</sup>

According to Catherine Hennessey's 1981 document on community museums, in or around 1975 the PEIHF began running workshops and other training efforts as a way to increase professionalism. The Foundation was also responsible for the allocation of a small grant provided by the Province for the purpose of supporting selected community museums. In the last years of the 1970s these grants went to the facilities in Alberton, Montague, O'Leary and Miscouche, the four reviewed by Robert Frame in 1979. Hennessey's comments, a valuable synopsis on the state of these and the other museums then extant, reveal a frustration in supporting with limited funds those created with little foresight or planning as to their continued operations.<sup>36</sup>

In 1983, following a recommendation of the Lord report, the Community Heritage Foundation (now the Community Museums Association of PEI) was created largely to take over these responsibilities formerly carried out by the PEIHF. And in 1985, following recommendations in a report by Lee Jolliffe on training for museum personnel, the Community Heritage Foundation began to apply for and receive funds for that purpose from the National Museums of Canada.<sup>37</sup>

These parallel museum systems have remained. One aspect of their relationship surfaced most recently in the IIS public meetings with the question of how a new central museum facility would affect the smaller branch sites as well as the Island-wide community museums. While a few participants worried that a central facility would detract from the smaller ones, the majority felt that it could act as a sort of ambassador for the others, as well as direct traffic their way and provide them better access to museological advice, support and training. Some also suggested that representatives from the Community Museums could serve on an expanded board of the provincial museum.<sup>38</sup>

### ***Lack of a lead facility in the provincial museum system***

The lack of a substantial provincial museum was the dominant issue at the IIS public meetings but it has long been a key problem in the Island heritage sector, recognized by several consultants including MacBeath, Lord, and Lemieux. A major result of this gap has been the loss or perceived loss of tangible and intangible heritage due to the lack of resources that would normally be attached to such an entity, like professional staff or adequate funds for acquisition purposes, and sufficient storage and display spaces. In 1972 the PEIHF's "Aims and Policies" noted this, as did MacBeath, as did the IIS report some 31 years later. Participants at the IIS meetings urged immediate action to prevent further loss.<sup>39</sup>

Also evident has been the difficulty, without a substantial core facility, of carrying out key museological functions besides collection and exhibition, like preservation, education and public programming. MacBeath, for one, made this observation, but also that the situation meant there was no leadership on museological matters overall.<sup>40</sup> The Lord report was perhaps the most emphatic. Indeed, most of the 75 recommendations therein concerned the creation and operation of "a provincial museum of man and nature" that would continue the decentralized model, but include a new centrally-located facility able to perform all of the above functions. As no steps had been taken toward this end since Lord reported in 1982, the IIS meetings 25 years later were largely taken up with the same issue.

### ***Lack of a natural history component in the provincial museum system***

Since the mandate of the PEIMHF is “to study, collect, preserve, interpret and protect the human and natural heritage of Prince Edward Island,” another of the most evident gaps in Island heritage is the lack of attention to this natural history component. Again, this was recognized in almost all of the museum reports, in particular those by Lord, Lemieux, the Ministerial Committee on Heritage and Museum Policy, and the IIS.

In addition to these studies, there exist several reports specifically on natural history. André Lavoie, a provincial government employee in outdoor education and recreation, in 1972 submitted to the PEIHF his suggestions on the establishment of a nature centre primarily for the use of teachers and their students in the educational system. The complex was to include a residence for camping, complete with classroom facilities and interpretive capabilities, and during the summer months it would serve as an exhibition and interpretive program centre.<sup>41</sup>

In an Island Studies project at UPEI in 1982, Kathy Martin compiled a preliminary inventory of “natural science specimens” from scattered collections containing such specimens. This inventory was seen as the first step towards establishing a collection that would be representative of the Island’s floral, faunal and mineral history, though there was no institution capable of housing such a collection. Martin’s recommendations included the creation of a clear policy on the collecting of natural science items, the computerization of documentation on the extant collection and future collections, and the establishment of priorities given the gaps and duplications identified.<sup>42</sup>

Five years later, in response to Lemieux’s recommendation for the creation of a natural history museum, Barbara MacDonald and the Natural History Museum Advisory Committee made fourteen recommendations on the subject to the PEIMHF. These included the hiring of a Curator of Natural History, the acquisition of a collections space and the development of a natural history collection, the creation of educational programs in the topic at the branch museums, and the initiation of cooperative agreements with other Island organizations concerned with natural history.<sup>43</sup> None of these recommendations was realized.

### ***Museological mandates of the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum and the provincial museum***

As part of the 1972 National Museums Policy and the idea of “decentralization and democratization,” the National Museums of Canada designated a network of associate museums to receive funds in order to partially fulfill the function of a national museum service in more local jurisdictions. In Prince Edward Island the designated institution was the Confederation Centre Art Gallery and Museum, though, as noted above, it functioned chiefly as an art gallery with a national mandate. The PEIHF at the time was not operating as a fully fledged provincial museum and therefore had no facility capable of meeting the associate criteria. As a result, as Barry Lord has noted, PEI was the only Canadian province without an associate institution able to deliver museum services in the fields of history and science.<sup>44</sup>

Several consultants, including MacBeath and Lemieux, noted the problem but Lord provided the most in-depth analysis. He suggested that the provincial government make the case to the federal government that either the PEIHF or the new museum that he proposed be given associate status, or that the Confederation Centre begin to exercise the museum part of its mandate. Advocating the latter view was the then-director of the Confederation Centre Art Gallery, David Webber. Webber, whose experience was more in the realm of museums and historic sites, in an address to the Friends of the Confederation Centre in 1983, expanded on Lord's suggestions. He put forward that the Gallery could continue its associate status and cooperate with the PEIHF by providing it space, expertise and security for its exhibitions.<sup>45</sup> This came to fruition by way of several exhibitions over subsequent years, but by the early 1990s had largely (though not completely) lapsed.

## **Literature Review Conclusions**

A review of the pertinent literature on heritage in Prince Edward Island reveals that the focus has been on museums. Relatively lacking are studies on other areas of governmental responsibility in heritage like archaeology, historic sites and buildings, archives and libraries. Also largely absent are analyses of national and provincial policies governing historical resources. These include the Cultural Property Export and Import Act, the Archaeological Sites Protection Act, the Archives Act, and the Museums Act. Essential to understanding heritage in the province is to understand how these policies are interpreted, supported and implemented, or not.

Governmental and other institutional studies are always commissioned as a response to an issue or problem. From 1972 to 2007, of note in the literature on heritage in Prince Edward Island is the consistency of these problems and the lack of resolution. They include the unimportance of heritage relative to other governmental sectors, the inadequacy of funding and resources, the lack of overall vision and resulting haphazard planning, the imbalance in the idea of heritage for the public good compared to heritage for economic benefit, and the absence of a strong provincial museum able to function as other provincial museums.

## Literature Review Notes

1. Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation (PEIHF), "Aims and Policies of Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation" (April 1972), 1, 4-9.
2. PEIHF, "Aims and Policies...", 10-13.
3. Wayne MacKinnon, "Museums in Prince Edward Island" (1974), 1, 9, 11-12, 31; Catherine Hennessey, "Statement on Community Museums" (19 January 1981), 1.
4. George MacBeath et. al., "Historical Resources of Prince Edward Island: a proposal for effective administration," (1976), 1; Barry Lord, "The Museums of Prince Edward Island: A Programme for Development" (1982), 10.
5. MacBeath, 26-28.
6. Donald Nemetz, "A Report on the Administration of the Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation" (August 1977), 1-2, 5-19, 24.
7. Robert Frame, "Evaluation of Community Museums in Prince Edward Island" (1979), 1-2.
8. Frame, 7-9.
9. Catherine Hennessey, "Executive Director's Report" (5 December 1981), 2-4.
10. Hennessey, "Statement on Community Museums," 2-5.
11. Lord, 1, 186.
12. Lord, 155-56, 161-62, 171-73.
13. Lord, 153.
14. Lord, 157-58, 174-85.
15. Lynton Martin, "Recommendations on the Structure, Function, and Development of a PEI Provincial Museum" (March 1983), 1, 6A.
16. Martin, 12-15.
17. Louis Lemieux, Heather Lemieux (Diomedia Consultants), et. al., "A Planning and Development Study for Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation" (January 1986), 1-4.
18. Jim Hornby, John Shaw, "Report on a Sound & Film Archives for Prince Edward Island" (September 1988), i-iii.
19. Ministerial Committee on Heritage and Museums Policy, "Report" (July 1988), 29, 2.
20. Ministerial Committee on Heritage and Museums Policy, 23-27.
21. Ministerial Steering Committee on Culture, "Culture...Itself a Treasure: final report" (1998), 8, 6.
22. Ministerial Steering Committee on Culture, 4, 7, Appendix.
23. Matrix Consulting Group, "Culture and Heritage Integrated Service Delivery: final report" (March 1998), 5-6, 32.
24. Community and Cultural Affairs, "A Cultural Policy for Prince Edward Island" (2002), 2, 7.

25. MacArthur Group Inc., "Toward a Cultural Strategy for the Government of Prince Edward Island: final report" (December 2003), i, ii, 1, 4-5, 26-35.
26. Institute of Island Studies (IIS), "Public Consultations on the PEI Museum System" (March 2007), 6, 10.
27. Barbara MacDonald, "Recommendations on the Development of a Natural History Branch within the PEI Museum and Heritage System" (April 1987), 21.
28. MacBeath, 11-12.
29. Nemetz, 18-19.
30. IIS, 9.
31. Examples include Iris Group et. al., "The Economic Impact of Culture in Prince Edward Island and in the Charlottetown Region" (January 2006); Matrix Consulting Group, "Culture and Heritage Integrated Service Delivery: final report" (March 1998); Prince Edward Island Department of Education - Culture, Heritage and Recreation Division, "A Strategic Plan for Government Involvement in the Arts and Cultural Industries of Prince Edward Island, 1996-2001" (1995). See note 33 for tourism studies.
32. IIS, 9.
33. Examples include Burnett & Thorne, "The Prince Edward Island Cultural Heritage Corridor: Situation and SWOT Analysis" (March 2007); Dongkoo Yun et. al., "A Study of Cultural Tourism: The case of visitors to Prince Edward Island" (2007).
34. PEIHF, "Aims and Policies...", 12; André Lavoie, "Observations and Recommendations for an Outdoor Education Complex" (27 March 1972), 1; IIS, 7.
35. PEIHF, "Aims and Policies...", 12A; MacKinnon, 4, 12.
36. Hennessey, "Statement on Community Museums," 1-5.
37. Lee Jolliffe, *The Training of Museum Personnel In Prince Edward Island* (June 1985), iii-v.
38. IIS, 6-7, 10.
39. PEIHF, "Aims and Policies...", 7-8; MacBeath et. al., 4; IIS, 6.
40. MacBeath et. al., 4.
41. Lavoie, 2-4.
42. Kathy Martin, "Inventory of Natural Science Specimens of Prince Edward Island" (September 1982), 1-2, 36.
43. MacDonald, 1, 16-17.
44. See Lord, 75-81.
45. Lord, 77; David Webber, "To Friends of the Centre" (Autumn 1983).

## **Reviewed Reports and Documents: Culture, Heritage and Museums**

Burnett & Thorne. "The Prince Edward Island Cultural Heritage Corridor: Situation and SWOT Analysis." March 2007.

Community and Cultural Affairs. "A Cultural Policy for Prince Edward Island." 2002.

Cultural Affairs, PEI Department of Community Affairs. "Provincial Cultural Policy Review." 1982.

Diomedia Consultants. "A Planning and Development Study for Prince Edward Island Museum and Heritage Foundation." January 1986.

DPA Group Inc.. "A Proposal to Commemorate the Birthplace of Canada: Opportunities for Development." 1987.

Frame, Robert. "Evaluation of Community Museums in Prince Edward Island." 1979.

Hennessey, Catherine. "Statement on Community Museums." 19 January 1981.

Hornby, Jim and John Shaw. "Report on a Sound & Film Archives for Prince Edward Island." Charlottetown: Institute of Island Studies, UPEI, September 1988.

Institute of Island Studies (IIS). "Public Consultations on the PEI Museum System." Charlottetown: Institute of Island Studies, UPEI, March 2007.

Interdepartmental Study Committee on Cultural Industries. "Towards a Strategy for Cultural Enterprise Development in Prince Edward Island." 1985.

Iris Group, et. al.. "The Economic Impact of Culture in Prince Edward Island and in the Charlottetown Region." January 2006.

Jolliffe, Lee. "The Training of Museum Personnel in Prince Edward Island." Charlottetown: Department of Community and Cultural Affairs, 1985.

Lavoie, André. "Observations and Recommendations for an Outdoor Education Complex." March 1972.

Lord, Barry, and Gail Lord. "Le Musée Acadien: Portail à la région Evangeline." 1984.

Lord, Barry. "Report on Visit to Prince Edward Island." Ottawa: National Museums of Canada, 1980.

Lord, Barry. "The Museums of Prince Edward Island: A Programme for Development." Charlottetown: UPEI, 1982.

MacArthur Group Inc.. "Toward a Cultural Strategy for the Government of Prince Edward Island: Final Report." December 2003.

MacBeath, George, L.K. Ingersoll, T. Michael O'Rourke, Michael Swift. "Historical Resources of Prince Edward Island: a proposal for effective administration." Fredericton: New Brunswick Historical Resources Administration, 1976.

MacDonald, Barbara. "Recommendations on the Development of a Natural History Branch within the PEI Museum and Heritage System." April 1987.

MacKinnon, Wayne. "Museums in Prince Edward Island." 1974.

Martin, Kathy. "Inventory of Natural Science Specimens of Prince Edward Island." Charlottetown: UPEI, September 1982.

Martin, Lynton. "Recommendations on the Structure, Function, and Development of a PEI Provincial Museum. March 1983

Matrix Consulting Group. "Culture and Heritage Integrated Service Delivery: final report." March 1998.

Ministerial Committee on Heritage and Museums Policy. "Report." July 1988.

Ministerial Steering Committee on Culture. "Culture...Itself a Treasure: final report." Charlottetown: Ministerial Committee on Culture, 1998.

Nemetz, Donald. "A Report on the Administration of the Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation." August 1977.

PEI Tourism Advisory Council. "The New Product Culture: the Prince Edward Island strategy for tourism competitiveness, 2006 – 2010." 2005.

Prince Edward Island Department of Education - Culture, Heritage and Recreation Division. "A Strategic Plan for Government Involvement in the Arts and Cultural Industries of Prince Edward Island, 1996-2001." Charlottetown: Department of Education, 1995.

Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation. "Aims and Policies of Prince Edward Island Heritage Foundation. April 1972.

Statistics Canada. "The Health and Vitality of the Culture Sector in Prince Edward Island: prototype report." Ottawa: Statistics Canada, November 1997.

Tourism P.E.I.. "Economic Impact: tourism 2004 final report." 2004.

Webber, David. "To Friends of the Centre." Autumn 1983.

Yun, Dongkoo, et. al.. "A Study of Cultural Tourism: The case of visitors to Prince Edward Island." Charlottetown: Tourism Research Centre, School of Business Administration, UPEI, 2007.

## **APPENDIX C. – PUBLIC CONSULTATION PROCESS**

### **Public Meetings**

February 4<sup>th</sup> – O’Leary  
February 5<sup>th</sup> – Souris  
February 14<sup>th</sup> – Hunter River  
February 14<sup>th</sup> – Miscouche (in French)  
February 19<sup>th</sup> – Summerside  
February 20<sup>th</sup> – Montague  
February 21<sup>st</sup> – Charlottetown

### **Stakeholder Sessions**

February 20<sup>th</sup> – Staff, provincial government  
March 5<sup>th</sup> – Deputy ministers, heritage interest  
March 10<sup>th</sup> – Aboriginal people of PEI  
March 11<sup>th</sup> – Built heritage  
March 13<sup>th</sup> – Intangible heritage  
March 18<sup>th</sup> – Museums, archives and genealogy  
March 20<sup>th</sup> – Heritage sites  
March 27<sup>th</sup> – Natural heritage  
March 31<sup>st</sup> – Education

Stakeholder sessions were conducted as part of these consultations to supplement public meetings and individual key informant interviews through in-depth information gathered from working sessions attended by those individuals and organizations with a demonstrated or vested interest in Island heritage. It was decided to range broadly in the invitations to these stakeholder sessions rather than to identify and invite a narrow selection of individuals for several reasons:

- To ensure Island-wide representation geographically;
- Because the Island is dense in heritage interests, with a range of sites and levels of professionalism, a cross-section of representation was required;
- Given the diverse perspectives within the Island heritage community, and the changing demographic, it was essential to access and integrate this material into this study;
- To support on-going co-operation of the heritage community for the study by demonstrating the intentions of the government and consultants to make every effort to bring together those with a deep commitment – cultural, personal, professional or otherwise – in that community.

These in-depth discussions were undertaken and recorded in a working group format, in response to the questions provided. Two exceptions to this format were the Aboriginal session, conducted as a talking circle, and the round-table meeting with the deputy ministers.

### **Stakeholder Category Descriptions**

**1. ABORIGINAL PEOPLES** – includes on-reserve and off-reserve Aboriginal persons, elders and individuals working in directly related fields. The discussion included tangible and intangible heritage.

**2. BUILT HERITAGE** – built heritage resources including architecture: buildings, e.g. churches; cemeteries and monuments; urban, rural and marine architecture; cityscapes and built structures within industrial heritage areas.

**3. EDUCATION** and related resources for cultural and natural heritage at all levels of the educational systems, both formal and informal. This includes such areas as policy, curriculum, research, interpretation, publication, access, learning and teaching resources, public awareness; and learning in non-school settings for cultural and natural heritage.

**4. HERITAGE SITES** – e.g. eco-cultural sites. These include areas that contain cultural components, such as built structures, within a significant natural setting. Examples include such sites as: heritage roads, the Confederation Trail, lighthouses, archaeological and historical sites (both land and marine); Mi'kmaq sacred sites; heritage farms; land-based and sea-based industrial sites; Parks Canada sites; landscapes and seascapes.

**5. INTANGIBLE CULTURAL HERITAGE** – living heritage and folklore, e.g. oral history, beliefs, customs, ways of working, language, food, traditional knowledge, skills, ways of celebrating, music, dance, arts and crafts, storytelling all within communities, including women's culture and ethno-cultural groups, including members of the more recent cultural communities. It includes research, related creative communities; heritage services and societies related to same.

**6. MUSEUMS, ARCHIVES, GENEALOGY** – museums: e.g. specialized and mixed collections of cultural and natural history; archives (visual, sound, text); related creative heritage communities; publications, records; genealogical centres. (intangible/tangible)

**7. NATURAL HERITAGE** – natural landscape/the land, sea, waterways (as represented in the earth and marine sciences/collections) air, flora and fauna; type and study specimen collections.

**8. HERITAGE STAFF, PEI GOVERNMENT** – Public employees who may otherwise feel constrained from discussing internal affairs in public meetings.

**9. DEPUTY MINISTERS** – deputy ministers of departments which may reasonably be perceived as being philosophically, practically, or ethically involved in heritage issues, at the individual and/or intra-governmental level.

## **Method and Structure of Sessions**

These in-depth discussions were undertaken and recorded in a working group format, in response to the questions provided. Two exceptions to this format were the Aboriginal Session, conducted as a Talking Circle, and the round-table meeting with the Deputy Ministers of the PEI Government. The questions for each group were developed to guide discussions, not constrain participants. The basic topics and framework of the questions was retained; they were applied to each category specifically, both in the invitations and in-session. Participants and recorders produced notes from a range of perspectives, information, recommendations and visions for the future regarding the cultural and natural heritage of PEI.

## Key Informants

These people were interviewed by members of the project team. They were selected for their expertise, geographic representation and for their history of participation in heritage preservation and related activities.

**Donald Arsenault** – Director, Department of Canadian Heritage

**Boyde Beck** – a senior staff member at the PEIM&HF in charge of public programming

**Linda Berko** – a curator and conservator at the PEIMHF

**Chief Darlene Bernard** – Chief, Lennox Island First Nation

**Barbara Boys - MacCormick** – past president, Community Museums Association

**Marian Bruce** – author of several books about Island and/or local history

**John Cousins** – former high school teacher of Island History, folklorist, and former Board Member of both PEIMHF and the Institute of Island Studies

**George Dalton** – President of the Summerside and Area Historical Society

**Lori Ellis** – head of cultural/historical resources for the City of Summerside

**Cecile Gallant** – Director of the Acadian Museum and on the board of the Acadian Museum Association of PEI

**Bill Greenlaw** – Executive Director, Heritage Division, Department of Tourism, Culture and Heritage, Province of Nova Scotia

**Daryl Guignon** – UPEI Biology professor with ongoing dedication to natural history

**Catherine Hennessey** – the first Executive Director of the PEI Heritage Foundation

**Fred Horne** – President of the Archives Council of Prince Edward Island

**René Hurtubise** – PEI Department of Education

**Dr. David Keenlyside** – Director of the PEIM&HF, formerly with the Archaeological Survey of Canada

**Rev. Dr. Barry King** – Executive Director, Community Museum Association

**Don LeClair** – Chair of the PEI Museums Association and former Director of the provincial heritage division

**Simon Lloyd** – Special Collections Librarian, UPEI Robertson Library

**Barbara MacDonald** – Parks Canada, PEI

**Judy MacDonald** – 2007 President, Tourism Association of PEI, a board member of the Island Institute for Architectural Studies and Conservation

**David MacKenzie** – Executive Director, Confederation Centre of the Arts

**Jill McMicken-Wilson** – Provincial Archivist, PEI Public Archives and Records Office

**Reg Porter** – former Director of Programs at the PEIMHF

**Ian Scott** – former Executive Director of PEIM&HF and heritage activist

## APPENDIX D - SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETINGS

Seven public meetings were held during February, 2008: O’Leary on the 4<sup>th</sup> (14 participants); Souris, 5<sup>th</sup> (11); Hunter River, 14<sup>th</sup> (30); Miscouche, in French, 14<sup>th</sup> (13); Summerside, 19<sup>th</sup> (30); Montague, 20<sup>th</sup> (15), and Charlottetown, 21<sup>st</sup> (85-90). The attendance was about 200 people, beginning with small meetings in the western and eastern regions of the Island, and building to rather large crowds in Summerside and Charlottetown.

The weather was a problem as the evening of the Souris meeting was stormy, and the Hunter River gathering was postponed twice and in Miscouche, once. The meetings, although not particularly large, did attract an excellent cross-section of heritage opinion.

### **QUESTION ONE: Is heritage important to PEI? Why or why not?**

A common theme was that of knowing who we are and where we’ve come from – in part as a guide to the future. Equally prevalent was an emphasis on identity, a sense of place, particularly important for young people. Without it, you’d be a “nowhere man.” Heritage is what “sets us apart.”

“The more you work on a guiding idea of the place you live in – a sense of place, of a people, of a culture and tradition that is *mine*, my historical place – the more you can realize your desire to be a special person, an Islander.”

In Charlottetown, a City Councillor called attention to the strong resource represented by the city’s “rich architectural heritage and variety of architectural styles.... It’s a strength we can build on.” In Hunter River, a speaker emphasized the importance of culture and heritage as major “selling points” for drawing visitors to the Island. “Our stories, recipes, food, fishing villages, landscapes, farmhouses, forestry, environmental consciousness – all draw new and returning tourists.”

In several localities, though, doubt was expressed about whether government appreciated the central importance of heritage to our culture and economy. This was stated bluntly in Hunter River: “Heritage must become more important to legislators – lack of foresight/respect for heritage buildings and for shape of communities threatens the identity of villages, threatens the environment, and leaves educational holes.”

### **QUESTION TWO: What do you consider to be the main strengths and assets of the Island’s heritage resources, institutions, organizations and programs?**

At all the meetings, there was major emphasis on the Island’s intangible assets, beginning with the human dimension. Again and again, credit was given to the numerous volunteers who provide the impetus for so many institutions and organizations, both local and province-wide. Without their passion and commitment, little would be accomplished

or sustained. These people are motivated by a love for the Island, and for their communities.

In some cases, particular “heritage leaders” were singled out for praise – such as Catherine Hennessey and Irene Rogers in Charlottetown, who helped convince then-Community and Cultural Affairs Minister Horace Carver that not only should the fire-damaged Charlottetown Courthouse be restored, but a proper public clock should be added. Tribute was given to the community leaders who rescued the historic Macphail Homestead from falling into its own basement. Other such examples were given.

The environment of the Island was mentioned as another asset, as well as the beauty of the landscape.

Also a strength is the strong sense of community – both of the general Island community, and the various local communities. This can provide a better opportunity for networking, for working together. “Smallness is an advantage: In a small Island province, a village could actually lead the province: the politicians are our friends and neighbours.”

Among the resources singled out were the numerous artifacts in public and private collections, as well as the intangible heritage of folklore, with particular reference to folk music, oral history and storytelling. At several meetings, mention was made of traditional festivals and events.

One of the main themes of these meetings – indeed the issue which was brought up most often – was a strong pride in the Island’s heritage buildings, particularly our domestic architecture and churches. At the Charlottetown meeting, it was presented as a major resource for the City. Frequently associated with this was a stated appreciation for the “cultural landscape” – the buildings and their settings.

Among the institutional resources mentioned were the PEI Museum and Heritage Foundation, with its seven sites spread across the Island: there seemed to be a general appreciation for this “decentralization”. Other important institutions are the various small community museums, served by the Community Museums Association of PEI.

Perhaps surprisingly, archives were high on the list of highly-valued heritage resources. One person in Summerside (not an archivist) said flatly that archives were the single greatest heritage resource. Affiliated closely with archives is the popular past-time of genealogy, researching the family tree. A Souris participant stated that genealogy was also good for business in many ways, since it brings people to the Island: “globally there are literally millions of people who have at least one ancestor on the Island.”

Other resources mentioned included heritage-based publications (such as *The Island Magazine*), school courses in Island history/social studies (both Grade 6 and in high school), the Heritage Fair (for school students), and Heritage Day activities.

And finally, credit was given to privately-generated resources, such as the excellent Island Register website created and maintained by David Hunter (at [www.islandregister.com](http://www.islandregister.com)) – “your Number 1 on-line source for P.E.I. Genealogy.”

**QUESTION THREE: What do you consider to be the major gaps or weaknesses in the Island's heritage resources, institutions, organizations and programs?**

People felt strongly that the available resources – particularly those allocated by the Provincial Government – were insufficient to do the job. They said, bold investments were made in heritage in the 1970s (partly with Comprehensive Development Plan funding), but there has been little advancement since then. In fact, the situation has become worse, because existing resources are spread thinner and infrastructure has deteriorated. Even at the provincial heritage sites, floors are sagging and something as important as the boat collection at Basin Head has suffered from neglect.

And because the funding is so limited, the overall heritage community has fragmented, with various communities and institutions “squared off in their own corners.”

The lamentable condition of the Artifactory has been much in the news this past year. People just don't trust the Province to care for their precious collections; they don't want the “family treasures put in some leaky old warehouse.” At the same time, heritage institutions have insufficient acquisition funds. Thus important artifacts and collections continue to leave the Island, some via e-Bay.

This down-at-heels situation applies generally, so that there are inadequate heritage services, exhibits, and educational programs.

One particular gap, mentioned at Miscouche, is that there are “no archive services to centralize and conserve our oral documents.”

Too much of the available funding is tied to short-term jobs and projects, revolving largely around the employment of students in the summer-time. This makes long-term planning almost impossible, and reinforces the seasonality of our “heritage season.”

Another common complaint was the failure of the PEI Museum and Heritage Foundation to fulfill its natural history mandate, given to it in the 1980s. Natural history interpretation hardly exists across the province. One speaker in Summerside commented on the changing natural order on the Island, so that “frogs, crickets, and grasshoppers are not heard in profusion, as in the past.”

Overall, people lamented the lack of protection for our buildings (such as “beautiful little churches”) and landscapes, our rural countryside. One man stated in Charlottetown: “If we lose our rural landscape, it will be gone, and gone forever.” At several of the meetings, reference was made to the crisis in agriculture, and how this would likely increase the deterioration of our “working rural landscape.” Individuals mentioned the need to preserve particular heritage rural features, such as old dykes.

Several felt that planning and consultation needed to be better coordinated. For instance, there are plans to widen Highway 2 through Hunter River, which will mean the moving and/or destruction of some heritage homes and other features. And yet this process initially proceeded without apparent concern for heritage or cultural interests, much less consultation with the public.

Other concerns included lack of control over private individuals doing archaeological digs, and insufficient attention to particular heritage themes, such as the history of the Celts in PEI, or the Island railroad.

One person, in Summerside, mentioned the Board of the PEIMHF, saying it needed more effective Island-wide representation.

**QUESTION FOUR: What should PEI be doing to build on its heritage assets and address any existing weaknesses/gaps?**

Fundamentally, people were calling for a new mind-set among Islanders, one which would value much more highly the quality and originality of the heritage and cultural assets which we tend to overlook or take for granted. At several meetings, people contrasted the Island's lax approach to that in the U.K. and the eastern U.S., where much more is done to protect old buildings and the cultural landscape. "People are still farming, but they don't put vinyl siding on a 150-year-old house." (Montague)

Where does such education start? A number of individuals called for more heritage education in our school system, which would include enhanced (perhaps compulsory) courses in Island History, as well as more "hands-on" heritage experience, including school visits to museums and historic sites. "We need to return to vibrant, living museums and displays as were once in Green Park – shipyard; Basin Head – seafood celebrations; Orwell – organic growers." (Summerside) At the same time, this approach can be complemented by the use of new technologies, so that resources like *The Island Magazine* and the contents of our museums and archives can be made available on-line. (Miscouche)

This education should extend to – but also from – our political leaders: it's a two-way street.

Another common theme was that this should be a living heritage, one intrinsic to the Island experience and not created or acted out for tourists – although, of course, visitors would be welcome to share. Thus there should be a wise integration of culture and livelihood, keeping in mind the economic benefits of heritage. Several examples were given: in Summerside, some Americans recently bought neglected heritage homes, restored them, and opened B&Bs. In the village of Breadalbane, rich with longterm and new residents, artists and musicians have helped to create diversity and interest. A speaker at Hunter River called for funding for small training centres "to allow experienced and seasoned artists, craftspeople and heritage advocates to train young people, repopulate the cultural trades, and bring in new media that represent this era." Another, in Charlottetown, suggested the reopening of an Island craft training facility, similar to the highly successful, but long-since closed, School of Visual Arts at Holland College. Still another offered up the idea of volunteer-work vacations in the countryside.

In general, people urged caution about leaping into any major new museum development – that we should pay attention to what is in place before starting on a new course: "We don't have money for the museums we have now." On the other hand, enhanced central facilities could provide support for community heritage societies to benefit from access to better meeting space and joint publicity, storage and networking opportunities.

Once again, the protection of the cultural landscape was a strong theme. A speaker in Hunter River urged that heritage properties across the whole Island be given the same degree of protection and support as they are in the City of Charlottetown.

Here are some other ideas, each raised at least once:

- Create a central registry for all Island artifacts, including those in private collections;
- Make wise decisions about what artifacts, etc., to save – the most representative and the best;
- Prevent continuing removal or loss of important artifacts from the Island;
- Create an oral archives for the Island, plus an inventory of cultural heritage assets (sites, historical monuments, etc.);
- Provide more support for heritage volunteers.

Finally, people at all the meetings expressed a strong sense of urgency, that coherent action was necessary right away: “We lose something every day: every storm costs us another piece of archaeological history; every obituary, the loss of another voice.”

**QUESTION FIVE: What is your vision for a healthy and dynamic future for the heritage in PEI?**

In terms of a vision for the future, the dominant theme was the possibility of a new multi-purpose provincial museum facility, located centrally but serving the entire Island. A speaker in Charlottetown described this as including an expanded Artifactory, expanded provincial archives, and expanded provincial library, while reflecting both the natural history and the cultural development of the Island.

The proponents of a natural history museum were of two minds, some favouring a single, integrated museum, others preferring a separate natural history museum or interpretative centre, possibly at Orwell Corner/Macphail. Either way, a complementary natural setting was felt to be a priority: “After seeing the exhibits inside, one goes outside and is able to interact fully with nature, as the setting is part of the museum.” (Montague)

Generally speaking, the farther away a person lived from Charlottetown, the more skeptical he or she tended to be about a new central facility – particularly the residents of communities, like Montague, O’Leary and Miscouche, which have local museums. This ambivalence was summed up in the meeting notes from Miscouche, in reference to “A central provincial museum in Charlottetown that tells the history of the Island and makes its services available to the other museums. There are advantages and disadvantages to the project but if there is to be a provincial museum it cannot be done to the detriment of the other museums. However, most of the people attending the meeting are not in favour of a new central museum since they fear that it will have a negative impact on the development of the museums that are now in existence.”

In Summerside, there was general agreement to the concept of an enhanced provincial museum – as well as an opinion that it should be located in the Prince County capital city. As well (or as an alternative), there was strong support for the idea of a new Summerside community museum, to tell the story of that part of the Island.

At Charlottetown, the debate was not so much about “if” as “where”. Spokespersons for two different municipal governments pitched their particular concepts and sites. The Charlottetown Greater Chamber of Commerce advocated for a multi-use cultural and heritage “cluster” facility, in the downtown core. The proposed home would be a renovated Dominion Building, now vacated by the federal government. Also included in the cluster might be the Public Archives, Provincial Library Service and other tenants.

A competing “vision” was proposed by the Town of Stratford, on a waterfront site overlooking Charlottetown and the harbour. This would be a new facility, built expressly “to tell the Island story” – but not to the detriment of current historic sites and local museums.

The members of the Island Celtic community were out in force at the Charlottetown meeting, with presentations by the two oldest heritage organizations in the province, the Caledonia Club (Scottish) and the Benevolent Irish Society (BIS). Both made the point that the Island is historically – by population origin – a Celtic-majority community and the most Scottish of all the provinces (Nova Scotia not excepted). However, this Celtic heritage has received scant support at the provincial level, the once vibrant Gaelic language has died out, and various requests to right this historic wrong have fallen on deaf ears. One spokesperson called for the creation of a Scottish museum.

A vision of sympathetic architectural preservation across the Island was presented by a spokesperson from the Institute of Architectural Studies and Conservation. (Charlottetown) In Summerside there was a call for a “heritage commissioner”, with broad powers “to protect the churches and farm buildings that have been, or are, at risk of being torn down.” Moreover, the preservation of built heritage must not be done in isolation from landscape but “with the best idea of vibrant, living heritage.”

Others talked about a vision of the Island itself, the Island story – one based on the history of its composite peoples (Mi’kmaq, Acadian, Scots, Irish, etc.) – including both oldtimers and newcomers – going beyond clichéd themes such as Anne or Green Gables, potatoes or Confederation.

The issue of the planned widening of Highway 2, much discussed at Hunter River, suggested a vision of an Island where local citizens and communities would have more power to control the built environment/cultural landscape of the places where they live. Because the municipality of Hunter River has no “official plan” for land use, there is no need for the local council or citizens to be consulted about something as major as the new highway construction. Unfortunately, such is the case throughout most rural areas.

As one frustrated person exclaimed at Hunter River, improved transportation is all well and good, but “I don’t want the whole hill wiped out. We’ll just be a breezeway!”

**QUESTION SIX: What role do you think the Government of PEI should play to achieve this vision?**

Participants were not shy about advising the government on action to promote and protect our heritage. One person in Summerside summed up what was needed with great succinctness: “leadership and money”. Elsewhere, government was called on to show “a real commitment to heritage.”

Government was urged to regard heritage and culture not as fringe activities for Islanders – nor as entertainment for tourists – but as basic social programming, like education or health care. And the level of financial support provided should be closer to that given to amateur sport. “We need not just leadership, but *informed* leadership in government,” even if decisions are politically unpopular.

Nor was there any shortage of suggestions about where substantial additional funding might be invested. In Souris there was a call for reinvestment in the provincial heritage sites; the provision of consistent programs and funding “that people can count on”; and the improvement of educational heritage resources – including curriculum materials, free access to sites and activities, and provision of space for permanent and temporary exhibits. In Hunter River, a speaker advocated that resources be provided to “sustain natural and cultural heritage sites and collections.”

In addition, measures were demanded to protect the Island’s built heritage. These could include tax concessions, grants, and a policy of public designation of heritage properties. The standards set should be high, at an international level, “such as is the case in England with the National Trust and in other European countries.”

Accompanying this was the call, at several meetings, for a provincial land use plan, to curtail ribbon development and the like.

At least three speakers suggested that government departments be reorganized so that heritage is given more visibility and clout. In fact, one suggested a separate government department, and another suggested a deputy minister “appointed with sole responsibility for archives and museums.”

Following are some specific additional suggestions:

- Government funding for protection of the Gaelic/Celtic heritage of the province;
- Hiring of a provincial oral historian;
- Establish an official provincial holiday in February, to be called “Heritage Day”;
- Expand the heritage road program (rural, unpaved “red” roads in scenic localities);
- Seek recognition by the Parliament of Canada of Charlottetown as “the birthplace of Canada.”

And a speaker in Souris stated: government needs a well-coordinated provincial heritage plan, a policy.

# **Charting a Course: A Study of Heritage in Prince Edward Island**

## **Draft Report**

**The IRIS Group**  
**52 East River Drive, Stratford, PE**  
[www.theIRISgroup.ca](http://www.theIRISgroup.ca)

**A.L. Arbic Consulting**  
**6071 Welsford St., Halifax, NS**