

London Journal of Canadian Studies

Battlefield to Baseball Diamond: The Niagara Parks Commission and Queenston Heights Park

Elaine Young ¹

How to cite: Young, E. 'Battlefield to Baseball Diamond: The Niagara Parks Commission and Queenston Heights Park.' *London Journal of Canadian Studies*, 2014, 29(1), pp. 47-68 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.ljcs.2014v29.003>.

Published: 01 January 2014

Peer Review:

This article has been peer reviewed through the journal's standard double blind peer-review, where both the reviewers and authors are anonymised during review.

Copyright:

© 2014, The Author(s). This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY) 2.0 <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>, which permits unrestricted use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited • DOI: <https://doi.org/10.14324/111.444.ljcs.2014v29.003>

Open Access:

London Journal of Canadian Studies is a peer-reviewed open access journal.

¹ Laurier Research Group, Canada

Battlefield to Baseball Diamond: The Niagara Parks Commission and Queenston Heights Park

*Elaine Young**

Abstract

Between the War of 1812's end and the late 1920s Queenston Heights was redefined from being primarily a place of memory associated with the War of 1812 to being for the most part a place of recreation. The site of a significant War of 1812 battle, until the late nineteenth century it drew growing numbers of tourists, many of whom wanted to feel closer to its wartime past. Beginning in the late nineteenth century the site's popularity for recreation increased, and by the 1920s Queenston Heights Park was a destination where thousands of people went to enjoy recreational activities such as picnics and sports. The Niagara Parks Commission, which owned the site from 1895, facilitated this transformation. The Commission saw Queenston Heights more as a park than a historic site and worked to create a recreational space that would draw tourists and increase revenue. By the 1920s the park featured attractions such as playing fields, picnic shelters, tennis courts, a restaurant, and a souvenir stand. There was little opposition to these changes, which at times jeopardized the historic landscape. Although Queenston Heights' commemorative meanings were no longer closely associated with its battlefield landscape, these meanings were increasingly invested in the imposing Brock Monument. This allowed the Commission's development of the battlefield to continue unabated, and under the Commission the landscape of the former battlefield became increasingly distanced from its wartime past.

In the spring of 1897 an older woman from Toronto, Ontario took a school-aged girl to Niagara Falls and stopped en route to visit Queenston Heights Park. Peppered by questions from her young cohort

about the battle, the woman attempted to distract her with the scenic view from the Heights, all to no avail. Later she would warn any adult taking a child to the Heights to study the details of its 1812 battle before going, 'lest, like me, [you] perchance be caught tripping.'¹ The older woman had not been visiting Queenston Heights for its historical associations, and had been caught off guard by her charge's interest in the place's history. Indeed, in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries Queenston Heights' identity was redefined from being primarily a place of memory to a destination used predominantly for recreation unrelated to its wartime past. Queenston Heights had been the site of an important War of 1812 battle, and after the war and into the late nineteenth century tourists had visited the battlefield primarily because of its historical associations. The transformation from battlefield to park was facilitated by the owners of the site, the Niagara Parks Commission (NPC).² The owners of the site, the Commission downplayed the battlefield's history in favour of creating a recreational space that included attractions such as sports fields, picnic pavilions, a restaurant, souvenir stand, and wading pool. The site's popularity as a recreational destination grew from the NPC's acquisition of the site in 1895 and peaked in the 1920s until the Depression of the 1930s led to declining attendance.³ There was little opposition amongst the general public or local historians to the NPC's development of the battlefield, suggesting that by the twentieth century the landscape was no longer closely associated with the battle that took place there. The visually dominant Brock Monument came to embody the historical associations of the site, facilitating the NPC's plans to promote the surrounding landscape as an ideal location for an afternoon outing. Although the NPC promoted itself as a guardian of historic sites, the organization saw Queenston Heights primarily as a recreational destination rather than a historic site, and in the absence of opposition developed it as such.

Queenston Heights, a plateau on an escarpment 107 metres above the Niagara River, was the site of a significant battle in the War of 1812. In the early hours of 13 October 1812 American forces from Lewiston, New York landed at Queenston in an attempted invasion of Upper Canada. The American attackers were able to ascend the Heights using a steep foot path and drove the British regulars and Canadian militia into the village of Queenston at the base of the escarpment. Sir Isaac Brock was killed leading an initial attack to retake the Heights, and his aide-de-camp Lieutenant-Colonel John Macdonell was fatally wounded in another unsuccessful frontal assault. Around noon Major-General Roger Sheaffe arrived with reinforcements made up of British regulars

and Canadian militia. Sheaffe had sent a group of Six Nations warriors under John Norton ahead of his own troops. Rather than risking another frontal assault, Norton led the warriors on a circuitous route up the opposite side of the Heights and harassed the American position. Later Sheaffe and his troops followed a similar route, and the combined Six Nations, British, and Canadian force attacked the Americans. Unable to reform a proper front and fearful of the Six Nations warriors, some American troops ran in the hopes of getting back across the river, and the remaining forces quickly surrendered. The Americans suffered 300 killed and wounded, while the defenders suffered 14 killed, 77 wounded, and 21 missing.⁴ The battle repelled the American invasion attempt, but the loss of Sir Isaac Brock in the attack was a blow to the British and their allies. The war would continue for over two years, and what is now Ontario's Niagara region would be the site of many other battles, such as the capture of Fort George, the Battle of Beaverdams, the Battle of Chippewa, the Battle of Lundy's Lane, and the siege of Fort Erie.

After the war's end, Upper Canadian battlefields along the Niagara River were added to the itineraries of middle and upper class tourists to Niagara Falls. Many nineteenth century tourists were searching for the natural sublime, a sense of awe and terror inspired by natural phenomena which many hoped could be found at Niagara Falls. After the War of 1812 the former battlefields were added to their itineraries, as tourists sought a sense of the historical sublime that emphasized the beauty of traces of the past.⁵ Although most guidebooks still concentrated on Niagara Falls as tourists' primary goal, they also encouraged visitors to explore the area around the falls where 'many incidents [had] occurred to impart additional interest.'⁶ Among these sites, Queenston Heights lent itself to the morbid contemplation characteristic of historical romanticism and the search for the historical sublime. John J. Bigsby recorded his visit to Queenston Heights in his journal, writing that his guide had pointed out the 'broken precipice ... down which the American soldiers sprang to avoid the English bayonet, and so perished by a death more forlorn, lingering, and painful still, at the bottom of the cliff or in the waters.'⁷ Bigsby's morbid imaginings were in keeping with the general attraction of battlefield sites in this period, which included vicariously experiencing deadly conflict and imagining suffering that the visitor does not expect to confront.⁸

Romanticism was also associated with hero-worship, especially of figures associated with the nation. Queenston Heights therefore had the added attraction of being associated with the tragic hero of the war,

Sir Isaac Brock, who had become the leading symbol of the conflict.⁹ In laying out attractions near Niagara Falls an 1866 tourist guide suggested that Queenston Heights may be the one most worth visiting because it 'has a mournful interest . . . as the place where the brave and good Brock fell in the arms of victory.'¹⁰ In 1814 the Legislature of Upper Canada had taken action to commemorate the hero and passed a motion to erect a monument to him on Queenston Heights. The first Brock Monument was dedicated in 1824 after numerous delays. From a square base, a Tuscan column rose 41 metres tall and was topped by an observation deck and a simple round ornament that could be seen from a great distance. This monument was severely damaged on 17 April 1840 by Benjamin Lett, an Irish-Canadian who had been involved in the 1837 Rebellion and whose brother had reportedly been killed by government troops. The public was outraged at the destruction of the monument, and over 8,000 people attended a public meeting held a few months later to discuss the matter. It was agreed that the monument should be rebuilt, and a committee was formed to steer the project. More delays followed, but the second Brock Monument was completed in 1856. The remains of the first Brock Monument were left on the site until their removal in 1853, providing a point of interest for tourists in the intervening years. The second Brock Monument provided an impressive focal point for the battlefield and the adulation of General Brock. Standing 57 metres high, at the time of its completion it was the second tallest structure in the world. Placed on a large square base, the monument's column was topped by a 4.8 metre tall statue of Isaac Brock. The remains of Brock and his aide-de-camp Lieutenant-Colonel Macdonell had been interred at the base of the first Brock Monument, and later the second.¹¹ Lett's destruction of the monument and the outrage that followed it indicate the symbolic importance of the monument as a representation not only of Brock, but of the War of 1812.

The late nineteenth century saw increased interest in the province's history, and local historical societies and members of the public began to organize self-styled historical pilgrimages to the Niagara Frontier, including to Queenston Heights. The Women's Literary Club of St Catharines, for example, held annual pilgrimages to historic sites in the Niagara region and visited Queenston Heights several times.¹² At the turn of the century local entrepreneurs and history enthusiasts organized pilgrimages from Toronto to the Niagara Frontier, where members of local historical societies would often meet the delegates to discuss the historical significance of the area.¹³ In May 1897, for example, Toronto entrepreneur Frank Yeigh took a group from the YMCA on a pilgrimage

to Niagara-on-the-Lake and Fort George, where members of the Niagara Historical Society (NHS) guided them to different historic sites of interest. The group visited Queenston Heights next, where they heard a lecture on the events of the battle, before continuing on to Lundy's Lane where they were met by members of the Lundy's Lane Historical Society (LLHS).¹⁴ These pilgrimages, as the name implies, visited Queenston Heights and other battlefields primarily due to their association with the War of 1812. These groups were journeying to the former battlefields because of their histories, and using them for commemorative and educational purposes. However, in the early twentieth century formal pilgrimages were far outnumbered by groups visiting the site primarily for recreational activities.

Beginning in the 1910s Queenston Heights became an increasingly popular destination for picnic groups from Toronto, Ontario.¹⁵ Improvements in labour conditions meant that members of the working class had the leisure time to take day trips; in the early twentieth century middle class professionals were entitled to vacations with pay, and by the 1920s Canadian and American civil servants received two weeks of paid vacation per year.¹⁶ Niagara Falls had been the most popular destination for steamer traffic on Lake Ontario since the mid nineteenth century, but later improvements in transportation made other areas along the Niagara River more accessible.¹⁷ In 1893 the Niagara Falls Park and River Railway had opened a line connecting the Queenston dock with Niagara Falls, and many of the excursionists making their way to Niagara Falls stopped at Queenston Heights en route. Tracks were laid across the recently completed Upper Steel Arch Bridge and Lewiston-Queenston Suspension Bridge in 1899, creating a 'belt-line' that allowed visitors to disembark at different locations to enjoy various attractions. The completion of the Niagara Boulevard, connecting Queenston Heights to Niagara Falls, and improvements to the road connecting to Highway #8A, which linked to Hamilton and Toronto, made access easier for the increasing number of motorists in the 1920s.¹⁸ As early as 1908 Queenston Heights was on some days receiving more visitors than Niagara Falls' popular Queen Victoria Park, and by 1920 it was rivalling the latter as a destination for company and church picnics and family reunions.¹⁹ Over the span of five days in July 1920 4,850 people took part in over sixteen official company or church picnics at the Heights — numbers that do not include casual visitors or small groups.²⁰ Steamship and railway companies placed advertisements in local and Toronto newspapers encouraging picnics at Queenston Heights beginning in the 1890s, a trend that increased

dramatically with the growth of the advertising industry. In 1927 Canada Steamship Lines was warning readers in February to 'plan now for that summer picnic' at destinations including Queenston Heights, Niagara Falls, and La Salle Park in Hamilton.²¹ The owners of the site, the NPC, had worked consistently to draw these tourists by installing such attractions as picnic grounds, playing fields, and a restaurant.

Indeed, outings at Queenston Heights seem to have been great fun for all involved. Arriving at mid-morning on the Heights, most commonly from Toronto via steamer across Lake Ontario, most groups would indulge in a picnic lunch at one of the large pavilions, and then enjoy a variety of sporting events. For instance, a day at Queenston Heights for veterans of the Fenian Raids and NorthWest Rebellion in 1904 included a tug of war, a game of baseball, and various races including a boys' race, girls' race, a fat man's race, a smoking race, a walking race, a partners' walking race, an elected officers' walking race, a pick-up race, a running race, and an open race.²² *The Globe* Newspaper held its company picnic of over 500 staff and their families on the Heights in June 1922, where they enjoyed a picnic lunch and program of sports that included a baseball game pitting different departments against each other and a series of races for both adults and children.²³ A program of sports, as well as the occasional pie or bread roll eating contest, remained a fixture of these outings throughout the period.²⁴ This type of outing was enjoyed by thousands of visitors during the summer months. Queenston Heights Park was a successful recreational space, drawing locals, day-trippers, and those from further afield to enjoy its charms. Many visitors went to enjoy a relaxing and fun outing with friends, family, or work or church groups and used the recreational amenities provided by the NPC.

The NPC had been founded in 1885 to create a public park at Niagara Falls which had, in the eyes of many, become overrun with commercialism.²⁵ After the establishment of Queen Victoria Park near the falls, however, the Commissioners began to expand their ambitions. Over time the NPC gradually acquired lands along the Niagara River with the dream of establishing a public park system along its length. In the process they acquired several historic sites, including numerous War of 1812 battlefields, the first of which was Queenston Heights. After Confederation Brock's Monument and the surrounding 12 acres had been owned by the Dominion government, but cared for by the province of Ontario. In 1875 the province petitioned for ownership of the monument, and the structure and 31 acres of Military Reserve lands were transferred to them that year.²⁶ Since then the province

paid for repairs to the monument, but had not invested in the upkeep of the surrounding grounds.²⁷ Facing financial difficulty and noting that many people were visiting Queenston Heights and paying a fee to ascend the monument, in 1893 the commissioners publicly stated their desire that the Brock Monument and its grounds be placed under their control.²⁸ In 1895 the NPC proposed the government turn over the monument and grounds to them, promising to clean up the area and to improve ‘this historic ground, so near to the hearts of all true Canadians.’ Perhaps wanting to be rid of the expense of maintaining the area, the monument and the surrounding 31 acres were vested in the NPC that spring.²⁹ In 1895 the Commission also acquired a small cenotaph at the base of the escarpment marking the spot where Isaac Brock was killed, and in 1898 the Dominion Government granted the Commission additional lands on the slope of the escarpment.³⁰ By 1912 the park covered 88 acres, most of which had been vested in the Commission by either the Dominion or Provincial governments.³¹ The plateau on the top of the Heights was the focus of the majority of the NPC’s efforts, as the escarpment’s steep slope made access to other areas of NPC property, such as the cenotaph marking Brock’s fall, more difficult for casual visitors.

The NPC often portrayed itself as the defender of historic sites. The organization’s official history, for instance, states that because of its actions ‘many scenes with glorious associations have been saved from desecration and assured of protection for all time.’³² One of the Commission’s arguments for acquiring Queenston Heights was that ‘the grounds around the monument are in need of better attention than they now receive,’ and they wished to ‘have this historic ground, so near to the hearts of all true Canadians, maintained in a creditable manner.’³³ Indeed, after some landscaping of the area had been done in 1858 the grounds around the monument had been neglected.³⁴ Although the NPC stated that it wanted to protect the historic interest of the area, it saw Queenston Heights primarily as a recreational site rather than a former battlefield. The Commission wanted to incorporate it into their plans for a larger park system, hoping that ‘in a few years . . . this historic ground may be restored to a Park-like appearance.’³⁵

In creating the park at Queenston Heights the commissioners were influenced by the views of prominent American landscape architect Frederick Law Olmsted, who had been instrumental in the earlier movement to preserve the American part of Niagara Falls.³⁶ Olmsted argued that the main purpose of any park was to highlight the dominance of nature, a general view echoed in a 1903 address to the

American Park and Outdoor Art Association by the NPC's Chairman, J.W. Langmuir.³⁷ Langmuir encouraged his listeners to imagine

the whole shore of the Niagara River from Lake Erie to Lake Ontario, restored and converted into one continued series of avenues and parks for the recreation and enjoyment of the millions of overworked and tired humanity, where they can come for a time from the turmoil of their busy and wearing lives to this mecca of peace and quietness, to commune with the majesty of nature.³⁸

From early on, then, the Commissioners envisioned a park system that emphasized nature's restorative effects, not necessarily its historical associations. When R. Home Smith became chairman of the NPC in 1929 he inquired what arrangements were in place to preserve 'objects of historical interest' in the area.³⁹ John H. Jackson, the NPC General Manager, seemed taken aback by the question, and stated simply, 'the Commission has not, in the past, adopted a general policy regarding the preservation of old features of the Niagara District.'⁴⁰ This is perhaps not surprising, as the NPC's primary mandate had been to free one of the natural wonders of the world, Niagara Falls, from the grip of commercialism by creating a public park. Additionally, the NPC had no experience dealing with historic sites, and none of the commissioners had a background in preservation. John Woodburn Langmuir, chairman of the NPC from 1893 to 1915, had previously been Inspector of Prisons and Charities of Ontario, and had helped to found and manage the Toronto General Trusts Corporation.⁴¹ Philip William Ellis, chairman from 1915 to 1929, had been the founding partner of P.W. Ellis and Company, jewellers and silversmiths, in Toronto, and had been chairman of the Toronto Transit Commission.⁴² Both chairmen were well-established businessmen, but had no experience relating to the management of historic sites. It was perhaps natural, then, for the leaders of the NPC to see their new acquisition primarily as a link in a growing public park system rather than a historic site, and to develop it as such.

The commissioners did not see marking the history of the battlefield through monuments as a priority. Although they allowed historical markers to be erected and agreed to maintain them, they did not take any independent action to highlight the battlefield's history. All of the historic markers, such as the Brock Monument and cenotaph, were present when the NPC acquired the site or were undertaken at the initiative of outsiders such as members of local historical societies. For

example, in 1910 a monument to Laura Secord was erected to the east of the second Brock monument. Secord had by this time been adopted as a symbol of female heroism, and her monument commemorated not only saving her husband at the Battle of Queenston Heights, but also warning Lieutenant James FitzGibbon of an impending American attack at Beaverdams.⁴³ Emma Currie, a supporter of female suffrage and founder of the Woman's Literary Club of St Catharines, had been a force behind the erection of the monument. She had donated the proceeds of her book, *The Story of Laura Secord and Canadian Reminiscences*, to the project, and had worked to secure a government grant for the monument.⁴⁴ In 1908 a member of the Laura Secord Monument Committee asked the Commission for a financial contribution to the monument fund, but no grant was given and the monument proceeded without financial support from the NPC.⁴⁵ Made of grey granite, the monument stands twelve feet high and has a bronze medallion with a portrait of Secord affixed to its front above an inscription describing her wartime actions.⁴⁶ Plaques were erected by the Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada (HSMBC) and the LLHS further down the escarpment, but the Secord monument was the only historic marker added to the plateau until the HSMBC in cooperation with the NPC erected a marker for Fort Drummond in 1932.⁴⁷ Although the NPC was open to collaboration in marking the site's history, the commissioners clearly did not see the organization's primary function as undertaking the erection of monuments or plaques commemorating the War of 1812, focussing instead on the site's potential as a recreational destination.

Picnicking had taken place at Queenston Heights before its acquisition by the NPC, and it was an activity that the commissioners worked to capitalize on by providing amenities for large picnic groups.⁴⁸ The popularity of the site for picnicking grew dramatically throughout the early twentieth century, and the NPC undertook almost constant improvements and expansions to both keep up with and stimulate demand. The Commission provided picnic tables in a grove of trees, called the 'picnic grove,' and made further improvements in 1901.⁴⁹ In 1917 the volume of visitors so endangered the trees in the grove, whose roots were being exposed by visitors 'tramping over the ground,' that the open picnic area was moved west of the Brock monument.⁵⁰ The first large, permanent shelter at the site was erected in a clear area west of the monument in 1907.⁵¹ In 1921 another shelter, 195 feet long and 32 feet wide, was erected between Forts Drummond and Riall, and a third was added in 1926.⁵² Drinking water was also provided, and the installation of a water line from the City of Niagara Falls in 1923 allowed

modern restrooms to be built that year.⁵³ The NPC also installed sports facilities. In 1900 the NPC installed a proper ball ground for the use of picnic parties, and a 'convenient location' near the earthwork forts was selected, levelled, and sowed.⁵⁴ The play ground was improved in 1911, and extended in 1912 'for the sports that are always indulged in, chiefly during the school vacation.'⁵⁵ These recreations were provided free of charge, and helped to draw in ever increasing numbers of visitors, particularly parties using the grounds for picnics.

The NPC also recognized that there was a profit to be made from the popularity of Queenston Heights. Although the parks system had been created for the free enjoyment of all, the NPC had incorporated paid amusements throughout the system, and Queenston Heights was no exception.⁵⁶ Two of the founding principles of the legislation that created the park at Niagara Falls were that it not be a financial burden on the Province, and that the park be as free as possible to the public. Financial worries plagued the NPC in its infancy, and it was unable to provide for necessary park improvements and pay interest on its government debentures until 1904.⁵⁷ The NPC therefore concentrated its efforts on drawing large crowds to Queenston Heights by providing amenities, some for a price. A small refreshment stand was in operation when the NPC acquired the site, and a larger restaurant and refreshment stand were built to the east of the Brock Monument in 1900.⁵⁸ The commissioners leased the operation of the concessions to applicants, usually for a flat fee, and in 1913 began asking lessees to surrender a percentage of their gross sales in addition to the flat rate. By this time there were several different business ventures at the Heights, including the refreshment stand, a souvenir store, and a business selling photographs of visitors and scenery from a building near the Secord Monument. Lessees were expected to provide meals and refreshments to visitors, check parcels for them, sell souvenirs, and take and sell photographs.⁵⁹ The commissioners also worked to keep jurisdiction over the sale of souvenirs on the road leading to the park, acquiring this land from the County of Lincoln in 1909 in order to disperse souvenir vendors operating there. Although the NPC argued that these vendors were 'in no way amenable to Park regulations,' it is more likely that they preferred visitors spend their money inside the park gates.⁶⁰

Security concerns associated with the First World War led to the closing of the Brock Monument to the public in 1915, and the structure was guarded day and night by a military picket or a park employee.⁶¹ The closing of the monument, combined with a Queenston trolley accident in 1915, had a negative effect on the number of visitors and

forced the NPC to put some of its projects on hold.⁶² However, after the low point of 1915 revenues gradually increased, and the NPC decided to take over the restaurant and souvenir stand in 1920 and to expand the restaurant facilities to serve the growing number of visitors. This plan seems to have paid off, as the gross receipts from the restaurant in 1920 were \$35,584.60, or four times more than those in 1919.⁶³ Indeed, the revenues from the operation of concessions and attractions remained a key part of Commission finances throughout the twentieth century.⁶⁴ The NPC invested in improvements in these businesses, enlarging the restaurant in 1921 and the souvenir store in 1924.⁶⁵ By 1921 the park boasted 10 acres of sports fields, a supply of spring water, a souvenir stand, a check room, a restaurant and a cafeteria, two large shelter pavilions with a capacity of 1,500, tables and benches for 1,000, and plates, cups and saucers available for rental by picnic parties. The NPC also sold refreshments such as ice cream, soft drinks, and bread.⁶⁶ In 1930 the commissioners were planning to add more amenities, including a new restaurant with a dance floor and a swimming pool, but complications in planning and declining revenues necessitated that this project be put on hold.⁶⁷ The commissioners showed no reservations about the commercialisation of the park area, and worked to create a welcoming recreational environment that drew in visitors and generated revenue.

Queenston Heights and the Brock Monument also offered a beautiful and picturesque view of the Niagara River, a fact frequently commented on in the nineteenth century. Early tourists had visited the battlefield primarily for its historical associations, but were also impressed with its view of the river. Indeed, most guidebooks from the period that mentioned Queenston Heights pointed out that scaling the Brock Monument offered a view of ‘the whole scene of battle, and an extended prospect of a magnificent country – now the abode of peace and plenty.’⁶⁸ One guidebook stated breathlessly that ‘standing on this gallery one sees unroll before him a matchless panorama, of battlefield and vineyard, of cataract and quiet stream, of dark wood and steeped villages and breadths of peach-orchard, and fortresses no longer hostile.’⁶⁹ The NPC recognized the scenic beauty of Queenston Heights, and many of the improvements to the site emphasized its view of the Niagara River. Although the motives of the NPC in acquiring historic sites on the Niagara Frontier have been portrayed as motivated by an ‘early interest in the preservation of national history, more than considerations of scenic beauty,’⁷⁰ the NPC’s first expression of interest in acquiring the Brock Monument and its grounds stressed the natural

beauty of the surroundings over its historical associations. 'The outlook from these grounds is remarkably beautiful,' stated an 1893 NPC report,

the eye commands a magnificent reach of the most highly cultivated lands in all Ontario, through which the noble Niagara River, resting after its mighty conflict with the 'Munitions of Rocks' pursues its placid way to Lake Ontario, bearing on its broad bosom many a noble steamer and tiny craft, and shimmering in the sunlight like a ribbon of silver fringed with jasper.⁷¹

After praising the idyllic view from the Heights, the report mentioned the site's historic associations, concluding that 'the traditions of the spot, its historic memories so dear to every loyal Canadian heart, and the natural beauty of the place, alike demand ... that proper care be taken not only of the grounds immediately around the monument but of the surrounding territory as well.'⁷²

However, the NPC was more interested in highlighting the scenery than promoting the site's history. At the turn of the century an arbour was built at the edge of the cliff where 'a magnificent panorama is afforded of the river valley,'⁷³ and in 1906 the commissioners reported that there had been an increase in the number of visitors, 'attracted ... by the magnificent views which have been provided for the comfort and recreation of picnic parties.'⁷⁴ The paths around the Brock and Second monuments along the edge of the escarpment were gently curving and reserved for pedestrian use, a configuration that encouraged visitors to stroll along their length.⁷⁵ The NPC also constructed additions that encouraged visitors to enjoy the view or take a 'delightful walk.'⁷⁶ A promenade and retaining wall were built in front of Brock's Monument in 1910–1911 so that visitors could better view 'what is said to be one of the most impressive pastoral scenes on this continent.'⁷⁷ In 1921 the NPC crowed that 'the tourist visitors from all parts of the globe voice their praise of the pastoral views from the promenade.'⁷⁸ These additions encouraged visitors to gaze outward from the Heights on the distant sights below, rather than to look inward at the battlefield landscape itself.⁷⁹ The Commission's focus on the picturesque view from the Heights was also reflected in its attitude to the Brock Monument.

The commissioners recognized the historical associations of the Brock Monument, but approached it primarily as a vehicle to help visitors obtain a better view of the Niagara River. Shortly before obtaining the site NPC Superintendent James Wilson briefly entertained a scheme to attach an electric elevator to the outside of the Brock monument

column. Wilson himself recognized that nothing should be done that would 'detract from the dignity and strength of the monument itself or that would offend the sensibilities of those who were instrumental in promoting its erection' and felt that 'any proposal suggested must have the qualification necessary to afford a reasonable excuse being given for its adoption.' Wilson's scheme to attach an elevator to the monument reflected a concern that more visitors be able to 'freely [enjoy] the sublimity of the emotions created by the delightful panorama' from the top of the monument.⁸⁰ Despite the assurances of the Fenson Elevator Works that the lift would be small, durable and safe, 'without detracting in any way from the appearance of the Monument,' the commissioners abandoned the plan in favour of maintaining the monument as it was.⁸¹ In order that more visitors be able to view the scenery, the NPC lowered the fee for ascending the monument from \$0.25 to \$0.15 in 1906.⁸² This strategy seems to have worked, as the 1920 annual report claimed that over 23,000 people had climbed the Brock Monument 'to obtain a view of Lake Ontario and the Niagara Fruit Farms.'⁸³ While nineteenth-century visitors had enjoyed both the natural and historical panorama, for the NPC the focus was on the picturesque scenery that could be best enjoyed from the edge of the escarpment or the top of Brock's Monument. For the commissioners, rather than functioning primarily as a historical marker the Brock Monument was a way for visitors to obtain a better view of the Niagara River. However, as suggested by the scrapping of the elevator plan, the NPC also recognized the symbolic and historical importance of the monument for the public. In contrast to the rest of the park, the commissioners made very few changes to the Brock Monument and did not consider any major alterations after Wilson's elevator proposal was rejected. The only changes made to the monument were of practical necessity, and even then their impact on the structure was minimized. In 1900 the Commission undertook maintenance work on the interior of the monument, and extensive repairs to the interior and exterior were made in 1901.⁸⁴ The Brock Monument, then, was maintained in its original condition as much as possible. This may have been due to the sacred associations of the monument; as Wilson had recognized, the monument was a mausoleum for Brock and alterations to it may have offended the public.

In the nineteenth century the Brock Monument had not only demonstrated Upper Canadians' devotion to the hero, but had also quickly become a point of interest for tourists. Generally, monuments can pull visitors' attention away from the battlefield itself, and the eye's natural tendency is to follow the monument upward and away from

the ground.⁸⁵ As Patricia Jasen has noted, soon after its construction the first (and later second) Brock Monument became the primary focus of tourists that led to a case of what Dean MacCannell calls 'marker-site displacement' whereby the marker (in this case the monument) comes to replace the original (the battlefield) as an attraction.⁸⁶ A.V. Seaton's examination of the Waterloo battlefield demonstrates that MacCannell's sight sacralisation model, whereby objects become quasi-holy items for tourists, can be adapted to the historical evolution of a battlefield and its markers through the process of naming and mechanical reproduction.⁸⁷ The first, and later second, Brock Monument began to take on these characteristics shortly after their erection. For instance, once the second monument was in place there was a growing tendency to linguistically separate the Brock Monument from Queenston Heights when referring to the area. An article in the *Niagara Mail and Advertiser* in June 1869, for example, listed Queenston Heights and the Brock Monument as separate attractions.⁸⁸ The public outrage over the destruction of the first monument and the decision to rebuild it also indicate that the monument itself had been named as something worthy of preservation. The new monument also figured prominently in descriptions of Queenston Heights published in guidebooks of the nineteenth century, and postcards depicting it were also produced.⁸⁹ The first and second Brock Monuments were sacralised according to MacCannell's model, and became the focus of tourists who wanted to 'do' the Queenston Heights battlefield and eventually came to symbolize the battle itself.⁹⁰ Those members of the public concerned with the historical associations of the former battlefields also vested commemorative meaning in the Brock Monument. In 1929 a wind storm caused Brock's outstretched arm to fall from the monument, and further inspection showed that the top half of the statue was in poor condition. In response the NPC undertook repairs to the monument.⁹¹ Rumours began to circulate that the NPC was planning to alter the monument by replacing the baton in Brock's outstretched hand with something else. This provoked severe criticism from members of the public, some of whom wrote letters to newspapers protesting the change. 'In the name of common sense,' read a letter from one A.M., 'will not someone in authority veto the proposed desecration of General Brock's statue.' A.M. continued that placing a scroll in Brock's hand would be tantamount to '[inflicting] a violin, a hair-brush or any old thing, upon the gallant defender of our country.'⁹² Numerous letters agreeing with A.M. appeared in the following weeks.⁹³ However, the rumours turned out to be unfounded, and the figure of Brock was repaired to resemble the original as much

as possible.⁹⁴ The protests regarding changes to the Brock monument suggest that the monument itself had come to embody the site's history. The association of the site's martial past with the Brock Monument is perhaps not surprising, as the Brock Monument literally and figuratively overshadows the area's historical associations.

Although built after the battle of Queenston Heights, the treatment of historic earthworks from the War of 1812 indicates how the commissioners' attitude toward historical remnants on the battlefield landscape contrasted with their attitude to the Brock Monument. Forts Drummond and Riall were both built by military labour in the spring of 1814. When the British retreated from Queenston Heights in July 1814 the fortifications were dismantled, but were reoccupied by the British in late July and held until the end of the war. The forts were located to the west of the later site of the Brock Monument.⁹⁵ Although early visitors had employed guides and sought out the outlines of old structures like the earthworks, their significance waned over time.⁹⁶ Combined with the marker-sight displacement of the well-maintained and visually dominant Brock Monument, The NPC did not consider these earthworks to be as important as the Brock monument. Little was done to protect Fort Drummond until 1921 when the NPC erected low fences to keep the growing number of visitors from walking on it.⁹⁷ No such protection was provided for Fort Riall, which a later visitor described as 'worn bare by the careless feet of sightseers.'⁹⁸ During the height of the park's development in 1922 NPC General Manager John Jackson wrote to General Cruickshank, chairman of the HSMBC and an historian, asking about placing tennis courts in the 'Westerly Earth Works.' He wrote: 'I would like to know whether it seems to you quite proper to put tennis courts in such a place. I cannot see any objection personally for it is a plot that is scarcely ever looked at now and the whole would probably be kept in better order than at present, but we would not want to have any criticism later.'⁹⁹ After clarifying that the earthworks were, in fact, Fort Drummond, Cruickshank replied that placing the tennis courts there would be acceptable if the earthworks were protected, but 'if ... there be another equally eligible spot it may be advisable to locate the tennis court elsewhere to avoid possible adverse criticism.'¹⁰⁰ Perhaps fearing the opposition of history enthusiasts and societies, the tennis courts were placed in another area of the park. However, in 1926 the Commissioners installed a 29-metre diameter concrete wading pool in the centre of the old fort.¹⁰¹

In 1926 the commissioners were again adding recreational amenities to the park. This time the proposed development was a

permanent building to house the Commission's crèche, or nursery, which had been operating in a double tent since 1921.¹⁰² One proposed location for the new building was within the earthworks of Fort Riall, an advanced battery also built in 1814.¹⁰³ The commissioners initially saw no problem with this proposal, but decided that 'it is well to get the different view points of other interests,' and wrote R.W. Geary, president of the LLHS, to ask his opinion.¹⁰⁴ Geary responded in much the way that Cruikshank had, stating that he saw no problem with the project as long as the earthworks were left undisturbed 'as much as possible.' Geary continued that the fort 'is not of the greatest importance historically' because it had no association with General Brock, and would provide an ideal location for the crèche.¹⁰⁵ Although the commission eventually placed the crèche elsewhere, Geary and Cruikshank's responses are perhaps surprising, as both were history enthusiasts. They expressed some concern that the earthworks not be destroyed, but they did not oppose their development on historical grounds. Geary's comment that the earthworks did not have anything to do with Brock and therefore were not significant indicates that the primary focus of the site, for both the NPC and some historical society members, was on Brock and his monument. Both the NPC and some members of local historical societies did not prioritize the war's historic landscape, focussing instead on the site's historic markers as symbols of the past. This may have been because the earthworks were constructed after the famous battle had taken place, or because the site's historical associations had been vested in the Brock Monument. In any case, the NPC did not act to protect the earthworks, instead seeing them as ideal locations for the expansion of recreational park services.

As demonstrated by the response of R.W. Geary, the development of the battlefield as a recreational destination was not contested or questioned by local historical societies. The increased interest in Ontario's history at the turn of the century had led to the creation of these historical societies, many of which were located in the Niagara Region. In the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries many of these societies, including the NHS, had invested their energy in saving other War of 1812 battlefields such as Forts George and Erie from development by an American railway company and a Buffalo Country Club, respectively. Their goal was to have these forts placed under the care of the NPC, which was perceived as their potential guardian.¹⁰⁶ Local historical societies may not have been as concerned about Queenston Heights, as it was already under the control of the NPC and

was not in danger of immediate large scale commercial development, especially by American entrepreneurs. Although these societies took a general interest in Queenston Heights and General Brock, the site had no active and organized local historical society to lobby for the protection of its historical relics. The members of the NHS promoted the history of Niagara-on-the-Lake, Ontario, including the battle of Fort George, and called for the preservation of the fort and the surrounding Niagara Commons.¹⁰⁷ The LLHS published prolifically about the war, and were concerned specifically with the maintenance of the Lundy's Lane battlefield. The LLHS conducted anniversary celebrations there almost yearly starting in 1887, and was active in calling for the preservation of the site and instrumental in erecting two War of 1812 monuments there.¹⁰⁸ No such concern was expressed for Queenston Heights. Beyond the unveiling of its monuments, the first large scale formal celebration of the anniversary of the battle of Queenston Heights did not take place until the centennial in 1912, and this was organized by the Toronto-based United Empire Loyalist Association of Canada.¹⁰⁹ With no strong local historical society to advocate for the site's historical associations, under the control of the NPC this history became subordinate to the former battlefield's identity as a site of recreation.

Queenston Heights' identities as a place of leisure and recreation were not mutually exclusive, however. The voices of twentieth century visitors are difficult to discern, but in practice it is likely that their activities in and motivations for visiting Queenston Heights were varied, as landscapes can be seen simultaneously in a variety of different ways.¹¹⁰ Those visiting the site to enjoy the view of the Niagara River were likely aware at some level of the historical associations of the site through the presence of the monuments, while those visiting because of its history were doubtless struck by the beauty of the view from the Heights. Either visitor may have stopped to enjoy lunch at the restaurant, or a picnic. Indeed, some local historical societies such as the NHS held several picnics at Queenston Heights in the 1910s where members and their guests enjoyed a luncheon and heard speakers on historical matters.¹¹¹ Company or church groups likely went to Queenston Heights because of the amenities provided for large groups and the picturesque scenery, but this would not preclude participants from pausing to read the inscriptions on the Brock or Secord monuments. The development of Queenston Heights primarily as a recreational space and its subsequent popularity for groups wanting to spend a day picnicking and indulging in sports suggests that the

transformation of the former battlefield to a site of recreation was a process that was generally accepted by members of the public. This may be due, in part, to the Brock Monument's embodiment of the site's historical associations, which allowed the remainder of the battlefield to be developed as a recreational space. The NPC, however, played a large role in how the area was perceived and worked to integrate the former battlefield into a wider recreational park system that emphasized recreation over history.

In the nineteenth century Queenston Heights was the site of tourism devoted mostly to connecting with the site's past. Early tourists searched for the historical sublime, while local historical society members organized pilgrimages to learn about the battle in the place it happened and to commemorate those killed. Beginning at the turn of the century Queenston Heights was increasingly a site of recreational activities not directly associated with the site's War of 1812 past. This trend continued into the twentieth century, and in the 1920s Queenston Heights' popularity as a recreational destination exploded. This shift in use and meaning was due in part to the activities of the NPC. The NPC perceived Queenston Heights more as a park than a historic site, and developed it accordingly. Although they left the Brock, and later Secord, monuments alone, the battlefield was developed and promoted primarily as a recreational space. The NPC did not take any action to commemorate the historical associations of the site, and the physical remnants from the war were given only grudging recognition. The Commission valued and emphasized the scenic beauty of the area, and encouraged the contemplation of nature while developing the former battlefield as a commercial recreational space. Through this development the NPC was able to draw large crowds of day trippers from Toronto who used the former battlefield as a site for a pleasant family outing. Indeed, the popularity of the site as a leisure destination and the lack of opposition to the NPC's program suggest that for many people the former battlefield was no longer strongly associated with its martial past. The Brock Monument's symbolic and physical dominance of the site aided in this process, as it contributed to the disassociation of the battlefield landscape from the conflict. A 1930 advertisement is telling of the site's transformation from battlefield to recreational park. It states, with questionable accuracy, 'Queenston Heights Park a century ago was a battlefield.' 'Today,' it continues, 'as children or as grown ups we thrill anew at the natural grandeur of the Park and revel in the completeness of its conveniences for family picnics.'¹¹²

Notes

- 1 'Chit Chat,' *Globe*, 23 July 1897.
- 2 Originally named the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park Commission, the organisation changed its name to the Niagara Parks Commission in 1927. For the sake of brevity and clarity the latter will be used throughout this paper. George A. Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks: A History* (Niagara Falls: The Niagara Parks Commission, 1985), 41.
- 3 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 220; NPC, *Forty-Eighth Annual Report of the Niagara Parks Commission 1933* (Toronto: T.E. Bowman, 1933), 5, 11.
- 4 J. Mackay Hitsman, *The Incredible War of 1812: A Military History* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965), 88–90; Robert Malcomson, *A Very Brilliant Affair: The Battle of Queenston Heights, 1812* (Toronto: Robin Brass Studio, 2003), 170–4.
- 5 Patricia Jasen, 'Romanticism, Modernity, and the Evolution of Tourism on the Niagara Frontier, 1790–1850,' *Canadian Historical Review* 72, 3 (1991): 292, 297–8; Stuart Semmel, 'Reading the Tangible Past: British Tourism, Collecting, and Memory after Waterloo,' *Representations* 69 (Winter 2000): 15; Thomas A. Chambers, *Memories of War: Visiting Battlegrounds and Bonefields in the Early American Republic* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2012), 129–31.
- 6 Horatio A Parsons, *The Book of Niagara Falls* (Buffalo: Steele & Peck, 1838), 75.
- 7 John J. Bigsby, *The Shoe and Canoe or Pictures of Travel in the Canadas Illustrative of Their Scenery and of Colonial Life; With Facts and Opinions on Emigration, State Policy, and Other Points of Public Interest. With numerous Plates and Maps*, Vol. II (London: Chapman and Hall, 1850), 28–9.
- 8 Jasen, 'Romanticism,' 305.
- 9 *Ibid.*, 284; Keith Walden, 'Isaac Brock: Man and Myth' (MA Thesis, Queen's University, 1971), ii.
- 10 C.R. Chisholm, *Chisholm's Hand-Book of Travel, and Tourist's Guide through Canada and the United States with Fifty Illustrations and Maps* (Montreal: C.R. Chisholm & Bro's, 1866), 6–7.
- 11 Robert Malcomson, *Burying General Brock: A History of Brock's Monuments* (Niagara-on-the-Lake: The Friends of Fort George, 1996), 9, 17–25, 31–2, 43.
- 12 Papers of the Women's Literary Club of St Catharines, Brock University Special Collections, RG18, Box 1, Folder 1.
- 13 See, for example, 'An Historic Trip to the Niagara,' *The Globe*, 19 May 1898.
- 14 'Historical Pilgrimage,' *The Globe*, 19 May 1897.
- 15 NPC, *Thirty-Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1920* (Toronto: Clarkson W. James, 1922), 43.
- 16 Karen Dubinsky, *The Second Greatest Disappointment: Honeymooning and Tourism at Niagara Falls* (New Brunswick, New Jersey: Rutgers University Press, 1999), 118.
- 17 Patricia Jasen, *Wild Things: Nature, Culture, and Tourism in Ontario 1790–1914* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995), 128.
- 18 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 217, 220, 223.
- 19 NPC, *Twenty-Third Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1908* (Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1909), 17. For the week ending 24 July 1920, the total participants in registered group picnics was 1,250 in Queenston Heights, and 1,465 at Queen Victoria Park. John Jackson to F.D.L. Smith, 20 July 1920, Archives of Ontario (AO), NPC General Managers Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-1.
- 20 'Picnics at Queenston,' *Toronto Daily Star*, 24 July 1920.
- 21 'The Whirlpool Route,' *The Globe*, 22 July 1893; for Canadian advertising see Russell Johnston, *Selling Themselves: The Emergence of Canadian Advertising* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2001); 'Plan Now!' *Toronto Daily Star*, 25 February 1927.
- 22 'The Veterans' Celebration,' *The Standard* (St. Catharines), 28 July 1904.
- 23 'Over 500 Holiday-Makers, Members of Globe Family, Spend Day in Happy Reunion,' *The Globe*, 12 June 1922.
- 24 See, for example, 'Civic Holiday Doings,' *Niagara Falls Daily Record*, 5 August 1909.
- 25 For a detailed account of the creation of the Niagara Park Commission and Queen Victoria Park, see Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 22–30.
- 26 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 217–20.

- 27 NPC, *Tenth annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1895* (Toronto: Warwick Bros. & Rutter, 1896), 47–8.
- 28 NPC, *Eighth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park, 1893* (Toronto: Warwick Bros. & Rutter, 1894), 10.
- 29 NPC, *Tenth Annual Report*, 44–8, 77.
- 30 NPC, *Report of the Commissioners for Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1896* (Toronto: Warwick Bro's & Rutter, 1897), 6; NPC, *Thirteenth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1888* (Toronto: Warwick Bro's & Rutter, 1899), 6.
- 31 Seible, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 221.
- 32 Ronald L. Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks: A History* (rev. ed.: Niagara Falls: Niagara Parks Commission, 1960), 205.
- 33 NPC, *Tenth Annual Report*, 44.
- 34 Malcolmson, *Burying General Brock*, 42; NPC, *Tenth Annual Report*, 52.
- 35 NPC, *Seventeenth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park for the Year Ending 1902* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1903), 21.
- 36 Charles E. Beveridge and Paul Rocheleau, *Frederick Law Olmsted: Designing the American Landscape* (New York: Universe, 1998), 174–75.
- 37 Linda Flint McClelland, *Building the National Parks: Historic Landscape Design and Construction* (Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1998), 37.
- 38 NPC, *Eighteenth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1904), 21.
- 39 Smith to Jackson, 27 May 1929, AO, NPC General Manager Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-2-913.
- 40 Jackson to Smith, 4 June 1929, AO, NPC General Manager Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-2-913.
- 41 Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 261, 27.
- 42 *Ibid.*, 261; 'Outstanding Servant Of City and Province, P.W. Ellis, Succumbs' *The Globe*, 22 April 1929.
- 43 Cecelia Morgan has examined Secord's adoption by first wave feminists; see Colin M. Coates and Cecelia Morgan, *Heroines and History: Representations of Madeleine de Verchères and Laura Secord* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2002); also Beverly Boutilier, 'Women's Rights and Duties: Sarah Anne Curzon and the Politics of Canadian History,' in *Creating Historical Memory: English-Canadian Women and the Work of History*, eds. Beverly Boutilier and Alison Prentice (Vancouver: UBC Press, 1997), 51–74.
- 44 Norman Knowles, *Inventing the Loyalists: The Ontario Loyalist Tradition & the Creation of Usable Pasts* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997), 131.
- 45 Laud to Wilson, 11 March 1908, AO, NPC General Manager Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-494.
- 46 'Honours Memory of Laura Secord,' *Globe*, 6 July 1911; for a more detailed discussion of the monument see Coates and Morgan, *Heroines and History*, 200–7.
- 47 Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 209.
- 48 See, for example, 'St. George's Society,' *The Daily Globe*, 12 June 1862.
- 49 NPC, *Sixteenth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park of the Province of Ontario for the Year Ending December 31st 1901* (Toronto: L. K. Cameron, 1902), 13.
- 50 NPC, *Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1917* (Toronto: A.T. Wilgress, 1918), 23.
- 51 'Specifications of Works Required in the Construction of a Shelter at Queenston Heights,' April 1907, AO, NPC General Manager Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-276.
- 52 *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1921* (Toronto: Clarkson W. James, 1923), 35.
- 53 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 223.
- 54 NPC, *Fifteenth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1901), 7; Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 223.
- 55 NPC, *Twenty-Sixth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1911* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1912), 26; NPC, *Twenty-Seventh Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1912* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1913), 13.
- 56 See Dubinsky, *The Second Greatest Disappointment*, 103–4.
- 57 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 336.
- 58 S. Barnett(?) to James Wilson, 22 October 1894, AO, NPC Superintendent's Office Chronological Correspondence, 1884–1902, RG38 2-0-10; Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 220.

- 59 James Humphries to Niagara Parks Commissioners, 24 February 1913, AO, NPC General Manager's Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-263; 'Proposal Queenston and Whirlpool Concessions,' 19 December 1913, *ibid.*
- 60 NPC, *Twenty-Fourth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1909* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1910), 8.
- 61 NPC, *Thirty-First Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1916* (Toronto: A.T. Wilgress, 1917), 21.
- 62 NPC, *Thirtieth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1915* (Toronto: A.T. Wilgress, 1916), 10, 12.
- 63 NPC, *Thirty-Fifth Annual Report*, 37.
- 64 Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 234.
- 65 NPC, *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report*, 23; NPC, *Thirty-Ninth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1924* (Toronto: Clarkson W. James, 1926), 8.
- 66 S.J. Murphy to John Jackson, 8 December 1921, AO, NPC General Manager's Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-1.
- 67 NPC, *Thirty-Ninth Annual Report*, 14-5.
- 68 *Chisholm's Hand-Book of Travel, and Tourist's Guide Through Canada and the United States with Fifty Illustrations and Maps* (Montreal: C.R. Chisholm & Bro's, 1866), 7.
- 69 Charles G.D. Roberts, *The Canadian Guide-Book the Tourist's and Sportsman's Guide to Eastern Canada and Newfoundland: Including Full Descriptions of Routes, Cities, Points of Interest, Summer Resorts, Fishing Places, etc. in Eastern Ontario, the Muskoka District, the St. Lawrence Region, the Lake St. John Country, the Maritime Provinces, Prince Edward Island, and Newfoundland: with an Appendix Giving Fish and Game Laws, and Official Lists of Trout and Salmon Rivers and their Lessees* (New York: D. Appleton, 1891), 14.
- 70 Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 205.
- 71 NPC, *Eighth Annual Report*, 10.
- 72 *Ibid.*, 10.
- 73 NPC, *Fifteenth Annual Report*, 7.
- 74 NPC, *Twenty-First Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1906* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1907), 24.
- 75 Galen Crazz, *The Politics of Park Design: A History of Urban Parks in America* (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 1982), 36, 8.
- 76 H. J. Moore to James Wilson, 1913, AO, NPC General Manager's Office Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-285.
- 77 NPC, *Twenty-Fifth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park 1910* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1911), 22.
- 78 NPC, *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report*, 37.
- 79 Chambers, *Memories of War*, 155.
- 80 NPC, *Tenth Annual Report*, 54.
- 81 John Fenson to James Wilson, 8 September 1894, Superintendent's Office Chronological Correspondence, AO RG38 2-0-13.
- 82 NPC, *Twenty-First Annual Report*, 24.
- 83 NPC, *Thirty-Fifth Annual Report*, 20.
- 84 NPC, *Fifteenth Annual Report*, 7; NPC, *Sixteenth Annual Report of the Commissioners for the Queen Victoria Niagara Falls Park of the Province of Ontario for the Year Ending December 31st 1901* (Toronto: L.K. Cameron, 1902), 13.
- 85 Mark Piekarz, 'It's Just a Bloody Field! Approaches, Opportunities and Dilemmas of Interpreting English Battlefields' in *Battlefield Tourism: History Place, and Interpretation*, ed. Chris Ryan (Oxford: Elsevier, 2007), 35; Jasen, *Wild Things*, 52.
- 86 Jasen, *Wild Things*, 52; Dean MacCannell, *The Tourist: A New Theory of the Leisure Class* (new ed.; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1999), 124.
- 87 A.V. Seaton, 'War and Thanatourism: Waterloo 1815-1914,' *Annals of Tourism Research* 26, no.1 (1996):140, 152.
- 88 'Summer Resort,' *Niagara Mail and Advertiser*, 16 June 1869; see also G. Mercer Adam, *Canada: Historical and Descriptive from Sea to Sea* (Toronto: W. Bryce, 1888), 24.
- 89 See, for example, Rev. J. M'Cowan, *A Tour in Canada* (Elgin Courant and Courier, 1894), 35-6; Parsons, *The Book of Niagara Falls*, 44-5; W.M.S. Hunter, Jr., *Chisholm's Panoramic Guide from Niagara Falls to Quebec* (Montreal: C.R. Chisholm, 1869), 4; *Souvenir View Book of Niagara Falls* (n.p:n.p., 1910), 28.
- 90 Jasen, *Wild Things*, 52.
- 91 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 227; NPC, *Forty-Fifth Annual Report of*

- the Niagara Parks Commission 1930* (Toronto: Herbert H. Ball, 1931), 15.
- 92 A.M., 'The Brock Monument,' *Mail & Empire*, 16 June 1930.
- 93 See R.T.N., 'General Brock's Statue,' *Mail & Empire*, 27 June 1930; Observer, 'General Brock's Statue,' *Mail & Empire*, 2 July 1930.
- 94 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 227.
- 95 Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 208.
- 96 Jasen, *Wild Things*, 39.
- 97 NPC, *Thirty-Sixth Annual Report*, 37; Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 208.
- 98 U.E. Loyalist, 'Preserve Historic Spots,' *The Globe*, 1 November 1930.
- 99 Jackson to E.A. Cruikshank, 27 June 1922, AO, NPC General Manager's Office Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-263.
- 100 E.A. Cruikshank to Jackson, 30 June 1922, AO, NPC General Manager's Office Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-1-263.
- 101 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 226-7.
- 102 Seibel, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 223.
- 103 Way, *Ontario's Niagara Parks*, 208.
- 104 Jackson to R.W. Geary, 1 March 1926, AO, NPC General Manager's Office Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-2-25.
- 105 R.W. Geary to Jackson 3 March 1926, AO, NPC General Manager's Office Subject Correspondence, RG38 3-2-25.
- 106 George Killan, *Preserving Ontario's Heritage: A History of the Ontario Historical Society* (Ottawa: Love Printing, 1976), 132-3.
- 107 Niagara Historical Society, *Tenth Annual Report of the Niagara Historical Society* (Niagara-on-the-Lake[?]: Niagara Historical Society[?], 1905[?]), n.p.; Killan, *Preserving Ontario's Heritage*, 135.
- 108 See, for example, 'Lundy's Lane,' *ThoroldPost*, 7 August 1891.
- 109 Alexander Fraser, *Brock Centenary 1812-1912: Account of the Celebration at Queenston Heights, Ontario, on the 12th October, 1912* (Toronto: William Briggs, 1913), 21.
- 110 Brian Grahame, *A Geography of Heritage: Power, Culture & Economy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2000), 33.
- 111 See Niagara Historical Society Minutes, AO, Niagara Historical Society Collection, F1138-F-1, MS 193, Reel 7.
- 112 'A Glorious Family Picnic Park,' *The Globe*, 22 July 1930.

* **Elaine Young** holds a PhD in history from the University of Guelph and has written on a wide array of topics, including Indian Residential and Day Schools, the First World War, the War of 1812 and tobacco companies. She is currently a senior researcher with the Laurier Research Group in Ottawa.