

THE PATRIMONIALIZATION OF OLD MONTREAL
or,
Preserving a Monument, a Cultural Resource, and a Heritage Space
for the Modern Metropolis

A Thesis by Adam Kaleb Poole

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
Master of Science in Historic Preservation

Graduate School of Architecture, Planning, & Preservation
Columbia University in the City of New York

(May 2012)

<i>Abstract</i>	<i>iii</i>
<i>Acknowledgements</i>	<i>iv</i>
<i>Conventions</i>	<i>v</i>
Introduction	1
Chapter One: An Exposition	5
<i>Monumentality: Commemoration and the Collective Memory</i>	5
<i>Cultural Property: Essentialized History and Pragmatic Preservation</i>	7
<i>Heritage Space: Socially-constructed meaning for Old Places</i>	9
Chapter Two: The Preservation of Old Montreal as Monument	12
<i>Commemorating an old Montreal</i>	12
<i>Planning for a Monument</i>	17
Chapter Three: The Preservation of Old Montreal as Cultural Property	24
<i>Planning for Cultural Property</i>	24
<i>Changing Ideologies</i>	28
<i>Exploiting Cultural Property</i>	30
Epilogue: Preserving Old Montreal as a Heritage Space	40
<i>Patrimonialization</i>	40
<i>The Heritage Palimpsest</i>	41
<i>Dematerialized Heritage</i>	43
<i>Conclusion</i>	45
Appendix 1: Illustrations	47
Bibliography	68

Abstract

The Historic Monuments Commission of Quebec declared Old Montreal an historic district in 1964 but that was hardly the beginning or the end of its preservation. This thesis explores what it meant for Old Montreal to be preserved and the long process whereby that happened.

Specifically it proposes that there were three general ways that the place was understood as something to keep: as an historic monument, as cultural property, and as a heritage space. While they are roughly embodied in the three versions of preservation law in Quebec and informed by international preservation discourse, each had its own players, its own important sites, and its own political agenda specific to the district. Moreover, each had its own methodology of preservation. Having brought us up more or less to the present day, this thesis concludes by speculating on the challenges that will face the district's preservation as the current paradigm develops.

Acknowledgements

Researching and writing this thesis has been a great exploratory exercise. I am deeply indebted to my faculty and peers in the Historic Preservation program at the GSAPP for their constant support and intellectual provocation. To my friends in Montreal, as well, on whom I relied during ventures northward for study, I offer my gratitude. I am also much obliged to the librarians and archivists at the Canadian Centre for Architecture and the Montreal City Archives for pointing me in helpful directions with such limited time. Without the experienced knowledge and careful attention of my readers, Martin Drouin and Julia Gersovitz, I would have undoubtedly lacked an important perception of the developments herein covered. Their willingness to participate despite the distance and bureaucracy was especially appreciated. Of course, I would have been lost without the guidance of my advisor, Paul Bentel. With preternatural insight, he helped me approach my topic with sure footing and critical inquisitiveness. And to my parents, thank you always for your love and encouragement.

Conventions

Regarding conventions for the names of places and organizations, I have chosen to adapt those used by the editors of *Old Montreal, History Through Heritage*.¹ These follow the common convention that the Saint Lawrence River flows past Old Montreal from west to east (rather than its true orientation from southwest to northeast), and that Boulevard Saint-Laurent therefore runs north-south. Streets crossing Boulevard Saint-Laurent are divided into east and west with civic numbers growing in their respective directions.

Because of Montreal's bilingual population, most places have existed under both English and French names (e.g. Saint Lawrence Boulevard and Boulevard Saint-Laurent), but in accordance with provincial regulations only the French street names are officially recognized. The exception will be Craig and Commissioners Streets, whose names were changed (to Saint-Antoine and de la Commune, respectively) before the regulation requiring their translation into French. I follow English grammatical rules, however, that oblige capitalizing the street type, hence Boulevard Saint-Laurent. Streets whose names have changed will be referenced in the name appropriate to the period in question with a note as to its current or historic name as necessary. Montreal and Quebec only receive accents when used in French. Neighborhood names and building names will be in English unless they have never existed in that language, as with Faubourg des Récollets and Place Ville-Marie.

As for organizations, these shall be in English regardless of whether or not they have officially existed under an English name so that those illiterate in French may more easily understand what the organization is (with the exception of publishing houses cited in references).

With the exception of quotations, this text uses American conventions, including a preference for the term 'preservation' in place of 'conservation.'

¹ Gilles Lauzon and Madeleine Forget, eds., *Old Montreal, History Through Heritage* (Sainte-Foy: Publications du Québec, 2004), 5.

Introduction

GENERAL: Frederic, in this chapel are ancestors: you cannot deny that. With the estate, I bought the chapel and its contents. I don't know whose ancestors they were, but I know whose ancestors they are, and I shudder to think that their descendant by purchase (if I may so describe myself) should have brought disgrace upon what, I have no doubt, was an unstained escutcheon.²

The historic district of Montreal is an area of both historical and architectural superlatives, leaving one as unsurprised at its being the subject of preservation as one is pleased at its having been so. Indeed, the qualities of what has become known as Old Montreal and the evident degree to which they are now put to good use makes the story of its resurrection from abject deterioration to an epicenter of heritage the more dramatic. Of course, while the fine architecture and noble stories associated with the place understandably overshadow the efforts to save those very things from academic oblivion, the preservationists of Montreal recite their own successes with nearly as much pride as they devote to extolling the stones and denizens of yore. The story of preservation may not carry the same weight as the foundations of Bonsecours Chapel, but it is, I argue, why those places mean to Montreal what they do. Such is a profound responsibility. To think that the present church might exist only as a photograph in a book, its place ceded to an expressway, lends it meaningful poignance. Imagine, moreover, this tale multiplied in kind across half a square mile, and one understands the position facing preservationists in previous decades.

This thesis is not a comprehensive history of preserving Old Montreal (if such a thing is even possible). Admirable historical narratives exist concerning that topic, including portions of Jean-Claude Marsan's *Montreal in Evolution*, Paul-André Linteau's *Histoire de Montréal Après la Confédération*, the government publication *Patrimoine de Montréal, Document de Référence*, Martin Drouin's *Le Combat du Patrimoine à Montréal, 1973-2003*, and last but certainly not least *Old Montreal: History Through Heritage*. The extraordinary attention to Old Montreal is partially what drew my interest to it. My project is to demonstrate collective notions of preservation through the application of theory to practice.

We now understand the preservation project as one simultaneously requiring both extensive physical and conceptual reconstruction. Old Montreal is not what it was fifty years ago when journalist Eric McLean bought the Papineau House. Its some five hundred buildings are clean and sound, its vacant lots are filled with new homes and businesses, its population has multiplied, and its streets are well-lit. More significantly, though, it has new meaning for the people who encounter it, whether as residents, workers, or tourists. In the past they saw

² W.S. Gilbert, *The Pirates of Penzance, or The Slave of Duty: an Entirely Original Comic Opera in Two Acts* (New York: Hitchcock, 1880).

obsolescence, slums, and decline; today they see heritage, prosperity, and culture. The experience of the place is profoundly different, justifiably prompting the question: has Old Montreal been preserved? Contrary to popular belief, this cannot be a yes-or-no question. The question can only ever be: How has Old Montreal been preserved? The answer, just as the place, is qualitative. Furthermore, it depends to a large degree on what one means both by 'preservation' and by 'heritage', concepts which have changed over the past century. That they have changed may not surprise the initiated, already aware of a gradual tendency to broaden the scope of preservation, but the trajectory – most saliently discernible through Quebec's preservation laws – from historic monument through cultural property to cultural heritage constitutes, I argue, a series of paradigm shifts which, in turn, play out in the urban environment. The project has not been simply a resigned acceptance of more and different architectural styles or periods of significance. Behind each of these approaches to preservation lies an epistemology with guidelines for architectural and urban decisions which are at once predicated on the previous regime and which clash with it.

Following the convention of the poststructuralist historian demonstrating the academic 'construction' of this or that accepted historical phenomenon, I offer this 'construction of heritage', to borrow the phrase of David Brett. In his monograph of that title, Brett describes the fundamentally constructed nature of heritage and the way in which the activity of constructing heritage has been carried out in his native Ireland. This is not to say that the construction of heritage is the material assemblage of heritage places, although that might be involved, but the studied assignment of meaning to those places with the objective of incorporating them into an historical narrative. In that manner, the construction of heritage is a form of popular history, a type of historical narrative relatively devoid of critical inquiry for facile dissemination among the masses through commodification and tourism.³ Its 'construction' is derivative of its relationship to history, which, for Brett and most postmodern historians, is itself a construct: not the way things were in the past but what those things mean to us now. The past, after all, did not transpire as the narrative format in which it is commonly recounted, but as the ever-present experience of individuals within their particular societies. In that vein he writes that, "History, truly considered, is a verb, not an abstract noun. We history. From which it follows that history is not given, but made."⁴ If heritage is a form of history, and history is 'made', then heritage, too, is 'made'. One could say that 'we heritage', which is not so surprising considering the relationship of that word to the verb inherit.

Heritage is only such in virtue of its being inherited, clearly predicating its generation on our agency. If we do not inherit it then it is not heritage. That is not to suggest that all heritage is voluntarily claimed; just as often it is thrust upon us

³ David Brett, *The Construction of Heritage* (Cork UP: Cork, 1996), 4. History and heritage are not identical, nor should history be teleologically derived from heritage.

⁴ *Ibid.*

by the 'other', in turn seeking its own identity in contrast. Nor is it ever at one person's discretion to construct heritage, its generation dependent instead on the cumulative actions of many people operating within a collective. Nevertheless, there are invariably leaders at whose initiative a particular practice (including the valuation of a particular heritage site) is normalized into the collective identity. The nation-collective, because it is charged with political governance and because its members are more or less beholden to it, presents especially strong opportunities for conflict between local identity and the national identity that nation-states have felt obliged to posit in justification of their power since at least the nineteenth century. The contest between Quebec and Canada is precisely this conflict, but even the Québécois are not so homogeneous as to preclude the same conflict within its own efforts at nationalism. That effort in Quebec, as in many nations, has been manifest through a focus on the nation as state and on the nation as ethnicity, both of which encourage architectural preservation. Civil nationalism asserts its authority over architecture as property while ethnic nationalism claims architecture as tradition.⁵ While Quebec has shifted from the latter to the former over the past half-century, both are unstable in the context of Montreal, whose cosmopolitan population defies the cultural and lingual homogeneity Quebec nationalists portrayed their 'nation' to possess. In some ways, the heritage of Montreal served as a battle ground between the modern pluralist Quebec nationalism and the traditional French Canadian Quebec nationalism and between both of those and the federal government's Canadian nationalism.

Heritage, however, is not only history, itself entirely abstract, but, especially in the case of Old Montreal, architecture. As such, it must respond to its urban situation as well, operating within functional and figurative systems such as aesthetics and economics which are only peripherally associated with the construction of heritage. These, too, are structures of meaning for a collective, and ones which, especially for modernists, have been more important than heritage-value. Thus architect Michael Fish said of his organization, Save Montreal, "we're into neighbourhoods, not history for its own sake."⁶ This principle, increasingly influential in Old Montreal because of the preponderance of architects who became involved in its leadership, was one of presentism and pragmatism: no matter how important a place is to history, its operation within the urban system *now* is paramount, even if that requires its demolition. Nevertheless, the case-by-case approach led to what heritage professionals have perceived as a lack of consistent preservation principles in Old Montreal. In the course of an article deploring that situation, Dinu Bumbaru observes with especially pertinence to this study that "Old Montreal has become a collection in which one can read the evolution (or absence of evolution) of the practices of

⁵ Mark Jarzombek, "The metaphysics of Permanence: Curating Critical Impossibilities," in *LOG 21* (Winter 2011): 125-135.

⁶ Martin Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine à Montréal, 1973-2003* (Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2005) 105.

conservation.”⁷ As Bumbaru suggests, this ‘evolution’ has not entirely left its earlier principles behind, and that they have been reified in physical places further perpetuates their contemporary influence.

⁷ Dinu Bumbaru, “Laboratoire du Patrimoine Montréalais,” *Continuité* 72 (1997): 55 [my translation].

Chapter One: An Exposition

Monumentality: Commemoration and the Collective Memory

The Monument gave birth to the preservation movement through the transition to monuments-of-history (or historical monuments) from the ancient practice of monuments-to-history. The latter are primarily statues and plaques, clearly creations of their time. They are not at first historical in themselves; they are built to act as aids to the memory of history (and memory, notoriously enigmatic, can be recalled in whatever light the sponsor desires). Alois Riegl (1858-1905), the Viennese art historian who authored the foundational analysis of the monument, called these ‘intentional monuments’.⁸ While he endorsed the conservation of plaques, statues, and memorials to ensure their ability to mnemonically signify history, he prioritized the ability of those ‘unintentional monuments’ – things whose association with memory, he argued, was a combination of their advanced age and their rarity – to communicate the oldness that made them monumental. In the case of buildings, these have conventionally been called historic monuments. Some unintentional monuments have historic-value for their salient prominence in an historical narrative, and these are furthermore only so valued by those schooled in history. Riegl proposed that the relationship of the unintentional monument with any historical narrative is not as important to the general public (unschooled in the details of history) as its ability to invoke oldness: “our appreciation of the time which has elapsed since it was made and which has burdened it with traces of age.”⁹ He concluded that the unintentional monument’s oldness should be preserved, even as a ruin, to commemorate its ‘age-value’, especially if its obsolescence precludes utility.

Monumentality, the quality exhibited by monuments in general, does not, however, generally convey oldness or even memory so much as importantness and impressiveness. While Riegl did not address the formal qualities of importantness and impressiveness, he did acknowledge that these characteristics operate in historic-value, for it is an unintentional monument’s importance within history that rescues it from the depths of obscurity.¹⁰ He acknowledges, however, that the assignment of historical value to an unintentional monument does not reflect an inherent value; historical monuments “refer to a particular moment, but the choice of that moment is left to our subjective preference.”¹¹ He did not pursue, the logical extension of that

⁸ Alois Riegl, “The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and its Origin,” Kurt Forster and Diane Ghirardo, trans., *Oppositions* 25 (1982): 20-51.

⁹ Riegl, 24. He was able to dismiss historic-value because of its limited relevance to the elite, but that argument is understandably distasteful in our time.

¹⁰ The combination of importance and integrity is significance or the state of signifying. It is thus highly reliant of figuration.

¹¹ Riegl, 24.

argument: if the historical referent of an historical monument is a choice, then that historicalness is the intentional creation of the present. The unintentional monument thus becomes intentional, and the distinction collapses. As even Riegl advocated, the symbols by which the intentional monument communicates history must be kept in good repair.¹² In the case of the unintentional intentional monument, whose initial unintentionality may have imparted on it a disappointing paucity of such symbols, becoming a monument obliges it to be made more formally monumental than it was. The monument can never escape its figuration within a collective memory, although the details of its story may change over time, nor can it avoid claiming in some way to be more important than other, not-monuments.

Intentional commemoration was, in any case, the reasoning behind Quebec's Bill Concerning the Conservation of Monuments and Art Objects Having an Historic or Artistic Interest (*La Loi relative à la conservation des monuments et des objets d'art ayant un intérêt historique ou artistique*), signed into law 21 March 1922.¹³ Tellingly, the Historic Monuments Commission thereby created oversaw more than the classification of old buildings; it was in charge of erecting historical placards across the province and filling the myriad niches on the Legislative Assembly House with commemorative statues. Its leaders were primarily historians, most notably Victor Morin in Montreal, who freely mixed the abstract narration of history with architectural props in the environment. Telling the story was the most important part of preservation, and if part of an historic monument did not fit with the story, they were freely removed.

Considering the directive to classify "monuments and art objects whose conservation presents a national interest from the viewpoint of history or of art," the Commission's first three monuments, one of which was the Chateau Ramezay in Old Montreal, are more explicitly preserved for commemorative purposes than for their age.¹⁴ The Commission continued in that vein after World War II with the restoration of Place Royale in Quebec City, inspired by the Colonial Williamsburg Project and by the Canadian government's reconstruction of the Fortress of Louisbourg in Nova Scotia. These governments chose their project's historical referent in the name of the collective with the intention of imparting a definitive meaning to those places. Heavily reliant on reconstruction, both Place Royale and the Fortress of Louisbourg are commemorative monuments to history as rooted in their own 'present' as the monument to

¹² Riegl, 38.

¹³ The bill was revised in 1951 to incorporate archeological sites and to encourage official classification under the name *Loi relative à la conservation des monument, sites, et objets historiques et artistiques*. It was revised again in 1963 as the *Loi des monuments historiques*, placing it under the newly created Ministry of Cultural Affairs and incorporating the power to designate arrondissements historiques (historic districts). See Gelly, Alain, Louise Brunelle-Lavoie, and Corneliu Kirjan, *La passion du patrimoine: la commission des biens culturels du Québec, 1922-1994* (Sillery, Quebec: Septentrion, 1995).

¹⁴ "Historique de la loi sur les biens culturels," <http://www.mcccf.gouv.qc.ca/index.php?id=2398> (accessed 5 May 2012)[my translation].

Admiral Nelson erected in 1809 on Place Jacques-Cartier and, at least according to Riegl's argument, should be conserved as such.¹⁵ However out-of-date their premise may have been they were not, like Dufferin Terrace in Quebec City, stylistic architecture masquerading as history. They tentatively participated in a new preservation discourse preoccupied with discovering a thing's historical essence through material science rather than through meaning-values.

Cultural Property: Essentialized History and Pragmatic Preservation

Riegl's prediction that age-value, at least in the way he conceived of it, would characterize the twentieth-century cult of monuments proved false.¹⁶ Historic monuments of the twentieth century were invariably restored to imaginary states or at the least vigorously cleaned to look new. His was a modern cult of monuments, predicated on a distinction between the past and the present that was characteristic of the modern era, not a Modernist cult of monuments which shunned the past out of principle. As Lewis Mumford wrote in 1938, "The truth is... that the notion of material survival by means of the monument no longer represents the impulses of our civilization, and in fact it defies our closest convictions."¹⁷ Mumford, like Riegl, understood the monument to be mnemonic, but he pejoratively equated its preoccupation with the past with death (curiously ignoring the obvious formal monumentality of the International Style). He argued that, in principle, monuments could not be Modern, for Modernism was an affirmation of 'life' and of the future.¹⁸ Yet some Modernists could endorse an historic monument if it functioned within a Modern environment; like Le Corbusier, Jacques Gréber retained historic buildings in his 1953 plan for Montreal for didactic contrast and monumental (e.g. impressive) effect.¹⁹

In acquiescence to the Modernist sentiment, international preservation discourse transcended the scrape/anti-scrape dichotomy which had preoccupied preservation in the nineteenth century through the development of a scientific conservation, one which sought to bring history in line with the present while retaining its essential historic elements.²⁰ The 1931 *Athens Charter for the*

¹⁵ The coade-stone Statue of Nelson now resides indoors within the Montreal History Center to protect it from the elements and, one fears, politically-charged vandalism.

¹⁶ The reasons are too complex to be explored here, but consider, for example, Thordis Arrhenius's conclusion that "The World Wars and totalitarian regimes of the 20th century led to the re-affirmation of the role and use of the intentional monument in the fabrication of national myths." Arrhenius, 'The Cult of Age in Mass Society: Alois Riegl's Theory of Conservation' in *Future Anterior* 1:1 (Spring 2004): 79.

¹⁷ Lewis Mumford, *Culture of Cities* (New York: Harcourt, 1938), 438.

¹⁸ Mumford, 438.

¹⁹ See discussion in Chapter Two. I admit that it is unfair to compare Le Corbusier and Jacques Gréber, who was a very traditional Modernist.

²⁰ Martin Drouin calls this principle "to set heritage in the present" (*décliner le patrimoine au présent*), *Le Combat du Patrimoine*, 199-224.

Restoration of Historic Monuments popularized the idea of material authenticity (although not in those terms), the notion that an historic monument was its materiality rather than a value or meaning one inscribed into it. While many preservationists denounced Modernism at this point, they could not help but be influenced by the epistemology on which it was based. This world-view considered a monument's material existence to be scientifically determinable and thus definitively absolute. Moreover, its form was a function of the society that produced it, although once produced it existed outside of us and independently of us. Thus material form was a testament to or a reflection of the past, comfortably compliant with the popular Modernist doctrine of environmental determinism quintessentially declared in the other *Athens Charter* of 1933; "History is inscribed in the layout and in the architecture of cities."²¹ While Modernist architects extrapolated that they should develop new forms and materials for the new society in which they lived, those engaged with preservation, including the planners of Old Montreal, made an effort to emphasize the 'living' quality of historic monuments. Especially in Montreal, Modernist architects, many of whom taught in the city's two schools of architecture, dominated preservation discourse beginning in the 1960s and wrested control of its theories from the historians of historic monuments. These late Modernists rejected the position that Modern society was entirely severed from its past conditions, or rather that it should not be, and therefore neither should its form be purged of 'living' traditions. Hence the *Venice Charter* of 1964 opened with an affirmation of both the inherent meaning of monuments and their continued relevance to Modern society; "Imbued with a message of the past, the historic monuments of generations of people remain to the present day as living witness of their age-old traditions."²² Practical conclusions from this epistemology stressed the preeminence of original material, the legibility of new material, and a preference for quotidian occupation. Although conventional use and the law still employed the term 'monument', there was less and less anything monumental about preservation.

As Riegl's notion of the monument broke down, new terms proliferated. In the United States, professionals referred increasingly to 'cultural resources', a basic societal product with value in the marketplace. UNESCO championed the idea of cultural property (*bien culturel*) through the creation in 1956 of the International Centre for the Study of the Preservation and Restoration of Cultural Property (ICCROM). 'Culture' is decidedly more presentist than 'historic' if only because it does not exclude contemporary society, and 'property' soundly embodies the immutable and physical qualities of the new preservation. Quebec adopted the term in 1972 through the Cultural Property Act, which replaced the Historic Monuments Act, but in many ways, new terminology was the most significant aspect of the bill, many of whose provisions had been progressively added to the old Historic Monuments Act. The text still referred to '*monuments*

²¹ Le Corbusier, *The Athens Charter*, trans. Anthony Eardley (New York: Grossman, 1973).

²² International Council of Monuments and Sites, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, The Second International Congress of the Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Venice, 1964.*

historiques' (buildings) and '*biens historiques*' (artifacts), now collectively termed '*biens culturels*', while adding further regulations.²³ From the commemoration of history through the creation of monuments out of old buildings, preservation had become a curatorial practice of collecting and exploiting material things.²⁴

Heritage Space: Socially-Constructed Meaning for Old Places

Cultural property is a broad term, encompassing many facets of past and present society. Nevertheless, it always refers to discrete objects. A property (or a resource or *un bien*) has essential qualities.²⁵ This model is satisfactory for discussion of a house museum or even the collection of artifacts displayed inside it, but has become inadequate for a 'place' such as Old Montreal. It is not possible or desirable to isolate a district's essential pieces or, as a corollary, to identify anything there that is *not* cultural property, for that would imply that it does not matter. In 1982, the *Conseil des monuments et des sites du Québec* of the *Comité francophone d'ICOMOS Canada* issued the *Déclaration de Deschambault* addressing this concern. The text maintained much of the cultural property language, most notably authenticity, but introduces another concept of heritage alongside the material one: the environment (*milieu*). In representational terms, the *milieu géographique* and the *milieu humain* are the fields that the figure (cultural property) inhabits. If both figure and field are heritage, suddenly everything is heritage. The field is figure and the distinction dissolves. As Martin Drouin explains, "heritage *in* the city... was no longer only limited by occasional traces spread here and there, but became heritage *of* the city."²⁶

While the *Déclaration de Deschambault* maintains the primacy of the material figure within the field, it hints at a new discourse of preservation wherein heritage is a phenomenal process rather than a thing. There are, of course, still material things that contribute to heritage, but they cannot be heritage by themselves. The meaning of those materials is contingent on and colored by the experience of them. The 'rendering-patrimonial', or more conventionally put, the construction of heritage, is a process that seeks to redefine heritage as Lefebvrian produced space or as Pierre Nora's *lieux de mémoire*.²⁷ In French, the process is called *patrimonialisation*. Within the Quebec school of heritage

²³ The most notable changes were the 'zone of protection' around a classified monument and the ability of the Ministry to classify without owner consent.

²⁴ Such is especially evident through the collection of essays by preeminent preservationist James Marston Fitch, *Historic Preservation: Curatorial Management of the Built World* (Charlottesville, UVA Press, 1990).

²⁵ *Un bien* is literally a 'good' and just as in English can be used to mean 'asset', especially in the plural, as in consumer 'goods.' In the case of *biens culturels*, it is more accurately translated 'cultural property' however.

²⁶ Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine*, 7 [my translation].

²⁷ See Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*, Donald Nicholson-Smith, trans. (Oxford: Blackwell, 1991) and Pierre Nora, "Lieux de mémoire," *Representations* 26 (1989): 7-24.

studies, notably through the *Institute de Patrimoine* at the *Université de Québec à Montréal*, a discourse of patrimonialization has largely come to replace one of Cultural Property. A salient difference between the two is the requirement, if something is to be patrimonialized, for collective approbation. The identity of that collective therefore becomes an important instrument in the construction of heritage.

Early efforts at preservation in Old Montreal and in Quebec at large came out of a contest for cultural hegemony, and the present reverence for diversity within preservation is likewise directly tied to the new pluralist paradigm for Quebec society. Such is evident not only in politics but in very way historians look at the city. Jacques de Rochers and Alain Roy begin their chapter on the present period of Old Montreal's history:

Old Montreal may no longer be the centre of the city, but it is more than ever Montreal's historical heart. In a way that is sometimes surprising to visitors but is very familiar to the thousands of Montrealers who work in the district every day, the contrasting buildings from various eras blend in a delightful diversity that reflects the city itself and, to some extent, modern Quebec society.²⁸

Societal conditions in Quebec mandating public consultation and an almost anxious attention to diversity have become a foundational aspect of contemporary preservation there. The desire for public consultation was first evident during the redevelopment of the Old Port, located on the banks of Saint Lawrence River and so adjacent to Old Montreal as to be almost indistinguishable from it.²⁹ As usual, the government internally made plans for the area after the Port of Montreal abandoned them for newer facilities to the east in 1974, but aired them during two series of consultations, one in 1979 and another from 1985 to 1986.³⁰

The utilization of public consultation for the preservation of Montreal has been a part of breaking the 'two solitudes'. Sociological discourse insisted for much of the twentieth century that the two language groups, who were more or less split along religious lines as well, inhabited isolated social and urban spaces within Montreal, but an increasing presence of *allophones* and the rise of a pluralist Quebec nation-state after 1960, in addition to political contests between Quebec and Canada, led to the deconstruction of traditional francophone and anglophone identities and to the current, if still contested, understanding of diversity within and between Quebec's language groups.³¹ In the social and

²⁸ Jacques des Rochers and Alain Roy, "Old Montreal, Time and Place Rediscovered," in Lauzon and Forget, *Old Montreal*, 247.

²⁹ Indeed, when the Cultural Property Commission extended the boundaries of the Montreal Historic District in 1995, the Old Port was included.

³⁰ Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine*, 179-180.

³¹ Annick Germain and Damaris Rose, *Montréal: The Quest for a Metropolis* (New York: Wiley, 2000): 213-253.

political atmosphere of pluralism, the argument for cultural hegemony is further weakened in favor of a ethnic-less civic nationalism whose heritage is as diverse as its citizens.³² Pluralist heritage is especially popular in Montreal, where widespread support for both nationalism and sovereignty never manifest as in the rest of the province. Moreover, the extraordinary attention given to Old Montreal ensures that it will remain an arena where some identity – whether it be Canadian, Québécois, or Montrealer – is performed.

Admittedly and unapologetically, it is within the current frame that this thesis operates. After all, it would only be possible to analyze the various constructions of heritage if one agreed that such a thing happened. Nevertheless, all of these modes of preservation – what I call monumentality, pragmatism, and patrimonialization – have prevailed upon Old Montreal and indelibly left their mark on its preservation. Certainly an understanding of this helps guide future preservation, but as an academic construction of heritage, it is also preservation in itself.

³² The transition in Quebec from an ethnic nationalism to a civic nationalism is too peripherally related to this thesis for in depth analysis, but it a fascinating topic. For an introduction, see the compiled essays of Ramsey Cook, *Watching Quebec* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP: 2005).

Chapter Two: The Preservation of Old Montreal as Monument

The preservation of Old Montreal did not begin as a response to the demolition of buildings. It began with a story. The story was a history, an interpretation of the past, and its icons were statues or plaques marking episodes of the story within the city. As much as a response to a new society as to a new city, people told this story to commemorate ‘the way things use to be’ and to remind others that, maybe, the future should look more like this story of the past. The icons, insofar as they call to mind the story, are monuments. The monument (ostensibly) calls to mind the salient points of a story, of a collective memory. It is, therefore, primarily figurative, but the monument has obviously acquired other connotations derivative of its figurative function as well. Most notably, the monument strives to be as formally important as the episode to which it refers. Just as often, it may attempt to elevate the importance of its referent through exaggerated formal qualities. Somewhat metonymically, this formal attribute of impressiveness – rather than the more etymologically correct meaning of recollection – has become ‘monumentality’. The argument for preservation was one of monumentality; it should be saved because it used to be important and moreover should be important again.³³ Hence the synonymity of preservation with restoration or, in the words of Dinu Bumbaru, “the story of making heritage more patrimonial than it was.”³⁴

Commemorating an old Montreal

The Commemoration of Old Montreal began long before it was officially declared an historic district. In 1965, it was still necessary for City Planning to argue that Old Montreal even existed.³⁵ Of course one could walk its streets and gaze upon its buildings, but before they could be preserved in a single manner as a testament to a single history, one had to epistemically gather those disparate places into one urban entity. Furthermore, one had to craft an historical narrative to which the whole place, in all its real heterogeneity, coherently referred. The project was not so contrived; in the past, the whole city had, indeed, more or less existed within the bounds of that area, enclosed in fortifications. Moreover, architectural remnants of that past did exist in various states there. Nevertheless, to interpret the modern district in terms of that historical situation was not innocent. It imposed a specific commemorative value on the place, designating it a monument in the collective memory if not yet in the law. That the district

³³ Of course, because it was usually the state who would intervene to preserve the site, these value-statements had to be made in terms of the nation.

³⁴ Dinu Bumbaru, “Laboratoire du Patrimoine,” 55 [my translation].

³⁵ In fact, the Master Plan does not follow the argument through, referring instead to the 1963 Van Ginkel Plan, which does not ever refer to Old Montreal as such. Evidently there was some toponymic uncertainty.

ultimately knew several kinds of preservation of many different histories attests to both the real complexity of the place and the variant values of those involved.

Gilles Lauzon and François Leclerc contend that Pierre-Louis Morin was one of the first to associate Montreal of the past with the commercial, industrial, and civic center known now as Old Montreal, although the revelation is hardly surprising considering their geographic concomitance.³⁶ It would not have been possible in this case to say that one was ‘in’ old Montreal because it was a time rather than a place.³⁷ The appellation appeared in Morin’s 1884 publication *Le Vieux Montréal 1611-1803*, the period from the settlement’s founding to the dismantlement of its fortifications.³⁸ This city, the former Montreal, figured against modern Montreal, the burgeoning industrial capital. As such, old Montreal represented pre-industrialism, and the study of it evoked a nostalgia for that condition if it did not openly participate in an anti-industrial sentiment not dissimilar to conservative movements in other industrializing nations.³⁹ Various organizations erected plaques beginning in the 1880s advertising to unassuming passers-by where characters from this historico-mythic ‘old Montreal’ had lived, fought, and died.⁴⁰ It was also at this time, in 1895, that the most active sponsor of historical placards in this period, the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society, persuaded the city to lease the Chateau Ramezay for its headquarters when the building’s fate was in question.⁴¹ Its eventual transformation into an historic monument through historicist renovations and the operation of a museum expanded on the Society’s commemorative program, pre-figuring the establishment of an historic district. Most commemorative plaques had little or no connection with their contemporary urban environment and required the observer to imagine the historical persons, events, or buildings to which they referred: an excellent way to create simplified and romanticized heroes.

The plaques and statues are classic Rieglian ‘intentional monuments’ which grounded old Montreal in the city center, making possible the equivalence of old time and old place. The monuments were eventually the vehicle for demonstrating to Montrealers not only what old Montreal was but where it was. In

³⁶ The Official Old Montreal Website identifies an earlier usage in Edward Murphy’s “Some Notes on Old Montreal” *Canadian Antiquarian and Numismatic Journal* VIII (Jan. 1879): 152-156.

³⁷ The uncapitalized adjective serves to demarcate a abstract, quasi-placeless Montreal-in-the-past, as suggested by Lauzon and Leclerc. It might also be called former Montreal.

³⁸ Samuel de Champlain founded a settlement called Ville Marie at what is now Montreal, but the city was not given a charter until 1642, which is its official founding year.

³⁹ See Gilles Lauzon, “Visages historique de Vieux-Montréal” *Continuité* 72 (1997): 23, “the name of Old Montreal... had to first of all designate the former fortified city and, to a certain point, the pre-industrial Montreal of the past” [my translation].

⁴⁰ The one exception is the statue of John Young, a pioneering businessman who advocated for enhancements of the port facilities. It was erected in 1908 by the Montreal Port Society.

⁴¹ Official Old Montreal website, ‘Fiche d’un bâtiment: Chateau de Ramezay,’ http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=a&num=1 (updated 21 June 2011).

1917, Victor Morin, the chairman of the Montreal Historical Society and of the Société Saint-Jean-Baptiste, a prestigious francophone social society, devised and presented a walking tour of these plaques to commemorate the 275th anniversary of the city's founding, weaving a narrative out of these places.⁴² It could not have been so obvious as it is today to contend that all of this was one district in virtue of a homogenizing feature which could not even be seen. The area once censured by walls was no longer so homogeneous either architecturally or in urban character. Rue Saint-Jacques was proudly lined with bank headquarters of ostentatious design, Rue Saint-Paul harbored dirty warehouses for the seaport, and City Hall anchored a stately administrative district on the east side. Of the twenty-two stops on Morin's tour, only five were historic buildings. These five historic monuments – the Hôpital Général des Soeurs Grises, Saint-Sulpice Seminary, Chateau Ramezay, Notre-Dame-de-Bonsecours Chapel, and Bonsecours Market – nevertheless came to stand in for the whole story.⁴³

That only two places on Morin's tour did not date from the French regime (Bonsecours Market and the site of the first Anglican Cathedral) also elucidates how closely connected the idea of old Montreal was with nationalism. Joly curiously dismisses any accusation of a deliberate omission of English history in Morin's tour by claiming "a lack of visual tools".⁴⁴ Evidently, no such paucity of material remains prevented him from visiting the other sites on his tour. True, the places associated with English-Canadian history in Montreal were not exactly historic in the contemporary sense of the term, most of them being less than one hundred years old, but the temporal and spatial framework of old Montreal precluded their inclusion anyway. Most of these places were not in the city center, for the anglophones were in the process of building a new downtown around Dominion Square and their mansions were even farther away in Westmount.⁴⁵ That is not to say that Morin ignored the later fates of those places valued for their association with French history; a text of the tour indicates that he contrasted the historical state of each place with its present condition and

⁴² For complete list of stops on the tour see Diane Joly, "Montréal 1917: L'émergence d'une identité patrimoniale," in *Patrimoine et patrimonialisation du Québec et d'ailleurs*, ed. Martin Drouin (Quebec City: MultiMonde, 2006): 178. Morin delivered the tour in French with running English translation. A text and map of the tour was recorded as *Pèlerinage historique du Vieux-Montreal* through the Montreal Historical Society. Celebratory events of the municipal anniversary also included a parade and a special mass.

⁴³ Joly, 180.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.* [my translation].

⁴⁵ The relocation of businesses to the west began with the Canadian Pacific Railway establishing its headquarters at Windsor Station in 1895 but was primarily achieved after World War II with the construction of Place Ville-Marie.

occasionally remarked on the fate of that place in the nineteenth century.⁴⁶ Yet as an historical narrative, old Montreal was not intended to glorify the progress of industrial Canada.

The monumentalization of old Montreal adopted a decidedly political aspect as well because industrialism was strongly associated with English Canadians, who led the city's financial sectors and held its wealth.⁴⁷ One needed only to realize that the pre-industrial city was roughly co-incidental with French governance to forge a nationalist myth out of that history and pit it against English modernizations. Indeed, Morin ended his tour with an invocation to the children in attendance, clarifying his patriotic intentions; "You most of all, children, youths, learn well the history of your country. That way you will learn to respect our institutions, our language, and our law."⁴⁸ Through the institutionalization of Morin's tour, which he repeated every year until the third centenary in 1942, the historic monuments were likewise grafted into the collective memory, and the history of Montreal gradually became synonymous with a place called Old Montreal.⁴⁹

The historic monument is really created, however, in the act of preserving it. The Bill Concerning the Conservation of Monuments and Art Objects Having an Historic or Artistic Interest passed the Quebec Legislative Assembly in 1922 as part of a cultural promotion program sponsored by Louis-Athanase David, Provincial Secretary.⁵⁰ The Liberal provincial government elected in 1920 was generally favorable to modernization, and the bill, despite its capacity to enshrine traditional culture, empowered the government to promote patriotism. In its title and in its direction, the bill's intentions lay exclusively with commemoration, ignoring altogether any Rieglian sense of age-value. Unsurprisingly, Victor Morin

⁴⁶ Joly, 180-181. Joly cites, as an example, Morin's critique of the recent renovation of Notre-Dame-de-Bonsecours Chapel, further evincing an intention to deplore the current urban and societal condition through the commemoration of heritage. Joly further contends that Morin, as an intellectual, was less inclined to inflammatory generalizations or mythologizing. Thus his text comments on the location of the city's first synagogue and Presbyterian church.

⁴⁷ See Paul-André Linteau, *Histoire de Montréal après la confédération* (Montreal: Boréal, 2000). Hugh MacLennan's powerful and popular novel *Two Solitudes* (New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1945) propagated the economic, religious, and cultural differences between Quebec's two 'races'. The 'Two Solitudes' theory has only been recently abandoned. See Germain and Rose, *Quest for a Metropolis*.

⁴⁸ As quoted in Joly, 186 [my translation: 'our language' referred to French, the language in which he spoke to the children]. Indeed, the entire event was not apolitical; many French-Canadians had publicly opposed conscription into the British armed forces during WWI, creating a socially-tense atmosphere between the two language-groups. Celebrating the founding of Montreal under the French regime was tacitly tantamount to (re)claiming the city.

⁴⁹ Morin published the tour as *Vieux Montreal - Fondation - Développement - visite* (Montreal: Éditions des Dix, 1942).

⁵⁰ The bill was based on the Historic Monuments Act of 1913 in France. Other programs sponsored by David included the Provincial Archives, Provincial Museums, and Fine-Arts Schools. David and his wife also helped to found the Montreal Symphony Orchestra in 1934.

served as one of the first five commissioners of the Historic Monuments Commission and, as he succeeded to the presidency of the Numismatic and Antiquarian Society, it was undoubtedly at his suggestion that, in 1929, the Chateau Ramezay became Quebec's first classified historic monument.⁵¹ The Commission did not, however, engage otherwise with the commemoration of an old Montreal at that time and even ceased to meet between 1937 and 1951. Although the Commission had enjoyed a period of success in the 1920s, during which time it oversaw the erection of numerous plaques and statues across the province, severe budget cuts during the Great Depression arrested its projects.⁵² While Morin and the Commission were unsuccessful in establishing a cult of preservation in Montreal before World War II, they continued the erection of historical placards so that in 1942, when Morin led his last walking tour, he counted almost fifty monumental markers in the city center alone. If the urban place lacked a certain monumentality, the (hi)story of old Montreal now figured large in the collective memory; it had become monumental.

After World War II, there was something decidedly old about Old Montreal. Indeed, the rapid pace at which the district became both architecturally and usefully obsolete has been widely recognized as foundational to its preservation.⁵³ Only a handful of new structures had gone up since the onset of the Depression, a fire toppled the grand dome of Bonsecours Market in 1948, and the district's public squares were converted to parking lots. Montreal was no stranger to the style of urban planning sweeping North America after World War II, and its City Planning Department (created in 1942) anticipated massive urban change. The department drafted a master plan in 1944 which, though never formally adopted, foresaw the need for a series of inner-city expressways and identified the entirety of the old city centre for redevelopment. Yet instead of renewal in the city center, Montreal expanded outwards into a sea of suburban neighborhoods. While the metropolitan population grew from 1.4 million in 1951 to 2.1 million in 1961, the city proper fell from representing 73 percent of that total to 56 percent. In effect, only 23 percent of the region's population growth in that decade went to the city of Montreal.⁵⁴ As the urban condition of the old city center became increasingly imperiled by neglect and the threat of renewal, the commemorative narrative woven into it throughout the early twentieth century ensured that whatever was done to it carried a highly charged symbolic value.

⁵¹ Gelly, 31. The historic monument nominations were actually made in 1927.

⁵² The public demand for employment further crippled the Commissions's authority to regulate its handful of monuments to the point that, despite much protestation, it could not stop the City of Montreal from constructing a vehicular tunnel underneath the classified Chateau Ramezay, the tunnel being a public works project the City claimed was necessary for the operation of Bonsecours Market.

⁵³ Linteau, 504.

⁵⁴ Linteau, 493, citing Canadian Census. For statistical purposes, it is prudent to note that the boundaries of the metropolitan census region expanded in accordance with the urban population.

If the early 1950s brought little by the way of preservation to Montreal, it was both because the interests of the *Historic Monuments Commission* were elsewhere and the city possessed no mechanism for preservation. Premier Maurice Duplessis and his conservative Union Nationale party reinvigorated the Commission in 1951 at the behest of Paul Gouin, “hero of the ‘*refrancisation*’ of Quebec and of the safeguarding of traditions and of heritage,” against the possibility of the analogous Federal body asserting authority in Quebec.⁵⁵ While Gouin became the Commission’s new chairman, its real leader was Gerard Morisset, art historian and conservator extraordinaire. Morisset had ‘discovered’ the historical treasures around Place Royal in Quebec City by 1949 and advocated increasingly for their restoration, a project he began once provided with the resources of the Commission.⁵⁶ During the 1950s, the Commission professed most openly its exclusive interest in monuments from the French regime, and, as many were wont to admit, Montreal harbored few such structures. Nevertheless, the Commission’s vigorous restorations of Place Royale and of ‘traditional’ French churches across the province could not help but affect the prospects of preservation in Montreal. The provisions of the new monuments law (officially adopted in 1952) allowed the Commission to expropriate the buildings Morisset wished to restore, but the difficult and expensive task of classifying and purchasing all the buildings around Place Royale prompted the Commission to study the possibility of a “museum-quarter” classification as early as 1955. When the law was changed in December 1963 to provide for the classification of *arrondissements historiques*, its purpose was, according to Alain Gelly, “above all else to regulate the case of Old Quebec City.”⁵⁷ For the Commission to classify Old Montreal presented local preservationists with a mixed bag; the Commission offered the only legal means to regulate development, but it also ensured that such regulation would follow the Commission’s standards for preservation. By that time, however, Montreal was developing a different mode of preservation, one less predicated on the monument and, thus, on commemoration. Montreal, as a more cosmopolitan city than Quebec City, never exhibited the same univocal support for nationalism. Moreover, its leaders’ greater exposure to international discourse facilitated the adoption of more progressive methods of preservation.

Planning for a Monument

Following the success of Jacques Gréber’s plan for Ottawa, Montreal hired the French architect as a consultant for both the municipal region and

⁵⁵ Gelly, 67 [my translation]. Duplessis was infamous for his conservative, anti-federal politics. His period in office is now called ‘la grande noirceur’. The Historic Sites and Monuments Board of Canada, established in 1919, had concerned itself primarily with battlefields in Ontario during the first few decades of its commission, but the Federal Government’s increasingly nationalist policies after World War II broadened the scope of the Board’s actions.

⁵⁶ Gelly, 69-75.

⁵⁷ Gelly, 127 [my translation].

especially for an expanded administrative district around City Hall.⁵⁸ Importantly, Gréber's plan for the administrative district acknowledged the historical importance of the place attributed to it by Morin and its colleagues, and it introduced a new urban expression of that monumentality; the plan proposed the retention of some two dozen private buildings for restoration, mostly along the axis of Rue Bonsecours and Rue Saint-Paul. This preservation was evidently not so much for those buildings' particular histories, however, as for their contribution to the atmosphere of Bonsecours Chapel and Bonsecours Market. Through their generally historical character, they served to formally frame those two landmarks and further monumentalize them. While this urban expression of the monument is still primarily concerned with vaguely beaux-arts aesthetic impressions, it is important for its difference from the convention Gréber proposed for Chateau Ramezay: clear the whole block so that the monument is presented as if on a pedestal. For better or for worse, the Gréber plan was not directly adopted, but its preservation of the streetscape near Bonsecours Chapel pre-figured the initial stages of preservation a decade later.

The final concretization of old Montreal and the beginning of its preservation as *cit  historique* coalesced in 1960.⁵⁹ It was in 1960 that the Quebec Liberal Party came into power under Premier Jean Lesage, ushering in the Quiet Revolution. As a part of this profound social and political transformation, promoted under the slogan 'Maîtres chez nous', the Lesage government created a Ministry of Cultural Affairs in 1961. Significantly, the *Historic Monuments Commission* was attached to this Ministry under the Historic Monuments Act of 1963, underscoring its consultative role within a program of cultural nationalism. Despite the Commission's diminished authority, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs sought to utilize preservation more broadly than the Commission had conventionally done. To that end, it connected the Commission to a new Service d'Arch ologie and a new Service des Monuments Historiques for facilitated pro-active restoration projects, the most important of which was undoubtedly Place Royale.

In Montreal, 1960 saw that election of Jean Drapeau as mayor, a post he would hold until 1986. Along with Lucien Saulnier, chairman of the municipal Executive Committee from 1960 to 1970, Drapeau promoted widespread modernization on both the political and urban levels with an vision of 'the metropolis of progress.'⁶⁰ The two icons of 'the metropolis of progress' were the

⁵⁸ The textual explication of Gr ber's municipal plan has evidently been lost, but the map survives in the Archives of the City of Montreal, Fonds de la Service d'Urbanisme VM97.

⁵⁹ See Martin Drouin, "Le renaissance du Vieux-Montr al, 1960-1979," *Patrimoines: fabrique, usages et r emploi*, Capucine Lema tre and Benjamin Sabatier, eds. (Quebec City:  ditions MultiMondes, 2008). Also, Des Rochers and Roy, "Time and Place Rediscovered."

⁶⁰ See Linteau, 535-554; Drouin. *Le combat du patrimoine*; Peter Blake, "Downtown in 3-D," *Architectural Forum* 125:2 (Sept. 1966): 31-49. Blake wrote in his article that these development made Montreal "the first 20th century city in North America." In the course of justifying that claim, it is interesting to note that he mentions the classification of Old Montreal and the restorations in progress there.

Metro, opened 1966, and Place Ville-Marie, an office tower and underground complex opened in 1962, whose name also notably commemorates the seventeenth-century French settlement that became Montreal. Place Ville-Marie created a completely new urban and architectural space in Montreal, spurring the construction of several other such mega-structures in its vicinity. This new modern city space confirmed the urban shift westward begun before World War II and the obsolescence of the old city center. Old Montreal, in turn, was poignantly contrasted to New Montreal in urban space.

It was also in 1960 that the engineering firm Valois and Lalonde submitted their report for an East-West Expressway, perhaps the most damning of the three foundational threats to Old Montreal's physical integrity identified by Martin Drouin in his study of that district's rebirth from 1960 to 1979.⁶¹ While their report acknowledged the presence of "several old constructions some of which could, undoubtedly, be considered as historic," it understandably argued against any widespread significance for these places or the district in general, whose "constructions form an ensemble without personality and lacking harmony."⁶²

In February 1960, the Director of City Planning, Romeo Mondello, issued a brief on the role of his department in the 'Preservation of the Past' which picked up the idea of preserving the eastern quarter of what he called 'lower town'.⁶³ With priorities comfortably in line with the provincial Commission's, he stated of those blocks, "we find there are an ensemble of buildings more or less old fully giving the appearance of the streets in the past."⁶⁴ The document expressed an attitude towards the exclusive valuation of Montreal's French history espoused by the Commission, although he valued the formal qualities of such 'non-historic' places as Rue Saint-Paul. That the rest of the district was included at all owes much to the former Hôpital Général (also known for its institutional owners, *les Frères Charon* and *les Soeurs Grises*) off of Place d'Youville. As stylistically and programmatically reminiscent of the French Regime, it consistently earned praise in evaluations of the area's monuments despite (or, perhaps, because of) its partially-ruinous state. Of course, the memory of a commemorative, quasi-mythic old Montreal inscribed with plaques and statues still loomed large, its vanished walls demarcating the *lieu de mémoire*.

Mondello's approach to preservation is most remarkable, however, for its invocation of a testimonial function for historic monuments.⁶⁵ 'Testimony'

⁶¹ Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine*, 184-185.

⁶² Lalonde & Valois, *Une Autostrade Est-Ouest* (1960): 23-27 [my translations]. While this conclusion is obviously informed by the firm's priority for the expressway, it demonstrates that the value of a place is relative. As the majority of Montrealers did not agree with Lalonde and Valois, we might say that the collective's values were different.

⁶³ Roméo Mondello, "le Service d'Urbanisme à Montréal et le Préservation du Passé" (Montreal City Planning Department, February 1960).

⁶⁴ Mondello, 7 [my translation].

⁶⁵ Mondello, 1. He distinguished between 1) the conservation of artistic buildings and 2) the conservation of buildings that, while not artistic, could be considered testaments of the past.

objectifies and even reifies history, deferring commemoration and the act of agency involved. In so doing it posits an authentic past and, in turn, an authentic preservation. Thus, in lamenting the relative paucity of “testaments of the past” in Montreal, which implies that the past was exclusively French-colonial, Mondello asserted an authenticity to that past ostensibly absent in subsequent periods. In its conflation of monumentality and scientific essentialism, the implicit position is reminiscent of the way Paul Gouin described the work of Historic Monuments Commission; their restorations were “as conscientious as possible, in the course of which we have sought to eliminate the parasites that have grown over the course of the last century and to bring [the monument] back to the beautiful simplicity of our fathers.”⁶⁶ This epistemological shift pre-figured the popularity of preserving cultural property: later preservationists needed only to assert that other periods are ‘past’ to conclude that other buildings are ‘testaments’ and, therefore, worthy of preservation.

Mondello’s brief is also notable because it does not acknowledge an Old Montreal. His preservation plans locate historic monuments within the lower town, but there is no effort to monumentalize the district. Nevertheless, the report prompted Paul Gouin, then engaged with restoration plans for Place Royale in Quebec City, to request from Mondello a list of Montreal’s ‘richesses historiques’ for the Historic Monuments Commission. In response, Mondello submitted a second report of “*les maisons historiques dans le vieux Montréal*,” listing, somewhat infamously at this point, only eighteen buildings.⁶⁷ While this second report clearly espoused the Commission’s nationalist version of preservation, it also re-introduced Old Montreal as a monumental epicenter.

Internally, the City Planning Department studied the possibility of planning an Old Montreal district delineated by Craig (now Saint-Antoine), McGill, Commissioners (now de la Commune), and Berri, prioritizing a mixed-use restoration project in the eastern quarter which would have involved the relocation of some structures to that area.⁶⁸ The study also recommended a system of architectural review for an entire Old Montreal district, and in the next year the provincial government sanctioned the creation of the Jacques-Viger Commission, named after the city’s first mayor, to serve that purpose. A

⁶⁶ Paul Gouin, “Nos monuments historiques,” *Vie des Arts* 1 (1956): 12 [my translation].

⁶⁷ It was evidently Mondello’s prerogative to narrow the field to Old Montreal. In any case, the eighteen buildings were: Notre-Dame-de-Bonsecours Chapel, Pierre du Calvet House, Bonsecours Market, Rasco Hotel, Papineau House, de Beaujeau House, Chateau Ramezay, Birthplace of Henri Bourassa (site of Complex Chaussegros-de-Léry), du Patriote House, Silver Dollar Saloon, Restaurant Au Coq d’Or, Simon McTavish House, J.J. Astor Fur Shop, Hotel de France (site of 1971 Courthouse), Joe Beef’s Canteen, Chartier de Lotbinière House (Robert Redford House), Vieux Séminaire, Hôpital Général des Frères Charon. Most of places are all vaguely characteristic of ‘traditional’ French Canadian architecture, but it is especially the birthplace of Henri Bourassa, father of Québécois nationalism, that so clearly identifies the theme for this set of monuments.

⁶⁸ Ernest Langlois, Assistant to the Director of City Planning, to Claude Robillard, Director of City Planning, 27 February 1961, City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger VM34. Robillard replaced Mondello as Director of City Planning in 1961.

consultative body to the Planning Department, the members of the Viger Commission were responsible for “all questions connected with the conservation, in Old Montreal, of the historical character of the district ... as well as of any other part of the city, as the case may be.”⁶⁹ The Commission’s chairman was none other than Paul Gouin, also chairman of the provincial Historic Monuments Commission. This connection ensured that, when the latter commission’s new legislation passed in 1963 the preservation of Old Montreal would benefit from its new provisions.⁷⁰ Yet when the province declared Old Montreal an historic district in January 1964, the classification did not extend north of Rue Notre-Dame. Apparently, the abbreviated boundary was at the insistence of provincial commissioner and architect Léopold Fontaine, who envisioned for Rue Saint-Jacques “a street of skyscrapers.”⁷¹ Indeed, the provincial government had been planning for a new, high-rise courthouse at the intersection of Rue Notre-Dame and Rue Saint-Laurent for several years. Only two of the eighteen monuments identified by Mondello fell north of Rue Notre-Dame anyway, one of which was already doomed by plans for the courthouse. The provincial Commission had demonstrated its investment in restoration, and if the intention was, as already begun at Place Royale in Quebec City, to facilitate the (re)creation of an ‘old French Quarter’, these blocks of domineering, ostentatious office and public buildings from the late-nineteenth-century did not participate. Nevertheless, the boundary at Rue Notre-Dame was a compromise, the limits of a commemorative, monumental old Montreal having been established decades earlier by Victor Morin and his colleagues. With the Viger Commission and the provincial classification effectively came a public approbation of Old Montreal as such, or at least an intention to see the place more closely correspond to its monumental identity.

In Martin Drouin’s study of Old Montreal’s rebirth, he demonstrates the strength of the ‘old French Quarter’ image during this time.⁷² Of course there was little about Old Montreal that actually resembled an old French quarter, but the

⁶⁹ Article 2 of Municipal By-Law 2760, cited in “Extract of the Minutes from the Meeting of the Montreal City Council held on September 26, 1962,” City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger VM34. The Viger Commission did not hesitate to take advantage of the curious extension of powers afforded them by the last clause.

⁷⁰ At the meeting of the Viger Commission in October 1963, the Commission discussed the proposed changes to the Historic Monuments Bill and resolved to request classification of Old Montreal. Minutes of the Jacques-Viger Commission 16 October 1963, City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger VM34.

⁷¹ Gelly, 132 [my translation].

⁷² See Drouin, “Renaissance,” 187-194. On this he writes: “the idea of reconquest of the quarter by ‘*francisation*’ of its character found an echo at the level of the metropolis... the multi-century history of Old Montreal allowed [one] to fall back on the French past of the city,” 187 [my translation]. He cites the interesting case of a guide of Old Montreal written in 1968 which, while describing the buildings and their history, makes very little reference to their structural relationship or present condition. Its tours is more akin to the imaginary walks of armchair tourism. See Léon Trépanier, *Les Rues du Vieux-Montréal au Fil du Temps* (Paris: Fides, 1968).

story of one having existed there at one time responded powerfully to a need in the national imagination. The image was founded, of course, on the history expounded decades earlier, but as the Quiet Revolution transformed Quebec, the preservation of Old Montreal found new meaning within the establishment of a Québécois nation-state. An 'old French Quarter' was not only an opportunity to commemorate Québécois culture, but to exercise and legitimate the governing authority of the province. Provincial designation of Old Montreal indicated the value of the place and the role, ability, and responsibility of the province to protect it. Reserving ultimate authority to the Historic Monuments Commission ensured that preservation remained a national concern (rather than a local one and especially rather than a federal one). That authority was most strongly manifest in Quebec City, *la capitale nationale*, where Morisset's pet project at Place Royale became, in the words of Luc Noppen, a "site of the construction of a collective memory."⁷³ The restoration of Place Royale was not unlike Rockefeller's Colonial Williamsburg project, except that Place Royale was a product of the nation-state rather than private enterprise. Through the restoration and reconstruction of some seventy-five buildings to their (speculative) original state, the Commissioners sought to strip away the visual queues of the English Conquest and to change the outcome of the Seven Years' War, if only in this little square. Neither the history nor the architecture of Old Montreal would have so easily facilitated such a pure and simple preservation ideology, but it was evident that some thought it should anyway.⁷⁴

The Historic Monuments Commission, suddenly responsible for reviewing every alteration to every building within the Montreal Historic District, exhibited its ideological stance through lenient permits to commercial buildings and strict regulation of historic houses.⁷⁵ According to Gelly's research however, the provincial commission relied on the decisions of the Viger Commission, undoubtedly because of their common chairman. The Viger Commission, however, had a somewhat different approach to preservation than the provincial commission's explicitly nationalist commemoration, partially because of its mandate within the City Planning Department and partially because of its other members. While Gouin and Lucien Bergeron, Municipal Tourism Director, openly desired a monumental, even didactic restoration that expressed the French origins of the city (and its salient role within a Québécois nation), others focused

⁷³ Luc Noppen, "Place-Royale: chantier de construction d'une identité nationale" [my translation]. See also Fitch, *Historic Preservation*, 55: "A direct expression of the Québécois' determination to reassert the presence of French culture in contemporary Canada, the Place Royale is being radically restored... The current campaign involves a hard-edged mix of demolition, restoration, and sometimes complete reconstruction of the oldest buildings to re-create the appearance of Place Royale before the British Conquest." Although the restoration and reconstruction of some seventy-five buildings there was led by the Quebec Ministry of Cultural Affairs, it was jointly financed with the federal government.

⁷⁴ See previous discussion of Mondello's 1960 brief.

⁷⁵ Gelly, 140.

on the revitalization of Old Montreal as an urban neighborhood.⁷⁶ Instead of considering commemorative or historical values, this approach understood old buildings primarily as architectural resources for exploitation. To preserve them, one had to consider their formal and economic roles in the urban environment as (cultural) property. The next chapter will address this manner of preserving Old Montreal, but it did not come about over night. Simultaneous with its introduction was a lingering monumentality bolstered by a growing influence of Quebec nationalism. That sort of monumental preservation was politically associated with Quebec City's intentions to 'restore' the French Canadian nation. Quebec nationalism was complex, however, and there were also those such Mayor Jean Drapeau who imagined for Quebec a modern and progressive identity. For Drapeau's Metropolis of Progress, Old Montreal was a cultural center where the municipal government could demonstrate the strength of its civic authority. Increasingly, the same principle existed on the provincial scale, but the culture in question was indisputably francophone.⁷⁷

The conventional critique of preserving historic monuments even now is that the classification is too narrow and, in English at least, is associated with a sort of restoration contrary to the Venice Charter (which nevertheless uses 'monument' to describe historic buildings). Ostensibly, monuments are only high style, grandiose structures. With the political and architectural bias of preserving historical monumentality laid bare, late Modernist architects rebelling against the abstract formalism of their predecessors championed a pragmatic even disinterested re-appropriation of old buildings.

⁷⁶ Bergeron was quoted in 1967 saying, "The restoration of Old Montreal should not signify simply a change in the nature of buildings' occupation... this district will offer a real interest inasmuch as it will portray a French visage." Drouin, "Renaissance," 187. It is of interest to note that the restorations at Place Royale were also posed as urban renewal when they first began, but the nationalist preservation agenda thwarted the housing program because it proved impractical to have people live in a museum quarter. By the 1980s, however, the project underwent review and compromises were made so that residents could move back in. See André Cloutier, Madeleine Gobeil-Trudeau, and Luc Noppen, *La Restauration à la Place Royale de Québec: Une Étude sur les Concepts et sur la Nature des interventions* (Quebec City: Université Laval, 1978).

⁷⁷ Quebec was not the only government interested in preserving Old Montreal; in celebration of the Centenary of the Canadian Confederation, Parks Canada purchased the Maison George-Etienne Cartier on the corner of Rue Berri and Rue Notre-Dame Est for restoration as a museum of its onetime owner, a Father of the Confederation. Although the project was planned before 1967, the Centenary year, the federal department did not purchase the house until 1973 and did not complete restorations until 1985. Its participation in a monumental and cultural property preservation is, therefore, complex because, while a house museum is always monumental to some degree, the restoration has been at least somewhat open about what artifice it did employ to commemorate Cartier. Parks Canada chose to retain the architectural and additions post-dating Cartier, but reconstructed the interiors partially as a modern museum space and partially in the style of Cartier's time. It was the first and remains the only such house museum in Old Montreal, although Park Canada intends to turn the Papineau House into another such museum.

Chapter Three: The Preservation of Old Montreal as Cultural Property

The preservation of Old Montreal as cultural property hit a fervor during the 1980s and, synchronously with a building boom, led to widespread transformation of the district. While there was certainly a degree of commemoration involved with the exploitation of resources, it was because of an abiding reliance on the monumentality of a previous generation's efforts. Jacques des Rochers and Alain Roy somewhat inadvertently characterize the kind of change that Old Montreal underwent in their description of the new Old Montreal; "by the late 1990s, Old Montreal had regained its geographic integrity. All of the district's areas had been resettled and reoccupied and all of its historical layers had been brought to the fore and re-examined."⁷⁸ It was a process of coming to terms with collective memory, but it was also one of colonization and scientific discovery. The preservation of Old Montreal entailed its exploitation as much or more than its figuration with a collective narrative. Between 1979 and the city's 350th anniversary celebration in 1992, all levels of government poured millions of dollars into redevelopment with the historic district and its environs. It was, in the words of Dinu Bumbaru, "era of '*mise en valeur*' or 'interpretation', the history of making heritage more communicative or more showbizz than it was."⁷⁹ The success of preservation was no longer its commemoration of collective memory but its economic resourcefulness and historical testimony. The character of development in the 1980s utilized preservation principles expounded over the previous decades both through the advocacy of citizen groups and through the 1972 Cultural Property Act. Those principles are evident, however, in the earliest rehabilitation plans for Old Montreal drafted by Van Ginkel & Associates in 1963, whose functional and Structuralist approach reveals the origination of cultural property in late Modernism. But before the plan could be fully carried out, however, its proponents and allies had to condone the old approach.

Planning for Cultural Property

Following City Planning's 1961 study leading to the creation of the Viger Commission, the department engaged Van Ginkel & Associates as consultants for the restoration. Daniel Van Ginkel was Dutch by origin, but had moved to Montreal after meeting Blanche Lemco, a Canadian, at the 1953 CIAM convention. As committed Modernists, the Van Ginkels brought to the restoration of Old Montreal a pragmatic concern for urban Structuralism, a marked lack of

⁷⁸ Des Rochers and Roy, "Time and Place Rediscovered," 273.

⁷⁹ Bumbaru, "Laboratoire," 55-56. The term *mise en valeur* is literally 'put in value' or 'valorization', but is also 'exploitation'. The operative argument is that the heritage artifact needs to be properly used in order for its value to be appreciated. It is important to note here as well that *interpretation* also means 'performance' as in to perform before an audience. Hence Bumbaru's connection with showbizz and communication. In the case of Old Montreal, the audience is invariably the tourist.

national ideology, and a demonstrated interest in preservation.⁸⁰ By December 1961, the Van Ginkels had conducted a survey of physical conditions in Old Montreal and begun historical research in collaboration with Patricia Ling, an employee of City Planning.⁸¹ The Van Ginkels' *Draft Rehabilitation of the Old City of Montreal*, dated January 1963, clearly poses the project as one of urban renewal rather than as the creation of a museological historic center, stating that "Meaningful restoration of the Old City can be effected only be the restoration of its life and activities."⁸² Their sort of urban renewal was in marked contrast to rationalist clearance programs, Montreal's closest example of which were the Habitations Jeanne-Mance, built in from 1957 to 1961 some six blocks from City Hall. The Van Ginkel plan never refers to 'Old Montreal', preferring to invoke the Old City urban genre so popular in Europe. In so doing, it denies the historical significance that had been associated with 'old Montreal' over the past decades through monumental commemoration and establishes a new, modern epistemic paradigm for the urban phenomenon. The plan also eschews any identification of the district with an 'old French quarter,' citing instead its continuous role as a "centre of finance, commerce and trading."⁸³ The Van Ginkels gloss over the historical role and identity of the city center, advocating its preservation partially on the basis of its significance as "one of the oldest cities in North America and essential evidence of our cultural heritage" and partially because, pragmatically, "it is false economy to discard the Old City - as it is to discard an old pair of shoes because it needs new soles."⁸⁴ Classification of buildings, which they intended as a "guide for preservation and visual improvement", is entirely based on visual character (as determined by a group of five architects) rather than historical significance.⁸⁵ At the conclusion of the plan, the major recommendations (of which there are eleven) notably omit further historical

⁸⁰ The couple worked with CIAM's Team 10 and participated in the 1959 Otterlo Conference. In 1960, the Van Ginkels prepared a pro bono plan for the Montreal Parks and Playgrounds Association called "Save the Mountain" which aimed to control development on the slopes of Mount Royal. In the course of a commissioned plan for the Port of Montreal that same year, the Van Ginkels objected to the East-West Expressway planned for the waterfront on the grounds that it would be detrimental to Old Montreal.

⁸¹ As City Planning's primary historian during the 1960s, Ling contributed greatly to the restoration of Old Montreal, but her name has all but disappeared. Not only responsible for research, she took it upon herself to define 'maison historique' for the purpose of preservation. She was critical of Mondello's report listing eighteen historic houses, stating, "from the beginning of my work, I was persuaded that this list did not correspond to reality... This list is incomplete. It presents also a danger: we give them so much attention that come to believe that the rest can be demolished," Archives of the City of Montreal VM 97, *Etude pour un inventaire du secteur historique de Montréal*. Patricia Ling, December 1961 [my translation].

⁸² Van Ginkel & Associates, *Draft Rehabilitation Plan for the Old City of Montreal* (Montreal: Van Ginkel & associates, 1963), 32.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 2-3. They later call the district "cultural heritage of Canada."

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 25.

research, whether for interpretation or to inform preservation. While the plan had little direct effect on Old Montreal at the time its was issued, it indelibly established the primacy of urban space over commemorative space through attention to economics and aesthetics.⁸⁶

The City Planning Department released a master plan for Old Montreal in November 1965 which adopted the principles of the Van Ginkel plan and elaborated technical procedures.⁸⁷ Through intricate zoning, the plan sought to reinforce what it asserted was the primary value of Old Montreal: its formal and aesthetic unity. Over the course of fifty-one pages and through several large maps, the master plan specified regulations for those qualities. In addition, the mater plan located twenty-two sites for specific development, be it rehabilitation, new construction, or, in the case of the former Hôpital Général, archeological preservation. This plan was adopted, and as we shall see, a large portion of it was eventually carried out, if in considerably altered form.

Before the Van Ginkels even finished their plan, however, several pioneering individuals had begun the project of urban renewal through preservation. The leader of this movement was journalist Eric McLean, long acknowledged as a pivotal figure in the history of Old Montreal.⁸⁸ In 1961, McLean very publicly purchased the old Papineau House on Rue Bonsecours with the intention of restoring it and encouraging others to move into the neighborhood.⁸⁹ Despite eschewing identity-politics, McLean's choice of residence and restoration methodology cooperated with the contemporary association of preservation with monumentality; he selected the late-eighteenth-century house of a prominent proto-nationalist, Louis-Joseph Papineau, which had become a fishmonger and rooming house. Working from historical documentation, McLean personally restored the house to its condition during Papineau's residence, including the removal of a two-story brick addition and restitution of the pitched roof.⁹⁰ Architecturally, the project was analogous to the contemporaneous restoration of Maison Fornel on Place Royale, but there was a salient programmatic difference. McLean's restoration was self-funded and privately-directed, effectively claiming this heritage for residents rather than for the nation. Although the restoration invoked the identity of a Québécois nation, it

⁸⁶ The commemorative purposes of Old Montreal were not entirely lost, however. For one, no one started calling it the 'Old City' just because of the Van Ginkel plan.

⁸⁷ Service de l'Urbanisme, *Plan directeur du Vieux Montréal*, II vols. (Montreal: City of Montreal, 1965).

⁸⁸ As early as 1967, *Châtelaine* magazine attributed the first efforts at revitalization to McLean. Hélène Pilote, "Vieux-Montréal: dernier-né des quartiers chics," *Châtelaine* (1967).

⁸⁹ As Drouin notes, McLean used his connections in the public media to popularize the revitalization of Old Montreal. See "Renaissance," 185.

⁹⁰ Official Old Montreal Website, 'Fiche d'un Bâtiment: Maison Papineau,' http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=d&num=4 (updated 29 August 2011).

simultaneously denied the role of the nation-state.⁹¹ As McLean's friends and colleagues followed his example, they created a small neighborhood along Rue Bonsecours, both fulfilling the plans from earlier decades and in turn pre-figuring the restoration of Old Montreal as a private enterprise.⁹² To further promote his cause, McLean published a book of brief vignettes on Old Montreal with illustrations by Richard Wilson.⁹³ Wilson sketches showed a quiet, subdued neighborhood of stately if somewhat haunting architecture. Unafraid to include passers-by or modern automobiles, the illustrations decidedly portray an Old Montreal to live in. It was precisely what McLean thought the place should be: a living past.

Not all restorations at this time were so interested in a quotidian character. In addition to residential restorations, various Montreal corporations purchased historic houses in the eastern quarter for restoration as museums.⁹⁴ Invariably, these buildings architecturally represented a French colonial past and their restorations brought commercial activity to the neighborhood, although as ventures unrelated to the corporations' own business. The City undertook only one project, although it was a very noticeable one; in 1964, Bonsecours Market closed and the City led a restoration which saw the reconstruction of the building's dome (collapsed after a fire in 1948) and a gut-renovation of the interiors for new offices for Planning Department.⁹⁵ Of course, the Viger Commission acted under the aegis of the city as well, and under its direction the eastern quarter received cosmetic improvements, including reproduction gas lamps and granite paving-stones.

⁹¹ Ibid. McLean requested the *Historic Monuments Commission* to classify his house an individual historic monument in 1965 after he had completed restorations. He then sold the house to Parks Canada in 1982 with an agreement to lease it for the remainder of his life. Since his death in 2002, the Papineau House has been awaiting transformations into a federally operated house-museum.

⁹² The most notably of those residents were fashion designer Marie-Poule Nolin, who restored the 1860s residence at 416-420 Rue Bonsecours, and architect Frederic Lebensold, who restored the building's twin between Nolin's home and the Maison Papineau. Drouin, "Renaissance," 185.

⁹³ See Eric McLean, *Le Passé Vivant de Montréal = The Living Past of Montreal: Dessins de R.D. Wilson, texte de Eric McLean* (Montreal: McGill UP, 1964). The book was updated in 1975 and 1993.

⁹⁴ Most notably: Oglivy's department store restored the Maison du Calvet, Canadian Industries Ltd restored the Maison del Vecchio, and La Sauvegarde restored the Maison Au Coq d'Or. The first and last became exhibition and gallery space while the Maison del Vecchio housed a restaurant.

⁹⁵ For details of restoration see Official Old Montreal Website, 'Fiche d'un Bâtiment: Marché Bonsecours,' http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=e&num=19 (updated 21 May 2010). Aimé Desautels, then Associate Director of City Planning, was evidently very influential in the decision to move the department's offices to Bonsecours Market. He frequently attended the Viger Commission meetings as a liaison to City Planning, and at the first such meeting the Commission recommended the restoration of the market building. See Viger Commission Minutes, 22 October 1962 (City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger, VM34).

As Drouin notes, these latter improvements were indubitably in preparation for tourists visiting the World's Fair in 1967.⁹⁶ Indeed, as early as April 1963, the Viger Commission received a Mr Robinson from a New York City real estate firm expressing his interest in "reconstituting" Old Montreal for Expo '67.⁹⁷ The site for the Exposition had not yet then been chosen, but most options placed it near Old Montreal. Anticipation of the World's Fair proved a great stimulus for the city's modernization, and the restoration of Old Montreal was just as much a part of that urban project as the famous Metro. When, in 1964, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs announced its intention to build a Canadian Village on Île Sainte-Hélène, the Viger Commission responded vehemently, insisting that the village would "jeopardize irreparably" their own preservation program.⁹⁸ Certainly, the potential for tourism associated with Expo '67 encouraged a romantic 'reconstitution' of Montreal's fabled past, both exhibiting the identity of a Québécois Montreal and reinforcing that identity in the process, but by the time Van Ginkel & Associates had submitted the Draft Rehabilitation Plan, which decidedly denied that approach, Daniel Van Ginkel had been appointed Chief Planner for the Canadian World Exhibition Corporation. It was evident that Van Ginkel would get his way. When his influence over preparations for Expo '67 and with City Planning finally led, in 1964, to the adoption of an alternate course for the East-West Expressway north of Craig Street, the minute-taker for the Viger Commission wrote, "This is the survival of Old Montreal."⁹⁹

Changing Ideologies

There were two primary events that led to the definitive rejection of monumentality as a means of preserving Old Montreal and, in turn, the subsequent popularity of the kind of preservation that the Van Ginkel's advocated. The first was the demolition in 1973 of the Van Horne Mansion, which, significantly, was not in Old Montreal.¹⁰⁰ Located at the corner of Rues Sherbrooke and Stanley in the Square Mile, the mansion had been belonged to William Cornelius Van Horne, a powerful Dutch-American president of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Its short, intense, and ultimately unsuccessful battle for preservation elicited a pointed confrontation between a primarily anglophone constituency, who saw in its demolition a dismissal of their community, and the Ministry of Cultural Affairs which refused to classify the building on the grounds

⁹⁶ Drouin, "Renaissance," 193

⁹⁷ Viger Commission Minutes, 2 April 1963 (City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger, VM34). Mr Robinson emphasized the possible need to reconstruction stylistic buildings and the effectiveness of private restorations in the United States.

⁹⁸ Viger Commission Minutes, 16 March 1964 (City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger, VM34).

⁹⁹ Viger Commission Minutes 3 February 1964 (City of Montreal Archives, Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger, VM34).

¹⁰⁰ See Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine*, 35-40.

that neither it nor its historical figure were “*typiquement Québécois*.”¹⁰¹ The building’s obvious formal monumentality made the rejection all the more insulting. The Van Horne Mansion was not the first such victorian edifice to be torn down for replacement with an uninspired residential tower, but it was the first to see a movement coalesce around its preservation. The organization Save Montreal, a federation of local interest groups founded was founded shortly after the demolition to prevent repetitions of the disaster. With Heritage Montreal, founded in 1975 to provide technical and financial assistance for rehabilitations, Save Montreal opened a preservation discourse that countered the Ministry of Cultural Affairs and destabilized the government’s exclusive authority over preservation. That the official collective memory only recognized Old Montreal as an historic site allowed buildings such as the Van Horne Mansion to vanish with relatively little notice. The Ministry of Cultural Affairs was the only government body capable of intervening for preservation, and it had even received new powers the year previous under the Cultural Property Act allowing classification without owner consent. It appears that the newly renamed Cultural Property Commission had recommended that the Minister classify the building, but the effort stopped there.¹⁰² While the law could change in a day, the bureaucrats could not change their approach so quickly. The public outcry at the demolition of the Van Horne Mansion made it evident that the Ministry had made a mistake. The next year, however, the Ministry acquiesced to the Commission’s recommendation to designate four similar buildings a few blocks east on Rue Sherbrooke.¹⁰³

The second blow to monumentality was the defeat of a proposal in 1974 to reconstruct the former Hôpital Général off Place d’Youville for the Grey Nuns, who sought to return to their ancestral residence. At that time, the complex comprehended a veritable amalgam of additions, the oldest parts of which date to the 1690s but most of which was built in the early nineteenth century.¹⁰⁴ The entire eastern wing had been demolished to extend Rue Saint-Pierre south of Place d’Youville following the Grey Nuns’ relocation to west Dorchester Boulevard in 1872, leaving only one wall of the central chapel. Small stores had been built against this wall, but with the approval of the Viger Commission, these were removed as early as 1963. City Planning recommended as part of the 1965 Master Plan that some of the warehouses surrounding the former hospital be cleared to provide better views onto the monument. The Nuns’ 1974 plan entailed

¹⁰¹ Ibid. 37. There was an additional aspect to this discourse concerning the desirability of Victorian architecture, which had been stylistically unpopular for decades. The stalemate over the style led to a reliance on arguments of significance; while beauty could rest in the eye of the beholder ostensibly no one could argue that the design was not a testament to a period of history.

¹⁰² Gelly, 203.

¹⁰³ These buildings were accorded a lesser designation – recognition – which was introduced with the Cultural Property Act and did not allow for a zone of protection. One of these buildings, the Mount Royal Club was afforded full classification in 1975.

¹⁰⁴ Official Old Montreal Website, ‘Fiche d’un Bâtiment: Ancien Hôpital Général de Montréal,’ http://www.vieux.Montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?id=0039-48-7126-02&mat=0039-48-7126&sec=j (updated 12 September 2011).

the demolition of all warehouses for reconstruction of the former hospital's west wing, and while the Ministry of Cultural Affairs initially endorsed the project, the new preservationists decried the proposal's wanton destruction of nineteenth-century architecture for a "fake old building".¹⁰⁵ Almost more importantly than the proposal's controversial stylistic prejudice was its affront to authenticity. The discourse of authenticity in preservation dates at least to John Ruskin, but it is a particular hallmark of cultural property preservation. André Corboz, a professor at the Université de Montréal, pejoratively likened the reconstruction to the style of the infamous Viollet-le-Duc, condemning the misguided effort "to 'fabricate' an 'historic monument'."¹⁰⁶ The implication is that real historic monuments are 'found' not constructed, their authenticity being derivative of their materiality. Writing elsewhere, Corboz insisted that when a building is restored, "it should find a quotidian life again," which is ostensibly more honest and practical than a theatrical commemoration of a collective memory.¹⁰⁷

In order to fund the project, the nuns anticipated demolishing their Mother House on Dorchester Boulevard and redeveloping the site.¹⁰⁸ This complex was considerably more intact than the one in Old Montreal, and though it was newer, its design was largely the same and still dated to the nineteenth century. A separate preservation battle for these buildings led to their classification in 1976. After it became evident that both the reconstruction was too contentious and that the demolition that would fund was no longer an option, the Nuns compromised. In 1977, the Hôpital Général was rehabilitated for the convent as the Maison Mère-d'Youville.¹⁰⁹ Two warehouses immediately adjacent to the chapel's vestiges were demolished nevertheless, and the ensemble at the corner of Place d'Youville and Rue Saint Pierre were incorporated into a new documentation center.

By the end of the 1970s, the discourse of preservation anticipated by the Van Ginkels had taken hold. While the Ministry of Cultural Affairs was busy reconstructing Place Royale in Quebec City, Montrealers had not only moved decidedly away from that method of preservation but from that the understanding of the city that came with it.

Exploiting Cultural Property

¹⁰⁵ Drouin, "Renaissance," 199.

¹⁰⁶ Claude Corboz, "Le projet des Soeurs grises: lâcher la proie pour l'ombre," *La Presse* 30 June 1976 quoted in Drouin, "Renaissance," 199 [my translation].

¹⁰⁷ Claude Corboz, "Du bon usage des sites historique" in *De la ville au patrimoine urbain: histoires de forme et de sens*, edited by Lucie K. Morisset (Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2009): 292 [my translation].

¹⁰⁸ Drouin, *combat du patrimoine*, 131.

¹⁰⁹ Part of the 1979 project included the demolition of two warehouses built adjacent to the Hôpital.

In concert with the urban rehabilitation plan proposed by the Van Ginkels and adopted by City Planning was another approach to the preservation of Old Montreal that bridged the nationalists' attention to history and the planners' attention to urbanism. By the late 1960s and especially into the 1970s, this image is what Drouin calls 'Victorian Montreal', referring to a period its proponents felt better represented the actual building stock of the city.¹¹⁰ In addition to redefining the historic value of Old Montreal, the 'Victorian Montreal' image sought to redefine its geographic territory. During the nineteenth century, Montreal extended well beyond the old walls, which had been demolished by that time. This old Montreal, in the sense of a former Montreal, included the mansions of the Square Mile and the office buildings around Dominion Square. It included the bourgeois townhouses on Square Saint-Louis and even the industrial warehouses along the Lachine Canal. It was, in effect, a complete re-invention of Old Montreal as a history and as a place.

Among the advocates of 'Victorian Montreal' and a new approach to preservation in general were powerful architects and intellectuals including Melvin Charney, Claude Corboz and Jean-Claude Marsan of the Université de Montréal, and architects Michael Fish and Phyllis Lambert.¹¹¹ Their historic Montreal represented an era of metropolitan grandeur and prominence that the city was anxiously losing, but it was more than a new image. It was also a new preservation, at least for Montreal, eschewing monumentality in favor of a more practical and economic approach to old buildings. Michael Fish, as quoted earlier, summed up the approach nicely: "We're into neighbourhoods, not history for its own sake."¹¹² Phyllis Lambert, the famous promoter of Mies Van der Rohe and founder of the Canadian Centre for Architecture, explained her philosophy of conservation to *Canadian Heritage* for an interview in 1980; "conservation areas are in the business of urban renewal—they are *New Towns* within the city and as such they need all the careful planning which was built into urban renewal areas of the '50s and '60s... But one difference must be borne in mind: urban conservation must be as considerate of people as the urban renewal of '50s and

¹¹⁰ According to Drouin's thesis, the third image was that of the 'twenty-first-century city' or the 'metropolis of progress' promoted by Mayor Drapeau. Curiously, none of these images represented the contemporary era. Evidently no one imagined building a 'Montreal of 1970' in 1970. But, of course, that was the only possible outcome.

¹¹¹ As early as 1964, Charney published an article in *The Montrealer*, "The Old Montreal No One Wants to Preserve," referring as much to the era as to the places outside Old Montreal. Cited in Drouin, "Renaissance," 198.

¹¹² Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine*, 105.

'60s was ruthless."¹¹³ Lambert, whom Fish called 'the key figure on the Montreal conservation scene', helped found Heritage Montreal in 1975 to provide technical and financial assistance for private rehabilitations, or as the practice was called, recycling.¹¹⁴ There had been a few such projects in Montreal during the 1970s, just as often outside of Old Montreal as within it. Lambert deplored the lack of progress in Old Montreal, placing some of the blame on the 'antiquarian' Viger Commission.¹¹⁵ The advocacy of Save Montreal and the guidance of Heritage Montreal were about all that developers could look for during that decade. After the debacle at the former Hôpital Général, there was no longer a question of restoring historic monuments in Old Montreal, but neither was there a facilitated means to recycling cultural property.

The Montreal of 1980, when Lambert gave the interview, was a different place than the city of only thirty years earlier, not only because of its many new buildings and urban spaces but because of its altered role in Canada. By that time Toronto had decidedly overtaken Montreal as Canada's metropolis both economically and in population.¹¹⁶ Although Expo '67 and the Olympic Games of 1976 ensured that Montreal remained on the world stage, the attention was increasingly for a narrowed identity as North America's francophone metropolis. The nationalist government and its various attempts at sovereignty brought culture to the foreground, for it was ostensibly the exceptional culture of Quebec that made it worthy of its own, independent nation. The turmoil around sovereignty is often partially blamed for the city's population decline.¹¹⁷ Indeed, Montreal stagnated after the Quiet Revolution, and with what little growth there was going to the suburbs, the city proper actually lost some 20% of its population between 1966 and 1981.¹¹⁸ Old Montreal, in turn, diminished to only 435

¹¹³ "What Would We Do Without Her?" Phyllis Lambert: Architecture-aholic," *Canadian Heritage* (June 1980): 42-43. As an example of that position, Lambert participated in a partially-successful effort to preserve a neighborhood of rowhouses threatened by an enormous housing development, La Cité. The Milton-Park Affair, named after the neighborhood's two primary cross-streets, ended in a compromise; 255 buildings were demolished and 135 were saved for rehabilitation as co-ops. See Claire Helmann, *The Milton-Park Affair: Canada's Largest Citizen-Developer Confrontation* (Montreal: Véhicule, 1987).

¹¹⁴ "Phyllis Lambert," 38.

¹¹⁵ "Phyllis Lambert," 42. Lambert does not explain her condemnation of the Viger Commission in the interview.

¹¹⁶ See Linteau, 427-457. In 1976, the headquarters of the Royal Bank of Canada even left the famous Place Ville-Marie which had been built for it only fifteen years earlier, relocating to Toronto.

¹¹⁷ As an example of its ubiquitous acceptance, the Wikipedia article on Montreal cites the nationalist movement for causing the flight of anglophones to Ontario, <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Montreal>.

¹¹⁸ Linteau, 460.

residents by 1976.¹¹⁹ Despite isolated restorations and a decline in demolitions, the preservation project had failed to attract a permanent community. The authors of *Montreal at the Crossroads*, writing in 1975, bemoaned the inaction plaguing the preservation of Old Montreal and the Drapeau administration's misconceived submission to tourism; "It's like a seed that was planted and then never tended... The city put in some picture postcard views for the tourists and then let the whole thing drop."¹²⁰

The characterization was not entirely fair; several important projects had been initiated by 1980 which, if they did not in themselves change the course of the whole district, pre-figured its transformation in the decades to come. While the restorations before the Cultural Property Act had been primarily owner-occupied residences or small-scale tourist showpieces for large corporations, there is one salient exception. In 1967, the Grey Nuns sold a block of 1820s warehouses near their former Hôpital to a developer who renovated them for office and restaurant space. With a pitched roof and small windows, Les Ecuries d'Youville (also called the Bouthillier Warehouses) were of an older style than many other warehouses and better corresponded to the kind of French-colonial architecture so publicly valued. Architect Janusz Warunkiewicz's restoration, moreover, accentuated these features by removing an upper addition and clearing an inner courtyard in the style of a colonial French garden.¹²¹

The other such pioneering project was Cours le Royer, an unusually coherent ensemble built from 1866 to 1874 to replace the old Hôtel-Dieu. Architects Desnoyers, Mercure, Lézy, Gagnon, & Sheppard capitalized on the austerity and simplicity of the buildings to create a unified streetscape closed to traffic, borrowing the nascent convention of loft conversions in New York City to create condominiums, all over an underground parking garage for two hundred vehicles.¹²² The enormous project was achieved in six phases over five years beginning in 1975. When the first phase opened in 1977, the magazine *Habitat* lauded its originality and its scope, by which "Cours le Royer will be able to demonstrate the advantages there are to restoring and converting what remains to us of the commercial buildings built in Montreal at the end of the nineteenth

¹¹⁹ Marc Choko, *The New Montreal: Major Urban Projects in Old Montreal* (Montreal: Centre de Design de l'Université de Montréal, 2001): 32. In contrast, the population of Old Montreal in 1951 was 2600 and as of the 2011 Census numbers some 4000.

¹²⁰ Donna Gabeline, Dane Laken, and Gordon Pape, "The Compromised Commission," in *Montreal at the Crossroads* (Montreal: Harvest House, 1975): 127-138. The quotation comes from an unidentified Old Montreal resident.

¹²¹ Warunkiewicz (also Warunkiewicz) was primarily known for two metro station designs, Henri-Bourassa and Place d'Armes. In 1979, he designed La Pyramide, condominium building, on Nuns Island.

¹²² The 1965 Master Plan recommended almost exactly the design the architects adopted in 1975, including the removal of industrial uses and accoutrements and the closure of Rue Le Royer to automobile traffic.

century.”¹²³ Not only in the objective of its restoration but in its method, Cours Le Royer exhibited the new preservation. To accommodate the resource for present use, the architects identified those essentially historic elements for retention and changed the rest; “it is about creating a connection between the conception, the construction, and the finished product while using as much of the old materials that can be recuperated and the architectural elements found on-site.”¹²⁴ This was a modern urban space as much or more than a space of collective memory. In a gesture of public approbation, one of the first people to purchase a unit in the complex was newly elected Premier René Lévesque of the separatist Parti Québécois.¹²⁵

Simultaneous with the rehabilitation of Cours Le Royer was another important development on the periphery of Old Montreal whose profound impact cannot be overstated: the Old Port. Since the 1950s, the Port of Montreal had struggled to remain relevant at its location on the waterfront of Old Montreal. The federal government had acquiesced to new shipping demands by filling a part of the basin opposite Bonsecours Market for containers, but by 1974 the Port of Montreal had decided to abandon its old facilities for a new location downstream where it would have more space. The six quays bordering Rue de la Commune and all of the industrial facilities located there were transferred to the federal government, which began to plan a redevelopment project in concert with the City of Montreal. The government moved slowly, incorporating an agency for the project and engaging Moshe Safdie and the architects of Cours Le Royers as consultants for the Old Port, as it was subsequently renamed.¹²⁶ In 1978, the government took its first major step by demolishing Silo 02 across the street from Bonsecours market. The towering behemoth was undoubtedly significant – a photo of it had figured in Le Corbusier’s *Vers une Architecture* – but few people could see it as anything but an eyesore.¹²⁷ ‘Industrial heritage’ generally figured within a ‘Victorian Montreal’ collective memory, but the silos in particular were not easily repurposed for present need, a necessary component of the preservation paradigm espoused by those who advocated for ‘Victorian Montreal’. While monumental in many ways, the silos could not be cultural property because they were functionally useless and, most importantly in this case, inconveniently located on valuable waterfront property. Unlike with warehouses, architects could not devise a way to make the silos integrate into their new urban context. On the extreme, there were even those that sought to return the waterfront to its pre-

¹²³ “Le Cours Le Royer: une Seconde Jeunesse à des Bâtiments du 19e Siècle,” *Habitat* 20 (1977): 24 [my translation].

¹²⁴ *Ibid.* [my translation].

¹²⁵ Des Rochers and Roy, “Time and Place Rediscovered,” 263.

¹²⁶ Tom Paskel, “Montreal’s Waterfront District: Focus of a Planning Brainstorm,” *Habitat* 21:4 (1978), 36.

¹²⁷ Le Corbusier, *Towards a New Architecture*, trans. Frederick Etchells (New York: Dover, 1987), 28.

industrial state by demolishing the wharves.¹²⁸ Parks Canada, which participated in the redevelopment project of both the Old Port and the adjacent National Historic Site of Lachine Canal, was more interested in conserving some of the industrial facilities as “Canadian cultural heritage” while creating a riverside recreation center.¹²⁹ By 1978, however, it was clear that everyone at least wanted a ‘window on the river’.¹³⁰ At least Silo 02 and Silo 01, located at the foot of Boulevard Saint-Laurent, had to go. While the Old Port Corporation waited more than a decade before commencing with redevelopment, the demolition of these two silos and their maze of conveyors dramatically changed the atmosphere of Old Montreal against which they had formed a forbidding backdrop for nearly a century.

Not long after the first phase of Cours Le Royer opened to much acclaim, other similar projects were in the works. With more and more classifications, however, the portfolio of the Cultural Property Commission had grown too large for efficient administration. To correct this, the Ministry of Cultural Affairs succeeded in revising the Cultural Property Act in 1978 to provide for agreements with municipalities which would shift some responsibilities to the local level. The next year, the Ministry brokered an agreement with Mayor Drapeau to allow for joint funding and management of Old Montreal’s preservation. In fact, the city had proposed as early as 1965 that the Ministry relinquish responsibility for the regulation of monuments to ease what it considered a detrimental delay in the provincial commission’s bureaucratic oversight, but the 1979 agreement still retained that role for the Cultural Property Commission. Instead, the “Agreement on Old Montreal and Montreal Heritage” (*Entente sur le Vieux-Montréal et le patrimoine Montréalais*, commonly known as *Entente MAC-Ville* for its two parties the *Ministre des affaires culturelles* and the *Ville de Montréal*) established the Patrimonial Architecture Real Estate Agency (*la Société immobilière du patrimoine architectural de Montréal*, hereafter SIMPA) to manage preservation projects across the city and especially in Old Montreal.¹³¹

SIMPA was a tellingly different sort of body than the Cultural Property Commission. A public non-profit, its five-member body was charged to “promote and effect itself the construction, the restoration, the management and the residential, commercial, and touristic development of the Old Montreal historic district.”¹³² It had its programmatic origins in a development agency created for Place Royale in 1967, but if the objective there was to build a center of collective

¹²⁸ The group *Action Vieux-Montreal* was the main proponent of the restoration. Bernard LaMothe, “A Longstanding Public Project,” in Choko, *New Montreal*, 38.

¹²⁹ Paskel, “Montreal’s Waterfront District,” 35.

¹³⁰ Drouin, *Le combat du patrimoine*, 179.

¹³¹ Cours Le Royers received funding for its later phases under the *Entente MAC-Ville*. In addition, the *Entente MAC-Ville* provided funding for historical and archeological research including, in a later version of the agreement, the inestimably useful website vieux.montreal.qc.ca and the publication *Old Montreal, History Through Heritage*.

¹³² SIMPA *Rapport Annuel* 1982 [my translation].

memory the goal of SIMPA was decidedly more practical: make Old Montreal profitable. First led by Aimé Désautels, then Director of City Planning, SIMPA's first action plan had three goals: provide technical and promotional assistance to Old Montreal property owners, undertake demonstration projects, and prepare promotional tourist brochures.¹³³ One has little indication from these goals that the place in question is a heritage site. As Dinu Bumbaru later reflected, "They spoke of Montreal heritage and a lot about Old Montreal, but very little about heritage value, preferring by far the more quantifiable and, incidentally, taxable notion of real estate investment values."¹³⁴ This sort of economic pragmatism did not express preservation as a reconnection with history or even with a collective memory except insofar as the reconnection could be accomplished through tourism. Constructing heritage for tourists, however, variably privileges consumerism and theatricality because both can be quickly and easily experienced by a nameless mass of visitors. As if to confirm this relationship, SIMPA installed a tourist center on the ground floor of the building it rehabilitated for its offices, the Silver Dollar Saloon on Place Jacques-Cartier.¹³⁵ Nevertheless many of SIMPA's other projects brought in a resident population who opposed the noise, if not the spectacle, of a tourist district. Drouin has even suggested that the city's efforts of promote housing in Old Montreal were directly intended to mitigate the effects of tourism.¹³⁶ In any case, thirty-three buildings had been rehabilitated for residences within the first five years of SIMPA's activity, partly in participation with a city-wide program called *Opération 20 000 logements* that sought to redevelop inner-city properties for families who would have otherwise moved to the suburbs.¹³⁷

While SIMPA facilitated many rehabilitation projects – more than one hundred before 1990 in fact – its largest and most visible were its last.¹³⁸ The World Trade Center and the Chaussegros-de-Léry Complex each occupy entire city blocks, anchoring the west and east extremes of the district, respectively. Their entirely quotidian occupations and post-modern design reinforce the desire to make Old Montreal a functionally normative urban space. They are also mostly new construction rather than rehabilitation, although in a decidedly different vein than the international style Banque Canadienne-Nationale on Place D'Armes or

¹³³ SIMPA *Rapport Annuel* 1983.

¹³⁴ Bumbaru, "Laboratoire," 56.

¹³⁵ Official Old Montreal Website, 'Fiche d'un bâtiment: Maison Antoine Mallard,' http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=a&num=3 (updated 19 September 2007). In 1988, SIMPA moved its offices next door to a newly constructed, very traditional building.

¹³⁶ Martin Drouin, "Parcourir le Vieux-Montréal," *Vieux-Montréal, un quartier d'histoire?*, Joanne Burgess and Paul-André Linteau, eds. (Quebec City: Éditions MultiMondes, 2010), 85-86.

¹³⁷ Germain and Rose, *Quest for a Metropolis*, 165-167.

¹³⁸ 117 rehabilitations were effected under the *Entente MAC-Ville* between 1979 and 1989 across all of Montreal. Serge Carreau and Perla Serfaty-Garzon, eds. *Le Patrimoine de Montréal: Document de Référence*. (Quebec City: Gouvernement du Québec, 1998), 38.

the Courthouse. The World Trade Center and the Chaussegros-de-Léry Complex, like smaller contemporary projects, engaged somewhat more aesthetically with their surroundings through material and fenestration patterns if not in massing or ornamentation.

In 1987, SIMPA sponsored a competition for a mixed-use structure on the block east of City Hall on Rue Notre-Dame to be named after the French engineer of Montreal's colonial city walls, Gaspard Joseph Chaussegros de Léry. Administrative offices had been planned there since at least the Gréber plan of 1953, and the city had already expropriated many of the lots for that purpose. The 1965 Master Plan had recommended that several of the modest buildings on Rue Bonsecours and Rue Notre-Dame be preserved and incorporated into the *Centre Administratif*, but these were demolished for the Chaussegros-de-Léry Complex.¹³⁹ Because of the latter's density, however, the three blocks to the east, bound by Rues Saint-Antoine, Bonsecours, Notre-Dame, and Berri were left out of SIMPA's plan.¹⁴⁰ Besides more administrative space for the city government, the Chaussegros-de-Léry complex was to house commercial and residential units. Of the seven desired aspects, five specifically expressed a concern for the relationship of the project with the urban environment, but the winning design by Dan Hanganu was also cited for its distinctive "contemporary architectural contribution".¹⁴¹ Indeed, Hanganu's Chaussegros-de-Léry design, completed with some modifications in two phases by 1995, is both monumental in its unity and picturesque in its idiosyncrasies. It neither quotes nor ignores the architecture around it, but abstracts environmental features with a post-modern flare for large geometries. Almost as important as the building itself was its enormous underground parking garage, which SIMPA required so that it could restore the Champs-de-Mars to a greenspace (it had been a parking lot since the 1920s) and demolish La Dauversière parking structure next to Chateau Ramezay, both of which were accomplished by the late 1990s. With these substantial transformations, the eastern quarter followed through the dramatic restorations that had been planned in the early 1960s, but without the overbearing commemoration of Mondello's historic house district. With less large-scale commercial architecture than the western quarter, the area east of Place Jacques-Cartier is still defined by its contrast of modest and monumental architecture. In the western quarter, on the other hand, a different urbanism allowed SIMPA's interventions to engage differently with heritage.

The Montreal World Trade Center, which began construction in 1988, was a collaboration between five investment agencies, of which SIMPA was one, and

¹³⁹ Service de l'Urbanisme, *Plan Directeur du Vieux-Montréal* vol. 2.

¹⁴⁰ It is surprising that the 1965 Master Plan recommended the demolition of these blocks considering that an eighteenth-century house – Maison Brossard-Gauvin – was located there. We can only assume this was unknown because it had been considerably altered. The wooden siding and pitched roof were restored in 1986. Official Old Montreal Website, 'Fiche d'un bâtiment: Maison Broassard-Gauvin,' http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=b&num=1 (23 December 2010).

¹⁴¹ Pierre Beaupré, "Projet Chaussegros-de-Léry: Concours d'Idées," *ARQ* 42 (Apr. 1988): 27, 31.

three architecture firms: ARCOP, Provencher Roy, and Becker Gersovitz Moss. The complex incorporated five existing buildings, one new building, and six historic façades, all connected by an interior atrium over Ruelle des Fortifications, which had been leased by the the City of Montreal on the condition that it remain open to the public. In SIMPA's publication *Projet Vieux-Montréal*, the author writes, "The challenge lay in restoration and the harmonious integration of elements of a rich and prosperous past into an ultra-modern real-estate complex that was in keeping with the scale and spirit of Vieux-Montréal."¹⁴² The answer, apparently, to this challenge was façadism which, as much maligned then as it is now, soundly embodied the principle of pragmatism; the façades of the buildings along Rue Saint-Jacques were, after all, the heritage artifact as experienced from the public realm. If, in fact, preservation was the retention of historic material for the common good, then façadism was entirely acceptable. Because, however, preservationists invariably considered the interiors of a building to be 'historic' material and because the resulting effect on the otherwise modern structure influenced the modernity of its design, neither discourses of architecture nor preservation approved of it.

Façadism was relatively popular in Montreal, especially after the Cultural Property Commission endorsed the demolition of Saint James Church if its clock tower and south transept were integrated into a new building for the *Université du Québec à Montréal* in 1973. More conservative examples of the practice are evident in Old Montreal; in 1991 SIMPA partially reconstructed the Maison Cuvillier-Ostell, on the corner of Rue Notre-Dame and boulevard Saint-Laurent, into a new office tower following a fire. Its two street walls and pitched roof were retained, and the back wall removed to form a connection with the tower set just behind. In this "semi-conservation", as the editors of *Le Projet Vieux-Montréal* described it, "the new construction that neighbors [the Maison Cuvillier-Ostell] permits to exploit (*mettre en valeur*) the contrast between the old and modern."¹⁴³ Besides its dubious invocation of Venice Charter doctrines, the Maison Cuvillier-Ostell project was a practical solution that comprised between a desire to restore what one could of the historic structure while developing the adjacent lot with profitable office space.

Returning to the World Trade Center, the case is the more extreme because multiple façades were incorporated into a single edifice. It was clear that the Crown Trust Building, for example, did not 'exist' after the bulk of it was destroyed, even if the three-story portal remained. Because, moreover, the World Trade Center building rose some six stories above the old Crown Trust Building, the preserved building-as-façade became little more than an artifact or, as Dinu Bumbaru described it, "a poster glued onto a glass box."¹⁴⁴ There is something telling, however, in Bumbaru's response to façadism in general and this project in

¹⁴² *Projet Vieux-Montréal* 4:3 (Autumn 1991): 8.

¹⁴³ *Ibid.* 1.

¹⁴⁴ Dinu Bumbaru, "Le façadisme: De décor à l'envers! Ou less is Décor" *ICOMOS Information* (Oct./Dec.1989): 16.

particular; he questions the repulsion of heritage professionals – himself included – given the largely positive reactions from the public, who see in façadism a means of considering preservation within a broader context of urban revitalization.¹⁴⁵ He tentatively acquiesces to the possibility that heritage conservation may be more about a relationship to a socio-economic context than the doctrinal restoration of material. Programmatically, the World Trade Center participated in an urban design project proposed by the City of Montreal in 1989 called the *Quartier International*. Located between the old financial district along Rues Saint-Jacques, where some bank headquarters remained, and the newer business district around Place Ville-Marie, the *Quartier International* would be located on top of the Ville-Marie Expressway. The façadism of the World Trade Center, writes Bumbaru, “was an option for the preservation of the milieu more than the preservation of a building.”¹⁴⁶ Indeed, the appearance of the heritage environment and public participation in Montreal’s preservation discourse during this time pre-figured the current shift away from the exclusive focus on historic materials. It is ironic, perhaps, that the shift should be evident in the evaluation of façadism, otherwise the hallmark of preservation pragmatism.

In many ways, the exploitation of cultural property, or cultural resource management as it has been institutionalized south of the border, is still the professional paradigm. In Old Montreal, it has been instrumental to preservation. The historic district is a decidedly modern place, if not a perfect exemplification of conservative urbanism. With the salient exception of the World Trade Center, one can trace the concept for each major preservation project in Old Montreal to the 1965 Master Plan which, in turn, owes its inspiration to the Van Ginkel plan of 1963. If not in all of their exact details, the spirit of these plans have been largely carried out. Yet simultaneously with stylistically post-modern new construction and dubious façadism, preservationists in Montreal entered a discourse of heritage conservation that sought to ideologically sanction the sort of pragmatism that had grown out of an essentialist concern for material authenticity. It had very little to do with material, in fact, and everything to do with the ‘environment’, although not exactly as the modernists had posited it. This environment was more akin to Henri Lefebvre’s famous socially-produced space and, to an extreme, subjugates ‘authentic’ materiality to whatever other forms the experience of heritage may take.¹⁴⁷

¹⁴⁵ Ibid., 17.

¹⁴⁶ Bumbaru, “*Le façadisme*,” 16.

¹⁴⁷ Lefebvre, *The Production of Space*.

Epilogue: Preserving Old Montreal as a Heritage Space

In 1995, the Cultural Property Commission confirmed what everyone already knew; Old Montreal did not stop at Rue Notre-Dame. The Commission extended the boundaries of the historic district north to Rue Saint-Antoine, south around the Old Port, and a few irregular blocks to the east and west. As limits and inventories of cultural property grow, however, it became increasingly clear that heritage could not be essentialized. Rather than label one thing or another 'heritage', we must look at the heritage-value of every place as part of a heritage environment. For the most part, this is because the identification of cultural property is positivistic. As long as any argument can be made for the figuration of a resource within the collective memory, it must be heritage. This is not a fault; it indicates that *everything* figures somehow in the collective memory and that *everything* is therefore heritage. Conventionally, however, we limit heritage to those places with significance. The 'significance' of heritage is the ease with which one can represent it within the narrative of a collective memory and is usually used synonymously with its importance. Thus some places or things stand out among others for being important. With an ideology that places both the role of heritage and our ability to make it communicate memory within an historical process determined by individuals and their societal contexts (i.e. the process of patrimonialization) it becomes clear that the heritage environment must also adopt new methods of protection.

Patrimonialization

Conventionally speaking, the patrimonialization of Old Montreal is the process whereby the place becomes an epistemically patrimonial phenomenon. The process transcends physical alteration; it describes a shift in the ways people talk about the place, the ways people interact with the place, and the ways they think about it. Importantly, patrimonialization predicates 'being-heritage' on the agency of people and asserts heritage is a consequence of their actions rather than an inherent quality in the thing or place itself; "there is no heritage but what is claimed and appropriated in the present," writes Raymond Montpetit.¹⁴⁸ In that regard, it is a response to the kind of space created or at least proposed by the preservation of cultural property, a space 'rich' in representations of history which, we are assured, recount disinterested testimonies to cultural consumers whose own lives and societies remain at a comfortable distance. The latter may be beautiful, profitable, and even

¹⁴⁸ Raymond Montpetit, "Le Vieux-Montréal, un espace investi de signification," in Burgess and Linteau, *Un quartier de l'histoire?*, 65 [my translation].

entertaining, but it has no “soul.”¹⁴⁹ As a revisionist historiography, patrimonialization tells us that by preserving historic monuments, we imbue them with a message and perform through them our own version of tradition.

As we have seen, the process of patrimonializing Old Montreal began with an association of collective memory and place through the commemoration of historical monuments. Even if the monumental triggers did not successfully recall the details of history to everyone, they evoked for that history a grand aura, simultaneously transferred into the space of commemoration, namely Old Montreal. The subsequent *mise en valeur* of that monumental heritage as economic resources in the name of ‘culture’ strengthened the collective being and, reflexively, the importance of the historic district. With a concern for material and historical authenticity, a newly empowered residential and business bourgeoisie produced a modern urban space, quotidian but special, for managing and exploiting cultural resource commodities. If it is evident that preserving a monument and preserving cultural property produced different urban spaces, it should be equally possible that preserving the heritage environment manifest yet another spatialization of Old Montreal. Indeed, two discourses pre-figuring one of patrimonialization have surfaced over the past thirty years in regard to Old Montreal, each of which have led to new preservation practices: the heritage palimpsest and dematerialized heritage.

The Heritage Palimpsest

If the operating tenet of *patrimonialisation* is ‘construction’, the process can be conceptually broken down into chronological steps and their physical layers. The first historical step might be, in the present case, the commemorative historical societies of the late nineteenth century, and their ‘layer’ would be the various monuments erected to historical figures. Subsequent historical periods likewise left layers across the district, variously buried or vestigial. According to this discourse, Old Montreal is therefore a palimpsest whose surface layer conceals previous historical states or, in another metaphor, “the growth rings of history over the centuries.”¹⁵⁰ On the level of a single building, additions or paint schemes constitute the layers bestowed over time. At the urban scale, building styles or use-types form these historical layers. A discourse of layering contributed to preservationists’ arguments for more diverse classification and *mise en valeur* of heritage in the 1970s. Phyllis Lambert was, for instance, able to illustrate the many historical layers of the former Hôpital Général, obfuscating the putatively original state which the Grey Nuns proposed to reconstruct.¹⁵¹

¹⁴⁹ For a discussion of theatricality in the representation of history a heritage, see Anouk Bélanger, “l’histoire et la culture comme leviers de développement urbain à Montréal,” in Burgess and Linteau, *Un quartier de l’histoire?* Bélanger notes that despite intentions to preserve Old Montreal a unique place, its development follows standardized practices which make it functionally and economically very similar to historic quarters in many other cities.

¹⁵⁰ Jean-Claude Robert, “Preface” to Lauzon and Forget, *Old Montreal*, VII.

¹⁵¹ See previous chapter.

Condemning the fanciful restorations associated with early preservation, Claude Corboz reminded his readers in 1974 that “it is necessary to understand that one only adds another state to a series of anterior states.”¹⁵² The authors of *Old Montreal, History Through Heritage* likewise interpret the urban landscape as a series of historical states from which they derive historical periods that produced those layers. According to their thesis, Old Montreal was built (and re-built) in seven stages (including the current one beginning in 1950), each one more or less homogeneous in itself. Places that critically recognize those layers through their program or through their architecture and that conscientiously add another layer can be said to operate within a paradigm of patrimonialization.¹⁵³

With its excavated exhibitions, the program of the Pointe-à-Callière Museum, designed by Dan Hanganu and opened in 1992, demonstrates how layering has become a popular means of interpretation. At the culmination of the museum’s tour, visitors are presented with the exposed foundations of Place Royale, the in-situ artifacts from each period of its history highlighted in a different color. The increasing popularity of archeology, in fact required before any construction under the *Entente MAC-Ville* of 1979, has indubitably helped popularize an aesthetic of layering in Old Montreal, although as an architectural style it is even more prevalent in other cities.¹⁵⁴ The Éperon building of the Pointe-à-Callière museum, which occupies the site of the Royal Insurance Building demolished after a fire in 1947, architecturally expresses, in the words of architect Georges Adamczyk, “a constructed metaphor for an unfinished history.”¹⁵⁵ The building’s tower in particular manifests a lack of completion through the absence of an envelope on one side, revealing a steel structure. This tower also evokes the massing of the building’s predecessor for a powerful statement of modified, progressive continuity. The choice to build a museum at that location is also notable; the 1965 Master Plan had suggested a parking structure for the site. The choice for a program that critically engages with the collective memory, even if it is through the materiality of archeology, is indicative of the community’s newfound willingness to do so at all. Barnard LaMothe suggests as much in his evaluation of the Pointe-à-Callière project in the context of Old Montreal as an urban development project;

Both by its location and by the very concept of its construction, which gives it a strong symbolic power, Pointe-à-Callière expresses, probably better than any other project, the desire of

¹⁵² Corboz, “Du bon usage,” 292 [my translation].

¹⁵³ Layering did not come out of nowhere. The Venice Charter’s enjoinder to make modern additions legible derives from the foundational position of modernity as a separation from the past, but it effectively creates the opportunity to see layers within the historical.

¹⁵⁴ Most recently, architects in other cities have designed preservation projects which create a distressed, deconstructed, almost ruin-like aesthetic by carefully ‘peeling away’ various historic layers. See, for example, the Neues Museum in Berlin and the Park Avenue Armory in New York City.

¹⁵⁵ Georges Adamczyk, “The New Montreal Architecture,” in Choko, *The New Montreal*, 62.

governments and, through them, the population, to reappropriate the heritage and history to which it bears witness to affirm the identity of Montreal, in all its complexity, and express the dynamism of the city and the society that lives there.¹⁵⁶

The potential for a heritage palimpsest discourse to affect the preservation of Old Montreal grows higher as the city and province tackle the development of the districts on the periphery of Old Montreal. The three main *faubourgs* that surround the historic district – Faubourg des Récollets to the west, Faubourg Saint-Laurent to the north, and Faubourg Québec to the east – have each been the subject of urban design plans within the past twenty years that seek in part to create a better urban context for the historic district.¹⁵⁷ These plans include housing and office-space, but they also include improved transportation links and public service infrastructure.¹⁵⁸ Considering their proximity to the historic district, development of the *faubourgs* will undoubtedly change the experience of Old Montreal and its relationship to the rest of the city. But if these changes are to participate positively in the patrimonialization of Old Montreal we must first acknowledge their role within that patrimonialization, even if they lie outside the official boundaries, and that changes will in turn add to patrimonial meaning. The patrimonial environment extends beyond the physical bounds of its ‘cultural property’, and is more accurately a socially-produced intangible ‘heritage space.’

Dematerialized Heritage

The patrimonialization of Old Montreal’s urban environment and the ensuing inflation of heritage encompasses more than historic material; it includes or is even more concerned with the way one interacts with those places. These intangible heritages are an integral even fundamental reason for why heritage holds collective value; we make heritage by the process of preserving it for the common good. The 2003 UNESCO *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* initiated a discourse of ‘intangible heritage’, the habitual and especially the ritual practices associated or performed at tangible heritage places.¹⁵⁹ Together tangible and intangible heritage make ‘heritage space.’ But the question of how to preserve both intangible heritages and heritage space remains elusive in the context of cultural property conservation

¹⁵⁶ Bernard LaMothe, “A Longstanding Public Project,” in Choko, *The New Montreal*, 39.

¹⁵⁷ As these plans developed, other names for these areas or sub-areas have appeared, including Faubourg des Écluses (a housing project in the south of Faubourg des Récollets), Quartier International (a business sector centered on Square Victoria), Cité du Multimédia (a high-tech development project within the Faubourg des Récollets), and Quartier de la Santé (a mega-hospital project within Faubourg Saint-Laurent).

¹⁵⁸ See Choko, *The New Montreal*.

¹⁵⁹ UNESCO organized the *Convention for the Safeguarding of the Intangible Cultural Heritage* in 2003.

because the foundations of that preservation are so deeply ingrained in the conservation of materials.

Nevertheless, preservation has always been more or less aware of its ultimate interest in the values that materials convey. Riegl, for example, enumerated and analyzed the art-value, the age-value, the newness-value, etc. of monuments. While the new paradigm for preservation does not repudiate the representation of values in a monument (or in its successor term, heritage); it redefines the method of representation. Sheri Murray Ellis explains: "While we may hold a particular object or location as an important representative of our culture, it is the reason we consider it 'representative' that is at the heart of our culture."¹⁶⁰ Those reasons, while they may be contemporary values, are also intangible heritages; they are the ways-of-life that identify one culture from another. Preservation at this point becomes both confusing and unstable because it is unclear whether the aim is to preserve the intangible heritage or the material representation of it, and if the former, whether preserving the representation will preserve intangible heritage in order to preserve the values it represents. Moreover, every time we identify an intangible heritage in order to safeguard it we must define it; but by defining it and especially by trying to preserve it we give it a stasis it never had. The effort to preserve the French language, perhaps Quebec's greatest intangible heritage challenge, proposes creating a francophone public society that has never existed. Analyzing the patrimonialization of such heritages reiterates the fallacy of restoration, and even suggests the fallacy of preservation as well by deconstructing the process whereby the heritage thing came to represent an aspect of the collective memory. Positing an idiosyncratic human agent of representation calls into question the immutability of heritage values and the means of representing them. This concern has engaged an international audience. In the invocation of a 2011 conference for the ICOMOS Committee on the Theory and Philosophy of Conservation and Restoration, Gustavo Araoz, president of ICOMOS International, wrote;

It is commonly accepted now that the values attributed to a heritage place are not an immutable constant, but rather that they evolve in respect to time and space... [and] The truth is that values can be neither protected nor preserved. Values simply emerge from and exist in the ether of the communal public consciousness. Any attempt to institutionalize or freeze them permanently would be tantamount to social engineering or even ideological propaganda.¹⁶¹

His conclusion is that one must be clearly aware of the vessels of value in order to safeguard heritage, which does not explain why one should preserve the

¹⁶⁰ Sheri Murray Ellis, "'Intangible' Cultural Resources: Values Are in The Mind," in *A Companion to Cultural Resource Management*, ed. Thomas King (Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2011), 156.

¹⁶¹ Gustavo Araoz, "Protecting Heritage Places Under the New Heritage Paradigm & Defining Its Tolerance for Change," http://www.fondazione-delbianco.org/seminari/progetti_prof/progview_PL.asp?start=1&idprog=283 (accessed 5 May 2012).

vessels if the values cannot or should not be preserved. The compromise may very well simply be an awareness of that mutability, both on the part of heritage and of preservation. The values of heritage change and what it means to preserve that place changes, too. Old Montreal is by no means the only place where 'preservation' has held widely different meanings for an understanding of the place and the way its heritage is preserved. Patrimonialization helps preservationists analyze how those shifting approaches to preservation have created the place that exists today and therefore to preserve the vessels of its values.

Conclusion

On October 19, 2012, the Cultural Heritage Act will come into effect across Quebec, indicating that once again lawmakers are responding to the rise of a new preservation paradigm, although as before the new terminology does not bring with it such a complete shift in methodology.¹⁶² The renamed Cultural Heritage Council will be able to classify intangible heritage, including historical figures (expressly the premiers of Quebec) and historic events. Obviously, listing deceased persons does not ensure their preservation, but in any case the Cultural Heritage Act is less about safeguarding heritage than it is about managing its public role; "The object of this law is, among other things, to further the knowledge, the protection, the exploitation (*mise en valeur*), and the transmission of cultural heritage in the public interest and in the perspective of sustainable development."¹⁶³ Therefore it at least partially confirms the abandonment of pretensions to 'protection' associated with the management of heritage. The Council will be responsible for regulating listed heritages through public consultation which, in addition to new powers for municipal and Amerindian heritage councils, will attempt to 'democratize' their management and to ensure a heritage as diverse as the peoples of Quebec.

The emphasis on public consultation, largely pre-figured by the success of consultations in 1985 and 1986 over the redevelopment of the Old Port, were adapted to Old Montreal following a 1993 conference organized by SIMPA on tourism and the quality of life. The tourist industry had inherited from early preservation a notion of heritage as a spectacle which was at odds with the quotidian quality of heritage developed later. The invited constituents agreed that the model of an official commission was inadequate for regulating their diverse heritage space, and so they created the Round Table of Old Montreal (*la Table de concertation du Vieux-Montréal*) in 1994.¹⁶⁴ Bringing together representatives from constituent organizations, the Round Table offered less political and more open model for regulation. Because 'protection' of Old Montreal was less and

¹⁶² Asssemblée Nationale du Québec, *Projet de la loi 82: La loi sur le patrimoine culturel*. Available at <http://www.assnat.qc.ca/fr/travaux-parlementaires/projets-loi/projet-loi-82-39-1.html>.

¹⁶³ Asssemblée Nationale du Québec, *Projet de la loi 82: La loi sur le patrimoine culturel*, 2.

¹⁶⁴ Roch Poirier, "Table de concertation du Vieux-Montréal: de concert et en harmonie," *Continuité* 72 (1997): 67.

less an issue and because, after 1987, there was a city-wide heritage council, the Viger Commission was disbanded. When, in 1995, the Cultural Property Commission extended the boundaries of Old Montreal north to Rue Saint-Antoine, south around the Old Port, and a few erratic blocks east and west, they redressed a long-standing error, but everyone knew where Old Montreal was by then anyway and the move was mostly symbolic.

Yet so long as the government insists on classifying heritage, there will always be not-heritage. While it is unlikely that those places will receive no public attention when it comes to their redevelopment, there will be no mechanism for discussion of how the place figures in the collective memory. Phyllis Lambert, for her part, discouraged the idea that any part of the city could be not-heritage. In a statement that was very progressive for 1980, she insisted that “‘heritage’, is its largest sense... is the life of the city [and] the entire built-up community.”¹⁶⁵ Obviously, such a definition of heritage, now more widely accepted, necessitates new ways of engaging with it. That engagement, as the Cultural Heritage Act suggests, may not be ‘protection’ in the conventional sense. After all, how could we protect “the entire built-up community” and moreover, why would we want to? The authors of *Patrimoine de Montréal: Document de Référence*, clearly state the issue:

Current reflections on the preservation of heritage face the obstacle of the considerable extension of its field, but also the immaterial character of the concepts that underlie its intention, for it is necessary to all at once protect what it built and the *savoir-faire* it translates and the quality of life it guarantees. This triple cultural challenge risks to put in question the very viability of the patrimonial enterprise if it does not re-situate itself in the framework of a larger enterprise of new approaches, methods, and mechanisms appropriate to the actual heritage problematic.¹⁶⁶

In the case of Old Montreal, it is clear that preservationists must continue the trend to consider its welfare within broader spatial and discursive contexts. That includes its *faubourgs*, even the whole city, and it includes other ways of engaging with the heritage environment, whether they be urban planning or sociology. Because of the long and very public process by which Old Montreal has become part of the collective memory, and because of the indelible effects that process has had on its physical form, the heritage environment of Old Montreal will continue to represent complex social values and a complex history.

THE END

¹⁶⁵ “Phyllis Lambert,” 42-43.

¹⁶⁶ Carreau and Serfaty-Garzon, *Le Patrimoine de Montréal*, 39 [my translation].

Appendix 1: Illustrations

- Figure 1. Map of Old Montreal with key sites
- Figure 2. View onto Montreal, with Old Montreal and the Old Port in the foreground, 1955
- Figure 3. View onto Montreal, with Old Montreal and the Old Port in the foreground, 1966
- Figure 4. Chateau Ramezay, c. 1900-1925
- Figure 5. Champs de Mars, c. 1920s
- Figure 6. Gosford Tunnel underneath Chateay Ramezay, 1953
- Figure 7. Third Centenary Celebrations, Place d'Armes, 1942
- Figure 8. View south onto Place Jacques-Cartier, 1956
- Figure 9. Jacques Gréber, *Development of the City Hall Section*, 1953
- Figure 10. Papineau House, c.1963
- Figure 11. View north on Rue Bonsecours.
- Figure 12. Laying Cobblestones on Rue Saint-Paul Est, 1966
- Figure 13. View East on Rue Saint-Paul from Place Jacques-Cartier, 1966
- Figure 14. Construction site of the new Courthouse (Palais de Justice)
- Figure 15. View north onto City Hall and environs, 1969
- Figure 16. View southeast onto Bonsecours Market and Silo °2, 1933
- Figure 17. Bonsecours Market
- Figure 18. Notre-Dame-de-Bonsecours Chapel, 2001
- Figure 19. L'éperon, the main building of Pointe-à-Callière Museum
- Figure 20. Chaussegros-de-Léry Complex at Rues Notre-Dame and Bonsecours



CREATED BY ADAM KALEB POOLE

SOURCE: GOOGLE MAPS; OLD MONTREAL, HISTORY THROUGH HERITAGE

Key

A CHATEAU RAMEZAY
B CITY HALL
C PAPINEAU HOUSE
D BONSECOURS MARKET

E HÔPITAL GÉNÉRAL (MAISON MÈRE D'YOUVILLE)
F BANQUE CANADIENNE-NATIONALE
G PALAIS DE JUSTICE (COURTHOUSE)
H WORLD TRADE CENTER

I SITE OF SILO 01
J SITE OF SILO 02
K L'ÉPERON \ POINTE-À-CALLIÈRE MUSEUM
L CHASSEGROS-DE-LÉRY COMPLEX

--- 1964 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOUNDARY
 - - - 1995 HISTORIC DISTRICT BOUNDARY



Ville de Montréal. Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 2. View onto Montreal, with Old Montreal and the Old Port in the foreground, 1955

Archives de la Ville de Montréal D4000-2-002



Figure 3. View onto Montreal, with Old Montreal and the Old Port in the foreground, 1966

Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM-069



Figure 4. Chateau Ramezay, c. 1900-1925

Albertype Company Fonds, Library and Archives Canada, accession no. 1968-114, item 0395, PA-031932



Ville de Montréal. Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 5. Champs de Mars, c. 1920s
Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM94-Z1884



Figure 6. Gosford Tunnel underneath Chateay Ramezay, 1953
Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM94-Z-500-34



Ville de Montréal. Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 7. Third Centenary Celebrations, Place d'Armes, 1942
Archives de la Ville de Montréal G-1553



Ville de Montréal. Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 8. View south onto Place Jacques-Cartier, 1956

Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM94-Z-1466



Figure 9. Jacques Gréber, *Development of the City Hall Section*, 1953
 Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM94-D449-7



Figure 10. Papineau House, c.1963

Official Old Montreal Website / Archives de la Société d'habitation et de développement urban de Montréal. http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=d&num=4



Figure 11. View north on Rue Bonsecours. The restored Papineau House is visible at center as well as the Chaussegros-de-Léry Complex
Image by Adam Kaleb Poole



Ville de Montréal. Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 12. Laying Cobblestones on Rue Saint-Paul Est, 1966

Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM6-R3059-2-33OE-05



Ville de Montréal, Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 13. View East on Rue Saint-Paul from Place Jacques-Cartier, 1966
Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM6-R3059-2-33OE-04



Figure 14. Construction site of the new Courthouse (Palais de Justice)
Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM94-A322-2



Figure 15. View north onto City Hall and environs, 1969
Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM6-S10-R3067-2-1-06



Ville de Montréal. Gestion de documents et archives

Figure 16. View southeast onto Bonsecours Market and Silo °2, 1933
Archives de la Ville de Montréal VM94-Z-1504



Figure 17. Bonsecours Market
Image by Adam Kaleb Poole



Figure 18. Notre-Dame-de-Bonsecours Chapel, 2001
Ville de Montréal, http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/inventaire/fiches/fiche_bat.php?sec=e&num=2



Figure 19. L'éperon, the main building of Pointe-à-Callière Museum, designed by Dan Hanganu, 1992

Jean Gagnon (CC) Some rights reserved. http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Pointe-a-Calliere_4.jpg



Figure 20. Chaussegros-de-Léry Complex at Rues Notre-Dame and Bonsecours, designed by Dan Hanganu with Provencher Roy Architects, 1991-1995
Image by Adam Kaleb Poole

Bibliography

- Arrhenius, Thordis. "The Cult of Age in Mass Society: Alois Reigl's Theory of Conservation." *Future Anterior* 1:1 (Spring 2004): 79.
- Blake, Peter. "Downtown in 3-D." *Architectural Forum* 125:2 (Sept. 1966): 31-49.
- Brett, David. *The Construction of Heritage*. Cork, Ireland: Cork University Press, 1996.
- Beaupré, Pierre. "Chaussegros-de-Léry." *ARQ* 42 (Apr, 1988): 26-35.
- Bumbaru, Dinu. (1997). "Le Vieux-Montréal: laboratoire de patrimoine Montréalais?" *Continuité*, 72, 53-57.
- Burgess, Joanne and Paul-André Linteau, eds. *Le Vieux-Montréal, Un "quartier de l'histoire"?* Quebec City: Éditions MultiMondes, 2010.
- Charney, Melvin. "The Montrealness of Montreal." *Architectural Review* (1980): 299-302.
- Choko, Marc H., ed. *The New Montreal: Major Urban Projects in Old Montreal*. Montreal: Centre de design de l'Université de Montréal, 2001.
- Cloutier, André, Madeleine Gobeil-Trudeau, and Luc Noppen. *La restauration à la Place Royale de Québec: une étude sur les concepts et sur la nature des interventions*. Quebec City: Université Laval, 1978.
- Cook, Ramsey. *Watching Quebec: Collected Essays*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP: 2005.
- Corboz, André. "Du bon usages des sites historiques." In *De la ville au patrimoine urbain: histoires de forme et de sens*. Edited by Lucie K. Morisset. Quebec City: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2009.
- Le Corbusier. *The Athens Charter*. Translated by Anthony Eardley. New York: Grossman, 1973.
- Cormier, Anne. "Le Centre de Commerce Mondial de Montréal." *ARQ* 54 (Apr. 1990): 47.
- Demchinsky, Bryan, ed. *Grassroots, Greystones, and Glass Towers: Montreal Urban Issues and Architecture*. Montréal: Véhicule Press, 1989.
- Drouin, Martin. *Le combat du patrimoine à Montréal, 1973-2003*. Sainte-Foy: Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2005.
- . "Le renaissance du Vieux-Montréal, 1960-1979." *Patrimoines: fabrique, usages et réemplois*. Lemaître, Capucine and Benjamin Sabatier, eds. Quebec City: Éditions MultiMondes, 2008.
- Fitch, James Marston. *Historic Preservation: The Curatorial Management of the Built World*. Charlottesville: UVA, 1982.

- Gabeline, Donna, Dane Laken, and Gordon Pape. *Montreal at the Crossroads*. Montreal: Harvest House, 1975.
- Gelly, Alain, Louise Brunelle-Lavoie, and Corneliu Kirjan. *La Passion du Patrimoine : La Cultural Property Commission du Quebec, 1922-1994*. Sillery, Quebec: Septentrion, 1995.
- Germain, Annick and Damaris Rose. *Montréal: The Quest for a Metropolis*. New York: Wiley, 2000.
- Giraldeau, Jacques. *Au hasard du temps*. National Film Board of Canada, 1964.
- Gouin, Paul. "Nos monuments historiques." *Vie des Arts* 1 (1956): 9-13.
- Gournay, Isabelle and France Vanlaethem, eds. *Montreal Metropolis, 1880-1930*. New York: Stoddart, 1998.
- Helman, Claire. *The Milton-Park Affair: Canada's Largest Citizen-Developer Confrontation*. Dossier Quebec Series. Montréal: Véhicule Press, 1987.
- International Council of Monuments and Sites, *International Charter for the Conservation and Restoration of Monuments and Sites, The Second International Congress of the Architects and Technicians of Historic Monuments, Venice, 1964*
- Jarzombek, Mark. "The metaphysics of Permanence: Curating Critical Impossibilities." in *LOG* 21 (Winter 2011): 125-135.
- Joly, Diane "Montréal 1917: L'émergence d'une identité patrimoniale." *Patrimoine et patrimonialisation du Québec et d'ailleurs*. Edited by Martin Drouin. Quebec City: MultiMonde, 2006.
- Lalonde & Valois. *Autostrade Est-Ouest à Proximité du Fleuve Saint-Laurent, Cité De Montréal, Québec*. Montréal: Lalonde & Valois, 1960.
- Lauzon, Gilles. "Visages historique du Vieux-Montréal." *Continuité* 72 (1997): 16-23.
- Lauzon, Gilles, and Madeleine Forget, eds. *Old Montreal: History Through Heritage*. Translated by Alan Stewart and Joanne Burgess. Sainte-Foy: Publications du Québec, 2004.
- Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. Translated by Donald Nicholson-Smith. Oxford: Backwell, 1991.
- Linteau, Paul-André. *Montréal Depuis la Confédération*. Montreal: Boréal, 2000.
- London, Mark. "On the Waterfront: The Fight for Montreal's Vieux-Port." *Canadian Heritage* 38 (Dec., 1982): 20-30.
- Lortie, André et al. *The 60s: Montreal Thinks Big*. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 2004.
- Lynch, Kevin. *The Image of the City*. Publication of the Joint Center for Urban Studies. Cambridge, Mass.: M.I.T. Press, 1960.

- *What Time is this Place?*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1972.
- MacLennan, Hugh. *Two Solitudes*. New York: Duell, Sloan & Pearce, 1945.
- Marsan, Jean-Claude. *Sauver Montréal: Chroniques d'architecture et d'urbanisme*. Montreal: Boréal, 1990.
- *Montreal in Evolution: Historical Analysis of the Development of Montreal's Architecture and Urban Environment*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 1981.
- "Vieux-Montréal" in *Les Chemins de la Mémoire : Monuments et Sites Historiques du Québec*, edited by Paul Louis Martin, Jean Lavoie. Quebec City: Publications du Québec, 1990.
- McLean, Eric. *Le passé vivant de Montréal = The Living Past of Montreal: Dessins de R.D. Wilson, texte de Eric McLean*. Montreal: McGill UP, 1964.
- Mondello, Roméo. "Le Service d'Urbanisme à Montréal et le Préservation du Passé." Montreal City Planning Department, February 1960.
- Montréal City Planning Dept. *Plan Directeur Du Vieux Montréal*. Montréal: Service d'Urbanisme, 1965.
- *Une Autostrade Est-Ouest*. Montréal: Ville de Montréal, Service d'urbanisme, 1948.
- *Plan d'Action Pour Le Vieux-Montréal*. Montréal: Ville de Montréal, Service de l'urbanisme, 1998.
- Morin, Victor. *Le Vieux Montréal; Fondation-Développement-Visite*. Montreal: Les Éditions des Dix, 1942.
- and Charles Simpson. *Old Montreal with Pen and Pencil*. Canada: Canadian Pacific Railway, 1929.
- Mumford, Lewis. *The Culture of Cities*. New York: Harcourt, 1938.
- Noppen, Luc. "Place-Royale: Chantier de construction d'une identité nationale." In *Villes reconstruites: du dessin au destin, acts du Deuxième colloque international des villes reconstruites*, edited by Patrick Dieudonné, 301-306. Paris: Harmattan, 1994.
- Nora, Pierre. "Lieux de mémoire." *Representations* 26, (1989): 7-24.
- Paskel, Tom. "Montreal's Waterfront District: Focus of a Planning Brainstorm." *Habitat* 21:4 (1978): 34-39.
- Pilote, Hélène. "Vieux-Montréal: dernier-né des quartiers chics." *Châtaine* (1967).
- Poirier, Roch. "Table de concertation du Vieux-Montréal: de concert et en harmonie." *Continuité* 72 (1997): 66-69.

- Riegl, Alois. "The Modern Cult of Monuments: Its Character and its Origin."
Translated by Kurt Forster and Diane Ghirardo. *Oppositions* 25 (1982):
20-51.
- Société Immobilière du Patrimoine Architectural de Montréal. *Le Projet Vieux-
Montréal*. (1988-1993).
- *Rapport Annuel*. (1982-1994).
- Taylor, C. J. *Negotiating the Past: The Making of Canada's National Historic
Parks and Sites*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1990.
- Tunbridge, J. E and G. J. Ashworth. *Dissonant Heritage: The Management of the
Past as a Resource in Conflict*. Chichester: John Wiley, 1996.
- Van Ginkel, H. P. Daniel and Blanche Van Ginkel. *Preliminary Port Study for the
Montreal Port Council*. Montreal: 1960.
- and Claude Robillard. *Rehabilitation of the Old City of Montreal: Draft
Report to the Montreal City Planning Department*. Montreal: Van Ginkel &
Associates, 1963.
- "Le Cours Le Royers." *Habitat* 20, (1977): 20-24.
- Carreau, Serge, Perla Serfaty-Garzon, eds. *Le Patrimoine de Montréal :
Document de Référence*. Quebec City: Gouvernement du Quebec, 1998.
- "Le Vieux-Port De Montreal." *Canadian Architect* 39, no. 8 (Aug., 1994): 24-26.
- "'What Would We Do Without Her?' Phyllis Lambert: Architecture-aholic,"
Canadian Heritage (June 1980): 38-43.

Websites

- Historiques de la Loi sur les biens culturels. [http://www.mcccf.gouv.qc.ca/
index.php?id=2398](http://www.mcccf.gouv.qc.ca/index.php?id=2398).
- Official Website of Old Montreal. <http://www.vieux.montreal.qc.ca/>
- Déclaration de Deschambault*. [http://www.icomos.org/fr/charters-and-texts/179-
articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/191-la-declaration-
de-deschambault](http://www.icomos.org/fr/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/191-la-declaration-de-deschambault)
- 360 Degree Tour of Notre-Dame-de-Bonsecours Chapel. [http://www.marguerite-
bourgeoys.com/360/08ndbs.html](http://www.marguerite-bourgeoys.com/360/08ndbs.html)

Archives

City of Montreal Archives

VM34 Fonds de la Commission Jacques-Viger

VM97 Fonds de la Service d'Urbanisme

