

Recovering a Lost Heritage: The Case of the Canadian Forestry Service Records

by **GABRIELLE BLAIS**

For the period of time during which they have immediate administrative value, records may undergo several transformations. In addition to documenting a particular activity, they testify to the many legal, constitutional, political, and administrative mutations which can occur within an office. The impact of these changes greatly affects the amount and quality of the information researchers eventually uncover in them. Thus, it is the mission of archivists to study the origin and evolution of the records under their care so that they may first properly apply the principles of *provenance* and *respect des fonds* to those records, and secondly explain how the context in which historical documents were created and used affects the interests of users. This aspect of archival work requires extensive research, for the changes within a particular administrative body are not always immediately obvious.

The most dramatic changes in the characteristics of records and most complex applications of *provenance* and *respect des fonds* often arise when a particular administrative entity ceases to exist or transfers its responsibilities elsewhere. A good example of such a case can be given using any one of the agencies affected by the transfer of authority over natural resources in 1930. This agreement between the federal government and the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta gave the provinces control of the natural resources within their boundaries, a right which the other provinces had had since Confederation but which the former had been deprived of upon their creation. One of the major effects of the agreement was that within a short period of time, a number of very active policy making and operational areas at the federal level were shorn of their mandates as these now fell under provincial jurisdiction. And while in some cases these units were reorganized and allowed to continue operating, many were dissolved previous to, or in concurrence with, the abolition of the Department of the Interior in 1936.

At the archival level, there are a number of factors which must be considered: for instance, there were early transfers of files from the federal resource portfolios to the provinces, some destruction of them at all levels of government, further transfers to the provinces, more destruction, and a series of transfers of historical records to the National Archives of Canada and the three western provincial archives. This activity related almost exclusively to the records of the Department of the Interior, the agency which had been charged with the development of the West since 1873. One can thus imagine that the original contours of the Interior records system has all but disappeared.

For those generations of archivists who have been responsible for acquiring, describing, and making available the various record series affected by the transfer of natural resources, the work has been particularly challenging. At first, they were faced with a dilemma: should they attempt to reconstruct physically the actual record series which were divided and dispersed, thus providing researchers with a semblance of archival integrity, or should they concentrate on researching and preparing finding aids which would explain the dispersal process, identify the repositories which eventually benefitted from it and, of course, describe the fragments of records retained in them? For all intents and purposes, the question was answered by the assertion, in all institutions concerned, of a well-known principle of archival ownership: what we have, we keep! Furthermore, actual "repatriation" of records to satisfy the first objective could have been difficult when, following the transfer, some records remained operational and consequently now contain information from provincial as well as federal sources.

Given these facts, it was decided that the best method of describing the Interior archival legacy was through thematic guides and records surveys. In 1974, Peter Gillis and Bryan Corbett, then of the Federal Archives Division at the Public Archives of Canada (now the Government Archives Division of the National Archives of Canada), conducted the first, and last, national survey of the records of the Department of the Interior.¹ Then, in 1980, a manuscript "Guide to the Federal Records Relating to Immigration, Land Settlement and Resource Development in Western Canada, 1870-1936" was completed by Peter Gillis. Unfortunately, these two initiatives suffered as changes in personnel, budget restrictions, and other priorities interfered with the plans of the Federal Archives Division. In recent years, however, there has been renewed interest in completing the project. At this stage, archivists are concentrating on the history of the actual records transfer: the legal authorities providing for such a transfer, the ensuing debates over the interpretation of the relevant clauses, the physical transfer, and the resulting state of the records.²

As part of this last initiative, this article will concentrate on the transfer of authority over natural resources as it affected the Canadian Forestry Service (CFS). As an agency with considerable regional staff, the CFS, or the Forestry Branch as it was known until 1930, was bound to suffer from the 1930 agreement — indeed some would say it was dismembered by it. Most of its original activities were transferred to the provinces, thus forcing the Branch to redefine its mandate. Its survival at the federal level can be attributed to the determination of the leading forestry officials. From an archival point of view, the issue was dealt with brutally: there is a marked rupture between pre-and post-1930 records even though the records classification system of the agency remained the same. In this, as with all the other records-related issues, the experience of the Forestry Branch was considerably different from that of its sister agency, the timber administration in the Timber and Grazing Lands Branch. A brief description of the records disposal process of the latter, in the last section of the paper, will help to explain the present condition of the forestry records in the Government Archives Division of the NA.

Although negotiations for a planned transfer of authority over the natural resources of Western Canada had been going on for a number of years, the actual agreement between the Dominion and the provinces came as a surprise to officials of the Forestry Branch.³ It appears that while officials knew that such a transfer would eventually occur, they had convinced themselves that important components of their mandate, such as administration of the forest reserves, would remain under federal control.⁴ This attitude is very obvious when one surveys the records of the branch. There are few comments on an

impending transfer of control in any of the policy or operational files relating to Western Canada. Officials fulfilled their duties without making any preparations for the forthcoming event; then in 1930, the files at headquarters end abruptly.

With the transfer of resources, the work of the Forestry Branch was drastically altered. Within the federal government, the branch had previously played the role of conservation advocate and policy advisor in the field of forest resources while the timber administration of the Timber and Grazing Lands Branch had ensured the leasing of Crown lands for exploitation. After 1930, three of the new Forestry Service's basic functions — the administration and protection of forest reserves, fire protection, and forest reconnaissance — were abolished, while the fourth — the operation of nursery stations — was transferred to the Department of Agriculture.⁵ The only major exception was Riding Mountain Forest Reserve in Manitoba which was transformed into a national park and consequently remained under the jurisdiction of the Dominion, if not of the CFS. These events forced the service to redefine its mandate. It eventually claimed responsibility for investigation, research and experimentation in the fields of silviculture, forest protection, and forest products; tree planting and farm woodlot studies; the national inventory of forest resources; and the provision of advice to the Dominion government on forest matters of national importance.⁶

In Ottawa, at the administrative level, the natural resources agreement and the ensuing change in mandate led to a radical reorganization of the Forestry Service, which was later accentuated by the fiscal restraint programmes characteristic of the Depression. But it was in the regions that the effects of the transfer were most seriously felt. As a result of the agreement, the western provinces took over the entire regional staff of the CFS, except for a few employees retained by the latter. This included the inspectors, forestry engineers, supervisors of fire ranging, forest rangers, as well as the accounting and clerical staff.

Of all its original functions, however, it was the loss of authority over the forest reserves which caused the most harm to the service. The forest reserves of the period were huge, and consequently required a large staff to administer them. They were also the cornerstone upon which the CFS was built and the best justification for the existence of a strong forestry agency within the federal government. In Alberta, for instance, there were approximately 19,000 square miles of forest reserves; in Saskatchewan the number stood at approximately 8,300 square miles; and in Manitoba at approximately 3,900 square miles.⁷

The service maintained offices throughout the three provinces to administer these reserves, as well as to oversee the fire protection operations. These District Inspection offices were located at Calgary, Prince Albert, and Winnipeg. Other regional offices in Edmonton, Battleford, The Pas, and at various locations in Northern Saskatchewan, and Northern and Southern Manitoba were responsible for protection work on Crown forest lands outside the forest reserves. Finally, there were two tree nurseries at Indian Head and Sutherland, Saskatchewan which assisted settlers in planting shelter belts of trees around their homesteads.⁸

Following the 1930 agreement, most of these offices were dissolved. The financial books and files which had been created there were transferred to the new provincial forestry authorities. These records contained detailed information on the daily operations of the regional offices — which now formed the nuclei of the provincial forestry services — and were judged to be essential to the maintenance of proper forestry practices.

These records were rapidly integrated into the provincial records classification systems, thus hiding from history the existence of a separate, vibrant regional component of the Forestry Branch. In addition to handing over the field office files, the Dominion agreed to provide "at the request of the Province the originals or complete copies of all records in any department of the Government of Canada relating exclusively to dealings with Crown lands, mines and minerals...."⁹ This clause does not appear to have been of immediate concern to officials of either level of government, for the great majority of forestry records relating to the west remained in Ottawa. There, they retained some legal and fiscal value as they documented past policy decisions and financial agreements which could always be subject to future legal action.

Most of these latter files were stored away and forgotten. Many of these dormant records were destroyed as part of the austerity programmes of the Depression and in the paper drives conducted during the Second World War. What survived was transferred to the National Archives, at various intervals, during the fifties and sixties. As for the regional records rejected by the provincial governments, they were left in the hands of the few remaining CFS regional agents, who then implemented the new CFS mandate, until they too were long forgotten or destroyed as part of general office clean-outs. In Manitoba, for instance, George Tunstell, the Officer-in-Charge for the CFS, requested and obtained permission, in 1938, to destroy files relating to timber permits, personnel, fire patrols, supervision, policy, reconnaissance, and other matters. These had been declared of "no further interest" by the Manitoba Forest Service, Riding Mountain National Park, and Ottawa.¹⁰

How can such disinterest in the written record be explained, particularly in the profession of forestry administration which is known for its pride in and concern for history? First, after 1930, the forestry records relating to Western Canada lost most of their administrative, fiscal, legal, and operational value. For the Forestry Service, these records documented a now-distant past. Since the service was no longer engaged in many of the activities documented, the records were of no immediate or long-term use. As for the provinces, both the records retained at the federal level and those over which they now had control were of little interest because forestry administration as practiced at the provincial level differed considerably from the previous federal regime. For instance, in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and later in Alberta, the forestry and timber administrations were consolidated. Then, some forest reserves were abolished to make the land available for settlement, other areas under temporary reservation were discontinued, and the forestry programmes became generally more practical and less ambitious.

The second factor was that the thirties were a period of acute economic depression. As the crisis worsened, radical changes were made to the federal and provincial forestry services. To save money, the prairie governments as early as 1933 reduced the forestry functions and staff. In Alberta, to reduce personnel, the Rocky Mountains Forest Reserve was regrouped into three units from the previous five; in the process, the number of employees was cut from 109 to 94.¹¹ In Northern Alberta, fire ranging activities were reduced through additional cuts in personnel. Changes as severe as these were not made in Saskatchewan and Manitoba where the forestry operations were less costly.¹² Nonetheless, little progress was made in either province.

With the system deteriorating to such an extent, it is hardly surprising that not much attention was given to the records involved. As staff was reduced or moved to other

offices, the records became an impediment. While emptying buildings, officials sought easy ways to dispose of excess material: the local dump was a most probable destination for the dormant records. During those years, the forestry records which received the best care were probably those which were forgotten at the Forestry Service offices in Ottawa. Although some of these were destroyed as a result of similar economic pressure, the bulk of policy files remained intact. They now make up a small, but valuable core of Record Group 39, the Records of the Canadian Forestry Service, at the NA.

One last factor which determined the fate of federal forestry records was the fact that forestry, as it had been practised by the Forestry Branch, was not a money making venture. In the reports prepared by the Dominion for the proposed transfer of natural resources to Alberta in 1925, the Director of the Forestry Branch readily admitted that the "administration of various existing reserves is not a paying business." E.H. Finlayson attributed the state of the service's finances to the deterioration of the western forests caused by the many fires which annually ravaged the reserves. Following such incidents, the branch had to make large expenditures to bring the areas back to a "reasonable state of productivity."¹³ At the time, it was Finlayson's argument that if he were given more authority in the area of fire prevention, instead of having it divided between federal and provincial jurisdictions, the reserves would soon be generating income.

A more realistic explanation for the lack of profitability, however, was the fact that the Forestry Branch did not have control of the timber operations in the provinces. As early as 1880-81, a Timber and Mines Branch existed within the Department of the Interior. Its existence was formalized in 1882 when the Timber, Mineral and Grazing Lands Office within the Dominion Lands Branch was created and given the task of supervising the use of natural resources on Crown land by private individuals, through mechanisms such as grazing leases, and timber and mining permits.¹⁴ In the case of timber, these leases were to provide wood to settlers and for local requirements (permits) and lumber companies (licences). Applications for cutting rights were made to the Crown Timber Agent, who sometimes also assumed the role of Dominion Lands Agent. This individual screened the applicants, awarded the leases, collected the rent and royalties, and supervised the inspectors who visited the areas under lease to ensure that all the conditions of the contract were met. On occasion, the timber administration was criticized for waste and inefficiency, particularly by the advocates of a united forestry and timber administration. It was widely believed that because the timber administration was mainly preoccupied with generating revenue, it had little concern for resource conservation and the practice of proper forestry techniques on the land which it leased. Consequently, this federal body, which should have been coordinating its work with the Forestry Branch, was instead, on numerous occasions, contravening its most basic policies.

The financial importance of this agency, as compared with Forestry, explains the different treatment given to the two sets of records. The transfer of forestry records was relatively uneventful; this would not be the case for the timber records. In the same documentation which had analyzed the financial value of forestry operations in 1925, it was revealed that the 137 timber berths (1,748 square miles) leased on 31 March 1924 had produced a revenue, for the federal government, of \$178,862.¹⁵ Consequently, those timber files dealing with the berths had an intrinsic monetary value, as in the case of the Dominion Lands and Survey records. During the resources transfer, there were no confrontations in the regions concerning those records since the provincial forestry services

took custody of the files maintained by the local Crown timber agents. At headquarters, however, the solution was not so simple.

At the time of transfer, the Dominion had agreed to supply each province with inventories of townships showing lands transferred to private ownership. These were to replace the township registers which Interior had used to control its records. Like the registers, the inventories would contain a separate entry for each township, parish, or settlement. These, in turn, would contain a description of each parcel of land turned over to private ownership, the nature of the grant (which would include timber permits and licences), the name of the entrant or patentee, the date of entry, the area, and the condition of title.¹⁶ Unfortunately, this work was discontinued in the spring of 1931 on the grounds of cost.¹⁷ The provinces reacted to this decision by quickly dispatching a delegation to Ottawa to negotiate an alternative solution to the records problem. Alberta was represented by John Harvie, its Director of Lands, Saskatchewan by Major John Barnett, and Manitoba by the Hon. D.G. MacKenzie, the Minister of Mines and Natural Resources, by C.H. Attwood, and C.C. McColl.

On arrival, the provincial delegation demanded that the Department of the Interior hand over the township registers previously used and other relevant records considered essential to the administration of their new functions. Among those records requested were the timber berth account registers, files relating to timber matters, and the index to timber berths. At first, the Dominion was not to be won over. Faced with two royal commissions at which it would have to defend its previous resource-related activities (the royal commission dealing with Manitoba had already taken place), it was reluctant to divest itself of records which would help determine the financial adjustments made to the prairie provinces to place them in a "position of equality with the other provinces."¹⁸ Instead, it sought a compromise. At a conference held on 15-18 May 1931, H.H. Rowatt, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, requested that he be supplied with a list of the additional records required. John Harvie immediately retorted that he wanted "the complete records in the Department of the Interior at the present time, that is so far as the lands are concerned."¹⁹ The reasoning behind this request was that the agency records which had been turned over were incomplete and that only a full transfer of records would solve the provinces' operational problems.²⁰

As the conference entered its third day, Thomas G. Murphy, the Minister of the Interior, made an appearance in the hope of breaking the deadlock. Reading from a prepared statement, he made a proposal which was accepted by the provincial representatives with few amendments. It was agreed that records from headquarters relating to lands held under entry, sale, lease or other commitment (i.e. timber records, grazing leases, land records, petroleum and natural gas files) would be delivered to the provinces. Concurrently, the Dominion was released from further responsibility in connection with the records received, and guaranteed full access to the records if needed.²¹ A subsequent clause also committed to transfer "such plans and correspondence relating to Water Power, Forestry, Surveys ... as are necessary to enable the Provincial Government to function under the Resources Agreement."²² This last offer was obviously not fully taken advantage of, as the early forestry records relating to the western provinces are now among the holdings of the Canadian Forestry Service in the NA.

A transfer of records agreement was signed in August 1931. The actual transfer process started soon thereafter. The files were listed, boxed, and turned over to the provinces. For

each bundle of files transferred, a proper receipt containing a list of the files with the corresponding timber berth numbers was signed by provincial officials and returned to Ottawa. The task was onerous. In Alberta, for instance, there were 477 berths to be dealt with, 145 of which consisted of licenced timber berths, 52 of portable sawmill berths, 157 of fire-killed timber berths, and 6 of old permit berths.²³ Putting these records in order was complicated by the fact that the federal timber administration had always used a chronological system of indexing its files instead of a geographical one, thus combining the records from the three provinces into one series, and that parts of some files had been transferred earlier.

It also appears that in 1930, Dominion officials had decided at first not to send the complete timber files for active leases, but only documents of immediate importance. Thus the files were stripped of all legal documents, including the annual licences, which were sent to the provinces. This exercise required time-consuming searches through a number of licences and return files — a task which became more difficult as the depletion of Interior personnel increased. Following the 1931 agreement, the stripped files were forwarded to the provinces where it was hoped they would be “reunited” with the legal documents. The situation became more complicated as the provinces started requesting dormant files which had not been stripped for renewed operational purposes.

Once the records arrived on the prairies, provincial officials were saddled with the problem of developing mechanisms to control the sudden influx of metres of material. The files they received had been removed from their original administrative framework, had been tampered with, and were without adequate finding aids to service them. Undoubtedly this sad state of affairs explains the archival legacy of the transfer. The provincial governments did not have the resources to organize these records when at the same time they were setting up new systems for their newly acquired responsibilities. They made the best use possible of the pre-1930 records at their disposal, and then moved on to the new regime. Within a few years, the records problem had become an archival one.

The timber records which were not requested by the western provinces were left behind in Ottawa. When in 1943 the issue of the disposal of the dormant Interior records was again brought to the surface, Gustave Lanctot, the Dominion Archivist, was consulted. In a report prepared for Lanctot, George W. Payton of the Land Registry of the Department of Mines and Resources noted that the timber records, from a research perspective, documented the “general trend of timber operations during Federal Government Administration,” the “growth of the lumber industry,” the “increase in demand for forest products,” the “establishment of large timber reservations,” the “different ways in which timber privileges were granted,” and so on.²⁴ Resolution of the issue dragged until 1951 when the Public Archives agreed to acquire a sample of the records. These included policy files, correspondence with local agents, application files, personnel matters, lumber mill files, legal questions, refunds, and other related matters. In all, for the four combined timber, mining, grazing, and irrigation functions, two to three thousand files out of a possible three million were kept to document over sixty years of active federal intervention in the development of Western Canada. At the same time as the transfer, the department was given authority to destroy those files which were not selected and the file classification index, which had been loaned to the Archives, was returned.²⁵

If these events caused serious problems to government officials at the time, they were minimal when compared with the problems currently facing researchers. In both the

timber and forestry fields, dispersal of the records, destruction of some and reintegration of the rest into the records classification systems of other governments has rendered research difficult. In certain cases, aspects of forestry history in Canada remain unwritten for lack of evidence; in other instances, description and analysis have been made possible by the "reconstruction" of files from various other sources. The records of royal commissions and inquiries, politicians, and renowned foresters have been particularly helpful. However, this work usually requires extensive travel to, or correspondence with, various archival institutions. Particularly in the case of government records, the indexes to a records series may be in one place and the records in another.

In the area of forest history alone, the present state of the forestry records has not only impeded research — it has also dictated its very nature. Because it is presently difficult to recreate this activity at both the federal and regional levels, researchers have tended to study one activity or the other. This has resulted in the development of very different historical interpretations. Students of federal forestry policy usually overlook the day-to-day activities in the field, the influence of local officers on regional development, and the problems associated with administering such a decentralized function. Concurrently, researchers working on regional issues, who often base their studies on family papers and local oral evidence, do not give significant attention to the overall forestry policy enunciated by headquarters. In this respect, forest history, like other aspects of our forestry legacy, deserves the qualifier of "Lost Heritage" which was given to it in a recent monograph.²⁶

In most survey studies of Western Canadian history, the transfer of natural resources from the federal government to the provinces has been treated as a minor event — some would even describe it as an administrative technicality. But for the Canadian Forestry Service, the agreement initiated a radical transformation in its operations. Its interventionist role in forestry, mainly in the areas of forest fire protection and forest reserves, was abolished and one which consisted of promoting forestry research and providing advice to the federal government was substituted. Such radical changes had great repercussions on records administration during the period, and consequently on the historical records of the CFS. Due to the dispersal, destruction, and neglect of these records, the archival legacy of the Canadian Forestry Service is small and fragmented. One hopes that as we now know how the disintegration of this valuable set of records occurred, efforts will be made to reconstruct a more complete Canadian Forestry Service records series through finding aids. In addition to assisting forestry research, these aids would enable archivists who regularly come across pre-1930 forestry material, either in private or public records, to correctly identify the *provenance* of the material and process it accordingly.

Notes

- 1 National Archives of Canada (NA), Federal Archives Division, File 8130-Int, General — Federal Government Records, Interior, National Survey of the records of the Department of the Interior, Prairie Region, memorandum by R.P. Gillis and B.E. Corbett, 2 May 1974.
- 2 Readers should also be aware of Irene Spry and Bennett McCardle, "The Records of the Department of the Interior and Research Concerning Canada's Western Frontier of Settlement." Manuscript, March 1987.

- 3 Serious negotiations between the Dominion and the prairie provinces dated back to 1922. Then, in anticipation of an agreement with Alberta in 1924-25, the Department of the Interior produced voluminous briefs discussing the implications of such a transfer on the various resource functions. These provide valuable information about the many branches of Interior up to 1924. Copies of these reports are available at the NA, Records of the Department of the Interior, RG 15, vol. 11.
- 4 For more on the effects of the transfer of natural resources on the Canadian Forestry Service, see Robert Peter Gillis and Thomas R. Roach, *Lost Initiatives: A History of Canadian Forest Industries and Forestry Policy*. (Westport, Conn. 1986), particularly Chapter 9.
- 5 P.C. 1362, 22 June 1931: NA, Records of the Canadian Forestry Service, RG 39, vol. 109, file 39478, pt. 2, H.H. Rowatt to E.H. Finlayson, 30 May 1931.
- 6 Robert H. Hayward, *Records of the Canadian Forestry Service*. Public Archives of Canada. General Inventory Series of the Federal Archives Division (Ottawa, 1982), p. 6.
- 7 NA, RG 15, vol. 45, Statement relative to the Dominion Forest Reserves and Fire Ranging Districts in Alberta prior to the transfer of the Natural Resources, 9 June 1933, p. 1. *Ibid.*, for Saskatchewan, p. 1. RG 39, vol. 96, file 48449, Forest Reserves in Manitoba, n.d.
- 8 NA, RG 15, vol. 29, Alberta Resources Commission 1934, V, Dominion Exhibits (vol. III), Forestry in Alberta. A Comparative Statement by E.H. Finlayson, Director of Forestry, 19 November 1934. *Ibid.*, vol. 45, file 5601852, pt. 1, Statement Relative to the Dominion Forest Reserves and Fire Ranging Districts in Saskatchewan prior to the transfer of the natural resources, 9 June 1933.
- 9 20-21 Geo. V, c.3, Section 23; c.29, Section 23; c.41, Section 25.
- 10 NA, RG 39, vol. 263, file 39430, correspondence between G. Tunstell and D.R. Cameron and R.A. Gibson, 15 and 26 September, and 18, 19, 24, 26 October 1938.
- 11 NA, RG 15, vol. 29, Forestry in Alberta, pp. 9-11.
- 12 NA, RG 15, vol. 16, file B7-A, Saskatchewan Resource Commission, 1934. Additional Information, vol. 7, Statement of E.H. Finlayson, Director of Forestry re Administration of Forest Resources, 1905-1930, 13 April 1934.
- 13 NA, RG 15, vol. 11, Transfer of Natural Resources. Province of Alberta, vol. I, 1925, p. 15.
- 14 Terry Cook, "Paper Trails: A Study in Northern Records and Northern Administration, 1898-1958," manuscript article, 1986. Robert Hayward, *Records of the Canadian Forestry Service*, p. 1. Chester Martin, "*Dominion Lands*" Policy, ed. by Lewis H. Thomas (Toronto, Carleton Library Series No. 69, 1973), pp. 181-89. Peter Gillis, "For the Purposes of the Dominion: A Guide to the Federal Records Relating to Immigration, Land Settlement and Resource Development in Western Canada, 1870-1936." (Public Archives of Canada, Federal Archives Division, 1980, manuscript guide), pp. 38-41.
- 15 NA, RG 15, vol. 11, Transfer of Natural Resources. Province of Alberta, vol. I, 1925. Timber and Grazing Lands Branch, p. 4.
- 16 NA, RG 15, vol. 64, file 5601898, Transfer of Natural Resources. Question of custody of records. (Dominion Lands Administration) memorandum, 5 June 1931.
- 17 During the negotiations which ensued, federal officials claimed that the completion of this "inventory of resources" would have taken seven years. *Ibid.*, Minutes of meeting of 15 May 1931.
- 18 P.C. 1258, 1 August 1928; P.C. 1402, 14 June 1930; P.C. 2722, 29 December 1933.
- 19 NA, RG 15, vol. 64, file 5601898, Minutes of meeting of 15 May 1931.
- 20 There appears to be strong evidence to support this claim. For instance in a letter to the minister in July 1931, Harvie remarked that during the federal regime, all sales of land were made "from the compilation of a list prepared at Head Office," and not in the region. "Furthermore, all leases, licenses and other matters pertaining to School lands were granted from Ottawa." Saskatchewan Archives Board, Saskatoon, Department of the Interior, Transfer of Natural Resources, 1930-40, file 5584588, John Harvie to T.G. Murphy, 27 July 1931.
- 21 NA, RG 15, vol. 64, file 5601898, Minutes of meeting of 18 May 1931.
- 22 NA, Records of the Department of Justice, RG 13, vol. 356, file 936, Natural Resources Records asked for by the Prairie Provinces, 1931, Draft agreement, n.d.
- 23 NA, RG 15, vol. 1289, file 635333TC, George W. Payton to H.E. Hume, Chairman, Dominion Lands Board, 14 December 1931.
- 24 NA, RG 15, vol. 2006, file 5672360, George W. Payton to Lorne Turner, 26 July 1943.
- 25 NA, Records of the Public Archives of Canada, RG 37, vol. 323, file 60-3-RD, W.K. Lamb to H.A. Young, 3 February 1951.
- 26 Donald MacKay, *Heritage Lost: The Crisis in Canada's Forests* (Toronto 1985).