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FOREWORD

In this, the second of our National Park series, the history of land use, landscape, controlling groups and agencies, and in part of technology, is examined for the townsite of Banff. As far as is known to us, the study is the first of its kind in Canada and seems comparatively unique in North America. The work is particularly interesting academically and should be of considerable practical value to administrators, planners and the public, for it describes changes in land use and in cultural influences thereon, whether in the form of town residents, the federal government, the provincial government, or Calgarians.

Scace concludes with certain simple but important and easily overlooked principles. One of the more important of these is the idea that no change, particularly where it involves facilities, should be made in a National Park without thorough study of its long-term implications. Seemingly innocuous changes can become major problems as demands change over the years. Scace goes on to comment on the demands that permanent residents make for urban services in townsites like Banff. Their desires are likely to be similar to those of citizens in communities located outside the National Parks. Scace is therefore concerned about developing more service centres within the National Parks, because of their implications for long-term changes in the National Park landscape. Other studies comparable to Scace's are needed for other townsites in the Canadian and other National Park systems.

J. G. Nelson
The Department of Geography
The University of Calgary
Alberta
PREFACE

Except for some small changes, the content of this study is similar to the original dissertation submitted to The University of Calgary in 1967. Generous assistance has been rendered from many quarters during the preparation of the study but any imperfections that it may contain are the responsibility of the author.

I particularly wish to thank Dr. J. G. Nelson of the Department of Geography, The University of Calgary who suggested the original idea and offered much in the way of valuable advice and criticism. My thanks must also be extended to: the staff of Federal and Provincial Government Departments in Banff, Calgary, Ottawa and Edmonton, particularly the personnel of the National and Historic Parks Branch, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, who gave freely of their time to answer questions and correspondence; to the staff of the Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Calgary; to Messrs. B. Kenny, M. Somerville and K. Shelton, Department of Geography, The University of Calgary, for technical assistance; and to The University of Calgary for financial assistance. A number of illustrations are reproduced by permission of the Canadian Pacific Railway, Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Geological Survey of Canada, Government of Alberta and Provincial Archives, Victoria, British Columbia.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Introductory remarks

Canada's National Parks have experienced heavy public use in the last two decades, giving rise to problems of land management and land use. The Rocky Mountain Parks of Alberta and British Columbia in particular have shown substantial annual increases in visitor totals, and because all but one of these Parks contain townsites, their administration has become a complex federal undertaking.

This paper is a cultural-historical study of the land tenure system, land use changes and land management in one of the Park townsites, Banff, up to the year 1945. The advantages inherent in such a historical-geographical study have been recognized by Mitchell.

The value of his [the historical-geographer's] work qua geographer . . . lies . . . in the fact that some elements of geographical design that develop in response to passing conditions are extremely stable in their form or long lasting in their effects, and the understanding of the present demands the study of the geography of the period of their establishment and development.

To satisfy Mitchell's conditions, the study might be initiated at the time of Banff townsite's establishment. But the development of the town, and its relationship with the National Park idea, are better understood on the basis of a brief look at the pre-Park days. This prelude to the main body of the study is set out in Chapter Two.

Thereafter, the study will seek:

1. to describe the establishment of Banff as a spa community and its subsequent development as a resort in a National Park;

2. to describe the development of the leasing system and its
results, notably the creation of virtual freeholds on public land;

3. to trace the introduction of many land uses which are now judged to be incompatible in a National Park townsite and with the National Park idea;

4. to survey the influence of the federal government, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company (C.P.R.), and other policy-making agencies and groups in the development of the townsite, particularly its land use, land tenure and planning aspects.

Land tenure in National Parks is based upon the principle of leasing publicly-owned and controlled land for a stated period of time. This principle is also applicable to Park townsites wherein no freehold system of tenure is permissible. Ostensibly, the purpose of a leasing system, whenever used historically, has been to eliminate private control of land explicitly reserved for public use. Consequently, maintenance of the leasehold system permits public access on a large scale and ensures public planning of the use of the townsite and Park. In this way, the reserve's stated aims may be fulfilled with minimum interference from private interests.

This paper will attempt to show that from Banff's establishment in 1886 until the years immediately following World War II, the townsite leasing system developed into something resembling a freehold system because of Prime Minister John A. MacDonald's proposal that long-term leases possessing perpetual renewal clauses should be issued. For more than 50 years after 1887, automatic renewal of leases became a familiar aspect of the land tenure system in Banff.

These conditions of lease combined with historical-geographical factors of location, population distribution and communication as well
as group influences (the C.P.R. for instance), to make public control
of land in Banff exceedingly difficult.

Belatedly aware of the undesirable consequence of federal town-
site management policy, administrators have set out to make great
changes in townsite operations in National Parks. Stated simply,
these changes are intended to make Banff a more functional visitor
servicing unit within the context of contemporary National Park concepts
by revamping the leasing system and using it for the control purposes
for which it was seemingly originally intended. Initial steps to bring
about a more stringent control policy appear to have begun with admin-
istrative decisions made in the 1950s, by which time it must have become
obvious that prevailing leasing and business conditions in Park town-
sites were incompatible with the need to service more visitors.

Statutory legislation has vested in Parliament the power to
ascribe land uses in National Parks and the wherewithal for their
management. However, federal governments have been consistently
susceptible to influences which encourage amendments to policies
established by individual departments. Commons Debates and obser-
vations by Pearce, Byrne, Wolfe, Fraser and others suggest that
such modifications have endangered the National Park concepts for which
such policies were established and locally have had real implications
for land use and management practices in Banff.

The scope of this study does not extend beyond the end of World
War II but it is hoped that it may contribute towards a better appreci-
ation of present problems in the field of National Park townsite
management and stimulate other researchers to join the writer in that
field. Researchers in Canada have paid insufficient heed to past
cultural, political, commercial and other pressures as moderators of federal land management policies in National Parks. American experience in such matters has been extensively documented, notably by Shankland and Ise; and Hays's study of the conservation movement from 1890 to 1920 is an invaluable source. The National Parks Association and Sierra Club, for example, have for long illustrated the forces seeking to discourage single-use withdrawals of multiple resource lands assigned as National Parks. And Udall and Douglas have brought before the general public, past and existing examples of developments detrimental to the conservation movement. Similar accomplishments appear long overdue in Canada.

The study area

Banff townsite is located on the Bow River, some 30 miles upstream from the eastern edge of the Rocky Mountains by way of the upper Bow Valley; and 40 miles from the Continental Divide, also by way of the Bow Valley. Calgary, the largest community in Southern Alberta (population approximately 335,000), is situated about 80 miles to the east of Banff and is directly linked to it by the Canadian Pacific Railway transcontinental line and the Trans-Canada and 1A Highways (Fig. 1).

Banff is located at an elevation of 4,538 feet above sea level and is circumscribed by mountains varying in height from 5,500 feet to 9,800 feet above sea level. Townsite development in Banff has been simplified by a marked broadening of the upper Bow Valley at this point (Plate 4). But to the southwest, settlement has been forced to leave the floodplain and ascend the lower slopes of Sulphur Mountain. It
Fig. 1
then extends southeast to the confluence of the Bow and Spray Rivers. Of the other mountains circumscribing Banff, only Tunnel Mountain to the east inhibits valley-bottom development. However, ill-drained land to the west of the townsite also acts as a physical deterrent to potential townsite expansion.

Four distinct types of building land may be distinguished for Banff, the first being the river margins which carry only a limited number of buildings, principally on Bow Avenue (Fig. 2). Poor natural drainage has rendered these margins unsuitable for extensive development; and in the second type of building land recognized—the poorly drained river flats to the west of Banff in the vicinity of the recreation grounds—distinctly less construction has been undertaken.

Most of Banff is built on an alluvial terrace composed of river gravels and silts, rising from 20 to 25 feet above the river itself. The terrace merges on the east into heavier clay deposits associated with the fourth distinctive type of building land, the Otter Street terrace on the slope of Tunnel Mountain.

In this paper the "study area" will include Banff townsite, an area of approximately 325 developed acres, and that part of the Park adjacent to Banff which, because of the municipal and recreational activities pursued therein, may be recognized as an extension of the townsite itself. The total study area thus corresponds to the land encompassed by Vermilion Lakes and Tunnel Mountain on the west and east respectively, and Mount Norquay and Sulphur Mountain on the north and south respectively (Fig. 3).
NOTES

1Banff, Jasper, Yoho, Kootenay and Waterton Lakes National Parks.


3"the government" in this study refers to the federal government of Canada unless otherwise stated.


CHAPTER II

THE EARLY SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT
OF A SPA AT BANFF (?-1910)

Introduction

The settlement and development of a spa community at Banff in the quarter century from 1886 to 1910 represented a unique undertaking on the western frontier of Canada as well as a marked departure from all known forms of earlier human activity in the area. In this chapter settlement and attendant activities in the years before 1883 will be described and their influence upon the area evaluated. Thereafter, a detailed discussion of the activities of government agencies and the C.P.R. in setting aside and developing a public reserve and planned village will be provided. These activities are interpreted as being responsible for the emergence of a fashionable spa, attractive primarily to the rich. An "age of exclusiveness" was successfully promoted until about 1910, largely because of the geographical isolation of the area and the absence of an interested regional population. The introduction of a particular form of land tenure on public land is also thought to have fostered spa development but to have had basic weaknesses in terms of future community growth.

Early Indian and European activity

Limited archaeological evidence precludes any constructive discussion of prehistoric man's presence in the study area. However, from the accounts of fur traders, missionaries and explorers such as Sir George Simpson, Rev. Robert Rundle and Dr. Hector who passed near the present site of Banff townsite in 1841, 1847 and 1858 and 1859
respectively, we can get some idea of Indian use of and early white activity in the area. Likewise, additional useful testimony is available from the papers of residents and government officials such as Tom Wilson and William Pearce who became familiar with the upper Bow Valley in the 1880s.

The valleys and passes of the Rockies became well known to Indian tribes of the eastern foothills and of the Columbia River Valley long before the first Europeans arrived in western Canada. Crees, Stoneys, Kootenays and the Plains Blackfoot used the passes to satisfy hunting and trading requirements as well as their warlike instincts.

During this extended period of mountain penetration a detailed knowledge of the study area was seemingly accumulated by the Crees, Stoneys and Kootenays who hunted and traded there, and who may also have recognized grazing possibilities in that locality. There are few indications that Indian use and settlement was anything other than transitory and we may only speculate upon the continuity of seasonal visits.

In 1841 Sir George Simpson, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, became the first known European definitely to visit the Banff area, although he may well have been preceded by fur traders from Old Bow Fort near Morley. He was followed, probably in 1847, by the missionary, Rev. Robert Rundle. Unfortunately, neither man commented in detail upon the area.

Dr. Hector of the Palliser Expedition was the first person to describe something of the geography of the Banff area. On his initial ascent of the upper Bow Valley in 1858, Hector visited the Bow Falls, noted the unusual feature of Tunnel Mountain and in accordance with
one of the Expedition's objectives—"regularly recording the physical features of the country through which you will pass, noting its principal elevations . . ." measured the height of Cascade Mountain. Hector again ascended the upper Bow in 1859. On this occasion he "observed some warm mineral springs which deposited iron and sulphur and seemed to escape from beds of limestone."

Shortly after Hector's departure the Earl of Southesk also camped in the study area after having crossed to the Bow River from the Saskatchewan by way of Pipestone Pass. Southesk's visit concluded known European penetration of the upper Bow Valley until 1881 but in the intervening decades an indeterminable number of fur traders and prospectors probably visited the region. Doubtless there were few individuals in the former category for, as Byrne intimates, the fur trade underwent a marked decline in importance and activity from mid-century.

On the other hand, prospecting for minerals represented a new field for resource exploitation in the Rockies. Following the discovery of gold in California in 1848, numerous unsuccessful prospectors gravitated northwards towards Oregon and British Territory. Simultaneously, prospectors travelled overland from Canada and the eastern United States to swell the numbers on the frontier. The discovery of gold in British Columbia in 1857 (particularly in the Kootenay Valley in 1864), and at White's Bar (now Bannock) in Montana in 1864, encouraged some activity in the streams issuing from the southern Canadian Rockies. An apparent consequence of this interest was the construction of a log hut on the south side of the Bow River at the site of Banff. William Pearce, who as Superintendent of Mines in the
Department of the Interior, examined the building in 1884, believed that it might have been constructed in 1874\textsuperscript{20} or 1875\textsuperscript{21} and may have been associated with the presence of four American prospectors who resided at Morley from 1875-1896. However, the marked paucity of other such evidence for early prospecting both in the study area and the present Banff Park area as a whole suggests that the region received relatively little attention from Europeans in the two decades which followed Southesk's departure from the upper Bow Valley.\textsuperscript{22}

European interest in the upper Bow Valley was reactivated in 1881 when the C.P.R. decided to project its transcontinental line through the Kicking Horse Pass.\textsuperscript{23} This railroad was to be constructed as part of the agreement between the Dominion of Canada and the Province of British Columbia whereby the latter became part of the Dominion in 1871. Penetration of the Rockies by the C.P.R. in 1883 enabled the immediate exploitation of many of the local resources including coal, copper and timber; and later, hot springs and scenery. Indeed the projection of the C.P.R. line along the Bow Valley "was probably the most important single factor in the historical geography of the Banff area."\textsuperscript{24}

Resource exploitation in the present Park area was facilitated by the establishment of a number of small frontier communities at various localities in the upper Bow Valley. For example, Silver City flourished as a copper ore mining community at the foot of Mount Eisenhower (Castle Mountain) from 1883 and attained a population of 1,550 before its demise in 1885.\textsuperscript{25} In 1883 too, a small community was established about the C.P.R. depot in the study area in the vicinity of the present buffalo paddock. Initially called Siding 29 but later
renamed Banff at Lord Strathcona's request, this depot acquired the usual trappings of a frontier community having two hotels and general stores, a furniture store, a livery stable and a few shacks at the close of 1886. This original depot at Banff faced decline when, in 1888, the C.P.R. relocated its station facilities in close proximity to the newly surveyed government spa—the present townsite of Banff. The original depot was abandoned in 1897.

The original depot community also functioned as something of a service centre during its brief existence. "Stores did a good business with miners from the newly opened mine at Anthracite, with construction men, and with a few trappers, etc."

Originally established by the Canadian Anthracite Coal Company in 1886, the community at Anthracite exceeded 300 persons before being abandoned in 1904. However, coal mining operations near the present site of Banff persisted until 1923 for, with the closure of the Anthracite mines, the C.P.R. promoted another mine at Bankhead, only four miles from Banff. For some years a thriving population of 1,000 inhabited Bankhead, making it the largest community in the present Park area.

Impermanence of operation attended all these frontier communities and represented not only a projection of the earlier characteristic of transitory human settlement in the upper Bow Valley, but also reflected a trend apparent in frontier exploitation throughout western North America. The C.P.R. line alone persisted as a permanent development upon the landscape and in consequence provided the railway company with a direct interest in future activities in the area about Banff. The importance of this agency in terms of future land use and management in the study area will become apparent at a later point in this study.
Although most of the current information provided by the National and Historic Parks Branch tends to give the idea that National Park landscapes such as Banff are preserves of a "virgin" or "untouched" wilderness little influenced by white man, the area about Banff differed little from other pioneer landscapes in the West. The usual early extractive activities such as trapping, lumbering and mining had been attempted and were still engaged upon at the time the first public reserve was set aside in 1885. Moreover, these pioneer activities were carried on for some years thereafter, during which time the youthful National Park policy was being initiated, tested and developed.

**The Hot Springs**

Of those communities established in the vicinity of the study area through the presence of the C.P.R., the depot at Banff became of particular significance because of the discovery of hot springs nearby. Whereas Anthracite and Bankhead were to lose economic viability and eventually disappear, the existence of the hot springs on Sulphur Mountain—the Cave and Basin, Middle and Upper Hot Springs (Fig. 3)—had more positive implications for settlement and development in the Banff area.

Those persons claiming "discovery" of the hot springs seemingly showed a common optimism with respect to the long-term commercial implications of the springs and vigorously pressed for recognition of their individual claims. Despite Wilson's assertion that Davis's C.P.R. survey party located the Cave and Basin in 1882, the McCardell Brothers and Frank McCabe have usually been accepted as the discoverers and were at least the first persons to try and actively exploit the
natural resource.\textsuperscript{33}

The prospect of financial rewards to be accrued after the completion of the C.P.R. line\textsuperscript{34} attracted other squatting parties, notably that outfitted by D. E. Woodworth, Conservative M.P. for King's, Nova Scotia.\textsuperscript{35} But "after a very great deal of investigation the conclusion was arrived at that it was impossible to define who was the discoverer of these springs,"\textsuperscript{36} or so said Pearce who visited the study area in 1884 and 1885. Nevertheless, when the Hot Springs Reserve was established in 1885 certain monies were distributed amongst the claimants as compensation for "improvements" although Pearce stated, "it was thought better to pay a small sum than exercise vigorously the law in the case"\textsuperscript{37} as this was "thought the easiest way to settle the matter."\textsuperscript{38}

The decision to reserve an area of land on Sulphur Mountain seemingly came from Pearce after some unpleasant encounters in September, 1885 with claimants to the springs.\textsuperscript{39} His decision may have been reinforced by a visit of Lord Lansdowne, Governor-General of Canada, to the study area in the same year. Analysis of the spring water encouraged Lansdowne to the opinion that Banff would be a mecca of thousands of invalids in succeeding years.\textsuperscript{40}

The reserve, which was formally established on November 25, 1885, encompassed an area of ten square miles on the south side of the Bow River.

His Excellency by and with the advice of the Queen's Privy Council for Canada has been pleased to order, and it is hereby ordered, that whereas near the Station of Banff on the Canadian Pacific Railway, in the Provisional District of Alberta, North-West Territories, there have been discovered several hot mineral springs which promise to be of great sanitary advantage to the public, and in order that proper control of the lands surrounding
these springs may remain vested in the Crown, the said lands in the territory including said springs and in their immediate neighborhood be and they are hereby reserved from sale or settlement or squatting, viz.: All of Sections, 13, 14, 15, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 28, and these portions of Sections 34, 35 and 36 lying south of the Bow River, all in Township 25, in Range 12 West of the 5th Meridian. 41

Although few persons resided in the study area in 1885, the setting aside of the reserve in that year encouraged some squatting, "the people connected . . . thinking thereby that they would establish their right to certain property." 42 However, federal authorities indicated that settlement other than with government approval would not be permitted and these early settlers of 1885 and 1886 "with the exception of one or two, agreed at once to accept a lease under the favorable terms" 43 by which land was to be made available by the government.

Dominion administrators seemingly had but one primary purpose for the Banff area in the period 1885-1886—acquisition of the hot springs for public use and their protection against commercial exploitation. This purpose is quite apparent from the limited dimensions of the first reserve and from reports in the Sessional Papers at that time. For example, Sir Thomas White, Minister of the Interior, stated on June 30, 1886:

In determining the system on which mineral springs of such exceedingly valuable curative properties as are undoubtedly possessed by the springs at Banff, should be disposed of, the first consideration would seem to be, to secure to the public the utmost benefit which can be derived from the waters without loss to the revenue. 44

He optimistically continued:

It is expected that a large number of people, both from Canada and the Northern States, will be attracted to the Banff Springs, not only by the virtues of the waters, but also by the beauty of the scenery and the excellence of the climate, and it is very
important that the springs be managed from the beginning in the best possible manner.45

Dominion concern as to the high capital expenditure that would be necessary for proposed developments at the hot springs was in part alleviated by the interest of the C.P.R. Company in promoting the site. Indeed the active cooperation of the Company was essential in the transportation of visitors and their accommodation at the isolated frontier site. The prospect of increased traffic on the mountain section of its transcontinental line proved most attractive to the C.P.R. In fact, in an earlier move in 1883, William Van Horne, the Company's general manager, had requested the reservation of an area about Lac des Arcs, a point about 30 miles downstream from Banff, "for park purposes."46 Surveyors were despatched to the designated location but no legislation resulted from the action. An attempt to stimulate passenger travel to the Rockies may well have motivated Van Horne to make this early request for a public reserve.

In order that the Hot Springs Reserve be managed "in the best possible manner," the Dominion Government sent John R. Hall, Secretary in the Department of the Interior, to the spa of Hot Springs, Arkansas in January, 1886, "for the purpose of examining and reporting upon the management of the Hot Springs of this place...."47 In so doing the government declared its intent to promote a community along similar lines at Banff,48 and White's proposals for the development of a spa in the study area, based upon Hall's report, were approved by the Privy Council in July, 1886.49

At the time the plans for this spa were being put into effect, events occurred which led to the extension of the original springs reserve and its designation as Rocky Mountains Park on June 23, 1887.50
The spa was incorporated in the 10 by 26 mile rectangle which constituted Canada's first National Park (Fig. 4).

Recommendations for this extension of public land may well have come from a group of parliamentarians who visited the area "and were so impressed with the scenery and the possibilities of the region that they boosted for a large reservation." Thereafter, changes, which are of no immediate concern to this study, led to the expansion (or contraction) of the Park as shown in Figure 4 and Table 1. (In Figure 4 the 1949 boundary amendment is shown as part of the 1930 boundary.)

This overall growth of the Park area was a manifestation of a preserve idea beyond that connected with the hot springs. The existence of such a large Park area about the original spa at Banff obviously was to be of great importance in the later growth and development of a townsite at Banff. Moreover, the desire of the government to have control of all land designated as a public reserve should be noted.

The coal deposits of the Cascade Basin to the east of Banff, and following the northwest to southeast trend of the Cascade Valley, had been discovered in 1883. In the following year the Department of the Interior delimited the 36 square mile Cascade Coal District which included the area of the present townsite. The lands therein were "withdrawn from ordinary sale and settlement" and offered at $20 per acre, then in 1885 at $12.50. The previously-described communities of Anthracite and Bankhead were subsequently established on this field.

In 1887, Sir Thomas White stated:

There were some grants in this area before it was reserved; they are private properties in the meantime and will have to be protected. If we can get them back into the hands of the Government without serious cost, I think it would be desirable to do so,
THE CHANGING BOUNDARIES OF THE ROCKY MOUNTAINS (BANFF) PARK

- Banff Hot Springs Reservation - 1885
- Lake Louise Reservation - 1892
- 1887
- 1902
- 1911
- 1917
- 1930
- B.C. - Alberta Boundary and Western Boundary of Post - 1902 Park

(after Byrne)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Miles)</th>
<th>Title</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Banff Hot Springs Reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>Rocky Mountains Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Lake Louise Reservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>c. 4,900</td>
<td>Rocky Mountains Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>Rocky Mountains Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>2,751</td>
<td>Rocky Mountains Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>2,580</td>
<td>Banff National Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>Banff National Park</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
1 Order in Council, Nov. 25, 1885.  
2 Chap. 32, 50-51 Victoria, June 25, 1887.  
3 Order in Council, July 23, 1892.  
4 Chap. 31, 2 Edward VII, May 15, 1902.  
5 Order in Council, June 8, 1911.  
6 Order in Council, Sept. 18, 1917.  
8 Chap. 5, 13 George VI, March 25, 1949.
so that the whole of them should belong to us, except in so far as the building up of a town on the opposite side of the Bow River may necessitate the sale of a portion of them for that purpose.\textsuperscript{53}

Undoubtedly included in the Minister's reference to "grants," were some of the ten 50-square mile timber berths on the Bow River and its tributaries which had been opened to tender at the Crown Timber Office in Calgary in July of 1883.\textsuperscript{54} One such berth even covered part of the original reserve of 1885 but no licence for lumbering had seemingly been issued in this particular case.\textsuperscript{55} However, for many years following 1885, lands previously allocated to private enterprise for mining and lumbering purposes continued to be so used within the boundaries of Banff Park.\textsuperscript{56}

Finally, by establishing the Hot Springs Reserve, the government became directly responsible for future land use developments and their management in the study area. The isolation of Banff from population centres, the need for alternative sources of capital for spa development and the precarious character of existing communications, decreed that such federal responsibility would for some years be readily shared with the C.P.R. Company. Pearce assessed the importance of the Company in the following manner:

The public is very greatly indebted to Mr. Van Horne and through him the C.P.R. for their hearty cooperation in any reservations made for scenic effect or pleasure resorts. Without that cooperation Canada's efforts would not have been anything as successful as they have been.\textsuperscript{57}

\textbf{The spa at Banff}

The surveys and plans for a spa at Banff became the responsibility of George A. Stewart, a civil engineer. He was initially commissioned to implement a survey of the Hot Springs Reserve and
thereafter, to furnish plans for the proposed spa or "townsite."
Upon completion of his first task in November, 1886, Stewart extended
his survey to cover an additional 13,000 acres "including the laying
out of two townsites." In preparing the plans for Banff (which was
to be located adjacent to the original reserve), Stewart appears to
have received much assistance from Dr. Deville, the Surveyor-General,
who became very familiar with the area in 1885.

The survey appears to have extended initially as far north as
Wolf Street and subsequently included blocks 1 to 27 inclusive, A and
B on the north bank (Fig. 2). On the south bank of the Bow the
survey was apparently completed in 1889 and not until July 29, 1914
did another plan appear to cover blocks 1 to 35 inclusive, A, B, C
and D.

With the exception of blocks A and B, lots on the north bank
were, as closely as possible, rectangular and plotted on the grid
pattern (Plate 2). Anomalies existed within this configuration. Thus
the present tangential intersection of Lynx Street with Bear Street
has its origin in the presence of "C.P.R. Avenue" along which materials
for Banff Springs Hotel were hauled to the Bow River pontoon (Plate 3).
In addition, S. B. Jones could find no rational explanation as to why
Banff Avenue was made to bend to the northeast, other than to give
the best view of Cascade Mountain. Other possible reasons include
(1) the fact that not until 1888 was the final location of the station
decided--it began operations on its present site in 1889; (2) the track
to Siding 29 was utilized, or (3) the apparent possibility that the
C.P.R. line might be relocated through the village, as suggested in
the Crag and Canyon in November, 1912. As lots had only been opened
up to Moose Street by 1911, this latter possibility should not be ruled out.

On the south side of the Bow lots were laid out on a far more generous scale, those higher up on the slopes of Sulphur Mountain being arranged in semi-circular blocks. The argument that more difficult slopes necessitated larger lots is invalid. Lots surveyed for the St. Julien Addition (blocks 34, 35 and 39 to 52 inclusive) of 1917 on Tunnel Mountain are only slightly larger than those of the business district located on blocks 1 and 2.64

Because of differences in lot sizes, variations were to occur in the spatial distribution of property. To the north of the Bow smaller lots provided for relatively dense property construction with limited backyard space (Plate 10) but in the "villa" townsite to the south and in blocks A and B (Plate 9), lots were more characteristic of a wealthy suburban community. This basic difference in land unit size later encouraged distinctive developments in land use and federal management in Banff. Business properties were introduced to the northern section and residences to the villa section. However, as there were insufficient businesses to occupy all lots in the northern section, private residences began to fill the smaller lots after 1886.

The arrangement and dimensions of lots surveyed on Sulphur Mountain showed a close resemblance to contemporary planned spa communities in Europe, for example, Buxton in England. Such similarity was seemingly desirable to the Dominion Government for during a House of Commons debate on Bill 16 (The Rocky Mountains Park Act) in 1887, Sir John A. MacDonald, the Prime Minister, stated:

I have no doubt that [Banff] will become a great watering-place
and that there will be a large town on the south side of the Bow River, where the government have laid out a town plot. I have no doubt that the Canadian Pacific Railway will lay out a town plot there.

He added that:

a portion of the park offers some beautiful sites for villas, and I believe the plan of the architect lays these out, to be leased to people of wealth, who will erect handsome buildings upon them.65

Clearly then the village of Banff was conceived of as a spa in the European sense. Furthermore, it was to be developed with this in mind for many years, the role of resort or townsite serving an enlarged National Park really only becoming apparent many years later.

The communities which grew up around hot mineral springs in Europe and the United States during the 19th century, seemingly owed their development as much to prevailing social customs as to their geographical location and ease of accessibility. The spas were usually frequented by persons distinctly conscious of their favoured position in contemporary society. Mumford states that centres such as Bath, Baden-Baden, Travemünde and Saratoga Springs:

were places where people of fashion met: met in order to exhibit themselves at the proper season, sometimes under the pretext of seeking health, but also to enjoy life, untainted by any visible connection with trade and industry . . . .66

Government plans for just such a community at Banff prompted the Toronto Globe to state with some irony in 1886:

The Salubrious Rocky and Selkirk ranges may now become a summer resort for the fashionable and crowded populations situated between Callander and Rat Portage.67

Hot Springs in Arkansas, "the most noted [spa] in the United States,"68 had been selected (p. 21) as the community which Banff might be modelled after. Following Hall's report upon spa developments
at Hot Springs in 1886, the Minister of the Interior reported:

"commencing as we do at Banff with a clean slate, it appears ... possible to adopt such regulations as would minimize the evils complained of at the Hot Springs of Arkansas ..." \(^{69}\)

In 1887 the Minister continued in Parliament:

"The intention is ... to frame such regulations as will make the springs a respectable resort, as well as an attractive one in all respects. Those who know anything of the hot springs at Arkansas are aware that this is one of the great difficulties. It is not a resort to which people will care to go if they can possibly avoid it. They go there for health purposes and nothing else. If we can make this particular reserve a really attractive resort, I believe great advantage will accrue to the country at large." \(^{70}\)

Nevertheless, despite White's concern about some of Hot Spring's characteristics, the regulations for the first Canadian National Park in 1887, drafted by William Pearce, "were based largely on the regulations for the Arkansas Hot Springs." \(^{71}\) The plan of Banff and commentary of administrators concerning the Spa's development likewise reveal the extent to which the Arkansas reservation influenced Canadian proposals for Banff. Some description of Hot Springs, Arkansas, is therefore pertinent at this point.

The hot springs in Arkansas were set aside as the first "national reservation" in 1832, the government having "properly reserved with them four sections of land." \(^{72}\) Unfortunately, the area was largely in private holdings with titles that were in the process of litigation for years. Moreover, Congress in withdrawing the hot springs:

"held no advanced notions ... of developing the area for the benefit of the public--as soon appeared when private citizens began exploiting the supposed medicinal properties of the springs." \(^{73}\)

A lack of federal interest and control enabled the townsite of Hot Springs to develop and the Hot Springs Reservation was not recognized until 1870, "when Congress tried to set up legal procedures for settling
some of the titles and claims to titles." Thereafter, in 1921, Stephen Mather, Director of the National Park Service, managed to have the reservation added to the National Park system through an amendment to a sundry civil appropriation bill. Subsequent recommendations in March, 1954, that the Park be deleted from the system were not adopted and the 960-acre public reserve survives today as a National Park. John Ise has noted that the mineral springs:

were located in Hot Springs, a fair-sized town, and a national park in a town seems something of a misnomer. It should have remained a reservation.

Similarly, Robert Shankland commented that "Hot Springs has remained unique in the system."

At the time Hall visited Arkansas, there was much local controversy as to how the reserved park land should be managed and used. The Canadian government official was much impressed by the deleterious effect of informal land management upon land uses in the reserve and in concluding his report to the Department of the Interior, he stated:

I cannot refrain from expressing my conviction that absolute government control, and management under medical supervision, is the only solution of the question that will ensure the maximum of benefit to those sufferers requiring the aid of the Hot Springs of Arkansas.

Hall's concern as to how land use and land management might be satisfactorily invoked in Arkansas, had obvious inferences for Canadian procedures at Banff. Predictably, because of the problems encountered at Hot Springs, the form of land tenure to be applied to Banff became a focus for discussion in parliamentary debates. Although some comments were directed towards land control procedures and regulations in Yellowstone, America's first National Park established in
1872, Arkansas Hot Springs proved to be the reserve from which most examples were drawn during Commons Debates on Canada's mountain spa.

The system of land tenure

Parliament sought to establish some form of land tenure in Banff which would evade the problems associated with freehold land and informal federal management at Hot Springs, and simultaneously produce revenue to the Crown from a spa of international repute.

Insofar as revenue was concerned, Sir Thomas White, Minister of the Interior, suggested that if a form of leasing of federal land at Banff were introduced:

we shall not only have a park with these advantageous surroundings but that the result of dealing with the property as is proposed will be to furnish a revenue quite sufficient to defray the expense of supervision and management, and also pay a liberal interest on all the expenditure we have made in connection with it . . . . We have reserved others, but have made no expenditure to bring them into use, in the meantime at all events.\(^1\) (See Table 2.)

Earlier, he had stated:

If we can make this particular reserve a really attractive resort, I believe great advantage will accrue to the country at large . . . the revenue we shall obtain from the town site, from the lease of the privileges at the springs, that is from the water of the springs, will almost recoup the Government for the amount that will have to be expended in connection with the undertaking.\(^2\)

As for the attraction of an international clientele, both White's (p. 20), and Sir John A. MacDonald's (p. 28) thoughts on the matter have been noted. The Prime Minister doubted that there existed any other locality:

which combined so many attractions and which promises in as great a degree not only large, pecuniary advantage to the Dominion, but much prestige to the whole country by attracting the population, not only on this continent, but of Europe to this place.\(^3\)

Hopefully, the land tenure system adopted would promote a
### TABLE 2.1

**NATIONAL PARKS OF CANADA**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Park</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Area (Sq. Miles)</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banff</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>2,564</td>
<td>1885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glacier</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>521</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yoho</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>507</td>
<td>1886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterton Lakes</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>1895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>4,200</td>
<td>1907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Island</td>
<td>Alberta</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Revelstoke</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Lawrence Islands</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>260 acres</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Pelee</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kootenay</td>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>1920</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Buffalo</td>
<td>Alberta and N.W. Territories</td>
<td>17,300</td>
<td>1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Albert</td>
<td>Saskatchewan</td>
<td>1,496</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riding Mountain</td>
<td>Manitoba</td>
<td>1,148</td>
<td>1927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgian Bay Islands</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>1929</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Breton Highlands</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>367</td>
<td>1936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward Islands</td>
<td>Prince Edward Island</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1938</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fundy</td>
<td>New Brunswick</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tierra Nova</td>
<td>Newfoundland</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kejimkujik</td>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>1957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
thriving spa community in the midst of a region which still possessed all the characteristics of the pioneer frontier, yet place the government in a position of absolute control of land uses.

In the Park Act of 1887, section 4(c) stated that the Park would be under the "control and management" of the Minister of the Interior while the Governor in Council could effect regulations for:

the lease for any term of years of such parcels of land in the park as he deems advisable in the public interest, for the construction of buildings for ordinary habitation and purposes of trade and industry, and for the accommodation of persons resorting to the park.\textsuperscript{84}

Discussing this clause in Parliament, Sir Donald A. Smith (Lord Strathcona) commented:

I trust that the leasing system will be adopted, so that the Government will have full and thorough control of it [Park land], and thus be able to impose conditions which will prevent the introduction of much that is to be found in such places, and which is not desirable should prevail.\textsuperscript{85}

Opposition to the leasing system was voiced on at least two grounds. From past experience it was feared that political party patronage might encourage "favouritism" with regard to choice townsite lots and business licences; and the expenditure of "large sums" of public money in a locality where "lots for the wealthy" would be specifically allocated, defeated the idea of a public reserve for all the people of Canada.\textsuperscript{86}

Sir Thomas White supported the idea of leasing on the grounds that such a system would enable government supervision of quality in land use while simultaneously providing revenue to the Crown. Leasing alone, argued White, would make the spa "a model as to the general character of its surroundings."\textsuperscript{87} Distribution of Crown land on a freehold basis would probably induce a general decline in the quality
of land use and the government's ability to manage municipal developments.

If, however, the leasing system were to be adopted, some arrangements would be necessary as to period of tenure and right to renewal. Prime Minister MacDonald, conscious of the possibility that fixed lease periods might deter politically and socially influential people from taking up lots in Banff, demurred at Sir Richard Cartwright's suggestion that "a limit of time . . . be fixed for these leases." 88

There is an objection to fixing a limit . . . . We cannot say what length of time we can get people to take leases for in order to induce them to put up handsome buildings. 89

Twenty-one years had been suggested as a sufficient lease period but MacDonald argued that "people will not build handsome houses on 21 year leases. If there is to be a limit at all, there must be the right of renewal." 90

His suggestion was adopted and implemented and residential leases were issued with a renewable "in perpetuity" or "and so on forever" clause. 91 These leases which came to be known as N.P.C. 179 or "perpetual leases," provided for a constant annual rental to the government for the first 42 years at the end of which period a review of the rental would take place. Thereafter, the lease would be renewed for a like term of years under similar conditions of tenure.

The lessee was supposed to build a "satisfactory" building prior to the issue of the lease, 92 and in this and succeeding leases discussed in the study:

The lessee shall not and will not exercise, carry on or commit, or permit to be exercised, carried on or committed any noisy, noxious or offensive entertainment, trade, business or manufacture in or upon the said premises . . . which may be an annoyance or
disturbance to the other inhabitants or citizens of the said Park. 93

Another condition of lease tenure prohibited lessees from transferring their lease to another party without first obtaining federal permission.

Annual rentals for lots were made available in early years at prices ranging from $2.50 to $10.00. Individual rents were determined arbitrarily on the size, quality and intended use of lots as the Table below indicates.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Amount</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5 acres, C.P.R. hotel</td>
<td>$20.00</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.89 acres, C.P.R.</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>84.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 acres, sanatorium</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 lots, hot springs</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 lots, Transfer Company</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>120.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 lots, applied for</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lots in townsite</td>
<td></td>
<td>$804.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,168.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,972.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What conclusions may be drawn from this land tenure "policy," if we may so call it? Primarily, the government appears to have been concerned over two major points when introducing the leasing system. First, there was a prevailing sense of urgency in promoting settlement and property construction in Banff, principally to ensure that the original decision to reserve and develop land for spa purposes with federal funds might be fully justified before a hostile Opposition
in Parliament. Secondly, by releasing lots at Banff on a lease basis, the government anticipated that undesirable forms of land use could be avoided. Hopefully, this unitary source of control might avoid mistakes such as those derived from the existence of private land on the public reserve at Hot Springs, Arkansas.

Although the revenues to be derived from the issue of leases was visualized in Parliament as a means of recouping expenditures on the Rocky Mountains National Park, and particularly the spa, actual rentals at Banff were almost negligible as noted in the Table above. Only $1,298 was collected as rental for 180 lots during 1887,95 i.e. an average of $7.00 per lot. In 1888, although $2,000 did come from rentals, only 12 per cent of the outlay on Cave and Basin work in that year was recovered in revenue. By 1912, lots were available "at prices varying from $8 to $15, according to size and situation."96 If the government were to continue to charge such nominal rents, it could not possibly accumulate sufficient revenues to offset management expenses associated with the provision of municipal and resort facilities.

Whether or not MacDonald's Conservative Government fully supported the idea of leasing land in Banff remains in doubt. Upon at least one occasion (p. 22), Sir Thomas White voiced the possibility of selling lots in Banff on a freehold basis and the Prime Minister seems to have been, at best, lukewarm to the idea of leases with anything other than long-term clauses. Moreover, government doubt as to the advisability of continuing this land tenure arrangement apparently gave rise to the possibility of a freehold system in 1911. Section 18.2(c) of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act in that year
reiterated section 4(c) of the Act of 1887 but added that regulations might be passed:

for the sale of lands laid out in town plots and shown on the plan of the town plot, Rocky Mountains Park of Canada . . . and on the plan of the town plot of Canmore . . . .97

Whatever the government's views may have been in 1887, the lease system which it introduced had long-term implications in part because the leases were issued to cover long periods (42 years), and could be renewed for a similar period; and in part because later government modifications to the lease did not fundamentally change its character throughout the period examined in this study. Also, the basic issues of right to lease renewal, maintenance of quality in land use, controls on lease transfer and so on, which provided so much contention in the 1880s were to cause problems many years later, especially after 1945 when visitor pressure on Banff and other Rocky Mountain National Parks accelerated very substantially. In short, that form of land tenure which the government thought best to assist the development of an exclusive spa survived the function it was originally intended to fulfil and was subsequently applied to a fully-developed National Park townsite.

Activities of the government and C.P.R. Company in spa development

In the period 1886 to 1910, the Dominion government and the C.P.R. were mutually responsible for most of the developments in the study area. Private enterprise activities initiated by residents of the spa such as the Brewster livery business, relied greatly upon the success of the government-C.P.R. programme. As the Province of Alberta was not established until 1905 and poor communications isolated Banff
from other urban nuclei in the region, capital investments from these quarters proved to be insignificant.

**Other government activities.** Government activities or services took many forms but because budget appropriations fell far short of the sums required to undertake all proposed improvements, the Department of the Interior concentrated on certain facilities, being guided by its own concept of development priorities.

Thus, improvements to the hot springs and the local landscape, the preparation of a coach-road network, and the introduction of certain resort-like facilities for the benefit of visitors usually exhausted appropriations to 1900.\(^98\) Thereafter, the introduction of certain municipal-type services to the growing community at Banff increased the number of facilities amongst which appropriations had to be distributed.

Historically, government service began with George Stewart's and Dr. Deville's surveying and laying out of the spa townsite and the footpaths about it (Plate 2). In the 1880s, too, a network of coach or tote roads was constructed for the benefit of visitors throughout the study area. These tote roads were built to facilitate travel by tally-hos (high-rigged carriages drawn by four-horse tandems), a fashionable, contemporary means of recreation travel in resort communities. These tote roads were to be gradually upgraded and hard-topped to constitute the present-day pattern of motor roads in the study area (Fig. 3). The tote roads led to (1) Anthracite and Canmore, (2) Upper Hot Springs, (3) Cave and Basin, (4) Banff Springs Hotel, (5) Tunnel Mountain, (6) Sundance Canyon, and the Loop Drive of the future golf course area. About 25 miles of these tourist "drives" were constructed
in the Banff area.

As the hot springs represented the focus of attention amongst visitors to Banff, George Stewart (who was appointed the Park's first Superintendent from 1887 to 1896), set about improving them and providing bathing and changing facilities. The Upper Hot Springs and Cave and Basin (Fig. 3) received the greatest attention, and a sulphur pipeline was constructed from the latter to the C.P.R.'s Banff Springs Hotel and Dr. R. G. Brett's Sanatorium in 1888.99

Improvements were also deemed necessary to the landscape of the study area. Byrne has shown how man-made and natural fires decimated the 19th century landscape of the upper Bow Valley and photographic evidence (Plates 1, 2) reveals that vegetation in the spa area had been largely removed by fires and timber felling. In 1887, W. H. Barneby described Banff as being surrounded by "grand and majestic [mountains], but almost devoid of vegetation, except for a few trees growing apparently out of the solid rock."100 Superintendent Stewart commented in 1888 that "the want of variety in our foliage has been constantly remarked, and regretted, by visitors whose admiration of the general beauties of the scenery is unbounded."101

Because of such criticism, and because Banff was hardly the "natural" scenic wonder it had been painted in Parliament, landscape improvement constituted an important part of the federal development programme for the spa. On the advice of Professor Saunders of the Central Experimental Farm at Ottawa, 40,000 young trees were ordered from the northwestern States and a site chosen for a permanent nursery at the base of Cascade Mountain.
It is hoped that in time, not only this nursery will form a great addition to the attractions of the park, but that every variety of shrub, plant, and flower, will be collected and cultivated in connection with the nursery, that naturalists and others visiting the place and interested in these studies may see samples of the whole flora of the mountains displayed in a moderate space.

This venture, however, did not prove successful. But in subsequent years many efforts were made to add to the vegetation of the study area, often through the introduction of exotics. In 1889 a number of evergreen trees were planted on Banff Avenue from Bow River Bridge to Cariboo Street "and grouped so as to add much to the beauty of the village." Stumps "and other unsightly objects" were removed, and in 1900 further evergreen additions made to the village's coniferous population. Removal of potentially fire-hazardous dead timber was in part a response to a recommendation made in 1886 by W. F. Whitcher, and in part, the result of local residents seeking fuel.

Plate 3 shows that landscape "improvements" were quite noticeable by about 1910 and one government publication stated that "of all the lovely resorts on the American continent, it [Banff] is without a peer." Only occasional opposition was voiced against these improvements as, for example, in the decision to "improve" access to the Cave on Sulphur Mountain.

Government activity also extended to the provision of facilities which might prove of benefit to tourists, for example, a weather station on Sulphur Mountain in 1903, the records of which were published in Annual Reports of the Department of the Interior. Or alternatively, the facilities might have some entertainment or recreational value. Included in this category were a boat house,
animal paddock (1897), zoo and aviary (1903), and Museum of Natural History (1904).

Prior to the establishment of Rocky Mountains Park, Whitcher had advocated the construction of a Museum of Natural History where "animal species weeded out (i.e. predators) could be used in a satisfactory manner." By the time his recommendation had been adopted, the animal paddock, zoo and aviary were in existence and at various times elk, buffalo, Rocky Mountain sheep, antelope, monkeys, a polar bear, Persian sheep, Angora goats, yak, red foxes and "9 varieties of pheasant" were kept in these establishments. The paddock and zoo were originally located to the northeast of the village the zoo being moved to the museum site immediately north of Bow Bridge in 1906.

To complement its efforts in the entertainment and recreational field, the government embarked upon a programme of municipal-type service development to resident villagers and visitors. While this form of service really began with the original village surveys and introduction of cheap, long-term leases in 1886 and 1887 respectively, few other services were introduced to the youthful, pioneer community in the 19th century. Federal appropriations were insufficient for such purposes and there was, as yet, little agitation from the resident population for a variety of municipal services in the frontier village. Nevertheless, a few facilities were introduced at that time.

In his Annual Report for 1903, Superintendent Douglas stated:

The population of Banff is increasing year by year at such a rate that something should be done . . . to provide a sewerage system, if the good name of Banff, as a health resort, is to be maintained . . . and the need of water supply, electric lighting, and sewerage connections is now already felt. The lighting of
the streets and public buildings would add greatly to the many attractions of the park.\textsuperscript{112}

Work on a water and sewer system commenced in 1905 and, although rates were "much less than in Calgary,"\textsuperscript{113} residential complaints against water, sewer and light rates were voiced as early as 1909.\textsuperscript{114} Light had been introduced to the village by the C.P.R. in 1904, although the government also seemed quite prepared to undertake provision of this utility.\textsuperscript{115} Superintendent Douglas was in favour of using an established "beauty spot" in the study area to serve the municipal needs of Banff.

The Bow falls afford unlimited water power for electric lighting and water power, and although no estimate has been furnished as to the probable cost of installing a plant, it would seem from an examination of the locality, that the cost of installation would not be very heavy.\textsuperscript{116}

In most provincial municipalities responsibility for local public services such as water supply, sewage disposal and lighting has long been a community responsibility. In Banff, federal assumption of the role of municipal government permitted administrators to initiate services as they saw fit but also implied a willingness to become responsible for the provision of most of the public services that would be needed in the village. Of course, the isolation of the area during this period necessitated federal responsibility with certain exceptions as in the presence of the C.P.R. and the provision of telephones from an outside source in 1907. Whether early administrators visualized the variety of services that would be required and the costs that would be involved as the townsite of Banff developed, is very doubtful. However, the casual introduction of municipal services in the 19th century established the precedent which committed the government
to its role of provider in the future.

Because Banff and other permanent Park communities such as Waterton, Jasper and Yoho represented integral units within the boundaries of their respective Parks, municipal-type services were not functionally separated from general Park administration in Canada. Consequently, financial records for Banff Park were not used to establish the basis of charges to residents for services and utilities in the townsite. Several types of service charges levied at various times were not based on any one financial policy although, upon occasions, efforts were made to calculate "fair" charges for individual services. These seemingly proved unfeasible due to the complexity of the division of responsibility between local residents and visitors. Recently, government officials have described the system as "complicated, difficult to administer and impossible to defend on the basis of real economic values."

By 1910 the above-described implications of federal management policy did not concern the authorities. More pressing was the need to maintain and expand existing facilities and introduce new ones. Large capital expenditures—the estimate for the waterworks in 1905 alone amounted to $95,000—and subsequent subsidization of services were justified by the government to the extent that these services were required to accommodate the visitor load and administrative needs generally. Moreover, these subsidized services seem to have been viewed as a necessary prerequisite in order that residents and entrepreneurs be drawn to Banff. Thus for example, Superintendent Clark regretted in 1916 that prevailing "financial stringency" on account of World War I, curtailed domestic water and sewer developments by the
government "as the provision of these services tends to foster the building spirit among lot-holders at Banff." \(^{119}\)

**C.P.R. Company activities.** As capital investment and facility development were essential to the successful settlement of Banff and exploitation of the Hot Springs Reserve and later, Rocky Mountains Park, it fell to the C.P.R. Company to undertake the major task of development. Only the C.P.R. was prepared or had the ability to expend large sums of money in this and other Rocky Mountain Parks, financing its enterprises from the sale of townsites previously allocated to them along the transcontinental line. \(^{120}\) In return the government provided the Company with certain monopolistic privileges in the Parks as a whole, but particularly in the study area. This arrangement reflected contemporary procedure in many American Parks where the railroads provided the principal means of access to the public lands. \(^{121}\)

Probable C.P.R. interest in promoting the Rockies as a tourist and revenue-producing area prior to the establishment of the federal reserves has been noted (p. 21). Consequently, the opportunities afforded the Company in Banff were quickly appreciated and exploited. Taking advantage of the seemingly monopolistic advantages available to it in the southern or "villa" section of the village (p. 28), the C.P.R. constructed the large and impressive Banff Springs Hotel between 1886 and 1888 (Plate 7). Also the Sanatorium at the south end of Bow River Bridge (Plates 1, 2), and Grand View Villa at the Upper Hot Springs were constructed in 1886 for the C.P.R.'s regional physician, Dr. R. G. Brett \(^{122}\) and his associate, Dr. Orton.

Thereafter, the C.P.R. embarked upon a programme of activities similar to the federal government, designed primarily to attract
fashionable clientele from throughout North America and overseas. Visitors in the latter category were particularly desirable for their potential use of the C.P.R.'s ship and rail communications network, and introduced the possibility of substantial revenues to be accrued by the Company. Through the media of advertising which both the C.P.R. and government employed to great effect, the desired clientele was attracted to Banff in gradually increasing numbers (Fig. 5), a fact proudly recorded by the Department of the Interior in its Annual Reports (Table 3).

In 1902:

The number of visitors to the Park is increasing very rapidly, and it is found that it is likely to become a place of very considerable resort especially for American tourists.  

The C.P.R. was primarily interested in getting passengers to the study area, thereby realizing its primary objective, public use of the Company's transport system. However, some additional developments other than those undertaken by the government were necessary if Banff was to be successfully promoted as an international spa.

These developments complemented government activity and included the provision of municipal services, "attractions" and landscape improvement.

In 1904 the C.P.R. began supplying Banff with electricity from the coal-mining community of Bankhead and continued to do so until the latter village's demise in 1923. Initially the Company was concerned with providing light on the "streets from the Canadian Pacific Railway Station to the Banff Springs Hotel," and on "roads leading to several points of interest in the neighbourhood of the village." 

C.P.R. efforts to improve the landscape and wildlife of the
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1887-1935

VEHICLE PASSENGERS TO
BANFF PARK (EAST GATE),
1917-1965

sources: Crag and Canyon, May 3, 1935; and Superintendent's Office, Banff, 1966
TABLE 3

ORIGIN OF VISITORS TO SELECTED BANFF HOTELS AND CAVE AND BASIN, 1888, 1893 AND 1910

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin of Visitors</th>
<th>Banff Springs 1888</th>
<th>Banff Springs 1893</th>
<th>Banff Springs 1910</th>
<th>Sanatorium 1888</th>
<th>Sanatorium 1893</th>
<th>Sanatorium 1910</th>
<th>Cave and Basin 1888</th>
<th>Cave and Basin 1893</th>
<th>Cave and Basin 1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>1,619</td>
<td>2,048</td>
<td>6,553</td>
<td>2,486</td>
<td>1,868</td>
<td>4,520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>389</td>
<td>1,227</td>
<td>7,686</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>1,305</td>
<td>8,816</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Gt. Britain)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>574</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>380</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>329</td>
<td>361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wales</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Africa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bermuda</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buda-Pesth</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ceylon</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fiji</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 3 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Origin of Visitors</th>
<th>Banff Springs 1888</th>
<th>Banff Springs 1893</th>
<th>Banff Springs 1910</th>
<th>Sanatorium 1888</th>
<th>Sanatorium 1893</th>
<th>Sanatorium 1910</th>
<th>Cave and Basin 1888</th>
<th>Cave and Basin 1893</th>
<th>Cave and Basin 1910</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Holland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>India</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korea</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madeira</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

area included fire patrols along the railway line from 1909, and "restocking of waters in the vicinity of the town" to "improve fishing for their guests" since dynamiting by C.P.R. engineers and overfishing by anglers had so reduced fish populations that by 1911 "the big catches which were common in former years are becoming almost unknown." Likewise, the need for fire patrols on the railway line emanated in part from accidental or careless procedures attending C.P.R. operation of the transcontinental line in the upper Bow Valley. Thus, for example, in 1891, a wood-burning C.P.R. locomotive allegedly started a heavy fire some three to four miles west of Banff which burned eastward to the Vermilion Lakes. Byrne has reported a number of such instances for the period to 1911.

Many varied facilities were provided by the C.P.R. for the comfort, entertainment or recreational benefit of visitors to the spa. The construction of luxury accommodation at Banff Springs Hotel, the Sanatorium and Grand View Villa has been noted as has the use of the mineral spring water at these establishments. Dr. Brett also used the hot springs to promote Banff's first souvenir business. He established the Banff Bottling Works and sold lithium water as "Banff Lithiated Mineral Water." A livery business, soon to be handled by the Brewster Brothers, enabled guests to enjoy the many tote roads (Plate 7), and from 1897 Banff Indian Days was promoted as a special attraction. C.P.R. President William Whyte placed pheasants in the zoo "with some thought of stocking the Park with these birds." Perhaps Whyte anticipated the improvement of hunting conditions, for the C.P.R. actively encouraged the formation of guided hunting parties from Banff, a practice which was somewhat curtailed with the expansion of the Park
boundary in 1902. Nevertheless, government records show the continued congregation of hunting as well as exploring and climbing parties in Banff after that date.

Residents' activities. The permanent residential population of Banff was recorded as being 350 persons in 1888, 271 in 1901 (Table 4), 700 in 1903 and 937 in 1911. Significantly perhaps, in the decade after 1901, similar substantial increases in population were recorded for the City of Calgary and Alberta as a whole (Table 5).

With a few exceptions such as railway crewmen and perhaps persons associated with mining operations at Anthracite and Bankhead, the residents of Banff were primarily engaged in some form of service to visitors albeit a seasonal one from May to September in most cases. Provision of accommodation and transport facilities seemingly predominated. By about 1900 there were nine hotels in the spa (Table 6), and alternative forms of accommodation were available either in the way of shack tents or cottages. A government publication reported in c. 1905:

In Banff . . . are a number of summer cottages, furnished with every requirement for a summer stay, with the exception of bedding and similar personal necessities. Many of these cottages can be rented at the rate of $25 per month, and for visitors making a few weeks' stay, and to whom the large expenditure of a prolonged visit at a good hotel is a consideration this is undoubtedly the cheapest and by no means the least satisfactory, way of enjoying the beauties of the Park. As the demand for these cottages considerably exceeds the supply, it is advisable to engage them for weeks, indeed months, ahead. Harmon states that in 1888 the "main business" of Banff was the operation of livery stables of which there were 12. Apart from horses required to pull carriages, additional animals and guides were required for the hunting parties congregating in Banff. There might
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Banff Townsite Population</th>
<th>Banff Park Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>271</td>
<td>508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>937</td>
<td>2,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>3,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>2,519</td>
<td>3,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>2,187</td>
<td>2,545</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>2,357</td>
<td>2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>2,518</td>
<td>3,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>3,429</td>
<td>4,101</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Alberta</th>
<th>Calgary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>73,022</td>
<td>4,091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911</td>
<td>374,295</td>
<td>43,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>588,454</td>
<td>63,305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>731,605</td>
<td>83,761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td>796,169</td>
<td>88,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>939,501</td>
<td>129,060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>1,123,116</td>
<td>181,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>1,331,944</td>
<td>249,641</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hotel</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banff Springs Hotel</td>
<td>$3.50 and upwards per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanatorium Hotel</td>
<td>$2.50–$4.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mount Royal Hotel</td>
<td>$3.00 and upwards per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>King Edward Hotel</td>
<td>$2.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alberta Hotel</td>
<td>$2.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Park Hotel</td>
<td>$1.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand View Villa</td>
<td>$2.00–$3.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hydro House</td>
<td>$2.00 per day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Minnewanka Chalet</td>
<td>$2.50 and upwards per day</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Calgary.
be 200 horses and 60 men leading hunting parties from Banff at the height of the season. Substantial profits were possible from such activities. For example, a $10,000 bank loan to the Brewster livery business was reportedly paid off in 18 months.

During those early years when Banff was such an important outfitting centre, the Brewsters were termed as "poachers in the fullest extent of the word"; R. B. Bennett (later Conservative Prime Minister), was "very much in favour of putting Brewster out of Park." In one 12-month period they apparently accumulated $2,500 in fines for killing game in the Park.

Although some resident villagers undoubtedly enjoyed considerable financial returns from free-enterprise activities, the success of most businesses depended upon the continued ability of the government and C.P.R. to attract increasing numbers of visitors to the spa. Without the vigorous developments promoted and advertised by these two agencies, Banff might have remained an unimportant frontier community. Even so, the spa's population displayed many characteristics of the frontier environment. Drunkeness was prevalent, there was much illegal movement and consumption of whiskey, and tramps (probably railway line transients), were "frequent visitors."

Settlement, land use and related matters to 1910

As a result of the development policies adopted by the government and C.P.R., the spa at Banff changed considerably in size and physical character during the period 1885 to 1910. Land uses were intended to conform with the government's conception of a spa and did so in part. However, the geographical isolation of Banff and informal management
of the land tenure system represented strong influences upon the character of settlement. Something of the settlement and land use in Banff in the 1880s and then in 1910 is hereafter briefly discussed.

During the 1880s settlement in the southern or "villa" section of the spa was sparse and indeed, was to remain slight until the post-1945 period. Land use was confined to the previously described government and C.P.R. developments associated with the hot springs and accommodation of guests. A few other free-enterprise activities were undertaken at the Upper Hot Springs including the construction of small hotels and bath houses. A number of tote roads connected the Banff Springs Hotel, Sanatorium and facilities at the various hot springs, and were extended as scenic drives to various "beauty spots" in the southern part of the study area (Plate 7).

To the north of the Bow, developments assumed the more familiar characteristics of a frontier community, a sharp contrast to the luxurious edifices in the southern section. A post office, four churches, several houses, cabins and hotels, a school, general stores and a North West Mounted Police post made up much of the northern section in 1888. False-fronted, single and double-storeyed buildings were very prominent (Plate 5), rather detracting from the popular, contemporary concept of what a fashionable spa should look like.

Plate 2 shows that settlement took place over a wide area of the surveyed townsite, from Bow River to Wolf Street. Moreover, a rudimentary form of land zoning was apparent. Blocks 1 and 2 (Fig. 2, Plate 5) represented the core of the commercial and retail district. Public and institutional buildings had also begun to appear on adjacent blocks and residential properties (including private houses offering
commercial services such as accommodation), were scattered throughout the other settled blocks.

Few recreational land uses were present in the 1880s. Tote roads and bridle paths existed, however (Plate 2), and a dancing pavilion had been built on block A across the river from the boat house.

Elsewhere in the northern section of the study area, land was put to a variety of uses. For example, John Brewster introduced 40 to 45 head of cattle to a ranch near the C.P.R. Station to obviate the need of importing milk from Moose Jaw. An "abundance of good marsh hay" was cut for the Department in 1887 for horse feed. In the following year it was feared that cropping might diminish future supplies, necessitating seeding of crops. However, by 1892 "there is no longer any question as to the value of these meadows." Interestingly, two years later, scarcity of hay in other parts of Alberta:

increased the market price for that cut in the park, and consequently after the local demand was supplied a considerable quantity was shipped to points outside the park.

In years when the local hay supply proved inadequate for the large horse population, hay might be imported from the nearby Stoney Indian Reserve at Morley.

Beyond the study area, land use associated with the management and development of Banff was most highly specialized at Lake Minnewanka. Here the government anticipated that certain landscape improvements would assist in the establishment of a "suburb" of the spa. Although the site was partially developed on land leasing arrangements similar to those operating in the spa, the damming of Lake Minnewanka required that it eventually be abandoned. Had the "suburb" survived, it might
have developed as a lakeside community similar to that established at Lake Edith in Jasper National Park.¹⁴⁷

The pattern of land settlement and land use in the spa during the 1880s is thought to have been considerably influenced by the policies adopted by the government for the management of the land tenure system. The leasing arrangements, of course, provided some of the initial stimulus for settlement and property construction because of the long-term clauses in the leases and the low rentals required from lessees.

With certain exceptions, the government issued leases on a "first come, first served" basis. The exceptions included large lots along the banks of the Bow River on blocks A and B, and probably, the large villa lots south of the river. These leases were seemingly to be issued to persons of wealth or social standing. The inefficient or relaxed distribution of other leases enabled speculation to take place. "Blanketing" of lots resulted, lessees hoping thereby to transfer their leases—a procedure to which the government invariably acceded—at elevated rates. As a result residential development took place on widely-scattered lots throughout the spa.

Some persons, however, retained their lease and acquired still more. Such people, notably the Brewster family, were thus able to influence business development and government schemes for townsite operation in later years. As automatic renewal and non-cancellation of leases¹⁴⁸ became standard government practice in land management from the outset, the influence of private citizens in land use matters, relative to their possession of leases could become a very significant element in community development. Thus by 1949, R. Wild noted, for
example, that "the Brewsters hold the town and the nearby glaciers in a firmly benevolent grip."^149 Doubtless, early administrators were unaware of the long-term implications of the land tenure system they had introduced to the spa. However, by adopting an informal management policy the government rendered impractical land leasing in Banff as a form of land use control.

By 1910, much of the present townsite area north of the Bow had been settled, primarily through the construction of single family residences (Plate 3). Business and residential developments which had seemingly proceeded at an irregular rate from the 1880s, had tied up most leases from the Bow to Wolf Street by 1903. Consequently, to meet the public's needs more blocks were opened between Wolf Street and Moose Street in 1910-11.

While no records have been obtained as to actual property construction at this time, Oberlander's valuable work in 1961 suggests that residential construction was very considerable (Table 7). He shows that at least 219 residences were built in Banff prior to 1915. Doubtless, many original buildings have been replaced but Oberlander has shown that in all classes of commercial and residential land use in 1961, property constructed between 1900 and 1915 occupied most of the lots from the Bow River to Fox Street.

The net effect of the development was to fill up many of the empty lots adjacent to Banff Avenue. On larger, preferential lots, quite sizeable properties were erected. In addition, there were many more businesses and entertainment facilities such as the Museum, paddock and zoo. To the south of the Bow the Alpine Club of Canada had built a headquarters in 1908.
The character and rate of development of Banff after 1900 (Fig. 5, Table 4) may have encouraged administrators (and probably the C.P.R.), to assume that the spa would continue to expand rapidly in future years. Undoubtedly such growth would have its attendant planning problems. But this need not have concerned the government for in its capacity as landlord, it could control and direct the character of spa development. The situation was supplemented, state Crawford et al.:

by its being the governmental body taking the place of both the municipal and, to a limited extent, the provincial government for the Parks and thus it [had] further extensive powers, such as licensing and law enforcement.150

Nevertheless, in seeming anticipation of future growth administrators hired T. A. Mawson in 1913 to make proposals on the "artistic layout" of Banff. Amongst Mawson's recommendations were:

1. a recreation ground, with ample space for picnics,
2. a new road, providing a circular drive, around the east side of Tunnel Mountain,
3. moving the zoo to the north side of the C.P.R. tracks,
4. new swimming pools at the Middle Springs,
5. construction of four bridges, one to replace the existing bridge across the Bow,
6. making a straight thoroughfare from the C.P.R. station to the bridge, and
7. a mile long, practically straight toboggan slide.

A significant comment by Mawson was that no changes in trees or shrubbery should be effected.151 Obviously, the vigorous efforts of the government and C.P.R. to improve the landscape about the village had proved fruitful.
TABLE 7
AGE OF RESIDENTIAL BUILDINGS BY TYPE, 1961

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Before 1915</th>
<th>1916-30</th>
<th>1931-45</th>
<th>1946-61</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>68.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplex</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>20.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: H. P. Oberlander, Urban Development Plan, Banff, Alberta, prepared for Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Ottawa, 1961, Table 6.
Chapter summary

In the quarter century preceding Mawson's report, Banff had developed from a site of ephemeral Indian and white settlement on the pioneer fringe, to a fashionable spa with an international reputation and growing resident population. Moreover, it enjoyed a multi-functional role as railway, service, administration and hunting centre.

Banff's dependence upon renewable resources such as hot springs, landscape and wildlife, differentiated it from other nearby transitory settlements which declined through exhaustion of the mineral resource or loss of economic viability. However, Banff's success was largely the result of a continuous and diversified interest expressed by the government and C.P.R. Company in terms of capital expenditure, provision of municipal and other services, particularly in terms of land tenure, landscape improvements, recreational and entertainment facilities, and perhaps most important of all—advertising. Ostensibly these investments were designed to encourage the public's appreciation of the region in terms of its healthful and scenic qualities and its "natural wonders," but another primary motivation appears to have been revenue to the Crown and the C.P.R.

Throughout the period discussed federal and free-enterprise agencies sought to promote facilities which would attract people of wealth, prestige and influence. In this they succeeded with the factor of geographical isolation playing a significant part in the character of village developed by 1910. Although a difficult, tedious wagon road had permitted access to Banff from Calgary for many years, the C.P.R. represented the primary means of transportation to the spa. Naturally, the railway company exploited this monopolistic advantage
to the full with active government cooperation--through preferential lease and land use agreements, facility development and advertising.

The government in turn, while anxious to have full control over settlement and free-enterprise developments on public land so as to direct village growth, recognized that land tenure arrangements had to be sufficiently flexible to encourage investment and settlement by the public. A compromise solution was found in a leasing system with freehold-like characteristics, and federal land management along very informal lines. Unfortunately, this decision undermined the concept of leasing as a means of land use control, giving rise to trading and speculation in village land. Moreover, government failure to act upon these matters gave rise to a pattern of land management and public attitudes which became traditional in Banff and other National Park communities.

Isolation, too, seemingly enabled the C.P.R. and to a lesser extent, the residents of Banff, to become significant local and political forces. In the former case, government reliance upon C.P.R. developments to promote the spa had obvious advantages to the railway company. And the residents of Banff, being remote from federal influence in Ottawa, quickly developed an element of pioneer independence and associated self-centredness. Informal local government administration must have proved influential in this development for the community was permitted no local self-government and no political structure beyond representation through a Member in the House of Commons. In 1905, when Banff became part of the newly-established Province of Alberta, a representative Member also sat in the Provincial Legislature. But local administration duties
came under the authority of the Park Superintendent with all aspects of capital works, maintenance, land and building leaseholds, licensing of commerce, etc., being his immediate responsibility.

Banff was conceived of and developed as a planned spa town to serve the resort purposes of the Hot Springs Reserve. When incorporated into Canada’s first National Park in 1887, Banff continued to grow along the lines for which it was originally established and townsite administration was extended to the reserve as a whole with no functional separation taking place. Emphasis on these historical matters clarifies a recent misconception that the function of all National Park communities was to prevent:

a scattering of facilities along the access routes . . . [and]
it also resulted in the creation of an urban environment which in itself was foreign to the National Park environment.152

Mawson’s recommendations in 1913 clearly indicate that despite the growth of the Park system (Table 2), and the expansion of Banff Park itself (Fig. 4), urban expansion of the village of Banff was desirable.
NOTES


2 J. Palliser, et al. The Journals, Detailed Reports, and Observations Relative to the Exploration by Captain Palliser of that Portion of British North America, which in Latitude, lies Between the British Boundary Line and the Height of Land or Watershed of the Northern or Frozen Ocean Respectively, and in Longitude, Between the Western Shore of Lake Superior and the Pacific Ocean During the Years 1857, 1858, 1859 and 1860 (London: Eyre and Spottiswoode, 1863), p. 100; and I. M. Spry, "Routes Through the Rockies," The Beaver, Autumn (1963a), p. 36.


4 A. Harmon, "History of Banff National Park," (Banff: Superintendent's Office, n.d.), pp. 4, 15 (mimeographed), and Rev. John McDougall, personal communication to W. B. Sanson, Banff, Nov. 21, 1879 (Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Calgary), File A. M. 137.

5 It was not unknown for the Stoney to winter ponies in sheltered areas of the Rockies. The Ya-Ha-Tinda ("Great Prairies") basin on the Red Deer River was used for just such a purpose.

6 Jack Fuller, Calgary (personal interview, April 7, 1966) states that Stoney pit houses existed in fine, sandy material in the vicinity of Deer Street, subsequently being destroyed by C.P.R. excavations.

7 Harmon, op. cit., p. 15.

8 Sir G. Simpson, Narrative of a Journey Round the World during the Years 1841 and 1842 (London: H. Colburn), Vol. 1, p. 117. This book is not in every detail identical with Simpson's original manuscript.

9 Originally known as Piegan Post, this trading establishment was operated by the Hudson's Bay Company in the period 1832-1834.
Statement by J. E. Nix, Alberta Conference of the United Church of Canada, Calgary, December 21, 1965. Personal communication. Most sources set the date of Rundle's visit at 1841; see for example, T. Wilson, personal communication to J. B. Harkin, Ottawa, June 28, 1922. (Wilson Papers, Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Calgary), file 19.

Rundle's Diary only became available in 1965 but gives little useful information about the country and people encountered. The more useful Journals are composed of notes and diary accounts which he sent to Britain.


I. M. Spry, The Palliser Expedition (Toronto: Macmillan, 1963b), p. 143. Many of Hector's measurements have been shown to be inaccurate.

Palliser, et al., op. cit., p. 147.

Earl of Southesk, Saskatchewan and the Rocky Mountains. A Diary and Narrative of Travel, Sport and Adventure, during a journey through the Hudson's Bay Company's Territories in 1859 and 1860 (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1875).

T. Wilson, personal communication to J. B. Harkin, Ottawa, November 30, 1922 (Wilson Papers, Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Calgary), file 19.

Byrne, op. cit., pp. 70-71.


W. Pearce, personal communication to T. Wilson of Banff, February 12, 1923 (Wilson Papers, Glenbow-Alberta Institute), file 15.

Byrne, op. cit., p. 76.

T. Wilson, in Canadian Pacific Spanner Vol 2, No. 8 (1963), states that Simpson and Kananaskis Passes were also examined as possible routes in 1881 but the present route was eventually selected. J. M. Gibbon in History of the Canadian Pacific (New York: Tudor Publications 1937), pp. 242-243, records that in 1882, the C.P.R. was authorized to change its route from the Yellowhead to the Kicking Horse Pass.
Lord Strathcona was a director of the C.P.R. C.P.R. officials were influential in naming many natural features in the Rockies.

Byrne, loc. cit.

Crag and Canyon, May 3, 1935.

Byrne, loc. cit.

See for example: Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources, The Origin and Meaning of the National Parks of Canada. Extracts from the papers of the late J. B. Harkin, first Commissioner of the National Parks of Canada (H.R. Larson Publishing Co., 1957); Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Canada's Heritage of Nature (Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1961); and R. Scharff, Canada's Mountain National Parks (Toronto: Musson Book Company, 1966). (Published in association with the Natural and Historic Resources Branch, Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources.)

Byrne, op. cit., discusses fully the landscape of Banff Park area to 1911.


These railway construction men preceded the C.P.R. line into the study area. They arrived in early summer, the railway coming in September, 1883.

Completed on November 7, 1885.

Crag and Canyon, May 3, 1935.

Pearce (1962), loc. cit.

Ibid., p. 13.

W. Pearce, personal communication to T. Wilson, Banff, Feb. 12, 1923 (Wilson Papers, Glenbow-Alberta Institute), file 15. Compensation need not have been paid as no leases or patents to the springs were issued by the Dept. of the Interior. McCabe sold the Cave and Basin to Woodworth in his partner's absence. The government paid Woodworth $1,000 and McCabe and one of the McCardell's $675 since they had not been paid by Woodworth for the transfer of property to him.

Pearce (1962), op. cit., pp. 11-12.

P. C. 1885-2197.


Interior, Annual Report for 1886, Pt. I, p. 84.

Ibid.

Ibid., p. 9.


Ibid., p. 84.

Ibid., p. 84.


Ibid.

Ibid., p. 9.


Ibid., p. 84.

Ibid., p. 84.

Chap. 32, 50-51 Victoria, June 25, 1887. The Rocky Mountains Park was renamed Banff National Park with passage of the National Parks Act in 1930.


Byrne, op. cit., p. 91.


Pearce (1962), loc. cit.

Interior, Annual Report for 1887, Pt. VI, p. 3. The two "townsites" were Banff and Lake Minnewanka.
59. W. Pearce, personal communication to T. Wilson, Banff, February 12, 1923 (Wilson Papers, Glenbow-Alberta Institute), file 15.


61. Plan of Villa Lots, June 8, 1899, sheet No. 2.


64. St. Julien Addition, Plan 24,423 Ottawa (1709CG, Calgary), May 26, 1917.


67. Toronto Globe, July 13, 1886.

68. Canada, Commons Debates, 50-51 Victoria (1887), Vol. 1, p. 239.


70. Canada, Commons Debates, 50-51 Victoria (1887), Vol. 1, p. 194.


74. Ise, loc. cit.

75. Ibid.

76. Ibid., pp. 522, 523.

77. Ibid., pp. 244, 245.

78. Shankland, op. cit., p. 82.

The popular belief that some leases with 90-year clauses were also issued in Banff, has not be substantiated by the writer.

Senator D. Cameron, Brief presented before Standing Committee, Dept. of Northern Affairs and National Resources, on behalf of Banff National Park Citizens' Association, November 30, 1966.

See, for example, National Park Lease NPC 178A.

Early reports of the Department of the Interior went into great detail as to what purposes appropriations had been used for.

102 Ibid.
107 Dept. of the Interior, Canadian National Park (Rocky Mountains), Banff, Alberta (Ottawa: King's Printer, c. 1905), p. 9.
108 Pearce (1962), loc. cit.
111 Donated by C.P.R. President, William Whyte.
113 Crag and Canyon, May 3, 1935.
114 Ibid.
116 Ibid.
118 Ibid.
121 Ise, op. cit.
122 Dr. Brett subsequently became Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta.

Harmon, op. cit., p. 23.


Calgary Herald, June 3, 1891.

Byrne, op. cit.

Harmon, op. cit., p. 20.

Ibid., p. 9. Harmon states that poaching persisted into the 1900s especially after the Park boundary was expanded in 1902. Establishment of a Warden system in 1909 curtailed hunting but it seems significant that in 1915, 21 hunting and exploring parties should outfit in Banff with many more congregating there.


Crag and Canyon, May 3, 1935.

Dept. of the Interior, Canadian National Park (Rocky Mountains), Banff, Alberta (Ottawa: King's Printer, c. 1905), p. 13.


Ibid.

Unsigned, undated comments extrapolated from the Norman Luxton Papers (Glenbow-Alberta Institute), Box 1, file 1.

Ibid.


Interior, Annual Report for 1888, Pt. VI, pp. 6, 8.


146 Interior, Annual Report for 1894, Pt. IV, p. 4.

147 Bodsworth, op. cit.

148 Pearce (1962), op. cit., cites the only example known to the writer of lease cancellation to the year 1900.


PLATES
Plate 1, dated 1886, was taken looking west from the slope of Tunnel Mountain. Plates 2, 3 and 4 are taken from approximately the same location. Plate 1 is indistinct but reveals a landscape badly decimated by fire. Early settlement is in the form of two hotels—the Banff (later the Sanatorium), and the Moulton Park (numbered 1 and 3 respectively). The white spots are tents erected by visitors to the hot springs who were unable to get hotel accommodation or could not afford it. Note also the routes to the first C.P.R. station at Banff (5) and the upper hot springs (6). The C.P.R. track is also visible.

Plate 2, dated about 1890, again shows burnt timber on both north and south-facing slopes. Felled fire-killed timber and fire succession lodgepole pine occupy the foreground. Banff townsite has acquired the trappings of a frontier community. Buildings which include churches and a school have been constructed on a number of blocks. Survey lines for the latter are clearly shown. Properties have been constructed on Lynx Street which connects with the second (present) C.P.R. station. The coach road at the lower left continues to Bow Falls lookout point and is representative of such routes built for the benefit of hotel guests. Note also the boat-house on the south bank of the Bow, the relocated bridge, enlarged Sanatorium and the dancing pavilion at the north end of the bridge.

Plate 3, taken about 1911, indicates the marked growth of Banff townsite, increased timber growth in the vicinity of the community, and the continued development of different land uses first shown in Plate 2. Beyond Banff, fire-killed timber is still visible. Settlement, confined to the west and east by ill-drained flats and the slopes of Tunnel Mountain respectively, has concentrated upon the early-settled blocks of the townsite. Businesses are principally located on Banff Avenue on blocks 1 and 2, while residential properties are made up largely of single family dwellings. The government museum is located in the Administration Building on the site of the dancing pavilion, near Bow Bridge. Note the many vacant lots.
Plate 4 (1965), contrasts sharply with its predecessors. Principal changes in landscape relate to more extensive tree cover and the development of the townsite. The slopes of Sulphur Mountain and Mount Norquay and the banks of the Bow River show marked reafforestations. The Trans-Canada Highway (upper right), was built during the mid-1950s and is a distinct landscape modification in the study area. Note Banff School of Fine Arts at the lower left and the public cemetery, centre. The vertical slash on Sulphur Mountain was used as a winter toboggan run.

Plates 5 and 6, taken in 1888 and 1965 respectively, again show the changes which have occurred in the landscape of the study area since the establishment of Banff townsite. Scattered pioneer settlement along the future Banff Avenue in 1888 contrasts sharply with the recent photograph taken at the peak of the summer tourist season.

Milk supplies for Park residents were obtained locally for many years.
Plate 7 (c. 1900) The original Banff Springs Hotel built by the C.P.R. in 1888 is shown with later additions. Note the coach road and tally-ho. This hotel was destroyed by fire in 1926 and replaced by the present structure.

Plate 8 (1965) The belt of trees beyond the motels and to the north of Banff Avenue consists of eight lots leased by one person but which contain only one residential property. This situation exists because of the availability of lots in early years and the characteristics of the perpetual leases by which the lots were acquired.

The motels represent post-war accommodation development on blocks 28 and 36. They have largely replaced the cabin accommodations favoured by earlier motor travellers.

Plate 9 (1965) Recent residential development on the slopes of Sulphur Mountain has been based upon the 19th century curvilinear plans prepared by Superintendent George Stewart. It was originally anticipated that the large lots and fashionable spa layout would prove attractive to people of wealth and influence.

The impressive Administration Building and Gardens were constructed as relief projects during the 1930s. Mineral Springs Hospital is located on the site of Brett's original hospital. Upper Hot Springs Road exits at upper left of the photograph.
Plate 10 (1965) View looks west along Wolf and Elk streets. The photograph shows a great diversity of land use with residential, commercial and institutional categories visible. The residential properties are mainly single family dwellings converted to multiple family status. Business properties constitute the northern limit of the main commercial area. The large building in the centre is a self-service grocery store.

Banff High and Elementary Schools are seen at right, the playground of the former serving as a summer parking area. The road at upper centre was built in 1965 to facilitate access to the Trans-Canada Highway.

Plate 11 (1965) Signs advertise a variety of services on Banff Avenue. Much of the souvenir trade is supported by the introduction of imported goods to the National Park.

Plate 12 (1965) The Luxton Museum, on the south bank of the Bow River, is a false-fronted fort inside which are displayed aspects of Indian life in western Canada. The Museum is operated by the Glenbow Alberta-Institute, Calgary, a charitable organization placed in the hands of the Alberta Provincial Government in 1966.
CHAPTER III

THE GROWTH AND DEVELOPMENT OF BANFF AS RESORT AND TOWNSITE (1911-1945)

Changes in communications

Fundamental to the growth of Banff from about 1910 were changes in communications, notably the introduction of the automobile. With the use of the car and construction of highways to and through the Rocky Mountain National Park system, the relative isolation of the village ended; it experienced vigorous growth and assumed certain new functions which were in part an outgrowth of the original spa purpose conceived for Banff. The community also became exposed to additional influences for land use change, in particular from regional sources such as Calgary, and on a less obvious scale from the provincial government.

Initially the government expressed antipathy to the presence of autos in the Park. After a Boston couple had penetrated the Park in 1904 by car, an Order in Council was passed in August, 1905 forbidding automobiles access to the Park. Opposition to the presence of vehicles arose from the allegedly detrimental effects these would have upon the game,¹ and recognition of the inability of existing tote roads to carry motor traffic. Some administrators, entrepreneurs and residents may have viewed the presence of automobiles as detrimental to the exclusive tourist industry established through 30 years of railway communications.²

Additional vehicular intrusion took place in 1909, two years after work had begun on the Banff-Calgary coach road. By 1910
regulations governing the use of autos had been partially amended and
by 1911 auto travel to Banff village was possible.\(^3\) In 1915 another
Order in Council permitted autos on all Park roads suitable for
vehicles, at speeds not exceeding 15 m.p.h.\(^4\) The effect of these
modified regulations was immediate. Administrators reported that by
1918 autos had "practically driven the . . . slower tally-ho off the
roads"\(^5\) of the study area, and in the following year the Department
of the Interior Annual Report stated:

In the parks which can be reached only by railway there was
a noticeable decrease in the number of visitors, but the three
parks accessible by motor road had a most successful season.\(^6\)

Government relaxation of travel regulations in 1911 had
coincided with a Park road construction programme. In that year both
the Banff-Radium Hot Springs and Banff-Yoho roads were started; they
were completed in 1923\(^7\) and 1926,\(^8\) respectively, the Banff-Calgary
road having been completed in 1914.

Throughout the period 1911 to 1945 extension of roads and trails
with "revisions, widening and gravel-surfacing"\(^9\) took up much of the
Park Branch's annual appropriations. However, employment of prisoners
of war, and unemployed males during the 1930s depression\(^10\) eased the
overall cost. The Mount Norquay and Banff-Jasper roads for example,
were initiated in 1931 as depression relief projects; they were
completed in 1936 and 1940 respectively.\(^11\) From 96.5 miles of graded
road in 1912, the Park communications network expanded to 127 miles of
road and 766 miles of trail in 1929, and 263.3 miles of road and 77
miles of fire road in 1943.

The obvious shift in government policy towards motor travel in
National Parks in 1911 was probably primarily attributable to J. B. Harkin
who was appointed Commissioner of the system in that year. At the same time, with the passage of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act (1911);

A recognition of the . . . essential differences in the administrative requirements concerning National Parks and National Forest Reserves led to the detachment of the parks from the Forestry Branch . . . .

With this change in administration the newly formed Parks Branch received "increased appropriations for the development of the parks . . . and gradually progress was made in opening up these areas to the visitor." Harkin, conscious of the economic benefits that a road system might bring to the Crown, strongly supported a programme of road construction in Canada. He observed that people wished to travel in comfort and if suitable facilities were provided:

the tourist [would] spend weeks instead of days in the Parks, and it is the tourist who does this that yields the big revenue.

Very probably the Commissioner was aware of contemporary policy in the American Park system where, between 1908 and 1915, eight Parks were opened to the motoring public. Harkin's American counterpart, Stephen Mather, appreciated the revenue potential of the auto to the Parks and despite initial strenuous objections from his government associates, embarked upon a Park road construction programme. By 1915 "automobile tourists were beginning to crowd into the [American] parks by the thousand." This trend caused Mather to observe that:

This tremendous increase in automobile travel leads to one conclusion only and that is that in the early future, travel in private machines will overtake the increasing railroad travel and constitute the greater part of all park travel. This makes it incumbent upon the Federal Government to prepare for the great influx of automobiles by constructing new roads and improving existing highways wherever improvement is needed.

Mather's statement had equal validity when applied in the Canadian
context. For example, Figure 5, which shows vehicle passengers to Banff Park through the East Gate (near Canmore), should be compared with the following Department estimates of railway passengers to the Park in the period 1935-1940:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years</th>
<th>Passengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1939-40</td>
<td>40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938-39</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937-38</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-37</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935-36</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

At the time the auto was introduced to Banff Park Southern Alberta's growing city populations had precipitated a great change in the C.P.R.'s operation of trains through Banff. "Weekend specials" from Calgary introduced in 1910, encouraged "thousands" of one-day excursion parties to visit Banff by 1914. Alderman G. E. Wood of Calgary even proposed that an electric car-line be constructed as far as Banff.

From 1915, eight passenger trains stopped daily in Banff during the summer, many conveying passengers:

who came up to spend the day in the Park, relying upon the motor bus service of Brewster Transport Company to take them around the scenic sights. After a day's outing, they gathered at the pavilion for a picnic, or to await the arrival of the train.

Visitor characteristics

The change in patterns of communications from 1911, and in particular the increased use of automobiles, fundamentally altered the origin, numbers and character of visitations to Banff National Park and the village of Banff.

Whereas Banff had previously only been readily accessible by the C.P.R. line, completion of the Banff-Calgary coach road and other
highways in the Rockies facilitated travel to the Park by auto, primarily on a regional basis. Until the 1940s, the poor quality of most provincial roads discouraged many potential Park visitors from embarking upon long-distance auto journeys. As a result, persons whose place of permanent residence lay not more than 100 miles from Banff were the most likely source of motor visitors. Park visitor registration reports consistently stated that the four western provinces provided most visitors, Alberta in particular and specifically Calgary, being highly represented in this western contribution. In 1923, for example, of 4,213 auto licences issued to Park visitors, 2,890 were to Alberta residents, all excepting 129 coming from Calgary. Recent reports by Taylor for 1961 and 1962, and Steiner for c. 1965 support the role of Calgary as a continuously heavy contributor to the Park's visitor population.

Because Banff was more readily accessible to populations east of the Rockies, Banff Park's East Gate recorded considerably higher figures than did other routes into the Park. Thus in 1928, 27,335 vehicles were recorded at the East Gate with 8,440 and 1,644 vehicles entering the Park by way of the Windermere and Yoho highways respectively.

Government reports show that the number of visitors to Banff Park and to the village itself increased very substantially from about 1911 through to 1945 although temporary declines occurred during both World Wars and also during the depression of the 1930s. The role of the auto as a contributor to this overall increase is very apparent in Figure 5.

Visitor characteristics also seem to have been influenced by
the auto as, with the possible exception of summer cottage owners, tourists tended towards stays of much shorter periods than in the 19th century. Government reports and early newspaper articles show that visitors originally made the relatively lengthy journey to Banff with the expectation of several days' stay, extending even to weeks or months in many cases. But as previously noted, weekend residence and day trips to Banff became commonplace after about 1911 and opportunities for intra- and inter-Park motor travel eliminated the necessity of residing in Banff itself. 2.52 days was stated to be the average period of residence in Tunnel Mountain campground in 1937. The trend seemingly has persisted for Taylor reports an average of 2.3 days for this campground in 1964.

**The Growth of Banff townsite**

Banff grew considerably in population and size between 1911 and 1945, with most activity taking place in the years to 1930. The original concept of Banff as a spa did not, however, fully account for the degree and character of settlement and development which took place. Certain new functions such as Banff's role as a summer home colony, entertainment and education centre are recognized as contributing towards one main function during these years: that of Banff as a recreational focus or resort town.

In this study the word "recreation" is recognized as including both active and passive types indulged in primarily during leisure hours. Also included is recreation where artificial facilities may or may not be required. Obviously where recreational opportunities of such variety are available, as in a resort town, some degree of
specialization must be expected in the types of facilities provided for visitors, and in land uses developed as a result.

Banff's growth may be expressed in three ways; as a gross increase in resident population, in terms of areal expansion of the townsite, and in the type of physical developments which took place. Each of these elements will be described in turn and their collective impact upon the land use pattern of Banff evaluated.

Population increase. Contemporaneous with transportation improvements and increases in visitor numbers, came a sharp rise in Banff's resident population. Numbers had in fact been growing since 1900 and continued to rise sharply until 1921. However, from 1921 to 1945 the population rose only slightly (Table 4).

Townsite expansion. These population increases were associated with an expansion of Banff's settled area. As noted in Chapter Two, much of the land originally surveyed in the northern part of Banff was held under lease by 1910. However, much of this land remained unimproved; that is, no property construction had been effected by lease-holders (Plate 3). Even so, the government decided to open a number of new blocks to settlement.

In 1913, many lots were made available to the public by means of an auction sale.

Col. Rodgers held auction sale of lots in blocks 28 to 35 inclusive. Attendance was less than 50 people. Block 28 sold 12 lots prices ranging from $5 to $26 with average about $9.00. Block 29 only sold 6 lots; blocks 30, 31, 32, 33, produced no buyers; blocks 34 and 35 sold out at average price of $23.32

At that time the government abandoned the old method of lease distribution whereby the public could acquire lots on a "first come, first served" basis.
During the year a new policy in regard to the disposal of lots in Banff was initiated. Experience had shown that in many cases speculators took up Banff lots without any intention of complying with the building conditions. The result was that persons who really desired to secure home sites for themselves either had to purchase from the speculators or do without lots, which meant that the progress of Banff was being retarded, and that bona fide lot seekers were compelled to pay money to speculators, without any real value being received. To terminate this condition of affairs a vigorous policy of cancellation was inaugurated against lot holders who had failed to carry out conditions of agreements covering their lots. To give everyone a chance to secure these cancelled lots, it was decided not to grant them to the first applicants, as had been the practise, but to dispose of them by public auction; it was also felt that this method of disposal would make it unprofitable for the speculator to endeavour to blanket lots as in the past. The experiment proved eminently successful and when a new subdivision--made necessary by the expansion of the town--was completed in the autumn, the lots therein were also offered by public auction.

In 1915 another subdivision was added to the plan of Banff. The "Badger Addition" included blocks 36, 37 and 38 and was surveyed, presumably to cater for more private development.

On May 16, seventy-four lots were offered at public auction, of which fifty-five were sold. Of the buyers, all but very few completed the purchase price and paid the first year's rental.

Little immediate property development resulted from either of the previous auctions and as late as 1961, about 121 lots in both subdivisions remained undeveloped. Yet in 1917 the "St. Julien Addition" taking in blocks 34, 35 and 39 to 52 inclusive was also added to the town plan. Here again property construction was delayed for many years and did not take place until after 1945. As Figure 2 illustrates, the federal decision to add all these subdivisions to the town plan added greatly to the land available in the townsite for settlement and development.

Land uses in the townsite. There is a problem in satisfactorily categorizing land uses in Banff. Although at first sight residential,
commercial and institutional uses can be recognized, properties thus
categorized also operated in many instances in a recreational capacity.
For example, land classed as being residential was in many instances
recreational insofar as the property placed on it was used only as a
summer home. Again, do we classify tourist accommodations in private
homes as being in a residential, commercial or recreational category?
To illustrate some of these problems a number of land uses are here­
after described to show how townsite functions were expressed in land
use terms.

1. Much residential development took place up to the year
1930 (Table 7), mainly in the form of single family dwellings (Plate 4),
which occupied the greatest area of townsite land and also contributed
to a low building density. This practice continued up to and after
1945 as Table 7 and Plate 9 show. There were no restrictions as to
who might reside in the townsite and Park employees, entrepreneurs,
local business employees and retired persons made up much of the
permanent population.

Residential properties were spread throughout Banff. South of
the Bow, developed land was sparse but Jones did record 32 residences
on Cave and Spray Streets in 1932, these having been constructed on
the spacious lots originally surveyed in the 19th century.

Beaver Street became a general demarcation line between
residential and other land categories north of the Bow River (Fig. 2).
East of Beaver Street, land was occupied almost completely by residen­
tial properties, while a diversity of categories occupied the original
business area in blocks 1 and 2.

Few restrictions are thought to have been placed on the
classification or quality of buildings erected. As noted, most were single family dwellings but occasional multiple family dwellings were erected, and in many cases the quality of construction could not have been very good. For example, administrators noted that in 1926:

A number of the better houses in Bankhead . . . were moved to Banff, and as a result practically every available lot in that townsite is now taken up.\(^{27}\)

Personal inspection of certain of these properties in 1965-66 showed that even when originally constructed they could hardly have conformed to the high-quality construction which the government sought in Banff.

What percentage of private residences represented summer houses, neither Jones in 1933, Oberlander in 1961, nor this writer in 1965-66 could ascertain. However, such properties are known to have contributed significantly to the residential category, and in view of their current distribution, were probably located throughout Banff. Wolfe (1951) reported 2,561 summer homes owned or leased in Alberta in 1941;\(^ {38}\) many of these are thought to have been located in National Park town-sites.

2. A great many business and commercial activities were permissible in Banff as can be ascertained from Table 8. Figures given for 1948 should be treated with some caution. Business and commercial land uses as defined have included all services provided by free enterprise to both residents and visitors and performed in premises other than those classed as residential habitations. As many of these services were oriented towards meeting the recreational needs of the public, for example, dance halls, pool halls, hotels and a cinema, they might also be thought of as recreational land uses. This duality in
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>1933</th>
<th>1948</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bakeries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber and Beauty Shops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beer Parlours</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Alleys</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleaners</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Halls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department Stores</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Sales Rooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical Appliances</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fuel and Lumber Yards</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furriers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garages, Commercial</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Company</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Stations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware Stores</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotels, Commercial</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Y.W.C.A.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Bureau</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Stores, Retail</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; Wholesale</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meat Markets</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motion Picture Theatre</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper Publishers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pool Halls</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Offices</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants, Tea Rooms</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Repair Shops</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoe Shine Parlours</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Souvenir and Gift Shops</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources:  
definition becomes even more apparent when we note that many so-called business and commercial activities functioned only during the summer tourist season.

The part of Banff wherein this type of land use predominated consisted of the original commercial area in blocks 1 and 2 but with a secondary commercial area being developed on Bear Street. Thus Wolf and Buffalo streets defined the northern and southern limits of the commercial centre (Fig. 2, Plate 6, 10).

3. As noted above, much of the residential and commercial land in Banff was devoted to the provision of tourist accommodations. In Chapter Two four types of accommodation were recorded—hotel, cottage, private room and tent. But from about 1911 motor communications encouraged a greater number and variety of accommodation types. By 1928 the government was able to report:

Banff now possesses in all 12 hotels with a total of nearly 1,000 rooms and accommodation for approximately 1,600 persons per day. In addition there are 400 private houses renting rooms and 160 tent houses.

Jones' figures for 1932 are more conservative, yet he found that of the 502 private residences in Banff, 172 (35%) offered tourist accommodation. Most residences offering rooms and cabins were located on blocks 10 to 13, 16, 17 to 20, and 23 (Fig. 2).

Jones attributed the predominance of this tourist accommodation lying north of Wolf Street to the fact that Banff Avenue was an extension of the highway from Calgary. Marten and Muskrat Streets provided convenient exits from the main thoroughfare for auto travellers who made almost exclusive use of these accommodations.

Private residents continued to add to their accommodation
capacity by erecting shack tents in their backyards for which the
government charged a permit fee of $1.00. In 1916 Superintendent
Clark commented:

Attention was given to shack tents which remain up from year
to year and are thus liable to become dilapidated, but little
difficulty was experienced in getting owners to look after these
places and to keep them in tidy repair.\textsuperscript{42}

In 1920:

Every cottage available in Banff was occupied (during the
summer) and several lodging-houses added tents to their
accommodation.\textsuperscript{43}

Few were winterised and while federal approval of this form of
accommodation always appeared lukewarm, cabin erection was not dis­
couraged until 1938.

For a number of years low cost accommodation had developed
in cabins of low standard in back yards. A poor situation
developed which was taken in hand in 1938: sub-standard struc­
tures were required to be torn down and the number of buildings
on a lot was limited. All cabins were required to be brought
up to standard before licensing for occupation was permitted.\textsuperscript{44}

Jones had recorded 124 residences possessing rental cabins in
1932. Despite federal concern in 1938, government plans to destroy
sub-standard structures were seemingly never enforced for Oberlander
recorded 205 cabins in existence in 1961.\textsuperscript{45} Although not all were
used for accommodation purposes in 1961, some were occupied the year
round and categorized under residential land use (Fig. 6).

Other early accommodation appeared in the form of campgrounds.
Before 1914 the confluence of the Bow River and Forty Mile Creek had
served as a campground but thereafter the confluence of the Bow and
Spray Rivers served as an official site (Fig. 3). Camping proved
very popular with automobile visitors and annual increments in
camping totals were sustained until the depression (Fig. 7). The
Fig. 7

CAMPING PERMITS ISSUED
IN BANFF PARK: 1916-65

source: Superintendent's Office, Banff, 1966
fall in camping totals during the depression followed the establishment of a new camp site on Tunnel Mountain in 1927 and numbers remained low from 1935 partly because of the introduction of bungalow camps. The government reported that in 1937, with "the advent of equipped bungalow camps . . . the popularity of the public motor campgrounds generally has decreased." Not until after 1945 did totals rise significantly.

4. Public and institutional land uses such as schools, churches, a post office and a hospital were comparable to those found in any provincial municipality of similar size. Of course, these facilities had been introduced soon after Banff became a permanent community (Chapter Two), and were recognized by the government as being essential to townsite growth.

Functional specialization did, however, take place in this general land use category. First, a number of federal buildings associated with the administration and maintenance of services in the townsite and Park as a whole were scattered throughout Banff, for example, the administrative building (Plate 9), and maintenance building in block 10.

Secondly, during the 1930s, Banff School of Fine Arts was located in the townsite. The School had its origins in a grant of $10,000 per year (for three years), made to the Department of Extension of the University of Alberta in 1933 by the Carnegie Corporation. This grant, "for the advancement of a programme of work in the Fine Arts," was renewed for a two-year term in 1936. An experimental school in the "Arts Related to the Theatre" was initiated in Banff, utilising high school and private property at nominal rentals as the University possessed no facilities of its own there. Stage facilities were
acquired through local taxation by the School Board—the only public body in Banff with authority to raise capital by such means—Banff School Auditorium being opened on January 5, 1940. Courses in music, painting, drama, ceramics, weaving and conversational French were offered mainly through the efforts of Donald (now Senator) Cameron who had "proceeded with great energy and enthusiasm to develop the new institution at Banff." The implications of this form of land use are discussed later.

From the preceding description of population numbers, urban expansion and land use in Banff from 1911 to 1945, we can say there developed a general land use pattern similar to urban communities of comparable size. However, upon closer examination of the general categories, the function of Banff as a resort is shown by the use of different types of land for similar purposes, particularly for accommodation. A mixture of real land uses was, therefore, to be found in each individual general land use category. This remained so when Oberlander examined land use categories in 1961. His work as shown in Figure 6 can only be described as a generalization of the real purposes which individual lots fulfilled in Banff. Obviously, any post-1945 attempt to zone land uses within the existing urban areas of Banff would pose tremendous problems for townsite planners.

Municipal services. The federal government's commitment to provide municipal and other services in Banff was continued after 1911. But urban growth and associated increments in visitor totals necessitated a broader application of the service policy and larger appropriations to support it.

In many instances introduction or improvement of services represented an outgrowth of visitor's complaints or more usually, local
agitations. For example, in 1917 residents sought to have Banff's streets oiled rather than watered as had been the practice since 1910. Eventually, in 1925 the government decided to implement the 1917 proposal. 49

Over the years to 1945, the government became responsible for:
1. expanding the street system,
2. street cleaning and snow removal, as well as street lighting,
3. sidewalk construction and maintenance,
4. surface drainage,
5. fire protection,
6. sanitation control,
7. building inspection,
8. traffic regulation,
9. street and traffic signs,
10. parks and playgrounds,
11. public conveniences,
12. cemeteries. 50

Residents, businesses and organizations made no contribution towards the cost of any of these services although they contributed towards one-half of the cost of water and sewer services, and contributed towards refuse collection and disposal.

As the provision of these services involved high annual expenditures by the government, residents of Banff were being heavily subsidized. All such services had they been supplied in a provincial municipality would invariably have been paid out of a municipal tax levied upon land and property owners. 51

Basic municipal services such as water, sewage and electric
power occupied the government in the early 1900s. In 1913 alone, "upwards of fifty new [water and sewer] connections [were] applied for and made." 52

In certain instances services continued to be provided by agencies other than the federal government.

Hospital and welfare services, education through the operations of the Board of School District #102, and electricity were all supplied on a provincial basis. At the same time, of course, services such as these made for growing provincial interest in the development of Banff.

The original supply of electricity from Bankhead ended with the closure of the town in 1923 and Calgary Power Company became responsible for servicing Banff. In 1912 the Company had erected a small dam at Lake Minnewanka for storage 53 and possibly flood-control purposes. 54 In so doing the Company complied with a federal request to construct a thimble for possible future use by the government. 55 In 1924 federal authorities constructed a powerhouse and utilized this thimble to supply Banff with electricity. In 1942 the Company took over power supply to Banff at rates initially "to be no greater than those in force under the Government's operation." 56

Other land uses and services in the study area. Townsite growth and increasing visitor totals precipitated the introduction or attempted introduction of ever more "improvements" and facilities-oriented recreation for the benefit of residents and tourists. In turn, an increasingly large area about the urban core of Banff experienced changes as these new facilities were introduced.

Proposed uses for the study area which never reached fruition included the establishment of an airship station on Sulphur Mountain, 57
the construction of a railway on Cascade Mountain and the expansion of the townsite to make it provincial capital.

Land uses which were introduced included Banff Springs Golf Course (1911), the government fish hatchery (1913), Mount Rundle Campground (1914), Banff Recreation Ground (1914), Administration Building Gardens (1930s; Plate 9), Banff Airfield (1930s), and Mount Norquay ski area (1930s). The golf course, campground and recreation ground are worthy of further description.

Banff Springs golf course was laid out by the C.P.R. as a 9-hole course in July, 1911. It occupied an area of partially treeless land at the base of Mount Rundle but still required the cutting or removal of five to six thousand trees. Alien labour was used to expand the course to 18 holes in 1916 after the government acquired the course. The C.P.R. ultimately regained possession in 1928, assisting federal efforts to establish the Tunnel Mountain campground as part of the "price."

The recreation grounds near the Cave and Basin (Fig. 2) were a direct outcome of Mawson's planning proposals (Chapter Two), and were designed "to accommodate the thousands of one-day excursion parties that daily visit Banff."

"Improvements" were also carried out in the study area to continue the practice the government had begun in the 1880s. Deadfall timber was removed; and drainage, oiling, brushing and beaver depletion programmes initiated at intervals from 1920 to contain the mosquito problem. In the townsite, continued efforts were made to maintain Banff as an "attractive" and "respectable" resort. Annual clean-up days were instituted prior to the tourist season and superintendents
complained of "unpleasant" features such as overhead wires.\textsuperscript{63} In 1925, "sketch plans for the improvement, from an aesthetic viewpoint, of fronts to a number of buildings on Banff Avenue"\textsuperscript{64} were prepared. Notices were posted "forbidding expectoration on the sidewalk."\textsuperscript{65} Yet despite concerns like the latter the government surprisingly neglected to treat sewage passing into the Bow River. Indeed not until the 1960s did this matter become a public issue.\textsuperscript{66}

Activities of the government and other groups in townsite development

As in the years prior to 1911, the development of Banff was strongly influenced, if not controlled by the federal government, the C.P.R. and townsite residents. A new influence was the provincial government; others included Banff School of Fine Arts and the City of Calgary but these were not destined to become really effective until after 1945.

The federal government. As in the 19th century, the government continued to influence townsite development in a number of ways, one being the leasing system. Others included land rents, licences, building regulations, municipal and associated services, and advertising.

1. A number of new leases and licences of occupancy were issued in Banff Park after 1911 but they are of no importance to this study because very few were given out in Banff townsite.\textsuperscript{67}

The major lease continued to be the "42 plus 42" perpetual type (NPC 179) which was issued unchanged until 1940, except that lease rentals were subject to review at the end of each decade from 1930.\textsuperscript{65} Since this lease was issued for all types of land use in Banff, it was
applied to lots in all parts of the townsite (Table 9). In 1940 when a number of these " Ordinary Townsite Leases" came up for renewal, "Special Townsite Lease" (NPC 178A) was introduced as a replacement for NPC 179, and was to be made available only to persons seeking renewal of the original perpetual lease.

NPC 178A was itself a perpetual lease and contained agreements similar to those presented in NPC 179 except that while the lease was again issued for periods of 42 years, the rent was fixed for only the first 21 years, at the end of which the rental for the next 21 years would be established.69

Because most lots in Banff were taken up during the issue of both these perpetual leases70 (Table 7), they became the most common ones in the townsite. Thus by 1967, 741 perpetual leases were still reported as being operative out of a total of 949 leases (Table 9). 101 of the non-renewable leases were at that time scattered throughout the townsite under NPC 179(62), a 42-year lease with a single renewal clause for 21 years which came into operation in 1962.

Basic conditions of tenure, therefore, were rather similar before and after 1911. However, changes were effected in the manner by which leases were made available to the public. In an effort to discourage speculative buying of leases, the government abandoned the original "first come, first served" method of lease distribution in 1913, replacing it with auction sales of leases as described on p. 92.

2. Land rents applied to lots continued to be very low. Most of the rents appear to have been set with large scale, early issues of NPC 179. Amendments to annual charges probably could have been effected through Orders in Council as for example, in the 10-year reviews supposedly instituted from 1930. Despite this possibility and the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Perpetual</th>
<th>42+21 Year</th>
<th>Total Leases in Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-41</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;K&quot; rd.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 9 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Perpetual</th>
<th>42+21 Year</th>
<th>Total Leases in Block</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>parcel A.SB</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 1A.SB</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; A of 2A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; B of 2A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; A of 3A</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; B of 3A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stable lots</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>villa lots</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot; 6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

introduction of lease HPC 178A in 1940 with its earlier revision clause, few substantial changes occurred in rental supplied to both residential and commercial lots.

In 1931 for example, only $1,260.60 was collected in rent from a population of 2,519 and as late as 1950 "prevailing residential rentals" were reported as being $8.00 per lot.\(^1\) By 1960 the highest rental charged in Banff was $100.00 for business lots but other rents were generally much lower (Table 10). In 1966, some residential leases were still held on $8.00 per annum land rentals.\(^2\)

3. Monies paid to the government for lot acquisition appear to have been rather low (p. 91). But when a demand for lots occurred during and after World War II, the purchase price began to rise sharply. In these instances the purchase price was invariably paid to the current lease-holder and not to the Crown which had by then distributed most of its leases in the developed parts of Banff. However, under the terms by which leases were issued, the government's right to control the transfer of leases still remained in effect.

4. The quality of property constructed in Banff could be controlled by the government through recourse to its building regulations and business licences. Moreover, these regulations and licences made it possible for the government to control any form of land use on town-site lots after leases had been issued. The cost to any entrepreneur to license his business was relatively cheap and remained so beyond 1945 (Table 11).

5. Provision of municipal services and "improvements" to the study area continued to be primarily a federal responsibility. Although most municipal services were provided free, certain charges were levied against residents. These charges were, however, few in number and in
TABLE 10

ANNUAL TOWNSITE LOT RENTALS (1961) IN BANFF, JASPER AND WATERTON LAKES TOWNSITES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Townsite</th>
<th>Business District:</th>
<th>Industrial Area:</th>
<th>Residential Lots North of Bow River:</th>
<th>Residential Lots South of Bow River:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Banff Townsite:</td>
<td>$20 to $100, median rate $45 (exceptions: churches and other institutions).</td>
<td>$10 to $21.</td>
<td>either $20 for corner lots, $16 for inside lots or $12 for corner lots, $10 for inside lots.</td>
<td>Block A (facing Bow Avenue) $30.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jasper Townsite:</td>
<td>$55 for corner lots, $45 for inside lots.</td>
<td>$35 per lot.</td>
<td>$15 for corner lots, $12 for inside lots.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterton Lakes Townsite:</td>
<td>Business District:</td>
<td>Residential Lots:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>one lot $40, others at $20.</td>
<td>lakeshore $15, others $12.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE 11

SELECTED BUSINESS LICENCE FEES, 1960

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Licence Fee</th>
<th>For Year</th>
<th>For Summer Season</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bake Shop</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barber Shop or Beauty Parlour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first chair</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional chair</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Billiards or Pool Tables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first table</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional table</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bowling Alley</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>first alley</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>each additional alley</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracting (general) by a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>resident contractor</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>non-resident contractor</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dance Hall</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug Store</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garage or Service Station</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>repairing or storing motor vehicles,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selling gas, lubricants, accessories</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>selling new or used motor vehicles,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an additional</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Merchandising</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guiding</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewellery Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jewellery, watches, clocks</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>film, novelties</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novelty Shop</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photographic Supplies</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sporting Goods</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatre (including cinema)</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>35.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trades</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>electrician, pipe-layer, plumber,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas fitter</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor Accommodation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for each of the no. of all guests that</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>can normally be accommodated</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>minimum fee for each establishment</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>where the rent for land is calculated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with reference to the gross receipts from</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the rental of accommodation, each visitor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>accommodation establishment</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

any event, subsidized by the government. As for other improvements in
the study area such as the road network, landscape "improvement," and
provision of recreational facilities, these were enjoyed by residents
and tourists without charge.

6. The government continued to advertise the benefits of
vacations in National Parks. Primarily the purpose of advertising
was to increase revenues from the Parks and much success attended the
government's programme. For example, Stephen Mather estimated that
following the San Francisco and San Diego expositions in 1916, 75 per
cent of American visitors from the eastern states "returned by the
Canadian Pacific, thanks to the very efficient advertising which Canada
has done." 74

A publicity division of the National Parks Branch expanded from
a small operation in 1921 to incorporate the National Development
Bureau's tourist division into the Branch in 1933. By that time there
were at least eight first editions and nine reprints of tourist
literature urging the public to vacation in the "mountain playgrounds"
where "resort towns" lay amidst the wonders of an "original landscape."
With certain modifications as to detail, this theme persisted for
years after 1945.

C.P.R. Company activities. Common interests and mutual
cooperation continued to characterize government-C.P.R. relationships.
C.P.R. advertising in particular undoubtedly played a key role in the
development of Banff as a resort town. Evidence presented before a
House of Representatives committee on public lands in 1916 stated:

Canadian national parks, because of their exploitation, and
because of the things that had been done to make them ready for
the comfort and convenience and safety of the tourists, drew the
great, wholesale travel . . . . That meant thousands upon thousands of dollars of cold American cash for Canada, to be credited to its parks.75

As regional population growth and improved accessibility drew visitors with less exclusive tastes to Banff, the C.P.R. began to promote "special events," attractive to the general public and promoted with the aid of "special rate" tours. Thus the Winter Carnival, Indian Days, Banff Regatta and Banff Springs Highland Gathering (1927-32) came to the public's notice. Similarly, the Trail Riders of the Canadian Rockies (established in 1924), and the Skyline Trail Hikers (1933)--in themselves a natural development of the small, private hunting parties which persisted into the 1900s--sought to establish traditions for Banff. Occasional events such as the Canadian track and field championships held at the Banff Springs Hotel in 1929, and the Dominion Ski Championships (1937, 1940), added to the aforementiond attractions, which in themselves were apparently uneconomical. The power of publicity in these developments may be gauged from a recent report that enquiries are still received about the Highland Gathering.76

After 1910 vigorous efforts were made by the C.P.R. to promote Banff as a winter sports resort. The natural affinity of residents for winter sports was gradually channelled into the establishment of small carnivals culminating in the Winter Carnival of 1917. By 1928 it was reported:

This annual carnival, staged on Canada's Winter Playground at Banff, has come to stay. There are indications this year that, with the special railway rates, hotel accommodations will be taxed to the limit.77

As insufficient tourists were attracted to encourage the winter opening of the Banff Springs Hotel, advertising schemes were largely
directed towards summer trade.

Because the government permitted the C.P.R. so much scope for development, land use conflicts seemed inevitable at some stage. In such an instance the public interest was not necessarily placed before the private interest. Expansion of the Banff Springs golf course, for example, brought about a "labour for land" exchange or "payment" whereby the Rundle Mountain campground had to be removed to make way for expansion of the golf course. The C.P.R. assisted to an unknown degree in developing the Tunnel Mountain campground.

In another case federal efforts to locate an airfield site focussed attention on an area adjacent to the golf course. The proposed development was vigorously attacked by the C.P.R.

The flying machines would be more or less of a menace to the players, and there is a possibility of the machines in landing, through accident or otherwise, tearing up the course. 79

C.P.R. officials proposed the present airfield site as an alternative, endorsing their opposition to the original proposal in a strongly worded letter dated March 11, 1929.

Residents' activities. Townsite residents, through representative bodies and other means, have perhaps contributed more towards changes in land use and management procedures in Banff than any other group outside the government.

The original federal policy for management control, as enunciated through legislated regulations, emphasized the federal prerogative to control all aspects of townsite operation. But from 1886 active federal support of free-enterprise developments facilitated diverse free-enterprise undertakings. By permitting such a course in a frontier environment, the government precipitated residential demands for
organized representation and the right to pursue liberally-controlled free-enterprise promotions in the early 1900s. Since, in such circumstances, political patronage and regional support stood behind the free-enterprise motive, many local aspirations were acceded to by the government. Indeed, regional support for residents already enjoying subsidized, freehold-like and virtually monopolistic circumstances is thought to have outlasted the frontier period and been extended to cover recent problems of townsite development. A 1965 publication epitomises this prevailing attitude.

Because of the national ownership of the Park, and because officialdom was obsessed with the idea of maintaining the park in its natural form the citizens found themselves hidebound by numerous regulations and rules.80

This attitude has also been shown in a 1966 brief prepared on behalf of the Government of Alberta and submitted to the federal government.81

Representative organizations were established to serve one or two main functions—the expression of municipal and business aspirations of Banff townsite. Banff School Board, the Board of Trade and Banff Citizens' Association Council (Banff Advisory Council), epitomise such organizations. The Advisory Council, for example, was established in 1921,82 following an initial federal refusal in 1911 and claims of "taxation without representation" in 1918.83

From the municipal and business viewpoints alike, such organizations sought to have improved services and facilities introduced to the study area. If it could be so arranged, the government became responsible for most if not all the cost involved, even in situations where only the smallest public benefit could be implied. Examples include attempts to have an airfield established in the study area,84
and a request to have a community golf course laid out on Tunnel Mountain in 1936. Although timber felling initiated the latter project, insufficient water pressure for sprinkling led to the use of the airfield as a golf course for two years from 1938. "Insufficient funds and prospects" diminished townsite enthusiasm for the project. In another instance in 1939, S. Thompson of Banff received widespread publicity after sustaining injuries in a skiing accident. Numerous communications of sympathy were sent to him. D. M. Soole of Banff Board of Trade suggested to Superintendent Jennings that the Board send a letter to American correspondents on behalf of Thompson, enclosing a folder of "Banff Facts"—a publicity folder—and paying for publicity costs of the latter if:

The Department will be prepared—if they consider the publicity worth while—to furnish the envelopes and $48 worth of 1-cent stamps.\(^8^5\)

Jennings forwarded this proposal to Ottawa "to form an opinion as to the nature of the correspondence and particularly as to its value from a publicity point of view." This "unique" opportunity would not be a "selfish advertising scheme for any individual company, but would be advertising the National Parks. In fact we could enclose one of our own folders . . . ." Thompson's death however, terminated further developments.\(^8^6\)

Recent work by Crawford et al. on the role of elected representative townsite councils has shown that while the latter recognize the government's right to final deliberations in townsite management,\(^8^7\) especially since municipal costs are borne largely by the general public,\(^8^8\) certain aspects of municipal operation have been largely controlled by the councils.\(^8^9\)
An unusual but nevertheless significant development arising out of these circumstances of local council control was the previously-described Banff School of Fine Arts (Plate 4). Following the efforts of Banff School Board in raising construction funds, the federal government offered blocks 41, 42, 46, 47 and 48, as well as free site preparation to the School on a perpetual lease of $1 per annum. In the post-1945 period the School expanded greatly and student enrollment increased (Fig. 8). Encouraged by the success of the School, Senator Cameron was to state in 1956:

We should immediately reserve, from the Federal Government, all of the land south of a line running due east over Tunnel Mountain from the north-east corner of the present property to where the line would cut the Bow River on the east. In this way the Bow River will form a perimeter on three sides of the property which will have an area of between three and four hundred acres. This area will be large enough to provide building space, recreation and park areas, and staff housing areas for the foreseeable future. The area has the advantages of being one unit, completely private and yet conveniently near to the services of the town. In a period of development the unused or unoccupied areas can be preserved as a natural park in which the flora of the Rocky Mountain region can be cultivated and displayed.

Provincial government interest. Little influence seems to have been exerted by the provincial government of Alberta in townsite development. Although interested in the Parks as sources of tourist revenue (a situation which still prevails), Albertan administrators were content to have their federal counterparts promote resort development in the Rocky Mountains National Parks.

At the same time, as the provincial government relied upon the National Parks in Alberta as recreation areas, little appears to have been done to provide alternative facilities outside these Parks. Even in 1945, a provincial reconstruction committee placed emphasis upon National Parks and their townsites as the primary recreation areas
Fig. 8
BANFF SCHOOL OF FINE ARTS: ATTENDANCE 1947-64

(00's) total fine arts students
(000's) total other students

total students

1947 64 47 years 64 47 64
11.50 10.50 9.50 8.50 7.50 6.50 5.50 5.00 2.50

SOURCE: Banff School Office, 1965
in provincial "planning" for the future.

It was not until 1939, when hard-surfaced highways were opened from the United States border to Alberta's resort centres, that this province was prepared to invite motorists here with any degree of assurance that they would return to their own communities as satisfied customers. In fact, those who did undertake the hazards of motor travel from distant points to Alberta usually returned to their homes disgruntled and dissatisfied and their reports of road conditions discouraged others from coming by motor to Alberta's holiday resorts. But with . . . the . . . Banff-Jasper scenic highway, Alberta's opportunity to develop the tourist industry blossomed in reality.94

**Influences from Calgary.** Calgary's ease of access and proximity to Banff, relative to other large urban populations, and substantial increments in the city's population to 1931 (Table 5), proved to be of some influence in Banff's development.

Woods' Calgary-Banff transport link proposal in 1910 (p. 88), and agitations from Calgary Auto Club for some relaxation in Park motor regulations in 1911,95 epitomise early city interest in improving access to Banff.

When communications did improve, Calgarians contributed very significantly to Park visitor totals (p. 89). Recreational attractions such as the hot springs, zoo, coach tours and others previously mentioned, together with townsite entertainments--beer parlours, dance halls, the cinema--undoubtedly attracted Calgarians on one day or weekend journeys to Banff. The growing need in Calgary for a definite recreation objective--partially satisfied by local developments such as Bowness Park (established 1909)96--may have encouraged the federal government to provide some such facilities in Banff. Mawson's development proposals noted in Chapter Two may have been compiled with Calgarians in mind, for his planning proposals for that city (contained in another report),97 allude to the recreational possibilities of the Rockies.
Calgarians probably used all available types of accommodation while residing in the study area, and many promoted townsite growth by establishing summer homes in the townsite, or its suburb, Lake Minnewanka. One Park official has intimated that Calgarians were preferred as summer home owners, a policy which continued after 1945.

A mutual desire for greater regional economic development strengthened the rapport between Calgary and Banff residents. Tourism was the single most important link and agencies such as the Calgary-Banff-Lake Louise Tourist Association actively advertised the resort facilities in the Park. These early elements of cooperation were to find full expression in the post-1945 period when considerable efforts were made to bring first, the 1968 and then the 1972 Winter Olympics to the study area.

**Summary**

By 1945 the townsite of Banff had reached a state rather similar to its present size and land use pattern. It had also emerged as a major resort, locally, nationally, and internationally, and offered many varied attractions more or less independent of the National Park in which it was situated.

Banff had reached this stage of development partly because of technological influences, notably changes in communication, and partly as a result of the activities and policies of a number of agencies and groups. These were principally the federal government, C.P.R. Company, residents of Calgary and the surrounding area, as well as residents from the townsite itself.

An extensive system of Park roads, initiated about 1911 and largely completed by 1940, permitted auto traffic to enter Banff Park
from Jasper, Yoho and Kootenay National Parks, as well as from the Calgary area. In the study area tote roads were upgraded to carry motor traffic.

Road construction, viewed in part by administrators as a means of producing revenues to the Crown, ended Banff's relative isolation and the C.P.R.'s monopoly of passenger traffic to the Park. Large increases in visitor totals followed road construction, tourists being drawn largely from Alberta. The numbers of visitors declined only during both World Wars and the 1930s depression.

The most important cultural influence of relevance to this study was the federal government and its apparent pursuit of two different policies for Banff National Park and the townsite itself. Although the development policies with respect to the National Park, exclusive of the townsite, have not been the subject of much study here, it seems clear that consistent efforts were made to develop a protectionist policy through the period 1911 to 1945, with activities such as lumbering, mining and so on, gradually being removed from the Park.

Byrne has noted that although there were protection clauses in the original Rocky Mountains Park Act of 1887, they:

had had little effect by 1911, mainly because of a lack of money. When they were enforced they were only seen as being part of the effort to make the Park a more attractive place for the tourist.101

Thereafter, however, J. B. Harkin embarked upon an ambitious programme of landscape protection and wildlife conservation in the National Parks. In 1930, the National Parks Act was passed and, in the Act's general purposes section, the importance of landscape protection is made apparent.
The Parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education and enjoyment... and such Parks shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations.  

Statutory arrangements for regulations as presented in the 1930 Act were also clearly oriented towards Park conservation practices despite the inclusion of an unfortunate clause concerned with the disposal of "noxious" or predatory animals.

In Banff Park at this time, boundary amendments brought about the exclusion of Park areas used for lumbering and mining (Fig. 4, Table 1). Townsites too, such as Canmore, were excluded from the Park but Banff townsite remained.

In the townsite, government policy as expressed through the leasing system, ground rents, building regulations and so on, developed in such a way as to produce planning problems that one might expect under conditions of private ownership.

The government in the first instance, stressed development in Banff. Thus more subdivisions were added to the town plan in various years and although administrators spoke optimistically of the numbers of people wishing to acquire lots when new subdivisions were "thrown open" in the early years of the period, many lots were not taken up by the public, or at least were not developed. Indeed, the first reference known to the writer which shows possible federal reticence over townsite expansion is the comment of Jones in 1933 that the "present park administration does not favour any attempts to boom the growth of Banff."

Most lots were still held on long-term perpetual leases and, as a result, land use control over much of the townsite proved very difficult. Many lots were not developed and leases were held in speculation.
Some land was tied up to satisfy personal whims. For example, to ensure privacy, Mrs. Pearl Moore (née Brewster), acquired leases to lots 23 to 30 inclusive in block 19, but only one of these lots has been developed for a residential building.106 (See Plate 8.)

Lessees assumed over the years that transfer of lease with the sale of property improvements on lots was in order without preliminary government acquiescence. This assumption was quite natural in view of the few occasions upon which lease transfers appear to have been withheld by the Parks Branch. Crawford et al. have stated that, "the right as owner of the freehold to refuse to consent to a transfer of a leasehold does not appear to have been used to control the type of land use."107

Perpetual leases enabled lessees to have almost freeholder rights to public land in the sense that initial terms of lease together with renewals were effective for a great many years. Subject only to government supervision through building regulations and/or business licences, depending upon his status as resident or entrepreneur, a lessee became virtual owner of the public land on which he settled.

Rare cases of efforts to discourage speculative buying and non-payment of rentals, resulted in seven lease cancellations and the collection of $900 in rental arrears in 1911.108 The auction system introduced in 1913 did not stop speculation either, for the government did not always force lessees to place property on their lots.

The use of ground rents as another possible form of land use control was not employed by the government. Following the auction of leases at very low rates, lessees paid very little more for annual lot rentals in 1945 than they had done in 1887. Rents received represented
but a very small percentage of total government administrative costs when distributed on a per capita basis on all townsite lots.

Control through building regulations seems to have been rather weak, either leading to situations where federal management decisions were not enforced, for example the failure to remove rental cabins (p. 97), or permitting developments contrary to general land use policies; construction of poor quality residential property (p. 94), for example. Crawford et al. observe that:

The only use of the freeholder powers has been to require leaseholders to improve the standard of maintenance of their property before renewals of leases or consents to assign or sub-lease are granted.109

On the other hand, Oberlander commented that leases were renewed with little regard for or relation to the condition of the building and its ability to serve a useful purpose until the renewed lease expired.110

Federal subsidization of municipal services became proportionally more favourable to residents as service costs to the government increased and charges to residents remained small. Failure to separate townsite administrative costs from those for Banff Park as a whole seemingly worked to the advantage of residents. Moreover, as the number of services increased and there were attendant improvements in quality, so did lease acquisition in Banff become more desirable. All these conditions applied equally to persons who did or did not provide services to Park visitors.

Finally, advertising represented a significant force in townsite development for, by attracting an indeterminable but undoubtedly high percentage of Banff's visitors, it indirectly encouraged the provision
of services and amenities to these Park visitors.

The C.P.R. still contributed significantly to townsite growth, advertising for, transporting, accommodating and entertaining large numbers of Park visitors. In so doing, the Company continued to have a say in local developments to the point where the government no longer made independent decisions.

Many additional recreational facilities and events were introduced by the C.P.R., largely in response to changes in communications which deprived the Company of its transport monopoly to the Park. Train schedules were rearranged and the Company placed emphasis upon Banff as a popular holiday resort rather than an exclusive spa.

Banff residents, residents of Calgary and the provincial government had respectively decreasing influences upon townsite development. In sum these influences encouraged greater provision of municipal services in the townsite, more tourist facilities and more tourists, attracted by the advertising programmes of all three groups.

A consequence of all these group influences was to make for great problems in designing Banff as a visitor service centre in the post-1945 period. In particular the introduction of an effective townsite plan in the 1960s no longer had the "clean slate" of undeveloped land to work on as had Sir Thomas White and his associates in the 19th century. Because government management policies in Banff had a "no teeth" approach, a very mixed land use pattern developed.

Rather than there being any formal zoning of land uses, buildings which might be loosely categorized as serving residential, commercial and public or institutional functions developed throughout
Banff. However, most properties also functioned in some capacity as recreational premises engaged upon one of a variety of accommodation or commercial activities, either seasonally or the year round. The quality of construction was in many instances poor, and because of the number of single family dwellings, building and population densities were low. Subdivisions were added to the town plan when many existing lots still had not been developed. In sum, the pattern of land use became a complex mosaic of the various functions which the townsite served.

Elsewhere in the study area, land was developed primarily to satisfy some of the recreational functions ascribed to Banff townsite, rather than Banff Park.

The total effect of government and other group developments in the study area between 1911 and 1930 was to make Banff the focus of human influence from which Park "wildlands" extended in graduated degrees--distorted by landscape configuration and avenues of human settlement--to reach a climax in the little used "wilderness areas," such as the upper Red Deer River Valley.
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CHAPTER IV

CONCLUSION

The principal aim of this paper has been to describe the historical settlement and development of a National Park community to the year 1945, and to analyse what effect the federal government and other cultural groups have had upon land use and land management in Banff. Some details of human activity in pre-Park days, followed by emphasis on the period from 1885, in which year the first public reserve was established, have provided a reasonably continuous record of man's use of the present Banff townsite area.

In recent years there has been a growing recognition amongst persons concerned with public land management of the need for cultural-historical studies of public reserves. Such studies are particularly urgent in National Parks where increasing public use has rendered such reserves ever more susceptible to landscape modification and biotic change. Cowan, for example, has called for such studies in the Rocky Mountain National Parks, including Banff National Park, although his focus is on the influence of resident populations in National Parks.

Where large resident human populations have developed within public reserved areas and national parks they inevitably view the area as almost solely for their private gain. Because their geographic entity gives them organization and dedication to their purpose, such small groups of individuals have exerted undue influence upon national conservation policy. Searching studies of the social position and political impact of such small towns as Banff and Jasper... would provide important guidelines for our future reaction to private vested interest within national parks or similar area.¹

This paper attempts, in part at least, to pursue the general line of research noted by Cowan. A search of relevant literature sources suggests that with the possible exception of S. B. Jones' work in the
Bow Valley in 1932 to 1934, no other studies have attempted to investigate the impact of technological innovations and particularly of influences upon historical land uses and landscapes in National Parks. There being no established format for carrying out such a study, certain problems have occurred in the adoption of a suitable approach and style. However, hopefully the research reported on here will lead to further studies of the same general type and to improvements in approach, as well as to the further understanding or even the solution of land management problems in National Parks and similar reserves.

A summary of the main findings of the study follows. Some principles are stated and the significance of the study to the present management of Banff National Park and townsite briefly examined.

The setting aside of the Hot Springs Reserve in 1886 and the survey of a townsite in the following year were federal government actions carried out in an area where pre-existing Indian and European settlement had probably been transitory and associated mainly with extractive activities such as the fur trade and mining. Some communities established near Banff when the government townsite was first settled also proved to be transitory because of their reliance upon local non-renewable natural resources.

The location of Banff townsite inside the boundaries of Rocky Mountains Park in 1887 ensured federal ownership of land developed in the vicinity of the hot springs, and theoretically made it possible for the government alone to decide what uses the publically-owned land might be put to. Banff was visualized by administrators as a planned spa town which would rely upon renewable natural resources such as hot springs, scenery and wildlife to attract an international clientele.
Hopefully, tourists would part with sufficient monies to make government and free-enterprise developments sound financial investments. Ideally, there would grow at Banff a spa community rather similar to those of Europe and the United States but free of land management problems such as were found in Hot Springs, Arkansas.

So as to achieve this goal the government embarked upon a diversified and gradually expanding service programme in the study area. Small appropriations from Parliament restricted activities until 1911, at which time greater developments were possible through increased appropriations to the new Dominion Parks Branch. Surveying, landscape "improvements," provision of a tote road--later a motor road--system, as well as recreational and entertainment facilities, provision of municipal services, advertising, and administration of land leasing, land use and municipal regulations, occupied the government throughout the period studied. Residents and visitors alike benefitted from these services which were, for the most part, provided without charge to the study area. As to services for which charges were made, the government made no attempt to establish cost responsibility between residents of Banff and visitors to the Park. Thus townsite residents were subsidized by the government in residential and commercial endeavours in Banff.

As noted in Chapter Two, the C.P.R. and, to a lesser extent, townsite residents, facilitated the growth of Banff as a spa town to about 1910. The C.P.R. complemented the government's activities through large capital investments and was rewarded by the latter with monopolistic privileges over and above that which it enjoyed as the primary means of communication to and in the Park. Townsite residents depended largely upon the Government-C.P.R. promotion of Banff and aided
development through the provision of accommodation and maintenance of such complementary facilities as livery stables.

The townsite's geographical isolation during this time undoubtedly helped Banff to pursue a line of spa development. Isolation placed controls upon the number and character of facilities provided and upon the elements of society that might enjoy them. Nevertheless, Banff also enjoyed a multi-functional role as a railway, service, administration and hunting centre.

Highway construction from about 1910 caused fundamental changes in the population, urban development and functions of Banff. Losing its isolated state, the townsite became readily accessible to a regional population which came to know Banff on the basis of short stopovers of from one to three days. These people sought some recreational opportunity, usually facilities-oriented, without the costs associated with luxury spas. The government, C.P.R. and entrepreneurs easily modified their respective commercial arrangements to meet this situation and with its zoo, paddock, golf course, toboggan run, horse trails, etc., Banff was transformed into a popular resort, an attraction in itself despite its National Park location. A summer home colony developed, Banff became a summer and winter sports centre and in the 1930s it developed as an advanced education centre.

The townsite's population rose from 937 in 1911 to 2,062 by 1931. Associated with this increase, Banff expanded areally to approximately its present size by 1945. Although the government had, from about 1911, become increasingly conscious of the merits of a landscape and wildlife protection policy and had implemented an incomplete conservation programme to reduce human influences upon the Park's biota, Banff
townsite (and other National Park townsites), were permitted an inde­
pendent line of development. After passage of the protectionist 1930
National Parks Act especially, 19th century spa development policies
continued by the government in Banff became increasingly incompatible
with contemporary general policies for Park protection.

In the 1880s, Sir John A. MacDonald's government introduced a
land leasing system with the intent of retaining full public control
of land use in Banff. But the contemporary policy of attracting
residents and businesses encouraged the issue of a perpetually renewable
lease which was applied to both residential and commercial land. With
the length of lease set at 42 years and a perpetual renewal opportunity,
private citizens were offered something akin to freeholder rights to
public land.

Indeed, the leasing system, ostensibly introduced as a means
of land use control, seems to have been used as a development incentive
in these early days, with the government exercising only nominal
control in such matters as land speculation and lease transfer.

Undoubtedly some concern about the characteristics of the
leasing system moved administrators to introduce, for example, a
revised perpetual lease in 1940. But such modifications of the system
did not change its freehold-like qualities. In short, the leasing
system applied in Banff in 1945 had changed little since 1887 despite
the slow emergence of a National Park situation which required con­
siderable government control of public land to ensure that incompatible
land uses associated with resource exploitation would be minimized.

Little was done to employ ground rents as another possible form
of land use control and indeed, rentals also seem to have been used
as a development incentive. As 19th century rents had been almost negligible and were held constant over many years because of the terms of perpetual leases, annual charges in Banff in 1945 remained very low. A revised policy in 1930 which permitted rental reviews in each decade does not seem to have been implemented and residents continued to lead a subsidized existence in this respect.

The absence of a formal land use policy for Banff and inefficient government management of lease agreements and building regulations, together with poor management of other land use controls such as licensing, produced a most unsatisfactory land use pattern by 1945. There was no townsite boundary, no zoning policy and no suitable town plan to guide urban development. As a result land uses which might be described as residential or commercial or institutional also served in recreational or commercial capacities throughout the developed townsite area. In many instances the quality of property was poor and a low building and population density took place because of non-development of lots for which leases were held, and the construction of many permanent or seasonally occupied single family dwellings.

Many of the land uses in Banff were quite incompatible with their Park location in the sense of the developing spirit of conservation expressed by the National Parks Act of 1930. Entertainments, artificial recreations, excessive duplication of service facilities, gas stations for example: all contributed to Banff's being actively developed as a man-dominated landscape where concern with biotic processes seemed of little importance.

All the previous conditions were to make for great problems in the post-1945 period when the government sought to gain more control
of land use so as to redesign Banff as a visitor service centre. However, machinery has recently been set in motion which will, hopefully, avoid some of the pitfalls of the past Park townsites management policies outlined in this historical-geographical study.²

In concluding this work, some principles for planning in National Parks should be noted, for as the study has shown at several points—and a number of photographs seek to illustrate—policies introduced prior to 1945 are still in effect today because of the conditions under which they were originally introduced.

First, improvements in transport lead to long-term increases in tourism and to further landscape changes through the provision of services and entertainments in National Parks. For Banff and many other Parks with townsites,⁴ this problem has become particularly acute. Post-war provincial governments have sought to attract tourist revenue from an increasingly mobile and leisure-conscious public through the provision of black-topped and high-grade, gravel-surfaced roads.

In Banff Park the construction of the Trans-Canada Highway has meant a considerable increase in facilities available to the public in Banff townsites, and further modifications to the local landscape. Motels, for example, are located throughout the study area. Intensive motel developments have occurred in blocks 28 and 36, and there are also motels near the Indian Days ground (Archway and Bel Plaza Motels), at the base of Mount Norquay (Timberline Hotel), and throughout the so-called residential and commercial districts of Banff. Provision of such facilities has necessitated more residential property construction on many early surveyed but previously undeveloped lots (Plate 9).
Secondly, no changes, especially those involving the introduction of facilities, should be made in a National Park (and perhaps any recreational area), without ample study of the future implications of these facilities being in the area. Administrators were doubtless unaware of what the Banff School of Fine Arts would grow to when it was first started in the 1930s. Likewise, the presence of this institution has probably encouraged other developments under the label of cultural facilities, for example, the Waxworks and Luxton Museum (Plate 12). The seemingly insignificant skiing developments on Mount Norquay in the 1930s contributed to the later growth of a sports facility which almost brought the Winter Olympics to Banff in 1972, and directly precipitated high quality motel construction in Banff and the introduction of a chairlift and attendant facilities on Sulphur Mountain.

Third, it seems impossible to have a permanent resident population in a National Park which will not aspire to the same facilities and services as similar resident populations outside the Park boundary. Unless carefully controlled, the result is urban sprawl, population increase and the provision of such amenities as are desired by the community or can be obtained from the federal government. In Park communities, local aspirations seem to have had greater expression—especially through political channels—than in townsites outside the Parks, probably because of the peculiarities of their administrative framework.

Fourth, many of the management problems in Banff have resulted from ill-defined, short-run federal management policies. There is little reason to doubt that if a similar approach were to be adopted at the present or in future years, even more problems of development
control would be experienced in National Park townsites.

The significance of these principles to National Park townsite planning has recently been recognized and investigated in separate reports. Following such studies as those by Crawford et al. (1960), on townsite administration, Oberlander (1961), on land use problems in townsites and the "Glassco Commission" (1962-63) on rental and revenue matters, the federal government introduced its first Parks policy statements in 1964 and 1965. Without attempting to evaluate these policy statements, we may say that their purpose is to state in general terms how the government intends to maintain the environmental quality of National Parks while accommodating the rapidly increasing numbers of tourists that visit them. Park lands will be zoned into "use," "transition," "wilderness" or other similar zones. Townsites such as Banff will be designated as use zones, as well as new townsites established at points such as Lake Louise and Saskatchewan River Crossing to carry the increased visitor load.

In these townsites, perpetual leases will no longer be available. In their place the government has provided a "New Standard Lease" of 42 years duration which does not carry the guarantee of automatic renewal. Improvements by lessees on their lots will ultimately revert to the Crown and compensation will be paid.

Theoretically, in existing townsites, a revamped leasing policy will facilitate government control of land uses, while at Lake Louise, for example, only basic services will be provided. But will not Lake Louise eventually develop into another Banff? Is it possible to avoid the development of pressure groups such as those identified in Banff wherever new Park populations are established?
The wisdom of introducing these new "service centres," together with additional roads such as that proposed for the upper Red Deer Valley, and new forms of transport, snowmobiles and tote goats, for example, must be evaluated in the long term. It is probable that in view of the four principles just stated, the net effect of these new developments will be to greatly modify and thereby impair National Park landscapes which have been managed under increasingly controlled conditions since about 1911.
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