WILDERNESS NOW

A Statement of Principles and Policies of the ALGONQUIN WILDLANDS LEAGUE


Permission to reprint any portion of this publication is hereby granted. We would appreciate credit being given as follows: "Reprinted from Wilderness Now, published by the ALGONQUIN WILDLANDS LEAGUE, BOX 114, POSTAL STATION Q, TORONTO, ONTARIO M4T 2L7, CANADA."
This book is dedicated to the memory of Neal Tack Turkheimer (1956-1974)
Wendigo camper, Northway guide and Wendigo assistant director.

His happiest days were spent in this wilderness he loved so well.

There, his grandfather once said, “He found a challenge and he met it.”
Charles Brian Cragg, 1933-1979
Douglas H. Pimlott, 1920-1978

Two remarkable teachers and men of science who were also leading directors of the Algonquin Wildlands League died during the preparation of this position paper. Dr. Douglas H. Pimlott of the University of Toronto and Dr. Charles Brian Cragg of York University—the former a founding father of the League, and the latter its most recent President—made enormous contributions to the environmental movement. Their thoughts and research inform this booklet, and it was their hope that *Wilderness Now* would generate both knowledge of and action for wilderness in Ontario and elsewhere.
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WHAT WE STAND FOR AND WHY

WILDERNESS NOW

I remembered that a Canadian who loves and understands wild areas had once written, “Where there is no parks philosophy, there is no policy” and I reflected that Ontario has a timber policy for its forested land but no parks philosophy or policy; no feeling for the place of “over-mature” forests in dynamic ecosystems; no understanding that the intrinsic value of a tree may sometimes be much greater than the value of the plywood doors that are fashioned from its cells and tissues.¹

This statement by Douglas Pimlott, made after an extensive survey of Lake Superior Provincial Park, explains why the Algonquin Wildlands League drew up the first edition of this position paper in 1972.

Nearly seven years later, some aspects of the situation have changed, at least on the surface. The Ministry of Natural Resources now has an overall parks policy against which individual management policies can be compared: Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies (1978). However, the Master Plan for Algonquin Park and the Provisional Master Plan for Superior Park, in conflict with the overall parks policy, still list commercial logging as one of the permanent objectives of park management. Threats such as air pollution and acid rain, little known to the lay public in 1972, have become important issues as they represent a threat to wilderness environments resulting from activities far outside park boundaries. On the other hand, the Minister’s Provincial Parks Council has, somewhat to our surprise, proved an effective voice on behalf of wilderness values. And we have an example of at least one Master Plan, that for Quetico, which shows that the Ministry can translate wilderness values into management policies which seem practical enough to be given a fair trial. Nevertheless, we believe that the League’s statement of philosophy and policy has not been superseded by events and deserves repeating in the light of present circumstances.

Here the Algonquin Wildlands League has set down its basic wilderness philosophy and, through this, suggests a policy for consideration by the public, government, and industry.

While the League has conducted extensive research on all aspects of its campaigns on behalf of specific parks, it has not the capability of producing a geographic and socio-economic survey of the entire Province; it cannot pinpoint every area that is worthy of protection as wilderness. The League cannot confidently state whether the ideal fraction of the Province that should be protected in a wild state is 3.5, 10 or 15 percent. It cannot prove that a wilderness should enclose a minimum of 1000, 1500 or 2500 km², or, as recommended by some organizations, that it should be “large enough to require two days’ travel by primitive means to cross in its least dimension”. Yet inevitably there has arisen the need to state figures, name areas, suggest dimensions. Some of these were arrived at arbitrarily as datum points for discussion—and for rejection if good cause can be shown—but in all cases we consider them reasonable and practical from every point of view.

The League submits this statement in the hope that it will stimulate the implementation of a durable policy for the protection of Ontario’s wilderness.

To critics we simply say, “Here’s our philosophy—where’s yours?”

VALUES OF THE VANISHING WILDERNESS

The Algonquin Wildlands League is a citizens’ organization working for the preservation of wilderness in Ontario. The League exists because there is real and immediate danger of losing the last remnants of our wilderness. In southern Ontario, practically nothing of our wild legacy remains. In the Near North (see Map 1) there may just be time to save a few prime areas of wild land. In the Far North, wilderness is increasingly threatened and, in many places, already degraded.

The Algonquin Wildlands League views this situation as dangerous. It functions out of the conviction that the loss of our remaining wild places would be tragic. Wilderness has been a strong formative influence on our culture and our national character. It has played a fundamental role in making us what we are. Furthermore, its present day values are high. In wilderness we can find clues, and information, and standards of comparison which are likely to be vital in moving toward a solution to our current and pressing environmental problems. Whether one approaches wild nature from the point of view of science, aesthetics, personal rejuvenation, or cultural analysis, it has much to offer.

Above all, it is part of our rightful heritage as citizens of Ontario, and as Canadians.

¹At present, roughly 3% of Ontario receives such protection—the area included in Killarney, Quetico and Polar Bear Provincial Parks and Pukaskwa National Park. Polar Bear, remotely situated on James Bay, in itself accounts for three-quarters of this relatively small area.
The Algonquin Wildlands League believes certain tracts of wilderness, viewed and protected as a resource in their own right, are far more valuable than whatever profit may be derived from altering or exploiting them.

Until very recently, wild country has generally been cherished simply as a recreational resource: a place to go fishing, or camping, or to "get away from it all". This recreational function of wilderness becomes increasingly important as more and more Canadians become city dwellers. However, the Algonquin Wildlands League sees appropriate forms of recreation as only one of a number of important values rooted in wild nature.

Historical Value:
Wilderness has done much to influence Canadian events, accomplishments and thought. Because Canada's history is largely that of men and women in or surrounded by the wilderness, this is not surprising. Bruce Littlejohn has elaborated this idea in "Wilderness: Canadian Cultural Heritage", an article originally published by the Conservation Council of Ontario:

We in Canada are, in large degree, formed by the wilderness. It has been, through most of our history, our context and—in some cases—our crucible. Our truly native people, the Indians and Eskimos, are people of the wilderness. And we are the spiritual descendants of Etienne Brulé and David Thompson, La Vérendrye and Simon Fraser, as well as thousands of unsung wilderness voyageurs and frontier farmers. Our cities and towns have only recently, in historical terms, grown from tiny settlements in the bush. The epic features of our national accomplishment have often been achieved against a wilderness backdrop: the French and Indian War, the expansion of the fur trade, Wolseley's march to confront Riel at Fort Garry, the construction of the C.P.R., the drawing together of small provinces into a confederation—provinces separated by vast tracts of mountain, plain and forest. The presence of wild lands has imprinted these events with a special character which is peculiarly Canadian and North American. And the continuing opportunity to experience wilderness—an opportunity which is rapidly diminishing for urban Canadians— aids us in understanding our historical roots and character.

While not everyone may wish to experience wild country at first hand, its formative influence on our history and the growing need to preserve some of it as an important component of our national heritage can be appreciated by all Canadians.

Cultural Value:
The wilderness has had a potent influence on painting, writing and film-making in Canada. In this sense it has benefited all Canadians, including those who do not find their recreation in wild places.

It is clear that untamed nature has inspired fine painting in this country. Examples leap to mind: the work of Tom Thomson and the Group of Seven, the great Emily Carr paintings of the western rainforest, and more recently, the art of Jacques de Tonnancour and Jack Shadbolt. Canada is, as A.Y. Jackson has noted, "a painter's country". Our painting has been nourished and made vigorous by wild nature.

The same can be said for Canadian writing. One thinks of the poetry of Archibald Lampman, Earle Birney, Douglas Le Pan, Margaret Atwood, and scores of others. And the wilderness is present in the prose of people such as Gabrielle Roy, Hugh MacLennan, Malcolm Lowry, and the fine novels of Fred Bodsworth. Younger prose writers such as Dave Godfrey, James Bacque and Wayland Drew continue to be influenced by the wilds. As critic George Woodcock has indicated, "The literature of direct experience of the wilderness has contributed in an unbroken tradition since Cartier". Another outstanding critic, Northrop Frye, goes even further in remarking that, "Everything that is central in Canadian writing seems to be marked by the imminence of the natural world".

The cultural influence of wild country is also clearly reflected in Canadian film-making. Two of Canada's finest cinematographers, Christopher Chapman and William Mason have demonstrated this in their films Quetico, The Enduring Wilderness, A Place to Stand, The Rise and Fall of the Great Lakes, and Paddle to the Sea—all of which have received international recognition for excellence. Dan Gibson is another important contributor to this art form. His films, such as White Throat and Land of the Loon have won many awards, both national and international. Through these films, and television series such as The Nature of Things, This Land and To The Wild Country, all Canadians can appreciate, enjoy and relate to their wilderness heritage.

The Canadian wilderness has also had its impact on Canadian composers, as illustrated by Murray Adaskin's Algonquin Symphony. Harry Somers' North Country Suite was partially inspired by a canoe trip through what is now Killarney Provincial Park in 1954. Other examples of such indigenous music are Images by Harry Freedman and Arctic Image by Derek Halsey.

This relationship between wilderness and the arts is a distinctive element in our Canadian heritage—a part of our past and a part of our being. It is, however, a dwindling heritage, and if wilderness is to continue as a dynamic cultural force, then we must ensure the continued existence of wild nature itself.

Scientific Value:
As a natural laboratory for pure and applied scientific studies, wilderness ecosystems have great value. We live in an age when we are frequently and alarmingly reminded of the unintended consequences of our manipulations of nature. It is clearly necessary for our future well-being to improve our knowledge of the processes affecting our environment, and our ability to predict the effects of our intrusions upon it. Some of the investigations required to gain such knowledge must be con-
ducted in wilderness. This is because wilderness has greater complexity than man-made environments: a greater variety of species interacting in a more complex way. More importantly, wilderness has historical continuity. Unlike man-made environments, it offers an evolutionary laboratory showing the results of thousands of years of the evolutionary process. Wilderness is the repository of genetic diversity—the refuge of many species of plant and animal that would be lessened or obliterated by man's intrusions.

In an essay published in the Algonquin Wildlands League book, *Why Wilderness*, Dr. Bruce Falls reinforces these remarks as follows:

We must try to prevent species from becoming extinct. Each kind of plant and animal possesses unique inherited properties. Thus, each species is a unique resource. Its removal may adversely affect ecological systems. In most cases we can only guess what the role of a particular species in the community may be. Still less can we foresee what value its genetic material may have to man. Unless it is preserved, it can have no value.

We need to study ecological systems in order to manage intelligently man-altered environments so as to maintain their productivity and stability. The International Biological Programme refers to the need for "permanent benchmark marks for all world-wide studies of production. As ecologist Edward Graham has put it, "It is tragic to contemplate that at the very time we are on the threshold of understanding ecosystems we find them being seriously disturbed or destroyed at an unprecedented rate".  

**Recreational Value:**

For many people, immersion in wild nature is a source of physical and emotional rejuvenation and health—a truly re-creative though temporary escape from their daily routine. "To live alone in the wilds is to know oneself", writes Christopher Chapman. "It is an experience that brings one closer to the creation of the world and our relationship with all living things." Fred Bodsworth puts it another way: "Let me say simply that paddling and portaging for a couple of days deep into wilderness country, leaving roads, people and all the artificial trappings of civilization far behind, feeling desk-softened muscles hardening, is the most invigorating, ego-boosting, and soul-satisfying experience I know".

Some people find great aesthetic pleasure in wild places. Abbott Conway, a director and former President of the League, has written of this in an article entitled "The Right to Preserve Wilderness in Ontario". There he outlines the dangers of approaching wilderness from the standpoint of narrow economic values and states:

If we accept the values of the logging operator, then the waters running over Niagara Falls have no value other than to produce hydro power. A deer bounding through the autumn woods has no value unless shot and eaten and a white pine tree has no value unless cut and harvested.

But there are aesthetic values which are as real as the economic values of the marketplace. And if the realization of these aesthetic values implies that certain trees mature, fall and are regenerated by other trees taking their place, with the whine of the saw and the growl of the logging truck never heard on the pine ridge, it does not mean that society is losing the greatest value and failing to make the highest use of the ridge of pine.

For people who share this point of view, the direct experience of wilderness may bring pleasure, health, even spiritual comfort. Others find personal value in experiencing the wilderness at second hand or in the abstract. They enjoy the literature, the art, the films, the television programs, and the music which deal with, or are influenced by, the wilderness. Or they like to know that wild places, and the free creatures which inhabit them, exist, and they believe it is ethically correct for man to refrain from destroying the integrity and continuity of wild nature.

***

Some of the values suggested above are associated with the direct experience of wild country—hiking or paddling through it. More of them, however, accrue to society at large, without reference to such direct experience (except on the part of a few scientists or artists who may interpret the wilderness in their work for others to appreciate). This fact is appreciated by many people who work in the cause of wilderness preservation, yet have no particular desire to experience wild country at first hand. If these values are to be perpetuated and made available to succeeding generations, we must work now to preserve our wilderness heritage.

REFERENCES:

4. Ibid.
WHAT WE MEAN BY WILDERNESS

Wilderness is an area where human activity is deliberately minimized, where non-human forces and forms of life remain virtually undisturbed by such activity.

Wilderness is a place where neither the permanent addition of artificial objects, nor the removal of natural objects shall result from human use.

Wilderness is an ecological unit of a size sufficient to be essentially self-regulating. It should be large enough to ensure physical and psychological separation from the man-dominated environment.

As custodian of wilderness, man will exclude from such areas:
• roads
• permanent structures
• mechanized equipment and vehicles
• trapping and hunting
• natural resource extraction
• any form of commercial exploitation
• any other form of disturbance which is incompatible with wilderness and wilderness values.

***

Obviously, this definition deals with "pure" wilderness. Little of such wilderness remains, especially in the southern parts of Ontario. Accordingly, the Algonquin Wildlands League is very much interested in areas which, at the moment, fulfill most of the criteria. We must work with what we have. Our definition puts forward an ideal toward which we can work, and against which we can measure the degree of wilderness quality of our major parks, and the potential of wild areas under consideration as wilderness park material.

THE WILDERNESS EXPERIENCE

The Algonquin Wildlands League believes that the direct experience of wilderness is important and beneficial to Canadians. We also believe that the option to partake of such experience should be kept open for future generations. And we believe that wilderness can tolerate certain types and degrees of use without destruction of either the resource or the values that flow from it.

What are appropriate forms of use?
Appropriate forms of use are those which:
(a) do not destroy or degrade the wilderness environment by permanent physical alterations, disturbance of flora and fauna, or the introduction of materials (including chemicals, except under extraordinary circumstances) in quantities which do not naturally occur in the wild state;
(b) do not interfere with the sense of being in wilderness for the participant and for others.

In short, human use should degrade neither the wilderness, nor the "wilderness experience" which other users seek.

What is the “wilderness experience”? Different people perceive the wilderness experience in different ways. The man on snowshoes and the snowmobiler may travel through the forest equally convinced that they are involved in the wilderness experience. The canoeist and the motorboater, the hiker and the trail bike rider may each claim a "wilderness" experience.

The Algonquin Wildlands League would immediately exclude some of these forms of use as being clearly destructive of the wilderness resource itself. For example, recent studies have demonstrated that snowmobiles damage plant life through snow compaction and breakage of saplings. Wildlife populations are frequently disturbed by snow machines during their most vulnerable period in winter, when survival itself is threatened.

Both the snowmobile and the motorboat, as well as the trail bike, introduce chemical substances (unburned gas and oil) which do not naturally occur in the wild state. Motorboats disrupt the water's edge nesting sites of birds, such as loons, by throwing up a wake. Furthermore, all of these mechanical devices produce high noise levels which do not naturally occur in wild places.

The Algonquin Wildlands League also argues that such forms of use are incompatible with the wilderness experience. In our view, the wilderness experience is at the opposite pole from the workaday, urban experience of the man-dominated environment. It is, therefore, distinguished by:

Quiet—the absence of noise produced by machines particularly.
A sense of solitude— involving separation from concentrations of people and human artifacts such as buildings, machines and roads.
A slowing of the normal pace of life— involving the temporary rejection of technological devices of high speed transit and instant communications,
Freedom from regimentation—including freedom from most of the rules and regulations which, of necessity, are imposed when large numbers of people occupy small spaces,
Natural beauty— unaltered by human activity.
A clean environment— water which is not only unpolluted, but also untainted by oil and gas residues; air which is not only unpolluted, but also free from the odours of the internal combustion engine and industrial activity.
Reliance on self—the opportunity to make basic decisions and engage in activities without advice or direction from others, and to accept the consequences.
Outdoor exercise— involving some degree of rejection of the sedentary mobility of modern, urban life,
A sense of adventure—a combination of the sense of solitude, reliance on self, and the opportunity for physical challenge,
A sense of closeness to wild nature—involving the opportunity to observe undisturbed wildlife, and the absence of the customary barriers which separate man from wild nature.

These, in our view, are some of the major components of the wilderness experience. We are opposed to any forms of wildlands use which might impair this experience. We therefore are opposed to the use of motorized vehicles within areas designated as Wilderness. We believe that only travel by primitive means of locomotion (hiking, snowshoeing, cross-country skiing, canoeing) is appropriate in such areas. While we recognize that these activities presuppose a reasonable degree of physical well-being, we do not believe that a satisfying wilderness experience necessarily implies physical hardship. In fact, a wilderness experience is (and should be) available to the vast majority of our citizens.

For example, wilderness camping can be made available in readily accessible portions of several parks so that minimal travel is required to reach the campsite although some will prefer to penetrate deeply into the core wilderness places within various parks.

There are other problems of human use which can detract from the wilderness experience. Two of these are littering and simple overuse with its effects of scarred trees, beaten-down topsoil, and the like. Experienced park rangers tell us that motorized users are the worst offenders. However, both problems remain to some degree even without motorized use. The Wildlands League is particularly concerned with the long term danger of overuse because it will do injury to both the wilderness environment and the wilderness experience. The League accordingly accepts the idea that prospective users will have to reserve in advance for the privilege of using wilderness. Nonetheless, it is convinced that, in the interim, many things can be done to provide a solution to this problem.

How to Protect the Wilderness Experience
1. Add several new Wilderness Parks to the existing system, so as to spread use over a wider area.
2. Redesignate some of our major existing parks as Wilderness—either in total, or in part, thus removing the pressure of motorized traffic.
3. Make additional access points on the peripheries of the parks to avoid undue concentrations of users along a few main routes. The access points should be selected judiciously, with due regard to control and administrative problems as well as the carrying capacity and enjoyment factors of the areas so opened.
4. Place user quotas on overused routes, directing users to other entry points and routes.

5. Advertise the lesser known parks and non-parklands which provide opportunities for wilderness travel, thus drawing user traffic away from better known (and highly advertised) parks such as Algonquin.
6. Continue to provide satellite parks (see the discussion of the role of non-wilderness parks in section 9) in increasing numbers, particularly in places easily accessible from major urban centres, thereby filtering out some users who might otherwise go to overused parks.
7. Establish more wild river parks for the same reason. Neither these, nor the satellite parks will occupy enormous areas but they can—without being true wilderness—provide many of the components of the wilderness experience.
8. Increase public education programs to develop proper behavior patterns in the parks, and an understanding of the purpose of parks.
9. Provide adequate areas for recreational activities that are not compatible with wilderness, e.g., mechanized vehicle travel, so that people who enjoy such activities can do so without putting pressure on wilderness areas.

THE REGRETTABLE NECESSITY FOR PARKS
At this point some of us feel ourselves to be in a paradoxical situation. The wilderness idea and the wilderness experience are all about the absence of human control and influence: we contemplate, and occasionally enter, a world not made by us but one which is essentially shaped by its own internal forces. Yet in order to ensure the continued existence of such places, we must make the decision that they should exist. In our system, "we" are the voters of the relevant political jurisdiction. In Canada, under our constitution, public lands are owned and controlled by the provinces. Therefore, if Ontario is to have areas exempt from human manipulation, it must be by decision of the Government of Ontario.

Our present position rests on the assumption that the paradox* is inescapable, that the continued existence of wilderness requires the whole political apparatus of laws, regulations and an administrative empire to enforce them. We can strive to make this apparatus as unobtrusive as possible, but we cannot do without it, disturbing as it may be to those who go to the wilderness to escape such restraints.

The device the Government has chosen for setting aside wilderness areas is the provincial park system. Therefore in what follows, we will be considering the policies the Government sets for this system as a measure of the adequacy of wilderness preservation.

*The paradox is not purely academic and theoretical. Visitation to Killarney Park increased 5 times after the park was designated Primitive and caused a severe problem of overuse.
ONTARIO’S PARKS NOW

THE POLITICAL SITUATION OF OUR PARKS

Since our first edition there has been a respectable amount of progress in the status of Ontario's parks, at least on paper. Two obvious exceptions are Algonquin and Lake Superior Parks.

First, the Good News

For several years now a draft parks policy has been floating back and forth between the Ministry of Natural Resources and the Cabinet. This draft policy was judged as a substantial advance, not only by ourselves but by the Minister's own Provincial Parks Council in successive Annual Reports. This Council passed increasingly stern resolutions urging the Cabinet to approve the policy statement.

From the 1975 (and first) Annual Report of the Council:
Resolutions Passed by Council on the Proposed Park Classification System
1. The proposed park classification is welcome and its realization would greatly enhance the Ontario Park System.
2. The real utility of the classification system is that it represents an important step towards the development of an Ontario Park Policy.
3. The classification system provides a useful vehicle for assessing the adequacy of parks in a particular region as well as the adequacy of the provision of a particular type of park throughout the Province.
4. There should be a separate classification for historical parks so that the adequacy of the park system can be evaluated regardless of the Ministry(ies) or governments involved.
5. There tends to be an over emphasis on the word recreation and a lack of emphasis on the primacy of nature over man in the provincial park system.
6. Although some concern was expressed over the feasibility of zoning in parks, a motion was passed to the effect that zoning in parks was imperative as a planning and management tool.
7. As far as recreational parks are concerned, the provincial parks should continue to provide such facilities and they should encourage other jurisdictions and the private sector to provide and manage an increasing proportion of such facilities.
8. In evaluating the adequacy of parks in terms of the number of park opportunities within particular distances of Ontario residents, there is definite need to account for non-resident use.
9. Utilizing the 'site region' concept in selecting nature reserves and wilderness parks should not be permitted to follow the 'collector' or one-of-a-kind mentality. In selecting sites for nature reserves and wilderness parks, the dramatic and the unique should definitely be considered.
10. There is a need to rewrite the Provincial Parks Act to allow for the statutory establishment of park boundaries and zones.

II. An intensive public education program of the park classification system is required.

From the 1976 Annual Report:
At the final meeting of the year Council endorsed the draft policy by passing the following resolution:

Resolution
The Provincial Parks Council emphasizes the need for a park policy for Ontario to guide the development of the Provincial Parks System. Council called for the implementation of such a policy a year ago and identified park policy as its first priority for 1976.

Council has reviewed in detail and endorses the park classification scheme which is a vital element of the proposed Provincial Parks Policy. Council has reviewed in detail the proposed provincial parks policy and endorses the policy as an important statement which not only defines the goal and objectives for the provincial parks system, but also outlines the means whereby such objectives can be achieved.

The Council recommends that the policy document be made available to the public as soon as it has been approved. It is not felt that further extensive revision is necessary as the principles in the document have already been publicly reviewed.

Council recommends that the Minister of Natural Resources take immediate steps to obtain government approval of the proposed provincial parks policy and, thereafter, to implement the provincial parks policy through the adoption of appropriate planning and management guidelines and the development of implementation strategies and programs.

Moved—C. Goodwin
2nd—M. Wilkinson
Agreed—Unanimously

From the 1977 Annual Report:

8.2 Resolutions
As a result of Council's continuing interest in the adoption of a parks policy, the following motion was passed on February 3, 1977:

Whereas the Provincial Parks Council has reviewed in detail and endorsed the proposed park classification scheme and the Proposed Parks Policy:

and whereas the Council identified implementation of such a Parks Policy as its first priority for 1976;

and the Council feels that the Parks Policy is an important statement defining the goals and objectives of the Provincial Parks System, requiring little further revision, and therefore should be made immediately available for public scrutiny;

Council therefore recommends that the Minister of Natural Resources immediately obtain internal Governmental approvals of the proposed Parks Policy, make the Policy available to the public immediately thereafter, and implement the Policy through
the adoption of appropriate planning and management guidelines and the development of implementation strategies and programs.

Agreed—Unanimously

On May 9, 1978, the Cabinet approved a document (Appendix B) including the following statement of objectives:

Objectives of the Provincial Park system

Protection To protect provincially significant elements of the natural and cultural landscape of Ontario.

Recreation To provide outdoor recreation opportunities ranging from high-intensity day use to low-intensity wilderness experiences.

Heritage To provide opportunities for exploration and appreciation of the outdoor natural and cultural heritage of Ontario.

Tourism To provide Ontario’s residents and out-of-province visitors with opportunities to discover and experience the distinctive regions of the Province.

Note that the list of objectives does not include resource extraction.

This policy statement is amplified by the Ministry’s document, Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies, in which details of zoning, management, etc., are laid out (see Appendix D).

Moreover, it is clear that, where the Parks Branch has had a free hand, the Master Plans for individual parks, notably Quetico, but also smaller parks such as Neys, reflect this general policy statement. If the story ended here, we could feel that we had a park system in Ontario that we could be proud of.

Now, the Bad News

Unfortunately, the cases of Algonquin and Superior remain. The decision to retain commercial logging in these Parks continues to bring with it consequences and confusions, all arising from the basic conflict in parks philosophy between that expressed by the general policy statement and that underlying the extraction of resources.

First, zoning. These Parks are the only ones to make major use of the various zones outlined in the general policy statements, but with very different intent than we advocate later on in this position paper. Our views on the actual effect of the zoning pattern proposed for Algonquin and Superior Parks were set forth in our brief of November 21, 1977, in response to the Preliminary Master Plan for Lake Superior Park.

We recognize the zoning categories, and the policies associated with them, proposed in the Preliminary Master Plan to be those described in the Administrative Policies* draft document, with the glaring exception of the Recreation-Utilization zones which are to constitute 56% of the land area of the Park. Now it is one of the great strengths of the Administrative Policies draft document, which we strongly commended to the Ministry and which we trust is retained in the revised version now being prepared for approval, that the relationship of the various zones to each other is clearly set forth in their general description, in the tables showing permitted activities, and in the sketch maps demonstrating typical zoning patterns. No such clarification has been provided for the Recreation-Utilization Zone (how could it be?) and the effect of the inclusion of this intruder, this cuckoo in the nest, upon the functioning of the other zones is devastating.

A look at the proposed zoning map shows two Wilderness Zones and six Nature Reserve zones with borders on the Trans-Canada Highway. Eight Nature Reserve zones are either entirely surrounded by Recreation-Utilization Zones or have as other boundaries the highway or non-park lands. The whole concept of “buffering” through the use of zoning (whereby those areas designated for the highest degree of protection are separated from areas of intensive use by zones permitting lower intensity use), has been abandoned. In its place we find, as in Algonquin, a “public relations” map with the “protected” zones concentrated in those parts of the Park most likely to come under the public eye. The zoning plans of these two great Parks exemplify brilliantly the characterization given by Prof. George Frodlle of the only doctrine of multiple use in parks that has actually been put into effect: the desperate attempt to keep recreational visitors and loggers in different parts of the park in the hope that they will not encounter each other.

In addition to the abandonment of the “buffering” function of zoning, the continuation of logging must weaken the resolve of recreational users to obey the necessarily restrictive regulations in the more sensitive zones. To quote again from our Superior Park brief:

The undermining of policy goes deeper. We are all aware that the compatibility of the preservation of wilderness and near-wilderness landscapes with any public recreational use of them will require greater restraints on the part of recreational users. Some of that restraint can be imposed, with access quotas, restrictions on non-burnable containers and so on, but these regulations can never be enforced, and in any case in themselves will never be sufficient, without general public understanding and sympathy with the goals to be achieved. How we can expect such understanding and sympathy to be forthcoming alongside the continuing resource extraction from the park is beyond our comprehension.

We do not claim to be able to compare the ecological damage to a forest environment due to commercial timber harvesting with that due to recreational abuse. Our grim experience shows us that no plan aimed at the preservation of park environments can be politically and administratively reconciled with commercially inspired resource extraction. Whether it might be technically possible, in the forester’s sense, could be a mildly interesting academic question; but it is not a question relevant to the real world. In this world, to expect administrative arrangements to stand up to the pressures of the international marketplace is to expect miracles. When a commercial operator is permitted to harvest wood from a park, there is inevitably a tacit understanding that the

---

*Earlier version of Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies

*By “stage four” Dr. Clarke is referring to the change that took place during the 1950s when year-round operation and a high degree of mechanization was introduced into the industry.
conditions will be such that the operator will not lose his shirt. If, as is often the case, the assumptions underlying the agreed conditions prove to be economically over-optimistic, the provincial officials responsible for enforcing the conditions will be under strong pressures to be lenient.

One rationale for permitting timber harvesting in a park is that the same area can be suitable, at different times in the harvesting cycle, for wilderness recreation and tree harvesting. We have put the contrary view innumerable times, and have found it supported and explained in a recent article by Dr. C.H.D. Clarke, retired head of the Fish and Wildlife Division, Ministry of Natural Resources:

The old logging and all its appurtenances vanished when stage four came, and so did the wilderness. When the floatable softwoods were cut there still remained large stands of non-floatable hardwoods, some of them very valuable veneer species. If you were going to use them you had to haul them out. Even that might have been sneaked in if the logging, as of old, had been confined to winter and the hauling done by tractor or truck, mostly over the ice of lakes and rivers or on frozen tracks on the level ground of wet swamps where nobody went in summer. There was a catch to this, so it was never considered. You can store a pine log for years in a head pond at a mill, but a maple or birch log will not float. In a pile it deteriorates day by day. If you are going to log only in winter your mill is going to run only in winter, and the men will be on unemployment in summer. No community likes that, and the prosperity of several communities is linked to logs from the park. You may say it is only a temporary prosperity—ars longa, vita brevis—but temporary can be a long time and communities always hope that one thing will lead to another.

So the decision was made to send in the bulldozers and make truck roads. At that time the tourist boom was just starting. Now there are thousands of canoeists instead of a few dozen. The economic argument then seemed loaded in favour of the stage-four logger. It seems not quite so simple now, and I am sure there are foresters who wish the bulldozers had never gone in, but the damage has been done. It shatters you in two ways. One is the realization that the people who made the decision did not even think about wilderness. This was a shock to some of us who had justified the impact of over-abundant unhunted deer by saying truthfully that
the degree of ready access that would have permitted effective public deer hunting would have destroyed what we valued most—the wilderness. The other thing was the sheer magnitude of the change. I had ceased working in the old park, and then, 10 years later, planned some field work. In choosing a spot I was told I could go anywhere within reason by car. All I needed was a key to unlock gates. I was shown a map such as the public would probably still not be allowed to see, with roads all over the place. I went in and saw them. They were not tote roads, they were cleared like a highway, graded and gravelled so that huge trucks loaded with logs could roar along at top speed and even pass without slowing down. The old park, with its feeling of space, was dead.

Every effort was made to hide those roads back in the bush, away from the main canoe routes, but you simply had to intersect some portages. Not only that, if you disliked racing other canoes for good camping places on the main routes and slipped up a creek to some lake off the beaten track where you or someone you knew had had good fishing years before, that was when you found where the action really was—trucks roaring over a bridge on your little creek, a great clearing, garages and gas stations and a store just like home, and a town of mobile homes with a generator, running water, showers and certainly no bedbugs, not for union men getting paid the way those guys are paid. To top it all—and I saw it and knew it was not unusual—the bosses probably had a motor boat or boats stashed, trucked in contrary to regulations, and in the evening the remote water was their private fish pond. In the daytime the whine of chainsaws was incessant. Often if you stopped to listen when you were two or three days in on a canoe route you could hear saws or trucks not too far away. If you parked your canoe and walked in early in the morning you could hitch a ride and make it back to faraway Toronto or Montreal the same day. Ah wilderness!

The year 1980 may be a year of decision for both Algonquin and Superior Parks. The Preliminary Master Plan for Superior Park, presented in mid 1977, left 56% of the land area of the Park in Recreation-Utilization Zones, that is, logging. This, along with other zoning anomalies and the absence of any forest management plans, disturbed the Provincial Parks Council, who, in their 1977 Annual Report, recommended that:

Commercial logging, or resource utilization, should eventually be banned from the park as a primary objective;
although their next recommendation is:
Commercial logging could continue indefinitely in the park where it is a secondary benefit from some other needed treatment in the park environment;
It will be interesting to see if such a "needed treatment" will ever occur on a scale sufficient to interest a commercial operator.

Loggers' haul roads cutting across a portage in Algonquin Provincial Park.
In Algonquin, the 5-year review of the 1974 Master Plan is due. In the debate in the Legislature on the bill to establish the Algonquin Forestry Authority (the Crown corporation which now holds the timber licences for the park), the Minister of Natural Resources assured the Legislature that (a) the review of the Master Plan could include the operations of the Algonquin Forestry Authority and therefore the effect of the timber harvest, and (b) the body responsible for the review would be the Provincial Parks Council. The Council seems to be gearing up for its task, although there is a plaintive note in its 1977 report:

*It was brought to Council's attention that the management plan for the Algonquin Forestry Authority would not be completed until 1980. This could create a problem inasmuch as the review of the Master Plan is to be in 1979.*

We think that the Parks Council should get on with it anyway, and address itself to the basic question: is the philosophy justifying setting aside a great park such as Algonquin for the "benefit, advantage and enjoyment of the people of the Province" compatible with the kind of technological assault described by Dr. Clarke? Can the management of a park in which the objectives of wilderness and near-wilderness recreation and resource production are combined ever amount to anything except a series of desperate and irrational compromises? We say no. We recognize that the decision to phase out logging in Algonquin and Superior Parks has economic consequences both for the industry and its labour force. Our sympathies are not equally divided between the two. The industry has, at least in its public statements, been so intransigent, greedy, and self-centred, when it could well have worked out reasonable compromises with groups such as ours, that we have lost almost all interest in what it has to say.

The workforce is a different matter: if they are to give up economic opportunity for the benefit of a wider public, the wider public has a corresponding responsibility to contribute to their finding alternative opportunities. In practical terms, this means some of our tax money should be specifically designated as seed money for other forms of employment. In the case of Lake Superior Park, we expect this process could be carried out readily. In the case of Algonquin, we recognize that the process could be long and difficult, but for that reason, a decision to start needs to be made now.

**WIDER THREATS TO THE WILDERNESS**

While dispute goes on about proper management policies within parks, we must not lose sight of factors occurring on a larger scale and which cannot be stopped at park boundaries.

One such factor is airborne pollution. It has recently been established that serious effects such as acid rain can be due to far distant sources of pollutants. Algonquin Park is influenced by industrial areas both in Canada and the American Midwest. Swedish lakes are affected by emissions from the U.K. and West Germany. And these effects are not subtle: lakes which lack the dissolved minerals capable of neutralizing the acid rain, can and have become completely devoid of all fish life*. Many of Ontario's Shield lakes are very vulnerable because of the low solubility and alkalinity of the rock in which they occur. Therefore, to preserve our parks we must fight for a general reduction of air pollution on an international scale.

Another factor originating outside the parks but which threatens their integrity is the crisis in forestry in Ontario. While proper forest management for tree harvesting is based on "sustained yield". That is, the replacement of trees cut by new trees either by natural seeding or by deliberate planting of seedlings to make a harvesting "cycle", it is becoming apparent to foresters that sustained yield is not even being approached. This fact has been disguised for some time by improvement in technology which allows the forest industry profitable use of lower quality materials. But now the industry is facing the prospect of an absolute shortage of wood of any kind*. The economic hardships that this situation will impose on the forest industry and the communities dependent on it will put pressure on governments to allow more harvest from the parks.

A third factor threatening the provincial park system is the increase in demand for outdoor recreational opportunity of all kinds. In Ontario only a small part of this increase can be attributed to overall population growth, which is expected to be modest: most of the increase comes from the lifestyle changes of our citizens. A projection included in the Ministry of Natural Resources' Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies document states that if participation rates in outdoor recreational activities for all Ontario reach by 1991 the present participation rates of the Northern Ontario population, then the number of people involved will double. If these users are not to overload our park system, then we will have to:

(a) provide a range of parks designed for variety of user intensity (see next section);
(b) educate users to behave in ways which minimize their impact on the environment;
(c) impose quotas and other restrictions to access when necessary to protect the most vulnerable areas.

**REFERENCES:**


*The example of the La Cloche Lakes has become a classic as documented in the 1972 study by Beamish and Harvey.*

*Notice of this fact was given by Kenneth Armson in his report commissioned by the Provincial Government wherein he states that the forest industry has entered a stage of development in which "the end of the exploitable forest is in sight and further significant increases in yield resulting from improved utilization technology are no longer possible without destruction of the productive capacity of the forest kind." An even earlier statement in this regard was made in the Provincial Legislature on May 11, 1972 by Leo Bernier, at that time the Minister of Natural Resources. In responding to a question from an opposition member he stated: "Certainly we accept the fact that we are not keeping pace with the areas that should be regenerated. I think the breakdown has been one-third that is being reforested artificially; one-third naturally. We are dropping back one-third. But I must point out that there are certain species which we just really can't talk about in terms of a sustained yield basis at this point in time. These would be white pine and yellow birch..."*
THE JOB TO BE DONE

A PARK SYSTEM: THE ROLE OF NON-WILDERNESS PARKS AND THE IMPORTANCE OF “BUFFERING”

Most North Americans have a need to experience the natural world. In the midst of the large cities, people keep African violets and pet animals, become excited about dying elms and flock to parks or beaches when they can. If this need cannot be satisfied in any other way, they will resort to the wilderness parks, where their sheer numbers would not only make impossible anything like a wilderness experience, but would physically destroy the environment, unless it were managed to a degree of intensity incompatible with the wilderness concept. Hence a crucial element in the strategy for preserving wilderness is the improvement of the non-wilderness environment to provide alternative opportunities for satisfying encounters with the natural world.

This strategy begins in the large cities. It involves the provision of adequate urban parks, the planning for local open spaces for play, the reduction of noise and air pollution, and all such measures which can make the urban environment pleasant.

In the near-urban areas, the provision of green belts, parks and conservation areas, and the management of wildlife which adapts to settled areas can give the city dweller an easily accessible escape from the steel and concrete urban landscape.

Nevertheless, many people will wish, in their vacations, to share the experiences they have associated with our national history and traditions: to hear the call of a loon, to paddle a canoe over a quiet lake, live in a tent and cook by a campfire. Yet they may have neither the skill nor desire to travel in the true wilderness, with all the demands on self-reliance that such travel implies. It should be possible to provide such recreational opportunities by suitable zoning of our forest areas: well designed canoe routes, hiking trails, and discreetly organized campsites would permit intensive but non-destructive use by many people, who would thereby encounter some of the values of our natural landscape.

We would advocate a graduated series of opportunities for outdoor recreation, ranging from fairly intensively managed environments (altered both for the convenience and safety of the visitor and the protection of particular natural features), to the unaltered wilderness, requiring the greatest degree of adaptation and self-reliance on the part of the visitor.

We are not implying a permanent division between a woodsy minority who alone can undertake wilderness travel, and the inexperienced majority who would be denied the privilege of such activity. Adequate provision of “near-wilderness” travel on the one hand recruits and trains those who will ultimately wish to travel in the true wilderness and on the other hand provides a satisfactory alternative to the enthusiast who may be content with fewer excursions into the true wilderness. The pleasure of introducing a friend or family to outdoor recreation in comparative security may outweigh any reservations about meeting the neighbours at the next portage.

The attainment of these objectives implies an overall plan for parks with a gradation of types in which different intensities of recreational use are reflected in corresponding intensities of management and ease of access.

Accessibility is a key factor in a park system. The wilderness of some parks may be protected by natural features, such as the rugged Lake Superior shoreline of Pukaskwa, or the remoteness of Polar Bear Park, at least for the present. But in most cases, wilderness parks will be best managed through the designation of “filter” zones whereby a large wilderness core is surrounded by one or more zones managed for more varied and crowded recreation. Outer zones will provide near-wilderness recreation, and will protect the inner core from damaging external influences such as the sight and sound of railways and highways, and from excessively easy access. For example, where canoe travel is likely to be the dominant form of recreation, there might be a three-zone set-up with the outer zone consisting of car camps and waterways accessible to them without portages, an intermediate zone reached by easy portages, and the inner wilderness zone. In such a park, a range of opportunities is made available to people of various skills and interests, while the wilderness zone is protected from casual traffic but accessible to the serious traveller.*

The zoning map should be an “isoprim” map, such that areas designated for the least human influence can be reached only by passing through zones designated for more intensive, if discreet, management: a wilderness zone adjoining a public highway or a waterway accessible by a highway is an absurdity. “Satellite parks” associated with a wilderness park can be valuable in relieving the pressure of numbers on the wilderness zones but they do not serve the same “buffering” function.

It is clear that there must also be zoning in many comparatively small non-wilderness parks and even in some urban parks. One can have intensive sailing, canoeing or water-skiiing, but not in the same place at the same time. Similarly, some types of industrial use may be found compatible with certain recreational uses and might be permitted with adequate controls in some non-wilderness parks.

*For a more detailed discussion of this technique, see the article by Joseph W. Pentzkoft entitled “The Outdoors, Quality, and Isoprim”, in Wilderness: America’s Living Heritage, Sierra Club, 1961, pp. 109-116.
Therefore, we must work, (a) to ensure the preservation in perpetuity of adequate and representative examples of our wilderness heritage in the form of major wilderness parks where human use is limited, and (b) to provide opportunities for large numbers of people to enjoy recreational activities in an environment of high quality outside the wilderness parks in order to protect the wilderness areas from overuse and to encourage an appreciation for the values of wilderness.

WHAT, WHERE, HOW MUCH?

Wilderness parks should be established to protect the major types of wild landscapes we possess.

In geographical terms, our major landscapes can be classified into, (a) the Paleozoic sediments of southern Ontario, (b) the Precambrian Shield, (c) the Mesozoic and Paleozoic sediments of the Hudson Bay Lowlands. In terms of vegetation, we have, (a) Deciduous Forest, (b) the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Forest, (c) the Boreal Forest, and (d) Tundra. Representative tracts of all these types should be preserved. In addition, we should ensure that examples of Great Lakes shoreline (and off-shore islands), a great northern river system (such as the Albany), chains of inter-connecting lakes, and examples of striking landforms be represented.

It is difficult to see how a wilderness park satisfying our criteria can be smaller than 400 square miles (1036 km²), e.g., 20 miles or 32 kilometers square, and should probably be at least 1000 square miles (2590 km²). In some regions, especially in the north, ecological criteria may dictate much larger areas. For example, where the preservation of caribou as an element of the ecosystem is a
goal, a very large area may be required. Where it is important to protect an entire drainage system, the same size criterion may apply.

Although the area of Ontario is large, all but one quarter is Boreal Forest or Tundra, and the northern half of the Province (roughly north of the C.N. Railway running between Kenora and Kapuskasing) is almost entirely inaccessible by surface transportation. If our variety of landscape is to be preserved and if the experience of wilderness travel is to be available to any but the rich, a substantial proportion of wilderness parks must be in the southern part of the Province and the Near North (Map No. 1).

For most people, two days' travel is about as much as they would normally contemplate to arrive at a place to spend a vacation. Two days' moderate car travel from the urban areas of southern Ontario would take the traveller to around Wawa or Cobalt. A line between these two centres marks the northern boundary of the most southerly 20 percent of the Province. It is this 20 percent of Ontario which can be considered to be readily accessible to most people.

The South:
There should be three wilderness parks of adequate size in this region of Ontario. Algonquin and Lake Superior (marginally) are large enough to be satisfactory wilderness parks. A third park should be established in this southern region, possibly northwest of the Temagami-Lady Evelyn Lake region. Such a wilderness park should be at least 500 square miles (1295 km²) in extent, and preferably much larger.

If a 1000 square mile (2590 km²) park is established in this region and all of Algonquin and Lake Superior Parks are managed as wilderness, then the total wilderness area will be about 4500 square miles (11,655 km²) or somewhat less than 6 percent of that portion of Ontario south of the Wawa to Cobalt line. Because this area includes practically all the Province south of the Boreal Forest, is closest to Ontario's major population centres, and is an area where the possibility of preserving a large block of land has almost disappeared, we consider that such provision is not excessive.

It is no longer possible to preserve true wilderness in the characteristic southern Ontario geological and ecological regions (those regions outside the Precambrian Shield). But it is well worth preserving what we can of natural landscapes on the Niagara Escarpment and Bruce Peninsula and preserving and expanding where possible examples of the southwestern Ontario deciduous forest.

Near North:
The northern three-quarters of the Province can be usefully divided into the Near North (bounded on the north by the CNR, hence accessible to surface transportation) and the Far North above this region. Population pressure on the Near North is much less than in the southern region but is increasing as improvement in road networks makes the region more accessible to tourists formerly confined to Highway 17. The only potential wilderness parks in this region at present are Quetico and Pukaskwa totalling 2500 square miles (6475 km²). Pressure on Quetico could be relieved by development of alternative filter parks on its boundaries. To expand the area in wilderness, the distinctive topographic and geological region comprising the Black Bay Peninsula and adjacent Lake Superior islands such as St. Ignace should be considered (see map, p. 25). Thought should also be given to the western shore of Lake Nipigon as a potential wilderness park and to the Missinaibi Wild River Park Reserve as a potential Waterway Park.

Lake Superior presents special problems and opportunities which will be discussed later.

The Far North:
In the Far North, population pressure is less of a factor and the dominant criteria should be the preservation of areas of particular ecological, scenic or historical interest. Consideration should be given to:

(a) seeing that provision is made, through boundary adjustments of Polar Bear Park or other measures, to ensure adequate protection of the Province's most northern ecological types, and
(b) including in a wilderness park a representative major river traversing both the Precambrian Shield and the Hudson Bay Lowlands, such as the Albany.

Of similar importance is the need to establish a wilderness park in the area identified by the Atikaki Coalition, 2500 square miles (6475 km²) of unspoiled waterways and wildlife habitat—including caribou—running west from Red Lake to the Manitoba boundary. (Here, under the recommendations of the Coalition, it would join an 1800 square-mile (4662 km²) wilderness park proposed for Manitoba.)

Alternative Recreational Opportunities
Essential to the preservation of wilderness areas is the provision of other areas which, through suitable management techniques, can offer recreational experiences with some of the features of wilderness to a much larger public than could use the wilderness parks without damaging them. Campsites with sophisticated sanitation and waste disposal facilities, patrolled canoe routes with marked portages, hiking trails, etc., can, if devised and managed with skill, provide satisfying and non-destructive contact with natural landscape and wildlife for many people.

To make this possible, all forested areas in Crown land except the designated wilderness parks should be looked at for recreational possibilities as well as resource extraction opportunities, in short, for that cliche of the forest industry, "multiple use". What this amounts to is no more than taking seriously the Ministry documents, Manual of Forest Management Plan Requirements and Design Guidelines for Forest Management. But we are not surprised that little
recreational land has been made available by that mechanism. Since it is the timber licence holders who have the responsibility of taking the initiative in identifying recreational potential and since the licence holders receive few benefits but instead incur costs and risks by so doing, they would be fools to do so. Clearly, to make “multiple use” really work, the Government must take the initiative, and this implies a major revision in the Government’s relation with the forest industries. We are not prepared to recommend how this should be done. However, we note that the options range from a Province-wide Crown corporation along the lines of the Algonquin Forestry Authority, to the privately owned forests of some pulp and paper companies in eastern Ontario, with recreational opportunities offered by the company.

An example of the necessity of considering wilderness preservation and non-wilderness outdoor recreation as part of overall regional planning is the case of Lake Superior, which as a whole must be considered one of the chief glories of our natural heritage. While it is clearly necessary to protect part of the shoreline and certain off-shore islands as wilderness park, this provision will be of little value if the lake is polluted. Industrial, recreational, and wilderness values must be realized in a non-conflicting manner which preserves the majestic quality of the lake. For example, although its waters are now badly polluted, the Nipigon Bay area—including the Black Bay Peninsula, St. Ignace Island, Simpson and Wilson Islands and the Slate Islands—is a region where wilderness preservation, high intensity recreation, and industry could be combined under careful management without destruction of the environment. The Black Bay Peninsula, St. Ignace, Simpson, Wilson, and the Slate Islands might be designated as a shoreline and offshore islands wilderness park of great scenic, ecological and geological interest (they seem to include the largest area of undisturbed volcanic formations in Ontario) (Map 4).

The village of Rossport might be revived as a major marina and boat tour centre. The pulp and paper industry (already established at Red Rock) could coexist with both the wilderness areas and the intensive recreation. It would be absolutely necessary to see that the Domtar Company mill at Red Rock (where Domtar was convicted of water pollution in 1970) ceased to pollute. The biological health and aesthetic quality of the surrounding waters would have to be carefully controlled. The current problem of widespread tainting of the water from Marathon (on the western edge of the Pukaskwa National Park) demands attention for the same reason. In addition, the facilities for intensive recreation would have to be carefully planned to ensure the protection of aesthetic qualities. The ugly lakeside and roadside development which is so often seen in the Province would have to be avoided. We must, in short, be actively concerned with the quality of the whole Lake Superior environment—an environment which can be one of the great assets of this Province, and an environment which can still be spared the fate of the other Great Lakes. The Algonquin Wildlands League is basically concerned with the preservation of wilderness on Lake Superior and elsewhere in Ontario; however, it recognizes the related need to become involved in environmental concerns which surround and affect existing and potential wilderness parks.

**Summary:**

The Algonquin Wildlands League exists to provide an effective voice for those who appreciate wilderness for whatever reason: ethical, cultural, scientific or recreational. Because an aware public is vital to the cause of wilderness preservation, we work to develop public appreciation of wilderness values and greater public knowledge of current and potential threats to the wildlands. We believe that such educational programs are basic to the long term public interest and the maintenance of a healthy environment. Beginning from the premise that wilderness is a precious and rightful element of our heritage as Canadians, our goals are both broad and deep.

Nonetheless, we also have immediate and concrete goals which are strictly limited. These concern the present provision of wilderness parks in Ontario. It is clear to us that the supply of such parks is inadequate—inadequate in relation to the important values which flow from wildlands, in relation to the dramatically increasing demand for the wilderness experience, in relation to the need to preserve representative ecological communities and in relation to the huge size and substantial wealth of this Province. To overcome this inadequacy we do NOT advocate huge additions of land to the present park system. We do, however, strongly urge changes in the management approach to some of our existing parks, and limited additions of wild parkland within each of the three regions we have outlined. More specifically, we say that the public interest will best be served by:

1. Phasing out logging in Algonquin and Superior Parks (and hence the Recreation-Utilization Zones) and, while leaving their designation as Natural Environment Parks unchanged, revising the zoning plans such that substantial wilderness zones totalling at least 50 percent of their land area are set out, suitably protected by other zones.

2. Adding an additional wilderness park of not less than 500 square miles (about 1,500 km²) in the southern quarter of the Province, thus bringing the percentage of wilderness parkland up to approximately 5 percent in this region of high demand.

3. Committing funds from the general revenue of the Province in a plan to facilitate the re-deployment of local workers, made necessary by the phasing out of logging in Algonquin and Superior Parks. This process need not be hurried but should start now: the workers and their communities should have the opportunity to plan and design alternative futures for themselves.
LAKE SUPERIOR
NORTH SHORE, SHOWING BLACK BAY PENINSULA AND OFF SHORE ISLANDS
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4. Adding additional parkland in the Near North region (where only about 2½ percent of the land is now in wilderness parks) to bring the total up to approximately 5 percent. Possible areas have been mentioned above.

5. Considering additions of wilderness in the Far North to ensure a representation of ecological and geological types, and landforms of scientific or scenic interest while they are still available for such designation.

6. Revising the relationship between the Ministry and the resource industries to ensure that Crown Lands outside the wilderness parks are managed to make the most of such opportunities for low-intensity non-wilderness outdoor recreation the landscape may provide.

7. Taking sufficient initiative in regenerating and properly managing those areas already set aside for commercial timber, that the industry need not repeatedly turn to wilderness areas for its wood supply.

8. Revising the Provincial Parks Act to give some protection from changes to park boundaries, zoning, classification and major management policies.

The implementation of these suggestions would be evidence of a land-use philosophy and policy which recognizes wilderness as a resource in its own right, an integral part of a healthy environment, and an invaluable element of our heritage which it is our responsibility to protect and perpetuate. We intend that this paper shall contribute to the formulation of such a philosophy and such a policy.
HOW WE GOT HERE AND WHY

On a blustery September day in 1965, nine people met on an island in Algonquin Park’s Source Lake to decide whether there should be an “Algonquin Park Association”. They included representatives of the Canadian Audubon Society, the Conservation Council of Ontario, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists and the Ontario Federation of Anglers and Hunters, and a small group of individuals who were alarmed by the rate at which the wilderness values of the large parks of Ontario, particularly Algonquin, were being destroyed.

Modern mechanized logging techniques, the network of all-weather, high-speed logging roads, illegal use of power boats on interior lakes and, in certain parts, concentrations of campers were combining to erode the character of Algonquin. Other parks were known to be suffering from some of the same problems.

The founding members of what was to become the Algonquin Wildlands League thought that consideration should be given to forming a new organization that would focus its efforts on preserving the integrity of Ontario’s existing wilderness parks; it would be prepared to take an active stand for or against specific aspects of park management policies on the basis of sound research by special committees.

It was clear that something had to be done, but in view of the number and variety of existing conservation organizations, there was some doubt as to whether a new organization was required or desirable. Hence the Source Lake conference.

After a day of deliberation, it was agreed that although the existing organizations had for years devoted a considerable portion of their energy towards protecting the parks, their efforts were necessarily diluted either by the vast geographical range of their concerns or a wide field of interests of which Ontario’s park problem was only one. There existed at that time no special medium through which individuals who identified themselves strongly with the quiet places of the lakes and woods could express their views collectively on the particular problems of Ontario’s parks; there was no organization devoted to sorting out the complex facts—ecological, sociological, economic and political—surrounding the management of Ontario’s wilderness and presenting them to the public.

At the conclusion of the day a declaration was passed unanimously:

“That this meeting go on record as favouring the organization of an Algonquin Park Association with the broad aim of ensuring that the heritage of Algonquin and other parks in Ontario, significant for their natural characteristics, shall be passed on intact to succeeding generations.”

From that point on, a review of the League’s campaigns, park by park, is perhaps the best way to describe how we got here and why.”

ALGONQUIN PARK

A steering committee was formed to draw up a constitution and apply for letters patent. In developing the bylaws, the committee settled on Algonquin Wildlands League as the name for the organization. While waiting for its official charter, the League was busy on its first project—preparing a recommended zoning plan for Algonquin Park in anticipation of the release by the Department of Lands and Forests of a Provisional Master Plan sometime in 1968. At the annual meeting of the Standing Committee of the Ontario Legislature on Tourism and Natural Resources in March of that year, Abbott Conway presented the League’s plan, calling for approximately 50% of the Park to be zoned Primitive. The brief pointed out that “the timber assets of Algonquin Park, so far as a saw-log economy is concerned, are nearing an end... The demand for recreation and the experience of life in natural surroundings is increasing every year... We must plan how Algonquin Park can cope with the tide of outdoormen and their families that is already upon it. Commercial interests must be phased out. Lumbering, as it is practised in Algonquin Park today, is not compatible with its future”.

As in the case with most briefs submitted to this body, it produced little excitement, but the League, in the name of “a number of interested persons”, had made its first move.

On June 1, 1968, the first public meeting of the Algonquin Wildlands League was held in Huntsville. With $197.41 on hand (contributions from a score of charter members) and outstanding bills amounting to $123, the directors confidently laid plans for the first phase of the League’s activities.

To announce the formation of the League, a press conference was held in Toronto on July 10. The League’s first president, Abbott Conway, outlined the main concerns of the League as they applied to Algonquin Park:

1. Increased activity of logging operations and the spread of logging roads.
2. Increase of air and water pollution and a rising level of mechanical noise.
3. The growing number of motorboats on the wilderness lakes, and pressures building up to allow automobiles into the wilderness areas.
4. The intrusion of permanent construction in the wilderness areas.
5. Protection of wildlife.
The Algonquin Alert

Mr. Conway announced, "We are now inviting the public to join us in what we are calling the 'Algonquin Alert' to bring into sharp focus our concern for the future of Algonquin Park as an area where wilderness experiences may be enjoyed". But he made it clear that the League was concerned not only with Algonquin. "The League's purpose is to protect the wilderness values of Ontario's parks from destruction by commercial or other uncontrolled interests. We have chosen to identify ourselves in name with the great Algonquin Park because it carries with it the image of these wilderness values."

While the press conference was being held, CBC Television News was in the Park, recording conditions from the air and on the ground. This film, with an interview with Mr. Conway, was carried on the national network. Newspapers across the Province picked up the story. During the following month, there were numerous television and radio interviews with League directors. Opposition members in the Legislature asked awkward questions of the Government. One abuse of the wilderness after another was uncovered and prominently featured in press and broadcast media. Editorials in the three Toronto dailies supported the League's stand.

The Minister of Lands and Forests invited League directors to meet with him and senior members of his Department. The League reiterated its position and made it clear that it was not to be diverted from its objectives, despite such negative attitudes as one expressed by a Lands and Forests official: "You might as well give up—you'll never get logging out of the parks". On leaving the meeting, Abbott Conway thanked the Minister for his time. "But rest assured," he said, "we won't go away."

In September, 1968, the League published its first newsletter, Wildland News.

Provisional Master Plan

In November, following release of the Department of Lands and Forests' Provisional Master Plan for Algonquin Park, a public meeting was held by the League to compare the Department's plan with that of the League. League members were urged to attend and endorse publicly the directors' position; the Minister of Lands and Forests, representatives of the forest industry and of the Faculty of Forestry of the University of Toronto were invited to take part in a panel discussion of the plan. No Government representatives appeared, but the 300 people attending the meeting were thoroughly exposed to arguments on behalf of each plan and clearly expressed their approval of the League's zoning recommendations. Public hearings were held by the Government at the end of November in Pembroke, Huntsville and Toronto with a total attendance of 1,000 people, a large proportion of whom had been moved to action by the League's disclosures over the previous months. The League was represented at all hearings and presented its official brief in Toronto. A number of League members presented private briefs.

The Government's master plan was rejected by the forest industry as being too restrictive to the loggers. It was criticised by the conservationists because they considered the 5 percent designated as Primitive Zone or Natural Zone totally unacceptable. The plan was quietly withdrawn. In April, 1969, the Minister announced that he was establishing a task force of senior officials and outside consultants to dig out data that were so obviously lacking in the development of the Provisional Master Plan. As an interim measure, new regulations considerably restricting logging activity in the Park were introduced in 1969.

In August, a League member discovered serious water pollution in Lake of Two Rivers. The coliform count, as measured by the Ontario Water Resources Commission from samples supplied by the League, was 150 times greater than the level considered safe for bathing. Official response was a flat denial by Park personnel, but by August 27, the Lake was closed to swimming. During the following winter, the number of campsites at Lake of Two Rivers was drastically reduced, new toilet facilities were installed and a lodge on the Lake was required to make extensive modifications to its sewage system.

The Advisory Committee

Seeking desperately for a medium to soak up the flow of revelations about Algonquin, the Government set up the Algonquin Provincial Park Advisory Committee in September, 1969. Chaired by a former premier of Ontario, Leslie Frost, it was composed of members—but not delegates—of conservation groups, the logging industry, cottagers, mayors and MPPs of communities surrounding the Park, and members of opposition parties. Its mandate was "to meet on the Call of the Minister of Lands and Forests and study and advise the Minister on such matters relating to the policy of the management of Algonquin Park as the Minister refers to it" (our emphasis). Since the Government had already decided on a policy of multiple use (permitting commercial logging to continue), the Committee was not permitted to make a recommendation on such a fundamental issue.

The Committee, which met in secret with no public participation, was such a success in stifling public enquiry and debate, that it was allowed to continue a year longer than its original two-year mandate, even though it met only once during its extra year. In 1972, a new Order-in-Council reconstituted the Committee for another year.

Frustrated by the Government's obstruction, the League turned its main efforts to other Ontario parks (see below), but it kept a watch on Algonquin and did what it could to stave off the further deterioration of the Park pending the production of a master plan. The Government was approving one scheme after another that must inevitably have a deleterious effect on the Park, without bothering to consult or even advise its own Advisory Committee!
Year by year, the League conducted a number of studies on Algonquin and reported its findings, doing what it could to expose and impede the blatant abuse of the Park. In the spring of 1973, the dormant Advisory Committee was suddenly ordered to wind up its affairs and present its final recommendations.

"The Average Man's Wilderness"—and Tree Farm
On July 17, Leo Bernier, Minister of Natural Resources* presented a major policy statement on Algonquin Park. This had to be done before a press conference because the Legislature had risen for the summer break three weeks before.

The statement was a bitter disappointment and gave little hope for an acceptable master plan to come. The Minister said that logging would be continued indefinitely at the existing rate, sound buffer zones around canoe routes would be reduced, automobile penetration of the interior would be encouraged. Nowhere in the statement was their assurance that a Primitive Zone would be established or that any limitation would be imposed on the number of visitors permitted in the Park at any one time (except on canoe routes), or that the proliferation of commercial developments would be controlled.

The Minister admitted in his statement that the Government had considered only two methods of managing the Park: either to close it entirely to "all but the most hardy", or to open it up to exploitation of many kinds. It chose the latter course, under the glib epigram, "The Average Man's Wilderness".

The Public Meetings
Well before the July 17 statement, the League had determined not to let yet another sleepy summer slip by with no action on Algonquin. It had planned a series of meetings to inform the public on the state of planning for Algonquin and to protest the Government's delays. The first meeting had been planned for July 27 in Huntsville, on the doorstep of Algonquin Park. Other meetings were to be held in Ottawa and Toronto.

The July 17 statement made the meetings all the more necessary. It was clear that the Algonquin problem was now out of the hands of the Advisory Committee, the task forces and other civil servants. It had become a purely

---

*In 1972, the Department of Lands and Forests was restructured and renamed the Ministry of Natural Resources.
political issue to be debated by elected representatives of the people of Ontario. Since the policy statement had not been presented in the Legislature, the League set out to provide a forum where the public could examine the document, hear the views of each of the political parties, and give the politicians a chance to sample the public's reaction to it before the opening of the Legislature in October.

Paid advertisements were placed in the local press encouraging everyone with an interest in Algonquin to take part—campers, cottagers, loggers, tourist operators and outfitters. Public service announcements and radio hotline shows also made it clear that these were not to be meetings of League members but of the public at large.

The Huntsville and Ottawa meetings were each attended by one of the leaders of the opposition parties, and both unequivocally denounced most of the terms of the July statement and especially the continuation of logging indefinitely. And they reiterated these convictions at subsequent meetings with their northern constituents and party associations, as well as in the Legislature in the fall. (The Toronto meeting, held on the eve of the opening of the Legislature, was aborted by a fire in the St. Lawrence Hall.)

Perhaps as a result of this clearly expressed opposition to the July 17 statement, the Government made no proposals about Algonquin during the 1973 fall session; it did not introduce a bill to establish the Algonquin Forestry Authority as it had indicated it would. Even John Roberts (another former premier), who had accepted the position of chairman of the Algonquin Forestry Authority appeared to be regretting his decision—and he later resigned before the Authority was brought into being. The League's newsletter noted at the time:

"If you think we aren't close to our objective, read this item by Gerry Welfram from a summer issue of Fisherman and Hunter: Even Algonquin Wildlands League officials are not aware of how close they recently came to accomplishing their goal almost single-handedly. They were so close in fact that relocation plans were drawn up at Queen's Park to put the logging firms to work cutting needed holes in the forest in major deer-hunting areas southeast of the Park." But we missed.

The Master Plan

The Master Plan for Algonquin Park was introduced on October 22, the opening day of the Legislature's 1974 fall session. One hundred pages in length, lavishly illustrated with colour photos and maps, the document set forth in commendable detail the Government's plans for every aspect of the management of the Park. Land acquisition, access points, zoning, the use of power boats and snowmobiles, limits on visitor use, redistribution of concessions, interpretive programs, wildlife management, perimeter recreation and a host of administrative matters were displayed and dealt with in a most impressive manner. But on the fundamental problems, it offered little more than the ill-fated 1968 Provisional Master Plan.

Logging was to continue unabated (15 to 17 million cubic feet or 420,000-476,000M³ per year) over 75 percent of the Park. Trapping and hunting were to continue as before. Insulting to the conservationists was the allocation of the Primitive Zone. Comprising less than 9 percent of the Park, it was split into three parts located in the busiest part of the Park, right up against the intensively used Recreation Zone along the Highway 60 corridor; the largest part included a luxury resort lodge and a youth camp, with their access roads, and three lakes on which outboards were to be allowed.

The master plan makes it quite clear that three-quarters of the Park is to be treated as a Timber Management Unit, "improved" by planned programs of artificial manipulation: "If a site is more suitable from the viewpoint of timber production for a species other than the one growing on it, it may be desirable to apply alternative silvicultural systems to establish the more suitable species".

However, some concessions to the natural values of Algonquin were included in the master plan which stated clearly that, beginning in 1975,
the use of motorboats will be phased out except in Lake Opeongo and 26 household lakes
mechanically assisted interior transport (wheels, rollers, or other devices for overland transport of watercraft) will be prohibited
maximum daily quotas will be placed on the number of canoes which may enter the interior through each access point
large parties entering the interior will be required to break up into camping parties of not more than nine persons
non-burnable, disposable food and beverage containers will be prohibited in areas where there is no waste collection service.

Instead of implementing any of these measures on schedule, the Government decided to call 1975 “a year of education”. A survey taken that year by the Government involving one out of every four interior campers showed that 80 percent were in favour of the outboard ban, 63 percent in favour of the mechanical assistance ban, 84 percent in favour of access point quotas, 80 percent in favour of limiting interior camping party size, and 59 percent in favour of the can and bottle ban. In spite of this overwhelming confirmation of previous surveys, the Government did nothing the following year except to declare the party size limit and the access point quota to be in effect, although even this was lifted for “administrative convenience” on the busiest weekend of the year!

Finally, three years later, the bans on outboards and disposable cans and bottles were imposed for the 1978 season—but even the long overdue outboard ban was grievously weakened by the addition of 12 interior lakes on which outboards can be used in the spring and fall.

The next phase in the Battle of Algonquin will be the five-year review of the effect of the master plan. There will be little observable change in the Park since 1974, owing to the years of delay in acting on the master plan. But the review will provide an opportunity to pose questions on the real economics of the forest industry that dominates Algonquin and on its effect on the present and future vegetative cover of the Park. Perhaps in another five years we will be able to determine whether the limits on use and temporary closing of some campsites and lakes to camping have in fact improved the results of over-use.

KILLARNEY PARK
In the spring of 1969, the League had noticed that just when public discussion about Algonquin was at its height, the Ontario Government had given its approval to the extension of logging activities in another provincial park—Killarney—on the north shore of Georgian Bay. According to the bold plan for the 4,000-square-mile (10,000 km²) North Georgian Bay Recreational Reserve, this little gem, often called the crown jewel of Ontario’s parks, was to be the one example of wilderness in the Recreational Area. One hundred and forty square miles in size, it is one of Canada’s magnificent beauty spots, a wild area of mountains and lakes, streams and meadows.

The League undertook an air and ground survey of the logging operations in the Park which revealed not only an extended logging road reaching into a stand of yellow birch, but also a logging camp on Kirk Lake. The results of the survey were turned over to the Government and released to the press. On being questioned in the Legislature, the Minister of Lands and Forests said the granting of permission to extend the road was consistent with the zoning plan for the Park. When the League tried to locate the plan, it discovered that it was still being prepared. There was no plan. The only inference to be drawn was that permission was given to build the road before any park plan was formulated, much less approved, by the Department, and that the proposed multiple-use zone into which it intruded was being mapped out to include the road.

While the League’s campaign produced only a defensive response at the time, in the summer of 1971 Premier Davis announced that commercial logging in Killarney had been stopped and that the Park was to be phased into Primitive classification.

In August, 1972, the Ministry of Natural Resources released three alternative plans for public consideration and held public hearings in Sudbury, Killarney and Espanola.

The three proposals aroused a great deal of local resentment. Expansion of the Park boundaries threatened a number of cottages, and snowmobilers objected to prohibition of their machines. But the main obstacle to the production of a firm master plan has apparently been the demand for a road through the Park to connect the town of Killarney to Whitefish Falls. Consultants were retained in 1978 to investigate the feasibility of a road and their report will be completed around the end of 1979. It seems unlikely that a road through the very difficult terrain of the Park will be found to be economically acceptable and the master plan will be released by 1980.

Since its establishment as a Park in 1964, the Killarney area has suffered from overuse. It is hoped that a prime objective of the master plan will be to institute strict limitations on the use of the interior to preserve its natural character as much as possible.

QUETICO PARK
The next major League project was launched in November, 1969, with a public meeting to explore the situation in Quetico Provincial Park. Three resolutions were passed calling for: 1) Domtar to give up its timber license in Quetico, 2) the Department of Lands and Forests to classify Quetico as a Primitive Park, and 3) the Government to transfer the administration of the provincial parks to a separate ministry whose policies would be
more in keeping with the preservation of the wilderness environment in the major parks.

The disclosures at the meeting resulted in wide press, radio and TV coverage and produced a heavy mail-in protest to the Department of Lands and Forests. Through the following year the League exposed the existence of 104 mining claims in the Park and the pending sale of Domtar's timber limits to Ontario-Minnesota Pulp and Paper, a wholly-owned subsidiary of the giant Boise Cascade Corp. of the U.S.

In June, 1970, the Minister of Lands and Forests appointed a Quetico Advisory Committee as a result of the public dissatisfaction with the management policies of Quetico. Its announced duties were to advise the Minister on matters referred to it, to hold public hearings and to interpret the expressed opinions of groups and individuals as part of the planning process, and to report periodically to the Minister on the progress of the planning "in order that the public may be informed".

Little was heard from the Committee through the summer, so the League organized a "Summit Meeting" in Quetico on October 3, 1970, to investigate, discuss and publicize the problem on the spot. Queen's Park declined the League's invitation, but over 100 people attended the meeting at their own expense, many coming from as far as Toronto and Ottawa, and a number from the U.S., including Sigurd Olson.

The day was spent examining the cutting area of the Park, and holding a discussion between conservationists, the forest industry and district employees of the Department of Lands and Forests. A resolution calling for the classification of Quetico as a Primitive Park and for a moratorium on logging until the reclassification took place was endorsed by representatives of the Canadian Audubon Society, the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, the International Biological Programme, the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada, Pollution Probe, Thunder Bay Field Naturalists and, of course, the Algonquin Wildlands League. At a subsequent meeting, the Conservation Council of Ontario called for an immediate moratorium on logging in Quetico until the recommendations of the Advisory Committee were handed down.

Perhaps the most significant result of the Summit Meeting was the spontaneous formation of a number of save-Quetico groups from Fort Frances to Toronto. On November 3, PDQ (Prevent Destruction of Quetico) called a Town Hall Meeting in Toronto's St. Lawrence Centre which attracted 1200 people, 700 of whom had to be turned away. Two League directors, the Deputy Minister of Lands and Forests and a Domtar vice-president took part in a panel discussion and answered questions from the audience. This was the first occasion on which a senior Lands and Forests official conceded that there were suitable areas outside the Park that could both
absorb the loggers then working in Quetico, and supply material for the mills.

A week later, Rene Brunelle, Minister of Lands and Forests, made an intransigent address in the Legislature, attempting to discredit the League, asserting his Department’s determination to retain Quetico as a Natural Environment Park (which would permit logging), and defending the Government’s refusal to block the proposed sale of Domtar’s interests and cutting license to Ontario-Minnesota. The implication was clear that the Minister at least had no intention of establishing a single accessible Primitive Park in the foreseeable future.

This statement aroused still further comment in the press and the League was besieged with requests for background information on the whole program. To meet this demand it was decided to produce 1,000 copies of an information kit for distribution to interested groups. This was an expensive undertaking for which the League did not have adequate funds, but grants from the White Owl Conservation Awards and the Wilderness Society in Washington covered the major portion of the cost. The kits, composed of nineteen reprints and specially prepared fact sheets, found wide distribution among those who were preparing briefs to present before the Advisory Committee the following spring.

The hearings were held in Fort Frances, Aitkakan, Thunder Bay and Toronto in April 1971. The vast majority of the briefs and letters—even those from the area around the Park—advocated reclassifying Quetico as a Primitive Park.

The following month, Premier Davis announced that the Committee had produced its first recommendation and said, “From this point onwards there will be no further commercial logging in Quetico Provincial Park”. This was a big step forward for both Quetico and basic Government attitudes on parks.

On August 9, 1972, the Quetico Advisory Committee formally presented its complete report to the Minister of Natural Resources. Conservationists were pleasantly surprised by the general intent of the report.

The five-year period between the Committee’s report and the master plan seemed an eternity, but when it came—in October 1977—it was worth the wait. Quetico was to be considered as one big Wilderness Zone with eight small Access Zones on the boundary. All commercial resource extraction was to be prohibited, with all mining claims and private leases to be terminated. The use of outboard motors was to be limited immediately to a few designated lakes and rivers, and totally banned in 1979. Park boundaries were to be adjusted to include boundary lakes, and a visitor regulation program was to be developed, based on carrying capacity research begun in 1970.

Of all Ontario’s large provincial parks, Quetico seemed to be well launched on a sound management course. It appeared to be a nice, clear-cut example of wise resource use that justified the thousands of man-hours people from all over the Province and beyond had voluntarily devoted to the cause. But a new hazard has reared its head just a dozen miles north of Quetico—a proposed coal-burning 800 megawatt generating station to be located on Marmion Lake. Hydro officials steadfastly maintain that there will be no risk of sulphur dioxide emissions (and hence acid rain) damaging the pines, lichens and waterways and they do not intend to install “scrubbers” until monitors (their own) indicate that damage has been done.

The U.S. State Department and Minnesota agencies are deeply concerned about the effects the plant may have on their Boundary Waters Canoe Area just across the international boundary from Quetico—so disturbed that they have held meetings with their Canadian counterparts to launch vigorous complaints. The League is not well versed at present on the issue of acid fall-out (although we’re working on this through a new committee). However, it does seem that the U.S. agencies’ concerns are prompted solely by apprehension regarding the threat to their air, land, and water, and Ontario’s reluctance to acknowledge potential danger could be prompted by a desire to cut costs (while adding still more to Ontario’s electrical surplus which we understand is already in the neighbourhood of 40 percent in excess of peak power demand).

LAKE SUPERIOR PARK
In the middle of the Quetico campaign, the League received disturbing reports on the logging activities in Lake Superior Park. Preliminary investigation revealed that 95 percent of the Park’s 526 square miles (1,362 km²) was under timber licenses granted to three companies.

After securing additional data on the history and natural features of the Park, the League organized a four-man task force to make an on-site study of the situation. The task force was well qualified for the job—Dr. Douglas Pimlott, Professor of Zoology and Forestry at the University of Toronto; Bruce Littljohn, former Parks Branch historian; Dr. C. Brian Cragg, Professor of Chemistry and Natural Sciences at York University; and Dennis Voigt, graduate forester.

They arrived in the Park on June 22, 1972, and spent five days talking to half a dozen Park personnel and a forest industry supervisor. They examined the Park in two teams, by car, foot and air.

On returning to Toronto, the task force reported to the Board of Directors of the League and it was agreed that one area in particular, just north of the Agawa River, should be closed immediately to logging, pending further study by the Department of Lands and Forests to determine its value as a protected Natural Zone. Four
days later a meeting was held with the Minister and three senior officials. They listened to the League’s proposal with interest. A Department naturalist, Shan Walsh, was sent to inspect the area. Mr. Walsh’s report has not been made public, but shortly after his inspection logging operations were discontinued in a portion of the area in question.

The complete record of the League’s inspection was later presented to the Minister. In it the League made eight recommendations, subsequently published in the League’s book, *Why Wilderness* (now out of print). Publication of the book was facilitated by a grant from the Eaton Foundation.

In 1972, the Ministry of Natural Resources released background information material on Lake Superior Park and invited recipients to fill out a broad questionnaire expressing their views on management plans for the Park. This material was to be used in drawing up a provisional master plan.

In 1977, the Ministry issued the long awaited Preliminary Master Plan for Lake Superior Provincial Park. According to rumours, the five-year delay was caused by a fierce internal battle over the logging issue. The resulting plan seems to confirm them. It makes little sense on its own terms and clearly is the result of a stand-off between two totally incompatible ideas of what the Park should be.

While about half the Park was zoned according to the policies set forth in the draft “Administrative Policies” document of 1975 (the basis for the “Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies”), the other half is designated as a Recreation/Utilization Zone, the current euphemism for Commercial Logging Zone. It can be argued that this is an improvement over the 95 percent of the Park that is now in timber limits, but in terms of a logical parks policy it does not hang together. The worst effect of the compromise with logging is that the planners are forced to put the “protected” zones where they are most exposed to visitor traffic, instead of where visitor impact would be filtered out by other zones. We see Wilderness Zones and Nature Reserves bordering on the Trans-Canada Highway! This plan confirms what we saw in Algonquin: as long as commercial logging is permitted in parks, park zoning will be mainly designed to separate loggers from recreational visitors, with the protection of the natural features of the park being far down on the scale of priorities.

In our 1977 response to the Preliminary Master Plan, we stressed the insensitivity of the economic argument for continuing logging, and were able to point out that our claim made in 1971 in *Why Wilderness*, that the logging operation in Lake Superior Park could not be carried out on a sustained yield basis, has been admitted to be correct in the Preliminary Master Plan.

The League will struggle on with Lake Superior Park, cheered on a little by the example of Quetico (although Quetico never had the Trans-Canada Highway running through the middle of it).

**OTHER PARKS AND ISSUES**

Keenly aware of its limited resources of talent and finances, the League has held firm in its determination not to allow its strength to be diluted by tackling projects not immediately associated with Ontario’s “large parks significant for their natural characteristics”. At the same time, it recognizes the importance of the smaller parks in the whole Ontario park system and has always been glad to lend a hand in support of other organizations’ efforts to improve the system.

In 1971, the Canadian Environmental Law Association launched a strong attack on the destruction, by a cement company, of the sand dunes on the border of Sandbanks Provincial Park. The League took part in a protest meeting at the Park in 1971 and made representations to Government in defence of the dunes.

When Inverhuron Park was to be sold to Ontario Hydro in 1973, the League supported a local citizens’ group and expressed its opposition to the take-over in a letter to Premier Davis. Similarly, when the Ontario Government was planning to finance a luxurious fly-in resort at Maple Mountain in the Temagami area in 1974, the League argued that such a development would effectively ruin the wild aspect of the last remaining area with wilderness park potential south of the Cobalt/Wawa line, and, by being virtually self-contained, would do little or nothing to boost the economy of the Tri-Town area of Cobalt, Haileybury and New Liskeard, which was the announced aim of the project. The Opposition took this up strongly in the Legislature, spurred on by the Minaki Lodge fiasco, and the Ontario Government appeared to be happy to acknowledge Indian land claims as an excuse to withdraw its proposal.

In June 1973, the League sent a crew of four to take part in a protest paddle down the Jacques Cartier River, just north of Quebec City. This beautiful and popular river, running through a spectacular gorge, was threatened with a Hydro-Quebec development. The National and Provincial Parks Association had first brought this to our attention in its journal *Park News* and the League offered to help the Quebec group and a branch of the International Biological Programme who were trying to stave off the construction of what appeared to be an unnecessary draw-down reservoir to handle peak load periods in Quebec. Hydro-Quebec has since been ordered to abandon any plans for hydro development on the river.

In 1974 and 1975, the Sierra Club of Ontario launched a campaign to have a section of the Missinaibi River established as a Wild River Park, and the League gave its full support to this project in letters to Government. A Wild River Park Reserve was announced early in 1977.
AMENDMENTS PROPOSED TO THE OFFICIAL ZONING PLAN OF ALGONQUIN PROVINCIAL PARK BY THE ALGONQUIN WILDLANDS LEAGUE

NOTE: NATURAL, HISTORIC AND ACCESS ZONES, RECREATIONAL RESERVES AND DEER YARDS TOTALING 11.9% OF THE PARK AREA ARE NOT SHOWN ON THE MAP OR INCLUDED IN THE FIGURES BELOW.

Map 5

EXISTING RECREATION-UTILIZATION ZONE (74.9% OF PARK AREA) 2,177 sq. mi.

EXISTING DEVELOPMENT ZONE (4.3% OF PARK AREA) 125 sq. mi.

EXISTING WILDERNESS ZONE (8.9% OF PARK AREA) 260 sq. mi.

PROPOSED WILDERNESS ZONE (31.3% OF PARK AREA) 911 sq. mi.

PROPOSED NATURAL ENVIRONMENT ZONE (2% OF PARK AREA) 58 sq. mi.
Over the past seven years, the management of Algonquin Park has been the subject of a series of studies, hearings and debates, culminating last October in the introduction of the Algonquin Provincial Park Master Plan.

The master plan incorporates many desirable policies. But in the view of the undersigned five organizations, it fails to deal properly with the fundamental question of commercial logging in the Park.

There is no need to repeat here the qualities that make Algonquin unique in Ontario, if not in the world. Ontario must accept the responsibility of protecting Algonquin’s recreational, scientific and cultural values; they are too precious to be squandered for short-term economic gain. Logging, whether conducted in the name of the Crown or by private enterprise, must unavoidably alter the forest growth patterns of the Park and must utilize a network of logging roads, now measuring some thousand miles in total length.

We propose that in the long-term public interest, commercial logging be phased out of Algonquin Park on an orderly, scheduled basis over a period of years, and that the Primitive Zones be increased immediately from the present 8.9% (260 square miles) to approximately 31.3% (911 square miles).

Wilderness is shrinking every day even in the most remote areas of Canada; in southern Ontario it is rare. Those few parks which still remain in a relatively undeveloped state must be protected from continuing exploitation.

On behalf of the combined membership of our organizations, and countless thousands of other Ontario residents who cherish in silence the integrity of Algonquin Park, we urge you to give this proposal your serious consideration and support in the critical months ahead.

C.B. Cragg, President
Algonquin Wildlands League
Box 114, Postal Station Q
Toronto, Ont. M4T 2L7
Tel. (416) 962-6305

Ian McLaren, President
Canadian Nature Federation
46 Elgin Street
Ottawa, Ont. K1P 5K6
Tel. (613) 233-3486

Gordon MacKenzie, President
Federation of Ontario Naturalists
1262 Don Mills Road
Don Mills, Ont. M3B 2W7
Tel. (416) 444-8419

Robin Fraser, President
National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada
47 Colborne St., Ste. 308
Toronto, Ont. M5E 1E3
Tel. (416) 366-3494

L.R.L. Symmes, Chairman
Sierra Club of Ontario
47 Colborne St., Ste. 308
Toronto, Ont. M5E 1E3
Tel. (416) 366-3494
One of the most ambitious non-government efforts to establish a major new park in Ontario is the Atikaki ("Country of the Caribou") Park proposal. First advanced by the Atikaki Coalition in Manitoba, the plan called for a 4,950 square-mile (12,820 km²) park, (3,150 square miles (8,159 km²) in Ontario and 1,800 (4,662 km²) in Manitoba), lying roughly between Red Lake and Lake Winnipeg. The proposed area (somewhat reduced in subsequent submissions by the Ontario section) encompasses four complete watersheds, a woodland caribou range, and perhaps the largest concentration of Indian rock paintings on the continent.

The League sent two representatives on a canoe trip with National and Provincial Parks Association personnel, the manager of the Atikaki Coalition, and Ministry of Natural Resources planners to study a portion of the proposed park west of Red Lake. When the N.P.P.A.C. (which had assumed leadership of the Ontario campaign) made representation to the Deputy Minister of Natural Resources and subsequently to the Minister in 1977, the League took part in both meetings, along with a representative of the F.O.N. A portion of the suggested area has been designated a park reserve, though divided into two parts.

The Minister of Natural Resources explained this response in terms of possible conflicts with logging and mining interests. The Coalition had gone to great pains to ensure that the proposed area was virtually free of such conflicts and was disappointed that it had been sliced up. However, the Government's prompt endorsement of the principle of a wilderness park in that area was encouraging.

The League has responded to most of the numerous public hearings on master plans or planning proposals for other parks including Sibley, Rondeau, and Polar Bear.

**OUR WILDERNESS POLICY**

About 1971, we became aware that we were responding to crises that were coming thick and fast without having decided on a policy of any sort against which our responses could be rationally judged. We therefore decided to hold a weekend conference in October 1971, at the Lake of Bays cottage of our President, Abbott Conway, to work out a policy stance for the League.

The immediate outcome of the conference was the definition of wilderness (the "What We Mean by Wilderness" section in this book), and the decision was made to expand on the theme from there. This resulted in the publication of the first edition of *Wilderness Now* the following spring. The booklet was distributed to members and formally ratified at the annual meeting of members that year.

In spite of its shortcomings, our booklet started something of a chain reaction. In 1973, at the annual meeting of the Federation of Ontario Naturalists, representatives of the League, the F.O.N., the Sierra Club of Ontario, the Canadian Nature Federation and the National and Provincial Parks Association held a meeting and agreed to support a study on the need and opportunity for establishing wilderness parks in Ontario. The study group adopted the name "Coalition for Wilderness", and completed a comprehensive report entitled *Wilderness in Ontario* which was presented to the Resource Policy Field Committee of the Ontario Cabinet in February 1974. The report was subsequently given wide circulation by being reprinted in three parts in the F.O.N. magazine, *Ontario Naturalist*. Developed mainly by W.D. Addison and J.D. Bates, the report has been acknowledged by Ministry personnel as having an important influence in the production of their own *Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies* manual published in 1978.

In 1975 the Coalition distributed a letter calling once again for an orderly phase-out of commercial logging in Algonquin Park and an immediate increase in the proposed Primitive Zone to 31 percent of the Park area. The letter, with map attached, was sent to conservationists, including League members, and Ontario MPP's just prior to the 1975 general election. p37

**SO...?**

The Algonquin Wildlands League has been described as "a spunky little organization that has done more in concrete terms to protect wilderness in Ontario than any other group of its kind". While we would have difficulty in finding serious fault with this statement, we must give credit to the many established conservation organizations and the new ones that sprang up, self-sufficient and self-energizing, that gave us the strong support which was indispensable to whatever success we have achieved.

The League was launched in a storm of harsh words, words that had to be said to produce the action that for decades had been so desperately needed. This is not to say that no effort had been made to reform Ontario's park policies before the advent of the Algonquin Wildlands League. Much valuable research had been undertaken; many sound recommendations had been presented to Government in one form or another. But with each passing year, it had become increasingly evident to the founding members of the League that there simply was not time to allow the normal course of events to bring in the protection needed for the surviving wilderness areas of Ontario. In spite of the urgency, the League was more than four years in the gestation stage. When its birth was finally announced in June of 1968, it had determined on a now-or-never course of action.

None of its members had experience in this sort of program. There were no precedents. The opposition was formidable. There were the corporate giants of the forest industry. There was a civil service brought up through university training and years of tenure in the Department of Lands and Forests with the firm belief that trees are measured in dollars, parks by the number of people
that can be lured into them, happiness by the intensity of activities offered. There was a noticeable lack of funds for the League's operation and scant likelihood of significant grants.

What a hope! But hope there was, and by a combination of fortuitous timing and a favourable press, the infant League attracted immediate support and made remarkable progress in developing a sound management policy for Ontario's parks.

Looking back over the past ten years, it's surprisingly difficult to envision the crude state of the art of Ontario park management in 1968. There was no published park management policy. The closest thing was the classification document that suggested that not all parks are created equal and that some should have different treatment from others. There were no working master plans. The Department of Lands and Forests staff consisted almost exclusively of graduate foresters and engineers.

Now a large proportion of the parks staff is trained in environmental studies. There is the comprehensive "Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies". There are master plans in use or in preparation for all the major parks. Public hearings are integral to the preparation of master plans. There is a Provincial Parks Council holding regular public hearings, under the chairmanship of an environmentalist and authority on parks, and the Council is submitting forceful public recommendations to the Ministry of Natural Resources.

The League recognizes that as conditions change, so must its own attitudes and strategy. A far higher degree of environmental sophistication and technical knowledge is needed by citizens' groups than a decade ago. The easy stuff's been done.

With this in mind, the League is modifying its programs and seeking the help of experts in a number of technical fields in order to approach the new problems of today with a degree of competence.

Environmental groups must now be prepared to face cross-examination by lawyers and specialized technologists. Some of our concerns originate outside our borders—notably air and water pollution—and must be resolved on the international level. This entails costly but essential liaison with our American counterparts.

Budget restrictions, energy shortages, unemployment and brisk commercial competition will all make our job more difficult—at times tedious. Our members will miss the easy headlines of yesteryear, and the instant signs of success. But the need for our work is no less urgent than before; the need for public support no less vital to our final success. Our work has really just begun!

"What can I do as an individual?"

This is the question we hear more than any other. One part of the answer is simple:
A NOTE ON THE APPENDICES

The single most important factor shaping the destiny of Ontario wildlands is that of the provincial Government's continuing preoccupation with the value of natural resources as raw material for industrial development. In this context, environmental protection values and the corresponding resource uses signified by the conferral of provincial park status remain entirely subordinate or residual to industrial policy. For this reason the approach to developing park-related legislation and policy has historically been piecemeal and often site-specific.

Readers may therefore find the legislation which follows to be confusing and framed largely with economic development in mind. This has been our experience. The introductions which preface the appendices are intended to cut through some of this confusion and direct attention to the major weaknesses which from our point of view have traditionally posed great difficulties for those of us committed to resource conservation and wilderness protection. (Editors)

INTRODUCTION TO APPENDIX A
THE WILDERNESS AREAS ACT

The principal reason why this Act has not been useful in preserving wilderness is Section 3 which limits the area that can be protected by the Act to a maximum of one square mile. At present, the total area designated wilderness under this Act is 13.5 square miles (35 km²). (Editors)

THE WILDERNESS AREAS ACT

1. In this Act,
   (a) "Minister" means the Minister of Lands and Forests;
   (b) "public lands" means the lands belonging to Her Majesty in right of Ontario, whether or not covered with water. 1959, c. 107, s. 1.

2. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may set apart any public lands as a wilderness area for the preservation of the area as nearly as may be in its natural state in which research and educational activities may be carried on, for the protection of the flora and fauna, for the improvement of the area, having regard to its historical, aesthetic, scientific or recreational value, or for such other purposes as may be prescribed. 1959, c. 107, s. 2.

3. Nothing in this Act or in the regulations made under this Act limits or affects the development or utilization of the natural resources in any wilderness area that is more than 640 acres in size. 1959, c. 107, s. 3.

4. Land may be acquired under The Public Works Act for the purposes of this Act. 1959, c. 107, s. 4.

5. Wilderness areas are under the control and management of the Minister. 1959, c. 107, s. 5.

6. Notwithstanding The Game and Fisheries Act and the regulations thereunder, the Minister may take such measures as he deems proper for the protection of fish, animals and birds in wilderness areas. 1959, c. 107, s. 6.

7. —(1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations,
   (a) for the care, preservation, improvement, control and management of wilderness areas;
   (b) for prohibiting or regulating and controlling the use of lands in wilderness areas;
   (c) for prohibiting or regulating and controlling the admission of persons or domestic animals to wilderness areas and for issuing permits to persons to enter and travel in wilderness areas and prescribing the terms and conditions thereof and the fee therefor;
   (d) respecting any matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the intent and purpose of this Act.

   (2) Any regulations under subsection 1 may be made applicable to all wilderness areas, to any wilderness area or to any part of a wilderness area. 1959, c. 107, s. 7.

8. Every person who contravenes any regulation made under this Act or any term or condition of a permit issued under the regulations is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine of not more than $500. 1959, c. 107, s. 8.

INTRODUCTION TO APPENDIX B
THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

The weakness of the existing Provincial Parks Act is that its statement of the purpose of parks (Section 2) is too vague to be useful, and that its main effect is to permit the Cabinet to pass regulations. (This is what the phrase: "The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may..." means.) Now while regulations when passed are available to the public, the Government is under no obligation to publish pending regulations earlier than the day they are to be passed. Such regulations (plus matters which may be determined by the Minister alone), are almost the whole of park policy. The present policy (May 1978) is being put in place without the necessity of bringing forward any legislation: it could be altered or withdrawn in the same way. (Editors)

THE PROVINCIAL PARKS ACT

1. In this Act,
   (a) "assistant superintendent" means a person who is designated by the Minister as an assistant superintendent for the purposes of this Act and the regulations;
   (b) "conservation officer" means a conservation officer appointed under The Game and Fish Act;
   (c) "district manager" means the person in charge of the administrative district of the Ministry of Natural Resources in which a provincial park is situate;
(d) “master plan” means a program and policy, or any part thereof, prepared from time to time in respect of a provincial park or proposed provincial park and includes the maps, texts and other material describing such program and policy;
(e) “Minister” means the Minister of Natural Resources;
(f) “park warden” means a person who is designated by the Minister as a park warden for the purposes of this Act and the regulations;
(g) “provincial park” includes provincial camp grounds, provincial picnic grounds and provincial camp and picnic grounds;
(h) “public lands” means lands belonging to Her Majesty in right of Ontario, whether or not covered with water;
(i) “regulations” means the regulations made under this Act;
(j) “superintendent” means a person who is designated by the Minister as a superintendent to have charge of a provincial park.
1976, c. 56, s. 1.

2. All provincial parks are dedicated to the people of the Province of Ontario and others who may use them for their healthful enjoyment and education, and the provincial parks shall be maintained for the benefit of future generations in accordance with this Act and the regulations. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 2.

3.—(1) All provincial parks in existence when this Act comes into force shall continue to be reserved, set apart and known as provincial parks.
(2) The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may set apart as a provincial park any area in Ontario, may increase or decrease the area of any provincial park and may deprecate any provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 3 (1, 2).
(3) Land may be acquired under The Ministry of Government Services Act, 1973 for the purposes of this Act. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 3 (3); 1973, c. 2, s. 2.

4. Notwithstanding The Municipal Act, every unopened road allowance that is within a provincial park and that has not been closed and conveyed shall be deemed to have been vested in the Crown from the day on which the provincial park was established or the area in which the unopened road allowance is located was added to a provincial park, as the case may be, and the Minister may close to travel any such road allowance one month after having caused notice of the proposed closing to be published once a week for four consecutive weeks in a newspaper having general circulation in the locality in which the road allowance is located or one month after having caused such a notice to be posted in a conspicuous place at or near the road allowance.

5. For municipal purposes, any land set apart as a provincial park or added thereto shall, so long as it remains part of the provincial park, be deemed to be separated from any municipality of which it formed a part immediately before it became a provincial park or a part thereof.

6. For judicial purposes, any land set apart as a provincial park or added thereto shall continue to form part of the county, if any, of which it formed a part immediately before it became a provincial park or a part thereof. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 3 (4-6).

4. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may designate any provincial park or any part of a provincial park as an area in which section 26 of The Game and Fish Act does not apply from and including the Tuesday following the second Monday in October to and including the 31st day of March next following. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 4.

5. The Lieutenant-Governor in Council may classify any provincial park as a natural environmental park, a nature reserve park, a primitive park, a recreational park, a wild river park or such other class of Park as he may designate. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 5.

6. The Minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, may appoint committees to perform such advisory functions as are considered necessary or desirable in connection with the administration of one or more of the provincial parks and fix the terms of reference and procedures of such committees. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 6.

7.—(1) Each provincial park is under the control and management of the Minister and shall be under the charge of a district manager or a superintendent designated by the Minister. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 7 (1); 1976, c. 56, s. 4, part.
(2) Without limiting the generality of subsection 1, in the management of a provincial park the Minister may from time to time define areas on maps or plans, designate such areas as zones, and classify any zone as an historic zone, multiple use zone, natural zone, primitive zone, recreational zone or otherwise as he considers proper. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 7 (2).
(3) Without limiting the generality of subsection 1, the district manager or the superintendent, with the approval of the Minister, may, in respect of the provincial park under his charge,
(a) construct and operate on public lands golf courses, bowling greens or other facilities for sports or amusement;
(b) construct and operate on public lands restaurants, refreshment booths, shops, sleeping accommodations and other facilities for the convenience of the public;
(c) construct and operate on public lands toilet, dressingroom, picnic, camping, cooking, bathing, parking and other facilities for the convenience of the public;
(d) acquire and operate boats, vehicles and other means of transportation in connection with the park;
(e) make agreements with persons with respect to the establishment or operation by them of any works, facilities or services on public lands;
(f) prescribe, by the erection, posting or other display of notices, the time or times of the day or year during which the park or any part thereof is open or closed, as the case may be, for the use of the public. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 7 (3); 1976, c. 56, s. 4, part.

7a.—(1) The Minister may prepare a master plan in respect of any provincial park or proposed provincial park.
(2) The Minister may review a master plan from time to time and make amendments thereto. 1976, c. 56, s. 2.

8.—(1) The Minister and any municipality, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, may enter into agreement for the construction or maintenance of a road or the reconstruction or maintenance of an existing road under the jurisdiction and control of the municipality for the purpose of providing access to a provincial park, and the provincial share of the cost thereof may be paid out of the moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 8 (1); 1975, c. 1, s. 87 (1).
(2) A road constructed, reconstructed or maintained under an
agreement made under subsection 1 remains under the jurisdiction and control of the municipality. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 8 (2).

(3) The Minister, with the approval of the Lieutenant Governor in Council, may arrange with the road commission elected under The Statute Law Act or with a person who is the owner of land in territory without municipal organization for the construction or maintenance of a road therein for the purpose of providing access to a provincial park, and the provincial share of the cost thereof may be paid out of the moneys appropriated therefor by the Legislature. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 8 (3); 1972, c. 1, s. 87 (2).

9.—(1) The Minister may receive and take from any person by grant, gift, devise, bequest or otherwise, any property, real or personal, or any interest therein, for the purposes of a provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 9 (1).

(2) Where only the surface rights in lands are received and taken by the Minister under subsection 1 and the mines and minerals are not vested in the Crown, subsection 1 of section 18 does not apply to such lands. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 9 (2); 1972, c. 27, s. 1.

10.—(1) The Minister may inquire into and ascertain all the facts concerning all leases and other agreements in respect of any lands in a provincial park.

(2) If the Minister is satisfied that any person claiming to be entitled to any rights in respect of public lands in a provincial park, or any person claiming under or through him, has been guilty of a fraud or imposition, or has contravened any of the conditions of his lease or other agreement, he may cancel such lease or other agreement and resume the land and dispose of it as if the lease or other agreement had never been made, and upon such cancellation all moneys paid in respect of such lease or other agreement remain the property of the Crown and the improvements, if any, on the land are forfeited to the Crown.

(3) Where a person refuses to deliver up land or where a trespasser is in possession, the Minister may obtain possession in a manner similar to that provided in section 27 of The Public Lands Act. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 10.

11. Except as provided by this Act or the regulations, no person shall use or occupy any public lands in a provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 11.

12. In a provincial park, the district manager, superintendent and assistant superintendent and a park warden and conservation officer have all the power and authority of a member of the Ontario Provincial Police Force. 1976, c. 56, s. 3.

13. Any person having the power and authority of a member of the Ontario Provincial Police Force may seize any motor or other vehicle, or any aircraft, or any boat, skiff, canoe, punt or other vessel, or any equipment or appliance, or any other article used in contravention of this Act and found in the possession of a person suspected of having committed an offence against this Act or the regulations, and upon conviction therefor the provincial judge may order the chattel so confiscated to be forfeited to the Crown in right of Ontario, and after the expiration of thirty days it may be disposed of in such manner as the Minister considers proper. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 13.

14.—(1) Any lost, mislaid or abandoned property coming into the custody of the district manager, superintendent or other person in charge of a provincial park and not claimed by the owner within three months is the property of the Crown in right of Ontario and may be sold under the direction of the Minister, but, where any such property is perishable or has no commercial value, it may be given to a charitable institution or destroyed. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 14 (1); 1976, c. 56, s. 4, part.

(2) Where a person establishes to the satisfaction of the Minister within one year of the date of sale that he was the owner of property sold under subsection 1, the Minister may direct the payment to such person of an amount equal to the price received for the property less the cost of the sale and other expenses incurred in connection with the property. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 14 (2).

15.—(1) The district manager or superintendent in charge of a provincial park may open or close to travel any road or trail within the provincial park that is not under the control of the Ministry of Transportation and Communications, or any portage in the provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 15 (1); 1972, c. 1', s. 100 (2); 1976, c. 56, s. 4, part.

(2) No person who has knowledge of the closing of a road or trail under subsection 1 shall travel thereon. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 15 (2).

15a.—(1) In this section, "road" includes a trail. 1971, c. 16, s. 1, part.

(2) The district manager or superintendent in charge of a provincial park may erect at the entrance to the provincial park or at the intersection of any roads therein a stop sign conforming with the regulations under The Highway Traffic Act. 1971, c. 16, s. 1, part; 1976, c. 56, s. 4, part.

(3) The driver or operator of a vehicle, upon approaching a stop sign at the entrance to a provincial park, shall bring the vehicle to a full stop at a clearly marked stop line or, if none, then immediately before proceeding past the stop sign.

(4) The driver or operator of a vehicle, (a) upon approaching a stop sign at an intersection in a provincial park, shall bring the vehicle to a full stop at a clearly marked stop line or, if none, then immediately before entering the nearest crosswalk or, if none, then immediately before entering the intersection; and

(b) upon entering the intersection, shall yield the right of way to traffic in the intersection or approaching the intersection on another road so closely that it constitutes an immediate hazard and having so yielded the right of way may proceed with caution and the traffic approaching the intersection on another road shall yield the right of way to the vehicle so proceeding in the intersection. 1971, c. 16, s. 1, part.

16. No licence or other authority shall be issued for the sale of liquor as defined in The Liquor Control Act in a provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 16.

17. Subject to The Game and Fish Act and the regulations thereunder, the Minister may take such measures as he considers proper for the protection of fish, animals and birds and any property of the Crown in a provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 17.
18.—(1) Subject to the regulations, prospecting and the staking out of mining claims or the development of mineral interests or the working of mines in provincial parks is prohibited.

(2) A licence of occupation may be issued under the regulations to the recorded holder of a lawfully staked mining claim in a provincial park.

(3) The staker or recorded holder of a mining claim or the holder of a licence of occupation issued to the recorded holder of a mining claim does not acquire any right, title or interest in or to the surface rights in the land. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 18 (1-3).

(4) Where it is necessary to interfere with the surface rights in any such land in order to carry on mining operations, the district manager or superintendent in charge of the provincial park in which the land is may permit such interference with the surface rights as he considers necessary. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 18 (4); 1976, c. 56, s. 4, part.

19.—(1) The Lieutenant Governor in Council may make regulations,

(a) for the care, preservation, improvement, control and management of the provincial parks;

(b) regulating and controlling prospecting or the staking out of mining claims or the development of mineral interest or the working of mines in provincial parks;

(c) prohibiting or regulating and controlling the occupation of public lands in provincial parks or designating areas therein in which land may be leased or occupied under licence of occupation and describing such areas by metes and bounds or in relation to highways, lakes, rivers or railways;

(d) regulating and controlling the use of lands in provincial parks;

(e) prohibiting the erection of buildings or structures in provincial parks, or regulating and controlling the nature, cost, type of construction or the location of buildings or structures that may be erected therein;

(f) governing the granting, issue, form, renewal, transfer and cancellation of leases, licences of occupation and other rights to public lands in provincial parks and prescribing terms and conditions in connection therewith;

(g) prohibiting or regulating and controlling the use or keeping of horses, dogs and other animals in provincial parks;

(h) prohibiting or regulating and controlling the erection, posting or other display of notices, signs, signboards and other advertising devices in provincial parks;

(i) prohibiting or regulating and controlling the use, setting out and extinguishment of fires in provincial parks;

(j) prohibiting or regulating and controlling pedestrian, vehicular, boat or air traffic in provincial parks;

(k) prohibiting or regulating and controlling and issuing permits for the use of vehicles, boats or aircraft or any defined class thereof in provincial parks;

(l) for issuing permits to persons to enter and travel in provincial parks;

(m) prohibiting or regulating, controlling and licensing trades, businesses, amusements, sports, occupations and other activities or undertaking in provincial parks;

(n) regulating, controlling and licensing and requiring the use of guides in provincial parks;

(o) prescribing the fees or rentals payable for any licence, permit, lease or other right issued, made or given in respect of a provincial park;

(p) prescribing the maximum periods of stay of persons, vehicles, boats, vessels or aircraft in provincial parks;

(q) providing for the imposition and collection of fees for entrance into provincial parks of persons, vehicles, boats or aircraft;

(r) respecting any matter necessary or advisable to carry out effectively the intent and purpose of this Act.

(2) Any regulation under subsection (1) may be made applicable to all provincial parks or to any provincial park or to any class of provincial park or to any part or zone of a provincial park. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 19.

20.—(1) Every person who contravenes any of the provisions of this Act or of the regulations is guilty of an offence and on summary conviction is liable to a fine of not more than $500.

(2) Where any regulation is contravened, in addition to any other remedy and to any penalty, the contravention may be restrained by action at the instance of the Minister. R.S.O. 1970, c. 371, s. 20.


INTRODUCTION TO APPENDIX C
ONTARIO PROVINCIAL PARKS POLICY
This appeared as a statement of intent requiring formal Cabinet (i.e., Government) approval before becoming accepted policy. It was approved on May 9, 1978. While much of the statement is couched in general terms reminiscent of the inadequate Provincial Parks Act (Appendix B) it does authorize new thinking and priorities:

— Protection is at the top of the list of objectives of the park system.

— Permanence is stressed. ("The Provincial Park system is dedicated for all time to the present and future generations..."

— The facts that "no individual park can be all things to all people" and "all objectives may not be met in each park" are acknowledged and put a brake on the hitherto prevailing multiple-use concept.

— Very significantly, it contains no mention of commercial exploitation or resource extraction.

The main importance of the policy statement is that its approval by Cabinet permitted the release of the exemplary Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies (Appendix D). (Editors)

ONTARIO PROVINCIAL PARKS POLICY
A Statement Approved by the Ontario Cabinet May 9, 1978

WHAT ARE PROVINCIAL PARKS?
Provincial Parks are areas of land and water managed for the benefit of present and future generations and dedicated to the people of Ontario and others who may use them for their healthful enjoyment and appreciation.
WHAT DO PROVINCIAL PARKS TRY TO ACHIEVE?

GOAL OF THE PROVINCIAL PARK SYSTEM

To provide a variety of outdoor recreation opportunities, and to protect provincially significant natural, cultural, and recreational environments, in a system of Provincial Parks.

OBJECTIVES OF THE PROVINCIAL PARK SYSTEM

Protection
To protect provincially significant elements of the natural and cultural landscape of Ontario.

Recreation
To provide outdoor recreation opportunities ranging from high-intensity day use to low-intensity wilderness experiences.

Heritage Appreciation
To provide opportunities for exploration and appreciation of the outdoor natural and cultural heritage of Ontario.

Tourism
To provide Ontario's residents and out-of-province visitors with opportunities to discover and experience the distinctive regions of the Province.

WHAT PRINCIPLES GUIDE MANAGEMENT OF THE PROVINCIAL PARK SYSTEM?

Permanence
The Provincial Park system is dedicated for all time to the present and future generations of the people of Ontario for their healthful enjoyment and appreciation.

Distinctiveness
Provincial Parks provide a distinctive range of quality outdoor recreation experiences many of which cannot be provided in other types of parks; for example, wilderness travel and appreciation.

Representation
Provincial Parks are established to secure for posterity representative features of Ontario's natural and cultural heritage. Wherever possible the best representations of our heritage will be included in the park system.

Variety
The Provincial Park system provides a wide variety of outdoor recreation opportunities, and protected natural and cultural landscapes and features.
Accessibility
The benefits of the Provincial Park system will be distributed as widely as possible geographically and as equitably as possible socially so that they are accessible to all Ontario residents.

Coordination
The Provincial Parks system will be managed in such a way as to be complementary to, rather than competitive with, the private sector and other public agencies.

System
Individual Provincial Parks contribute to the overall objectives of the Provincial Parks system. All objectives may not be met in each park. The park system, rather than individual parks, provides the diversity of experiences and landscapes which are sought.

Classification
No individual park can be all things to all people. Park classification organizes Ontario’s Provincial Parks into broad categories each of which has particular purposes and characteristics as well as distinctive planning, management and visitor services policies.

Zoning
Ontario’s Provincial Parks are zoned on the basis of resource significance and recreational potential. Several types of zones ensure that users get the most out of individual parks. Planning and management policies appropriate to each zone type are applied consistently throughout the park system.

WHAT IS PARK CLASSIFICATION?
No one park can be all things to all people. Accordingly, to provide a diversity of recreation experiences, different park environments are required. Distinctive recreation experiences and park environments are provided through six classes of parks.

All Provincial Parks in Ontario fall into one of these classes:

Wilderness Parks
Wilderness Parks are substantial areas where the forces of nature are permitted to function freely and where visitors travel by non-mechanized means and experience expansive solitude, challenge, and personal integration with nature.

Nature Reserves
Nature Reserves are areas selected to represent the distinctive natural habitats and landforms of the Province, and are protected for educational purposes and as gene pools for research to benefit present and future generations.

Historical Parks
Historical Parks are areas selected to represent the distinctive historical resources of the Province in open space settings, and are protected for interpretive, educational and research purposes.

Natural Environment Parks
Natural Environment Parks incorporate outstanding recreational landscapes with representative natural features and historical resources to provide high quality recreational and educational experiences.

Waterway Parks
Waterway Parks incorporate outstanding recreational water routes with representative natural features and historical resources to provide high quality recreational and educational experiences.

Recreation Parks
Recreation Parks are areas which support a wide variety of outdoor recreation opportunities for large numbers of people in attractive surroundings.

INTRODUCTION TO APPENDIX D
Excerpts from Ontario Provincial Parks Planning and Management Policies

This document is the first comprehensive and systematic statement of planning and management policy which parks officials have publicly committed themselves to. Our principal concern lies not with content, but with its implementation, since its formal authority is not clear. We assume the document represents an elaboration of the policy statement reproduced in Appendix C. However, until it has received formal Ministerial or Cabinet approval, it will likely remain as a statement of intent rather than practice.

When examining the following excerpts, readers should also note the anomalous Recreation-Utilization zone inserted in the section on Natural Environment Parks to explicitly rationalize continued logging in Algonquin and Superior Provincial Parks. Here is a glaring example of policy development based on existing conditions rather than a commitment to general principles.

Space limitations permit us to include only one Part and a section of another of the four Parts devoted to each of the six classifications of park. Whatever its shortcomings, this document is fundamentally supportive of establishing and responsibly managing a system of wilderness parks in Ontario and should be reviewed in its entirety by any reader with similar interests. While complete copies are not generally made available to individuals, the document can be examined in libraries and specific sections will be reproduced, when possible, on request to the Provincial Parks Branch, Ministry of Natural Resources. (Editors)

APPENDIX D

Purpose of this Document
This document, Ontario Provincial Parks: Planning and Management Policies, consists of six units each of which can stand on its own as an independent document. Each unit deals with an individual class of parks. The philosophy and history of each class is detailed, and the policy basis for that class is set out. Then follow long range planning policies for the development of that class as a whole. Finally master planning, development, and management policies applicable to individual parks within that class are set out. The scheme outlined in this document will be the principal organizational tool in the implementation of the Provincial Parks Policy approved by Cabinet on May 9, 1978. Therefore, Planning and Management Policies has been designed to be of particular use to park planners and managers involved in the planning, development, and management of individual Provincial Parks.
The targets for representation of the classes of parks as identified in Part II, Systems Planning Policies, for each class are tentative only. The material on representation and evaluation represents the present "state of the art" as developed in Provincial Parks Branch. The level of service to be provided and the distribution of new Provincial Parks is subject to approval by Cabinet.

**Why Park Classification?**

Park classification is an approach to park planning and management now in use in many countries which recognizes that a well-organized, balanced parks system provides a wide variety of experiences in a wide variety of landscapes. Classification helps to ensure the maintenance of the diversity intended in a parks system which includes everything from strictly protected natural areas to highly developed recreation facilities. It helps to ensure that the park user gets the most out of individual parks and the parks system as a whole.

All parks are distinctive environments; none are the same. No individual park can be all things to all people. Classification organizes parks into broad categories. Ideally, the visitor approaches a classified park with some idea of what to expect, because each park shares with the others in its class certain immediately recognizable characteristics. When in the park, the activities in which the visitor participates are those which best make use of the park's particular environment and facilities.

Ontario's classification scheme is tailored particularly to the landscape and people of this province. The classification scheme for Ontario Provincial Parks in use from 1967 until now included five classes: Primitive Parks, Wild River Parks, Natural Environment Parks, Recreation Parks, and Nature Reserves. These classes have proven basically sound, and are being continued with minor modifications. The Wild River Parks class has been broadened into Waterway Parks, and Primitive Parks have been renamed Wilderness Parks. A sixth class, Historical Parks, was proposed in 1972 but has not received policy approval until now.

The purposes of park classification in the Ontario Provincial Parks system are:

1. To clearly express the role of individual Provincial Parks in achieving the objectives established for the Provincial Parks system as a whole.
2. To enable managers to ensure that each individual who participates in the diverse opportunities provided by the Provincial Parks system can best satisfy and most reward his or her individual desires.
3. To promote the best management of the diverse resources of the Provincial Parks system, through the encouragement of public understanding and appreciation of the characteristics of individual Provincial Parks and of the parks system as a whole.

No classification system can dramatically alter overnight a long established, diverse, and complex parks system such as Ontario's. The adaptation of the parks system to more genuinely reflect the principles of park classification involves changes which can only be brought about over a number of years.

Figure A describes the location, classification, and size of all Provincial Parks currently operating or in regulation under The Provincial Parks Act.

**Why Park Zoning?**

Park zoning is another widely recognized planning and management technique. Zoning recognizes that every park includes a particular combination of significant resources, features, and potential experiences, most but not all of which relate to the principal purpose of the park established through its classification. For example, a significant historical site may be found in the middle of a block of wilderness. Classification without zoning would disregard such a resource. These special features complement the most dominant resources in their individual park, and help to achieve the objectives of the parks system as a whole.

Zoning allocates a park's lands on the basis of their significance for protection and their potential for recreation within the context of the park's classification. Zoning is essential to the orderly development and effective management of a park. The parks in each class combine zones in a particular way to provide protection and recreation opportunities distinctive to that class.

The 1967 Provincial Parks classification scheme provided for five zones: Primitive, Natural, Historic, Multiple Use, and Recreation. Again, these zones have proven basically sound, and despite name changes are not being altered radically in substance. An Access Zone has been added. The Multiple Use Zone has been deleted. The areas in Algonquin and Lake Superior Parks where commercial timber harvesting is permitted within areas devoted to recreational activities characteristic of Natural Environment Zones have been designated Recreation-Utilization Zones. Natural Zones have been replaced by Natural Environment and Nature Reserve Zones. Primitive, Historic, and Recreation Zones have been renamed Wilderness, Historical, and Development Zones respectively.

The purposes of park zoning in the Ontario Provincial Parks system are:

1. To enable planners and managers to ensure that the diverse resources of each Provincial Park make the fullest contribution to the achievement of the objectives of the Provincial Parks system and the park itself.
2. To enable managers to ensure that each individual who participates in the diverse opportunities provided by each Provincial Park can best satisfy and most reward his or her individual desires.
3. To promote the best management of the diverse resources of each Provincial Park, through the encouragement of public understanding and appreciation of each Park's particular combination of diverse characteristics.

Figure B illustrates the relationship of classes and zones in the Provincial Parks system.

---

## Figure A

### LOCATION, CLASSIFICATION, AND SIZE
### OF ONTARIO’S PROVINCIAL PARKS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROVINCIAL PARK</th>
<th>HECTARES</th>
<th>ACRES</th>
<th>REGULATION</th>
<th>PRESENT CLASS</th>
<th>FUTURE CLASS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. AARON</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ALERTON</td>
<td>765,300</td>
<td>1,891,290</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ANTIODE</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ARBOUR LAKE</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. AROWHEAD</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. AVONDA</td>
<td>1,886</td>
<td>4,660</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. BALESHAM LAKE</td>
<td>449</td>
<td>1,109</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. BASS LAKE</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. BAYHOE</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. BEACONSFIELD</td>
<td>1,585</td>
<td>3,604</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. BLUE LAKE</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. BON ECHO</td>
<td>6,662</td>
<td>16,417</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. BONNECHER</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. BRADFORD</td>
<td>641</td>
<td>1,570</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. CALIFER</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. CARILLON</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>1,714</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. CARRLAST</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. CAVERN LAKE</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>467</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. CHAPELUCK</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>20,200</td>
<td>NR WR</td>
<td>WR Wa</td>
<td>WR WR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. CHOLMINGTON</td>
<td>502</td>
<td>2,023</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. CHUTES</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. CRAGILLETH</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. CURTIS LAKE</td>
<td>665</td>
<td>1,654</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. DARTINGTON</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>516</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. DEVILS GLEN</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. DREXFIELD</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. EARLIE ROY</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>742</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28. EAST SISTER ISLAND</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>NE NR</td>
<td>NE NR</td>
<td>NE NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. ELEY</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. ESSA LAKE</td>
<td>3,108</td>
<td>7,684</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. FALFAR</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. FANGER</td>
<td>9,800</td>
<td>24,200</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. FERRIE</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>478</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. FLOOKPOINT</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. FITZROY</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>457</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. FIVE MILE LAKE</td>
<td>4,166</td>
<td>1,281</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. FORDYCE</td>
<td>4,916</td>
<td>12,222</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. FUSHIMI</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. GIBSON RIVER</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
<td>NE NE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. GREENWATER</td>
<td>5,350</td>
<td>13,220</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. GRUNDY LAKE</td>
<td>2,554</td>
<td>6,310</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. HALFWAY LAKE</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. HINNOOD</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>713</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. HOPPERS</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. IROQUIS BEACH</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. IVANHOE LAKE</td>
<td>1,326</td>
<td>3,276</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. JOHN E. PEARCE</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. KANKABA FALLS</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. KAPEL KAIN</td>
<td>276</td>
<td>681</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. KESTLE LAKES</td>
<td>978</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. KILLARNEY</td>
<td>35,126</td>
<td>84,328</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. KILLBREAD</td>
<td>1,756</td>
<td>4,340</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. KLOTZ LAKE</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. LADY EVELYN RIVER</td>
<td>2,464</td>
<td>6,088</td>
<td>WR Wa</td>
<td>WR Wa</td>
<td>WR Wa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. LAKE OF THE WOODS</td>
<td>1,097</td>
<td>2,711</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. LAKE ON THE MOUNTAIN</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. LAKE SUPERIOR</td>
<td>150,700</td>
<td>384,600</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. LONG POINT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. MACAPPON LAKE</td>
<td>431</td>
<td>1,066</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. MACLEOD</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. MARA</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. MESSIES, S. A.</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. MASHANTUCKET</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>1,034</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. MASHIKONJEE</td>
<td>1,242</td>
<td>3,070</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. MATTAWA</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. MATTAWA RIVER</td>
<td>3,458</td>
<td>8,505</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. McRae POINT</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>R A R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
<td>R A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) In regulation under the Provincial Parks Act; not in operation as a Provincial Park
(2) Not yet in regulation under the Provincial Parks Act; in operation as a Provincial Park; regulation pending

Revised to June 1, 1978

Parks in Regulation: 130
Operating Parks: 127
Total Area in Regulation: 4,243,305 ha (10,479,363 a)

---

Ministry of Natural Resources
Provincial Parks Branch
This diagram illustrates the relative size and importance of various zones from class to class, not how zones are related to each other within an actual park of any class. The absence of a particular zone within a class indicates that the zone in question is not compatible with the class.
ss a portage and illustrates the clash quin Provincial Park.

l Park near Agawa Island.
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES ENCOURAGED IN WILDERNESS PARKS

This figure shows activities and facilities encouraged in Wilderness Parks, by zone. It should be noted that zones are subordinate to the Park class. Therefore activities encouraged or not permitted in an Access Zone, for example, in one class of park will not necessarily be the same as those in an Access Zone in another class.

The left hand column includes both activities and facilities. Facilities have been used where the accompanying activity is totally dependent on specially designed facilities (e.g., golfing requires a golf course, pool swimming requires a swimming pool). Activities have been used where facilities are not essential to the pursuit of the activity. Most of these activities may be pursued with or without facilities. Where both options are a realistic possibility, the activity is preceded by an asterisk, and two symbols are given. The first symbol refers to the activity without supporting facilities; the second, to the activity with facilities. For those activities not preceded by an asterisk, special facilities are not normally required (e.g., orienteering, historical appreciation) or are at a minimal level and are covered elsewhere (e.g., canoeing).

In all cases, the development of any facilities will be at a level appropriate to the zone in question and subject to the general development policies for each zone. This list of activities and facilities is not, however, intended to be exhaustive.

Symbols

Y Normally encouraged in this zone.
M May be encouraged in this zone in certain parks of this class where appropriate.
Blank Not compatible with this zone; if now exists, a nonconforming use which will be phased out.
a If authentic to the Historical Zone.

2. Land and Water Uses

All alienated lands and waters within the boundaries of Wilderness Parks will be acquired. All physical improvements on acquired lands will be removed, unless they are in a location and of such design as to be of value for park management or visitor services, or unless they are significant to the Park's history or complementary to its cultural landscape. Lands will not be leased for the private use of individuals or corporations.

In any Wilderness Park, non-conforming land and water, resource, or recreational uses may exist at the time of its designation. Such uses will be identified as non-conforming uses in the Master Plan for the Park. No further expansion of these uses will be permitted. Provided that they are not demonstrably incompatible with the Park and the zone within which they are situated, such uses will be permitted to continue until the lands are acquired, the uses disappear through normal processes, or equal opportunities for such uses are provided elsewhere.

The master planning and development and management policies set out in this document are without prejudice to, and may be superseded by, any settlements of claims made between the Ontario Government and Indian bands in Ontario.

HYPOTHETICAL EXAMPLE OF ZONING IN WILDERNESS PARKS

MASTER PLANNING POLICIES

1. Zoning

Lands and waters within each Wilderness Park will be zoned so that they may be allocated to their most appropriate use relative to the Park. Wilderness Parks always include Wilderness and Access Zones, and may also include Nature Reserve and Historical Zones. Figure 0 illustrates a hypothetical example of zoning in Wilderness Parks.

Wilderness Zones include the wilderness landscapes of the Park, which protect significant natural and cultural features and are suitable for wilderness experiences, as well as a protective buffer, in which there is an absolute minimum of development. Access Zones serve as staging areas where minimum facilities support use of Wilderness Zones. Their numbers in individual Parks will be limited to the minimum required to provide effective access.

Nature Reserve Zones include any significant earth and life science features which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

Historical Zones include any significant historical resources which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES</th>
<th>Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Angling</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boating (ice)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds (car)(boat-in or walk-in)(group, day)(group, overnight)(back-country campsites)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cycling</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hiking</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Horseback trail riding</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hunting</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ice skating</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model aircraft flying</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model boat operation</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sailing</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting facilities (temporary)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skiing (downhill)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sledding</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Snowmobiling</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Swimming</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Trail biking</td>
<td>YM</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES ENCOURAGED IN NATURE RESERVES

This figure shows activities and facilities encouraged in Nature Reserves, by zone. [For further explanation of chart see page 52]

Symbols
Y Normally encouraged in this zone.
M May be encouraged in this zone in certain parks of this class where appropriate.
Blank Not compatible with this zone; if now exists, a non-conforming use which will be phased out.
a If authentic to the Historical Zone.

MASTER PLANNING POLICIES

1. Zoning
Lands and waters within each Nature Reserve will be zoned so that they may be allocated to their most appropriate use relative to the Reserve. Nature Reserves always include Nature Reserve Zones, and may also include Access and Historical Zones. Figure 0 illustrates a hypothetical example of zoning in Nature Reserves.

Nature Reserve Zones include significant earth and life science features of the Reserve, as well as a protective buffer, in which there is an absolute minimum of development.
Access Zones serve as staging areas where minimum facilities support use of Nature Reserve Zones. There normally will be only one such zone in any individual Reserve.
Historical Zones include any significant historical resources which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

2. Land and Water Uses
Identical to the corresponding section for Wilderness Parks, with the words “Nature Reserve(s)” and “Reserve(s)” being substituted for “Wilderness Park(s)” and “Parks(s)” respectively. (Editors)
### ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity/Facility</th>
<th>Zones</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Angling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Boating (ice)</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (powered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds (car)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(boat-in or walk-in)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, overnight)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back-country campsites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cycling</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hiking</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Horseback trail riding</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Ice skating</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Model aircraft flying</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Model boat operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sailing</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (downhill)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sledding</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Snowmobiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Swimming</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Trail biking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### ZONES

- **D**: Day
- **A**: Afternoon
- **W**: Evening
- **NR**: Night
- **H**: Harvest
- **NE**: Early morning

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zone</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Angling</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Boating (ice)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (powered)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds (car)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(boat-in or walk-in)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, day)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, overnight)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back-country campsites)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cycling</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hiking</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Horseback trail riding</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Ice skating</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Model aircraft flying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Model boat operation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sailing</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting facilities (temporary)</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (downhill)</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sledding</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Snowmobiling</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Swimming</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Trail biking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES
ENCOURAGED IN HISTORICAL PARKS

This figure shows activities and facilities encouraged in Historical Parks, by zone. [For further explanation of chart see page 52]

Symbols
Y Normally encouraged in this zone.
M May be encouraged in this zone in certain parks of this class where appropriate.
Blank Not compatible with this zone; if now exists, a non-conforming use which will be phased out.
a If authentic to the Historical Zone.

MASTER PLANNING POLICIES

1. Zoning

Lands and Waters within each Historical Park will be zoned so that they may be allocated to their most appropriate use relative to the Park. Historical Parks always include Historical Zones, and may also include Development, Access, Natural Environment, and Nature Reserve Zones. Figure 0 illustrates a hypothetical example of zoning in Historical Parks.

Historical Zones include the significant historical resources of the Park in which there is minimum development required to support visitor exploration and appreciation and scientific research.

Development Zones provide access where appropriate for large numbers to the Park, and facilities and services for day-use and camping activities. They will constitute a relatively small portion of individual parks.

Access Zones serve as staging areas where minimum facilities support the use of less developed Historical and Natural Environment Zones.

Natural Environment Zones include aesthetic landscapes, primarily where these provide an appropriate adjacent setting for Historical Zones, in which there is minimum development required to support low-intensity recreational activities.

Nature Reserve Zones include any significant earth and life science features which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

2. Land and Water Uses

Identical to the corresponding section for Wilderness Parks, with the words “Historical Parks(s)” substituted for “Wilderness Park(s)”. (Editors)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES</th>
<th>ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Angling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boating (ice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boating (powered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Campgrounds (car)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(boat-in or walk-in)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, day)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, overnight)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back country campsites)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hiking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Horseback trail riding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ice skating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Model aircraft flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Model boat operation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skiing (downhill)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sledding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Snowmobiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Swimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Trail bikiing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES ENCOURAGED IN NATURAL ENVIRONMENT PARKS

This figure shows activities and facilities encouraged in Natural Environment Parks, by zone. (For further explanation of chart see page 52.)

Symbols
Y Normally encouraged in this zone.
M May be encouraged in this zone in certain parks of this class where appropriate.
Blank Not compatible with this zone; if now exists, a non-conforming use which will be phased out.
a If authentic to the Historical Zone.

MASTER PLANNING POLICIES

1. Zoning
Lands and waters within each Natural Environment Park will be zoned so that they may be allocated to their most appropriate use relative to the Park. Natural Environment Parks always include Natural Environment and Development Zones, and may also include Wilderness, Nature Reserve, Historical, and Access Zones. Figure 4 illustrates a hypothetical example of zoning in Natural Environment Parks.

Natural Environment Zones include aesthetic landscapes in which there is minimum development required to support low-intensity recreational activities.

Development Zones provide the main access to the Park and facilities and services for a wide range of day-use and camping activities. They will constitute a relatively small portion of individual Parks.

Wilderness Zones include wilderness landscapes of appropriate size and integrity which protect significant natural and cultural features which are suitable for wilderness experiences.

Nature Reserve Zones include any significant earth and life science features which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

Historical Zones include any significant historical resources which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

Access Zones serve as staging areas where minimum facilities support use of Nature Reserve and Wilderness Zones, and less developed Natural Environment and Historical Zones.

Recreation-Utilization Zones include aesthetic landscapes in which there is minimum development required to support low-intensity recreational activities, and which also provide for commercial timber harvesting. To the greatest extent possible, they are to be planned, developed, and managed in accordance with the policies set out for Natural Environment Zones. Recreation-Utilization zones have been established in Algonquin and Lake Superior Parks only, and will not be established in any other parks.

2. Land and Water Uses
Identical to the corresponding section for Wilderness Parks, with the words “Natural Environment Park(s)” being substituted for “Wilderness Park(s)”. (Editors)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES</th>
<th>ZONES</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Angling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boating (ice)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** (powered)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds (car)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(boat-in or walk-in)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, day)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, overnight)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back-country campsites)</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cycling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hiking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Horseback trail riding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hunting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ice skating</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Model aircraft flying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Model boat operation</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sailing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>** (downhill)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sledging</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Snowmobiling</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Swimming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Trail biking</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES ENCOURAGED IN WATERWAY PARKS

This figure shows activities and facilities encouraged in Waterway Parks, by zone.

[For further explanation of chart see page 52]

Symbols
Y  Normally encouraged in this zone.
M  May be encouraged in this zone in certain parks of this class where appropriate.
Blank  Not compatible with this zone; if now exists, a non-conforming use which will be phased out.
a  If authentic to the Historical Zone.

MASTER PLANNING POLICIES

1. Zoning

Lands and waters within each Waterway Park will be zoned so that they may be allocated to their most appropriate use relative to the Park. Waterway Parks may include Natural Environment, Historical, Development, Access, Nature Reserve, and Wilderness Zones. Figure 0 illustrates hypothetical examples of zoning in Waterway Parks.

Natural Environment Zones include aesthetic sections of the corridor in which there is minimum development required to support low-intensity water travel activities, and associated aesthetic landscapes.

Historical Zones include any significant historical resources in the corridor which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones, and sections of the corridor in which there are outstanding opportunities for identification with historic waterway users and activities.

Development Zones provide access where appropriate for large numbers to the water route, and facilities and services for a wide range of day-use and camping activities where appropriate.

Access Zones serve as staging areas where minimum facilities support use of less developed portions of the water route.

Nature Reserve Zones include any significant earth and life science features in the corridor which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

Wilderness Zones include associated wilderness landscapes of appropriate size and integrity which protect significant natural and cultural features and are suitable for wilderness experiences.

2. Land and Water Uses

A boundary shall be described for each Waterway Park to include, as well as the waters and portages of the water route itself, adjacent public lands (vested in the Ministry of Natural Resources) on both sides sufficient to maintain for the waterway user perceptual integrity appropriate to the waterway. This boundary will be determined on the basis of lines of sight, contiguity of landforms and natural and cultural features, and ecological integrity. The boundary shall be not less than 200 m from the shoreline. This is the minimum standard to protect representative waterway corridors and provide scope and protection for recreational waterway travel activities. It shall normally not exceed 2 km from the shoreline except where nodes exist which include significant natural, cultural, or recreational landscapes or features which are complementary to the Park. Where a water route passes through a large lake where some of the waters and shoreline are remote from the route, discretion shall be used in determining the extent of the remote waters and shoreline to be included within the Waterway Park.

Accordingly, the boundary of a Waterway Park may include public lands and waters vested in the Ministry of Natural Resources, other federal, provincial, municipal, and other public agency lands, and private lands. Part or all of the lands not vested in the Ministry may be planned and zoned in the Master Plan, in cooperation with landowners and local and regional municipalities. Park development and management by the Ministry will normally be restricted to the Waterway Park proper, which will consist of the lands and waters within the Park boundary vested in the Ministry. However, the Ministry may cooperate with landowners in park development and management of lands within the Park boundary not vested in the Ministry and therefore not part of the Park proper.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Angling</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Boating (ice)</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(powered)</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds (car)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(boat-in or walk-in)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(group, day)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(group, overnight)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(back-country campsites)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Cycling</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hiking</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Horseback trail riding</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Hunting</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Ice skating</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Model aircraft flying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Model boat operation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sailing</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting Facilities (temporary)</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*(downhill)</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Sledding</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Snowmobiling</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Swimming</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
<td>M/</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Y/</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*Trail biking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any waters, beds of waters, and portages of the water route within the Waterway Parks not already in the public domain will be acquired. All alienated lands and waters within the boundaries of Wilderness Zones will be acquired. Other privately held lands will be acquired only as necessary to attain the objectives of the individual Park. As a minimum, lands will be acquired in Access and Development Zones to provide sufficient access, and, where necessary, resting and overnight camping points, for water travellers. Preference for acquisition will be given to lands with which outstanding natural or cultural values are associated, particularly where these values are threatened. All physical improvements on acquired lands will be removed, unless they are in a location and of such design as to be of value for park management or visitor services, or unless they are significant to the Park’s history or complementary to its cultural landscape. Lands will not be leased for the private use of individuals or corporations.

In any Waterway Park, non-conforming land and water, resource, or recreational uses may exist at the time of its designation. Such uses will be identified as non-conforming uses in the Master Plan for the Park. No further expansion of these uses will be permitted. Provided that they are not demonstrably incompatible with the Park and the zone within which they are situated, such uses will be permitted to continue until the lands are acquired, the uses disappear through normal processes, or equal opportunities for such uses are provided elsewhere.

The use of a water route in a Waterway Park for economically and socially necessary transportation by residents of an indigenous community in the area may be recognized as a continuing non-conforming use. The cooperation of residents will be sought to ensure maximum compatibility of this transportation use with management policies for the Park and the zones within which this use is situated.

The master planning and development and management policies set out in this document are without prejudice to, and may be superseded by, any settlements of claims made between the Ontario Government and Indian bands in Ontario.
RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES ENCOURAGED IN RECREATION PARKS

This figure shows activities and facilities encouraged in Recreation Parks, by zone. [For further explanation of chart see page 52]

Symbols

Y Normally encouraged in this zone.
M May be encouraged in this zone in certain parks of this class where appropriate.
Blank Not compatible with this zone; if now exists, a non-conforming use which will be phased out.
a If authentic to the Historical Zone.

MASTER PLANNING POLICIES

1. Zoning
Lands and waters within each Recreation Park will be zoned so that they may be allocated to their most appropriate use relative to the Park. Recreation Parks always include Development Zones, and may also include Access, Natural Environment, Historical, and Nature Reserve Zones. Figure 0 illustrates a hypothetical example of zoning in Recreation Parks.

Development Zones provide facilities and services for a wide range of day-use and camping activities.
Access Zones serve as staging areas where minimum facilities support use of Nature Reserve Zones, and less developed Natural Environment and Historical Zones.
Natural Environment Zones include aesthetic landscapes in which there is minimum development required to support low intensity day-use recreational activities.
Historical Zones include any significant historical resources which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.
Nature Reserve Zones include any significant earth and life science features which require management distinct from that in adjacent zones.

2. Land and Water Uses
Identical to the corresponding section for Wilderness Parks, with the words "Recreation Park(s)" being substituted for "Wilderness Park(s)." (Editors)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITIES AND FACILITIES</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>W</th>
<th>NR</th>
<th>H</th>
<th>NE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Arboretums</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery facilities (temporary)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Angling</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ma/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Boating (ice)</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ma/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (powered)</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Ma/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campgrounds (car)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(boat-in or walk-in)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, day)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(group, overnight)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(back-country campsites)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Cycling</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>Ma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demonstration areas (demonstration farms, logging exhibits, etc.)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dog trials</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf courses</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hiking</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical appreciation</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Horseback trail riding</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Hunting</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Ice skating</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kite flying</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Model aircraft flying</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Model boat operation</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nature appreciation</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orienteering</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outfitting services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Painting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkways for pleasure driving</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performing arts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photography</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Picnic grounds</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playing fields, open space</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playgrounds</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recreation programmes (organized)</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious programmes (organized)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resorts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and food services</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roller skating rinks</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sailing</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shooting facilities (temporary)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Scuba and skin diving</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Skiing (cross country)</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* (downhill)</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Sledding</td>
<td>Y/M</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Snowmobiling</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snowshoeing</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>M/M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Swimming</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td>Y/Y</td>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pools and lakes (artificial)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennis courts</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>* Trail biking</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td>M/M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INTRODUCTION TO APPENDIX E
Excerpts from the Crown Timber Act

The granting of licenses to the logging firms under the Crown Timber Act is the principal device for allowing industrial use of the Province's Crown Land. The quoted clauses include all those which deal with the forest management aspect of the licensee's responsibilities. The manual of management plan requirements mentioned in Section 24 (1)(a) is a very comprehensive document which, if followed, would lead to acceptable practices according to the state of the forester's art. However, it is far from clear that the spirit of the Act is being followed. In the cases of both Algonquin and Superior Parks, the Parks Council found no management plans existed. League representatives were told in 1976 by the Manager of the Algonquin Forestry Authority, the Crown Corporation which inherited in 1975 the cutting rights of the 18 private licence holders previously operating in the Park, that it would take until 1980 to prepare a management plan because of the lack of forest inventory data. (Editors)

APPENDIX E

Forest Management

24 (1) Every licensee shall, when required by the Minister, furnish within such period as is fixed by the Minister a management plan,

(a) consisting of a report, inventory, maps and an operating plan prepared in conformity with the manual of management plan requirements authorized by the Minister; and

(b) Prepared under the supervision of a professional forester and certified by him in the following form:

I hereby certify that this plan has been prepared under personal supervision and that all field work and calculations have been carried out to the best of my skill and judgment in accordance with the manual of management plan requirements.

(2) Every licensee who is not required to submit a management plan under subsection 1 shall, when required by the Minister and within such period as is fixed by the Minister, furnish an operating plan showing the proposed operations and a statement of the purpose for which the timber is to be used.

(3) The Minister may approve a management plan or operating plan as submitted to him or may approve it with such alterations therein as he considers advisable.

(4) A licensee shall conduct all operations on his licensed area in accordance with the approved management plan or operating plan, as the case may be.

(5) Where a licensee fails to furnish a management plan or an operating plan, as the case may be, within the period fixed by the Minister, the Minister may cause the plan to be prepared, and the cost thereof shall be a claim of the Crown in connection with the licensed area. 1964.c.16.s.5.

Loading logs from a Wabi wood cutting area in Superior Provincial Park.
25-(1) Every licensee shall furnish to the Minister, (a) at least thirty days before cutting operations commence in each year, an annual plan for the cutting operations to be conducted by him during the twelve-month period commencing on the 1st day of April in that year, and (b) not later than the 31st day of October in each year a map showing the boundaries and the acreages of the areas cut over and the parts thereof that were not cut during the twelve-month period ending on the 31st day of March of that year together with a statement of the acreages of the areas cut over, the parts thereof that were not cut and the amount, species and size of timber cut from each cutting area during such period. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.25(1); 1961-62,c.27.s.2(1); 1966,c.36.c.6.

(2) The Minister may approve an annual plan or may approve it with such alterations as he considers advisable, and, where the alterations involve the alteration of an approved management plan or operating plan, the management plan or the operating plan, as the case may be, shall be deemed to be altered accordingly. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.25(2); 1964,c.16.s.6.

(3) Cutting operations in each year shall be conducted in accordance with the approved annual plan. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.25(3).

(4) The Minister may enter into an agreement with a licensee for the promotion and maintenance of the productivity of the licensed area. 1961-62,c.27.s.2(2).

26-(1) Notwithstanding anything in any general or special Act or in any regulation or in any licence or in any management plan or operating plan, the Lieutenant Governor in Council, having regard to reasonable business requirements of the licensee, may cancel or vary any licence in respect of one or more parts of a licensed area or in respect of any type, size or species of timber designated by him. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.26(1); 1964,c.16.s.7(1).

(2) Notwithstanding anything in any general or special Act or in any regulation or in any licence or in any management plan or operating plan, the Minister may, (a) limit the cutting of the timber included in any licence in respect of the size, age, quality, species, types and distribution thereof as he considers consistent with the best forestry practices; (b) determine the species and quantities of Crown timber that may be cut by any licensee for the manufacture of lumber, pulp, paper or other products; and (c) for the purpose of forest management, watershed protection, fire protection, or the preservation of beauty of landscape, game preserves or game shelters, direct the marking of trees to be left standing or to be cut in any area designated by him, and direct the licensee to pay the cost of such marking. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.26(2); 1964,c.16.s.7(2).

(3) Any action by the Lieutenant Governor in Council under subsection 1 or any action by the Minister under subsection 2 in respect of matters other than fire protection does not affect operations being carried out or to be carried out pursuant to an approved annual plan. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.26(3).

27. No person shall commit wasteful practices in forest operations. R.S.O. 1960,c.83.s.27.

INTRODUCTION TO APPENDIX F
Excerpts from An Act to Incorporate the Algonquin Forestry Authority

Two points are to be noted about this Act. One is the subjection of the Authority to the Crown Timber Act (Section 9-(1)(a)), the other (Section 9-(4)(b)) that the Authority may be called upon to maintain or improve employment levels in the forest industry. This in a period when increasing mechanization is lowering the industry's labour requirement for a given output. (Editors)

APPENDIX F
Excerpts from An Act to Incorporate the Algonquin Forestry Authority

9-(1) Subject to subsection 2, the objects of the Authority are, (a) subject to The Crown Timber Act, to harvest Crown timber and produce logs therefrom and to sort, sell, supply and deliver the logs; (b) to perform, undertake and carry out such forestry, land management and other programs and projects as the Minister may authorize and to advise the Minister on forestry and land management programs and projects of general advantage to Ontario.

(2) The Authority shall carry out its objects in Algonquin Provincial Park and in respect of Crown timber on such lands adjacent thereto as may be designated by the Lieutenant Governor in Council.

(3) Subject to The Public Lands Act, the Authority may acquire and hold public lands or any interest therein for its actual use and occupation.

(4) The Authority is responsible to and subject to the direction and control of the Minister and, without limiting the generality of the foregoing, the Minister may determine for the Authority, (a) production and operational objectives aimed at regulating the flow of logs; (b) social objectives aimed at maintaining or improving employment levels in the forest industry; and (c) financial, commercial and economic objectives aimed at ensuring reasonable prices for logs produced by or on behalf of the Authority and ensuring a reasonable rate of return on the capital invested in the Authority.

11-(1) The Minister shall prepare a master plan that balances the public interest in maintaining and improving the quality of Algonquin Provincial Park for the purpose of recreation and the public interest in providing a flow of logs from Algonquin Provincial Park.

(2) The Minister may amend the master plan and shall provide a copy of it and every amendment to the Authority.

(3) The Authority shall conduct its operations in conformity and harmony with the provisions and true intent and spirit of the master plan and all amendments thereof, and shall ensure that such operations are conducted, so far as it is practicable so to do, with full regard at all times for the aesthetics, ecology and all other qualities of the environment.
APPENDIX G
An Open Letter from the President of the Algonquin Wildlands League to Professional Foresters

Professor Day of Lakehead University’s Forestry Faculty has pointed out to us that your magazine, the Professional Forester, has for some years now been carrying articles critical of management practices in Ontario’s forests, whether they originate with Government or industry. We agree that they show the concern of the profession as it relates to the shortcomings of present practices measured against the goal of management for sustained yield of commercially useful wood fibre. However, we do not see as much concern expressed for another aspect of the situation which also calls for the technical expertise of the professional foresters: that is, the public policy question of the allocation of our forests to industrial production as against other possible uses. This is clearly where the League’s interests lie, because the policy we advocate would require the withdrawal of a limited amount of productive forest from industrial use, and it is important to put some limits on the costs and benefits associated with these policy alternatives.

What are the total costs of proper forest management for sustained yield? Broken down by site class? What will the characteristics of the resulting forest be? What opportunities will they preclude?

The benefits of devoting the forest to fibre production have equally been called in question. The forest industry is an example of a dominating factor in the Canadian economy, that of staple trade based on the export of an unprocessed or semi-processed natural resource to a metropolitan market. Prof. Armstrong1 described the process as the conversion of capital in the form of trees to finance capital which flows out of the region. Very seldom have we achieved a permanent foundation for prosperity for the region from which the resource comes by such a staple trade.2

As we all know, the present system of wood harvesting in Ontario did not come about through the unrestricted operation of Adam Smith’s invisible hand. It was the deliberate creation of successive provincial governments, who, wanting to exploit their constitutional ownership of natural resources, saw this ownership as a means of encouraging economic development in the Province while providing revenue for the Government in a politically painless way.3 Historians can argue over whether the way they went about it was the best they could have done at the time; it is pointless to blame governments of half a century ago for not anticipating the present situation.

Ontario is now an overwhelmingly urban Province, in which the forest industry plays a minor economic role except in the north. For most people in the Province, forest products are important to them as consumers, not producers. Nevertheless, in regions such as Northwestern Ontario, the forest industry is a dominant one, and it is clear that the public policy question which is determining the Government’s actions on the forest industry is how various policy alternatives will affect the economic and social health of these regions.

It is our suspicion that the forest industry can do very little to solve the economic problems of these regions, which appear to be not so much low incomes as a highly restricted and diversified job market. As K.J. Rea4 has pointed out, northern resource-based economies may grow but they don’t develop, that is, evolve structurally. Employment in the forest industries is notoriously contracting, even when production is being maintained. The resource itself sets limits to extravagant projects for employment growth based on forest products.

It is no secret that the main political pressure for wilderness parks comes from the urban areas of Southern Ontario, both because park space in the south is in short supply in relation to the population, and because people have been frightened at the rate at which the remaining open space has been disappearing. On the other hand, northerners, while probably more appreciative of wilderness than southerners on the level of first-hand practical experience, seem to resist this pressure as an attempt to take away their little all; they have a vague sense of being cheated (justified)5, they have little faith in the forest industry as a source of improvement, but feel a need for some grand symbolic compensation for any restriction on their economic future.

To cut through some of the irrationalities on both sides, we need some cool account of the costs and benefits of sustained yield fibre production, and the associated effects on regional problems, as one of several alternative public policies for forest management. Let us have no more of the insatiable demand of the world for wood: the world will learn to do without oil and it will learn to live within what the world will supply in the way of wood, not what it would like. And if the world finds cheaper sources of wood than Ontario (if one can figure out a cost in the web of government-set charges and subsidies) there must be a point at which we can decide as a matter of public policy what segment of the industry is worth keeping and what has to be let go. We need some statement about what we can expect of the forest industry and what we can’t expect, and this statement must come from the professional foresters.

Sincerely,
C.B. Cragg
President

References:
NOTE TO THE READER

If you are in favour of the policy suggestions presented in this booklet please lend your support to the continuing public service and education programs of the Algonquin Wildlands League by becoming a member. Annual dues are $5.00. Donations in excess of the annual dues will be warmly welcomed, and are tax deductible. Just mail your name and address along with your cheque or money order to:

The Algonquin Wildlands League
Box 114, Postal Station “Q”
Toronto, Ontario
M4T 2L7

Below are listed some other conservation organizations which are active in parks-related issues in Ontario. A more extensive listing can be found in the Canadian Conservation Directory produced annually by the Canadian Nature Federation.

Canadian Environmental Law Association
1 Spadina Crescent, Suite 303, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2J5
Tel. 416-978-7156

Canadian Forestry Association
185 Somerset St. W., Suite 203, Ottawa, Ontario K2P 0J2
Tel. 613-232-1815

Canadian Nature Federation
75 Albert Street, Suite 203, Ottawa, Ontario K1P 6G1
Tel. 613-238-6154

Conservation Council of Ontario
45 Charles Street E., Sixth Floor, Toronto, Ontario M4Y 1S2
Tel. 416-961-6830

Federation of Ontario Naturalists
355 Lesmill Road, Don Mills, Ontario M3P 2W8
Tel. 416-444-8119

National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada
47 Colborne Street, Suite 308, Toronto, Ontario M5E 1E3
Tel. 416-366-3494

Nature Conservancy of Canada
2200 Yonge Street, Suite 611, Toronto, Ontario M4S 2E1
Tel. 416-486-1011

Pollution Probe at the University of Toronto
43 Queen’s Park Cres. E., Toronto, Ontario M5S 1A1
Tel. 416-978-7192

Toronto Field Naturalists Club
83 Joicey Boulevard, Toronto, Ontario M5M 2T4
Tel. 416-488-0553

The Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources is responsible for the administration of Provincial Parks. Some important offices of this Ministry and related agencies are:

Minister’s Office
Room 6927, Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St. W., Toronto, Ontario M7A 1W3
Tel. 416-965-1301

M.N.R., Provincial Parks Branch, Director’s Office
Room 3328, Whitney Block, 99 Wellesley St. W., Toronto, Ontario M7A 1W3
Tel. 416-965-5160

M.N.R., North Central Region, Regional Director’s Office
Ontario Government Building, 435 James St. W., N.O. Box 500, Thunder Bay “F”, Ontario P7C 5G6
Tel. 807-475-1261

M.N.R., Northern Region, Regional Director’s Office
140 Fourth Avenue, Box 3000, Cochrane, Ontario P0L 1C0
Tel. 705-272-1287

M.N.R., Northeastern Region, Regional Director’s Office
390 Bay Street, Box 1900, Sault Saint Marie, Ontario P6A 5N9
Tel. 705-949-1780

M.N.R., Algonquin Region, Regional Director’s Office
Brendale Square, Box 9000, Huntsville, Ontario P0A 1K0
Tel. 705-789-9611

The Ontario Provincial Parks Council, Chairman’s Office
Environmental Studies Building, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1
Tel. 519-885-1211 ext. 2782

Parks Canada, a division of the federal Department of Indian and Northern Affairs, is responsible for National Parks including those in Ontario. Some important offices are:

Minister’s Office
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H4
Tel. 613-997-0002

National Parks Branch, Director’s Office
Les Terrasses de la Chaudière, Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0H4
Tel. 613-992-0148

Parks Canada, Ontario Region, Regional Director’s Office
P.O. Box 1359, Cornwall, Ontario K6H 5V4
Tel. 613-933-7951
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