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Preface

In January of 1982 Parks Canada, Western Region, commissioned Great Plains Research Consultants to prepare a human history of Banff National Park, 1792-1965, and an accompanying inventory of identifiable heritage sites. The history was intended to assist management planning efforts within the park and the region. Six months and several thousand kilometers later, we presented a multi-volume bibliography of primary and secondary sources on which to base the history. Detailed research followed over the next year, culminating in this report. A two-volume inventory of heritage sites was submitted separately.

As our initial inventory of sources indicated, there are literally thousands of government files, books, articles, theses, films, and photographs dealing with Canada's first national park. That richness is apparent in the structure of this history, which tries to illustrate pertinent themes through case studies rather than through comment on every example of a particular park issue. The considerable degree to which the park has been studied by others also led us to concentrate our efforts
on its least understood aspect, administration. This report is, in essence, an administrative history. In the main, we chose to minimize discussion of themes which had been covered adequately by other authors, whose works are listed in the appended bibliography. Because so many of national park policies of this country were first implemented in Banff National Park, we hope that this study may provide a comparative framework for the preparation of other park histories.

During the past two years we have incurred innumerable debts, large and small, at most of the country's archives and libraries. We would like to express our thanks to the staffs of the Vancouver Public Library, the Provincial Archives of British Columbia, the Archives of the Canadian Rockies, the Glenbow-Alberta Institute, the Provincial Museum and Archives of Alberta, the Federal Regional Records Centre at Edmonton, the Western Regional Office of Parks Canada, the Archives of Saskatchewan, the Hudson's Bay Company Archives, the Provincial Archives of Manitoba, the Public Archives of Canada, the Public Archives Records Centre, Parks Canada Headquarters, and the Canadian Pacific Archives. For permission to examine and quote from the resources of the Hudson's Bay Company at Winnipeg, we are very grateful to Shirlee Anne Smith, Keeper.

The study is indisputably better for the unfailing co-operation we received from several key individuals.
These include our project supervisors, W.B. Yeo and Richard Stuart of Parks Canada, Western Region; our exemplary research assistants, Susan Padmos and Kenneth W. Tingley; and our federal records mentors at the Public Archives of Canada, Terry Cook, Gabrielle Blais, Robert Hayward, and Tom Nesmith. The failings of the history, and the opinions which inform it are, of course, the sole responsibility of the consultant.
The Search for Southern Passes, 1792-1856

Introduction

In Western Canada the southern reaches of the Rocky Mountain range were historically forbidding obstacles that simultaneously inhibited travel and piqued curiosity about possible corridors of passage. This situation persisted until the middle of the nineteenth century. Until then, only a few adventurous fur traders and Oregon-bound emigrants had crossed the mountains by passes south of the Athabasca route that Indians had known and used for millennia. These early Euro-Canadian visitors to the region depended extensively on the knowledge and guidance of local natives for their information about transmontane routes. This remained true until the Palliser expedition of 1857-60 accurately mapped the important southern mountain passes for the first time.

The early history of the Banff National Park area is therefore the story of mountain pass use for trade and warfare by the changing native groups of the southern Alberta and British Columbia regions, punctuated by intermittent crossings by small parties of white men. Such transmontane travel by local natives continued a pattern already evident in prehistoric times, when
aboriginal man moved back and forth between the foothills and the peaks in search of game and workable stone from which tools and weapons could be fashioned. Even then, trade across the mountains was not unknown. In the historic period, however, the mountain passes were also seen as imperative to territorial control.

Through the impetus of the fur trade, with its dissemination of trade goods such as firearms, native patterns of occupation in the foothills region changed drastically over less than a hundred year period that began in the mid-eighteenth century. Even though one tribe succeeded in driving the next over the mountains, raiding and trading parties of exiled tribesmen continued to make use of their traditional passes. Because of this constant interloping, it seems that until the 1840s the eastern slope Indians deliberately denied knowledge of those southern passes to the few whites who wished to cross by a less arduous and shorter route than that afforded by the Athabasca Pass. Once the tribal territories were fairly sharply defined, however, the Indians served increasingly as guides to ever larger parties that wished to cross the mountains.

Aboriginal Mountain Peoples

The traditional archaeological view of the Rocky Mountain eastern slopes held that they were culturally barren,
devoid of human habitation on a permanent or even seasonal basis. A seemingly rational explanation was not difficult to find: the harsh climatic conditions of the mountains, combined with their lack of abundant, easily-killed game animals, precluded all but fleeting visits by prehistoric peoples. However convincing such a view seemed to those conjecturing about the patterns of prehistoric occupation, it lost all credibility when archaeologists began to scrutinize the region intensively, beginning in the late 1950s. As more studies were done in succeeding decades, it became clear that there were close relationships between early patterns of culture and regional climate, physiography, minerals, and local ecosystems. As a result, archaeologists began to consider the eastern slopes as a region in "which a diversity of native land and resource patterns developed to efficiently and effectively utilize [sic] the region's mammals, fish, fowl, plants and lithic resources." This record of human use extended back 10,000 years.

The patterns of prehistoric occupation appear complex because the natural characteristics of the eastern slopes are complex. While in general it is true to say that the mountains exert a considerable effect on the movement of pacific and polar air masses, which determine the regional characteristics of wind, precipitation and temperature, it is equally true that micro-climates exist throughout the eastern slopes. For the southern parts of the region, the
chinook is a particular significant climatic element. The chinook, an intense warm air mass that sweeps across the mountains occasionally during the winter months, either reducing or eliminating all snow cover, has always encouraged upland game foraging and therefore habitation by prehistoric man. Similarly, in the mountains one finds unexpected, isolated areas of grassland such as the Ya-HaTinda plains of the upper Red Deer River valley. This combination of unique climate and vegetation contributed, for example, to penetration of the upper Bow Valley by prehistoric bison, the staple of plains and foothills tribes. Mountain lakes filled with fish, like Lake Minnewanka, also made habitation feasible for prehistoric man. Finally, the availability of excellent lithic (or stone) resources for the manufacture of tools and weapons prompted regular prehistoric visits to the eastern slopes. Trade in these materials also occurred via the mountain passes that run east-west between tribal territories. The pattern of prehistoric settlement in the mountains was, as Christenson has suggested, "closely tied to the seasonal and spatial distribution of resources within each [mountain] valley."

Within the Banff National Park area, archaeologists believe that prehistoric peoples followed a seasonal round of activities that was closely tied to regional climatic and resource characteristics. In the spring, settlement
was probably confined to both base camps and hunting camps in the lower subalpine reaches. It is thought that this pattern of settlement allowed aboriginal peoples to exploit large game animals that move upland with the retreating snows, while simultaneously providing abundant shelter, wood and water. During the summer months, the hunting parties probably grew in size and expanded into the higher timberline zone, while the functions of the base camps remained unchanged. Lithic resources were probably quarried by smaller groups at the same time. With the arrival of autumn, larger groups may have picked the abundant berries of the area. Winter forced local game to retreat to the valley bottoms, which probably caused the human inhabitants to follow.

The Fur Traders and the Passes

Similar patterns of seasonal habitation and resource exploitation prevailed when the first white explorers reached the valley of the Bow in the last decade of the eighteenth century. At that time the Kootenay Indians dominated the region. Their territory extended from the foothills along the Clearwater River to the Riviere de la Jolie Prairie, the Ram River, and the headwaters of the Red Deer River. In the main, though, they are thought to have stayed in the area near the present town of Coleman in the Crow's Nest Pass. From there they also travelled as far south as the Sun River in Montana. To the west of
the mountains, they frequented the Columbia and Kootenay River valleys. Seasonal travel through the mountain passes was common.

Along the eastern fringe of their vast territory lived the tribes of the Blackfoot Confederacy -- the Blackfoot proper, the Peigans, and the Bloods, and their allies, the Sarcees to the north and Gros Ventres to the south. The Blackfoot, Peigans, Bloods, and Gros Ventres had originally lived far to the east, while the Sarcees were a northern tribe, but by the middle of the eighteenth century all had been caught up in the vast tribal migrations occasioned by the fur trade. From posts on distant Hudson Bay, European trade goods passed through the hands of Indian middlemen into the possession of various tribes of the Blackfoot Confederacy. Not only kettles, beads, knives and other decorative and utilitarian items were traded, but also firearms. Those tribes closest to the trading posts at bayside possessed superior firepower which enabled them to drive other, weaker tribes westward before them as they sought new fur trading areas. This pattern of displacement took place over about three quarters of a century and resulted in a dramatic shifting of territorial boundaries throughout the west.

When Hudson's Bay Company traders and explorers Peter Fidler and J. Ward reached the Devil's Head in the valley
of the Bow River in 1792, accompanied by some Peigan Indians, the Kootenays had already retreated permanently across the Rockies. This was due to both the aggression of the Peigans and to the devastating effects of the great smallpox epidemic of 1780-1, which carried off thousands of Indians throughout the North West. The traders were eager to meet the Kootenays and to initiate a transmontane trade in furs, but the Peigans did everything to dissuade Fidler and Ward from their course, even though an uneasy truce obtained between the tribes. Fidler apparently believed that the Peigans wished to protect him from harm by the Kootenays, yet it is almost certain that they were attempting to prevent their traditional enemies from obtaining any trade advantages, particularly with respect to firearms. As such, Fidler learned only that journeys across the mountains were arduous, requiring at least five days of travel down treacherous rivers and that this was possible only westward from Chief Mountain, near the international boundary. With respect to the mountains west of the Devil's Head, the Indians told him that the mountains were "so steep and wide, that it appears like a high perpendicular wall across all these parts, which impassably prevents those useful animals to Indians, which offered them both Food and Clothing, from going there...." From this statement about an area that abounds in passes, it is clear that the Peigans had no wish to see Fidler and Ward cross the Rockies.
Although Fidler did not cross the mountains, he later recorded that in the autumn of 1800 two Canadian traders made the crossing in the company of Kootenay Indians who had been trading for the first time at Acton House, a new post that the Hudson's Bay Company had established to counter the North West Company's Rocky Mountain House near the headwaters of the North Saskatchewan River. Irene Spry believes these men were probably La Gasse and Le Blanc, "whom local tradition holds to have been the first white men to cross what is now called Howse Pass." Fidler noted that they were illiterate and merely told him about their means of passage:

...in going out they crossed over the Mountain near the source of the Saskatchewan [River] in an oblique direction the latter place was more easy to pass than the former across the Mountain...more Northerly the Mountain is wider and more difficult to cross--beyond the Mountain there is extensive plains intersected with wood in Places, when another rocky Mountain rears its lofty head, in a parallel direction with the main one and nearly as high--several of these single detached mountains was seen by these men running nearly Parallel with one another and with the main one which the Indians report continues in that manner to the Western shores of this continent--but particularly so more to the Northwards.

On the basis of such scarce verbal reports and with the co-operation of Indians, Fidler compiled a series of maps that purported to show the headwaters of rivers like the Athabasca and the Saskatchewan. In subsequent years, his efforts were emulated by other traders in the mountainous region.

These feeble attempts to map an area which few white
men had ever seen on the basis of suppositions about connecting river systems were an immediate consequence of the fur trade rivalry of the Nor'westers and the Hudson's Bay Company. The latter, which had enjoyed a virtual monopoly on the fur trade in the North West since 1670, met with serious competition from the Nor'westers beginning in the 1780s. With a capital base that arose from a multi-party partnership based at Montreal, the North West Company was able to mount an exceedingly strong commercial offensive in the North West. It did so by establishing a series of inland trading posts along the major river systems. This approach contrasted sharply with the Hudson's Bay Company policy of inducing inland natives to travel to its fur factories on the shores of Hudson Bay to trade. By the final years of the eighteenth century, the competition for trade territory had spread far up the North Saskatchewan River system and down the Mackenzie system as far as Great Slave Lake. In both these vast hinterlands, the North West Company predominated.

Even while the conquest of these hinterlands was taking place, the North West Company remained vitally interested in finding a route to the Pacific coast. It was presumed that if the Pacific slope could be occupied, it would become British territory and open the way to trade with the Orient. The North West Company hoped that
such an accomplishment might earn it special trade privileges. Peter Pond, the discoverer of the Methye Portage that opened the rich Athabasca country to the Nor'westers, had been convinced as early as the 1780s that the Mackenzie River would lead to the western coast. In 1789 Alexander Mackenzie learned, to his chagrin, that it did not. Four years later, however, Mackenzie succeeded in reaching the Pacific via the Peace and Fraser rivers and their tributaries. Unfortunately, his travel route was scarcely navigable and quite unsuitable as a trade corridor. As a result, the route languished until Simon Fraser's penetration of the interior in 1805.

The company then turned its attention to a more southerly route across the mountains. In 1800-1 David Thompson and Duncan McGillivray reconnoitred the eastern slopes of the Rockies between the Highwood and Bow rivers. Thompson was a veteran in this country, having spent the winter of 1787 among the Peigans, but McGillivray, being the nephew of powerful North West Company partner Simon McTavish, was selected to lead the expedition in search of mountain passes to the Pacific. In the autumn of 1800 Thompson arrived at Rocky Mountain House, which had been established just two years earlier to trade with the Kootenays. In the month of October, he travelled up the Red Deer River, visited some Peigan camps, and met with a few Kootenays who were coming to the post to trade. He was then joined by McGillivray, with whom he ascended the
Bow River as far as present-day Exshaw before retiring for the winter months. On that journey, they again met with local Peigans who tried to dissuade them from crossing the mountains. As Thompson reported,

In the Evening the Sacotow-wew, the principal Chief of the Pikenows [Peigans] paid us a visit with a few Men. He spoke to us upon several Subjects, about the Kootanaes, etc. He complained of our having arms by which means the Flat Heads [Indians who lived west and south of the Kootenays] would also acquire arms to their great Hurt. To this I replied that they themselves, the Pikenows, had first & principally armed the Kootanaes, in exchange for Horses, etc. 14

McGillivray then journeyed northward alone, and reached Brazeau Lake and the headwaters of the Athabasca River before being laid up with rheumatism. With the arrival of spring, the ailing McGillivray departed for Fort William, leaving orders for Thompson and his men to attempt to cross the mountains and discover the upper reaches of the Columbia River, of which little was known. Thompson decided to try an ascent of Sheep Creek, but was repulsed by flood waters. Shortly after, he quit the southern plains for the Peace River district.

There the situation rested until 1804, when the North West Company amalgamated with its Athabasca rival, the XY Company. This increase in the number of partners dictated that new fur fields would have to be developed, and attention again turned to the region across the mountains which the Kootenays had reported was rich in furs. David Thompson once more set out from the newly re-established
Rocky Mountain House in an attempt to duplicate the journey across the mountains that Jaco Finlay had successfully undertaken via the Blaeberry River through Howse Pass in 1806. Thompson found the trail that Finlay had cut through the pass, although he complained it was not wide enough for his pack horses, and established Kootenae House near Lake Windermere in 1807. There he was shortly joined by a band of hostile Peigans, and he sensibly abandoned this post for a location known as Kootenay Bottoms in modern Idaho. Two years later he built a new post, Kullyspell House, on Pend D'Oreille Lake. Later in the same year he built a third post in the new Columbia district, Salish House. For the next four years the Howse Pass remained the only route between the fur trade post on the upper Red Deer River and the Columbia district beyond the mountains.

During those years, the Peigans continued to be deeply troubled by the increasing trade with the Kootenays. From the events that occurred, it seems their fears about Kootenay aggression were justified. In 1810, for example, the well-armed tribes joined battle, resulting in the death of sixteen Peigans. As a result, the Peigans told the traders to cease their activities. When the traders attempted to move goods upstream and through Howse Pass, they were stopped by the Peigans. There was nothing to be done but find another route across the Rockies, outside Peigan territory. Again the task of
exploration fell to David Thompson.

It was late in the autumn of 1810 that Thompson left Rocky Mountain House in search of the more northerly mountain pass. By the time he and his men reached the Athabasca River, it was December and the snows were deep. They abandoned their horses and set off on snow-shoes through the mountains. Not until 10 January did Thompson reach the height of land where the Athabasca Pass led him to the Pacific slope. Two weeks later he was at the head of the Columbia River, where the sudden change in climate caused many of men to desert. Troubled by this, Thompson returned upstream to await better weather for the canoe journey to the coast. This he reached in July, 1811. For the next half century, the Athabasca Pass would remain an important route across the Rocky Mountains. Howse Pass, in the words of Irene Spry, "fell into disuse and oblivion...."

The Fur Trade on the Southern Plains

After 1811 it was as though no mountain passes existed south of the Athabasca River. Rocky Mountain House, and its Hudson's Bay Company counterpart, Acton House, relinquished all connection with the transmontane trade that had given them life. Instead, they became outposts of the Peigan trade and, somewhat later, counters to the incursions of American traders among the members of the
Blackfoot Confederacy on the southern plains. As Dempsey has written, "any significance which Rocky Mountain House had held as a link in the route to the Pacific Ocean was gone. Henceforth its history was confined to the Indian trade of the plains and foothills." This statement could also be applied to Acton House.

The events at these posts on the upper Saskatchewan between 1811 and 1821 are known only sketchily. Both forts probably remained in use until 1813 as a means of mollifying the Peigans until such time as the Athabasca Pass route to the Columbia district was firmly established. They were then closed until 1818, by which time it had become plain that the Peigans would not trade willingly at Dog Rump Creek House, an outpost of Edmonton House, which was too close to Assiniboine and Cree territory. Union of the rival fur trade concerns under the name of the Hudson's Bay Company in 1821 led to a policy of retrenchment, which meant the closure of all expensive outposts such as Rocky Mountain House. Undoubtedly, the decision was influenced in part by the findings of the Bow River Expedition, a party of eighty men from the North Saskatchewan District sent out to assess the trade potential of the southern plains in 1822. They found that the potential was very limited, given the lack of fur-bearing animals and the hostility of the tribes of the Blackfoot Confederacy. Despite protests from the irate Peigans, who threatened to go south to
trade with the Americans, the Hudson's Bay Company abandoned Rocky Mountain House in 1823.

The policy was quickly reversed as the Peigans made good their threat. Representatives of the American Fur Company, which had many posts in the Snake River of modern Idaho, enticed the Peigans into trade with them. At a time of diminishing fur returns, the Hudson's Bay Company wasted no time in retaliating by re-establishing Rocky Mountain House. This occurred in 1827. John Rowand, who was in charge of the Edmonton District, indicated that

We have this season permanently established the Rocky Mountain House for the accommodation of the Peigan, which will have the effect of drawing them during the winter from the Flathead [Indian] lands and thereby keep them out of the way of the American Trappers.23

Rocky Mountain House became a winter trading post for the Peigans and the policy seems to have worked quite well. In the autumn of 1828 the post clerk was able to report that twenty-five tents of Indians were camped at the mouth of the Clearwater River, awaiting the arrival of the Rocky Mountain House traders.

Within two years, however, the Peigans had learned to play the traders off against one another. When James "Jimmy Jock" Bird returned to Rocky Mountain House in 1830 from a visit to the Peigan camps, he reported that the Indians were planning to trade with the Americans as they received goods very cheaply there. This was indeed discouraging news, as Bird was believed to have the trust
of the Peigans, due in no small measure to the fact that he had ten Peigan wives. Matters worsened when Bird himself "sold out" to the Americans and tried to induce Peigan trade at Fort Union. By 1832 George Simpson of the Hudson's Bay Company had to inform his superiors in London that

we have determined on abandoning the Rocky Mountain House, and either establishing a Post for their [the Peigans'] accommodation on the head waters of the Bow River, which is near about the most Southern Limits of our territory, or attaching trading parties to their Camps.28

The first action of the company was to send out an expedition to convince the Peigans to return to British forts. Shortly after, it was decided to take Simpson's advice and construct a post deeper in Peigan territory. The Minutes of the Northern Council summed up the circumstances of this development:

The recent defection of the Piegan tribe rendering it unnecessary to maintain the Rocky Mountain House which was originally established for their convenience, IT IS RESOLVED 34. To abandon that post and to establish a new post to be called Piegan Post on the borders of the 49th parallel of latitude, with a view to attract that tribe and to prevent other Indians who are in the habit of frequenting the Honble Company's Posts in the upper part of the Saskatchewan from crossing the [international boundary] line.29

Peigan Post, or Bow Fort as it was also known, was not built at the 49th parallel, but rather on the edge of a ravine near the Bow River among the foothills west of present-day Calgary. With a five-sided stockade and eleven chimneys visible from a distance, it is clear that this was a considerable establishment, despite its limited
trade objectives.

John Edward Harriott, a former clerk with the Bow River Expedition, reached the new fort site with twenty servants and four half breeds in the autumn of 1832. By the time they had erected the post, it was too late to do any serious trading with the Indians, who had already visited the American establishments to the south. In the spring, the men closed the post and departed until the following July. They arrived to find that the Indians had "burnt every bit of Plank about the place and otherwise injured the Buildings very much." After several weeks of work rebuilding the post, the men were disappointed to learn that the Peigans had already traded virtually all their furs to the Americans once more. Undaunted, they conducted what trade they could with the local Bloods and Blackfoot, who were expected to trade only at Edmonton House. By December increasing enmity could be detected among the tribes, which subsequently erupted into a battle between the Peigans and interloping Bloods. As a result, there were no further visits from the Peigans. Apparently unwilling to deal with the poor trade situation and the attendant violence, Harriott recorded that

I have determined on leaving it [Peigan Post] and retreating to the old Rocky Mountain House to secure the trade of the Blood Indians where we shall be able to bring them more to our own terms than at this place....

From that time forward, Rocky Mountain House served as the
Blackfoot Confederacy trading post. Direct trading in the Bow River valley was at an end.

The Southern Passes and the Oregon Question
For the next four decades, Rocky Mountain House functioned as the meeting place for all who travelled through the country south of the Red Deer River. Visitors other than fur traders were quite scarce, so scarce, in fact, that between 1834 and 1841 none have been recorded. The universal acceptance among fur traders of the Athabasca Pass for mountain crossings, in combination with the warlike character of the Indians of the southern region, inhibited exploration of the more southerly passes. Eighteen forty-one proved, however, to be a year of intense activity in the area now known as Banff National Park.

Governor George Simpson of the Hudson's Bay Company was the first traveller of the season to follow a southern route through the mountains. In March of 1841, having just received a knighthood from Queen Victoria at London, he embarked on a journey around the world that took him through Montreal to the Red River settlement and onto the western plains. Like other members of the company, he planned to cross the Rockies via the Athabasca Pass.

Upon meeting Simpson at Red River, Chief Factor John Rowand dissuaded him from his course by arguing that the Columbia River would probably be in full flood just as
Simpson was ready to make his descent. He also informed Simpson that he had engaged a man named Peechee (or Pichee), "a halfbreed native of the the Kootonais country" to guide the party through a southern pass. Peechee was to meet Sir George at Fort Edmonton.

The Simpson party assembled at Fort Edmonton in the last week of July and set out across the parkland belt under the guidance of Peechee. Upon reaching Gull Lake, they ascended the Red Deer and Little Red Deer rivers. At a rate of about fifty-four kilometers a day, they reached the Devil's Gap on 1 August. They paused at Lake Minnewanka (Peechee Lake, as Simpson called it, or Devil's Lake as it was known to the Indians) long enough for the men to retrieve six missing horses, and then travelled southward past Cascade Mountain, where Simpson remarked on the waterfall which was like "a thread of silver on the gray rock," to the crossing of the Bow River. From there they passed "up feeders of the Bow, Brewster Creek and Healy Creek; over the crest of the Rockies; and down Simpson River to the Columbia-Kootenay Valley." In all, it took the party twenty-two days to reach Fort Colvile on the Columbia from Fort Edmonton, and only five of those days had been spent in crossing the mountains.

The Simpson party barely preceded a group of Red River emigrants through the mountains. Led by James Sinclair, a prominent Red River settler and opponent of
the Hudson's Bay Company trade monopoly in the North West, these people journeyed west at the behest of Sir George Simpson, who wished to strengthen the company's precarious hold on the Oregon Territory while simultaneously ridding Red River Settlement of a notorious gadfly. The United States and Great Britain had been jostling for control of the Oregon Territory since the Treaty of London of 1818 had accorded citizens of both countries the right to settle Oregon. Increasingly, however, the Americans had asserted their claim to the vast territory. The Hudson's Bay Company, as a vanguard of the Empire in British North America and the possessor of trading posts in Oregon, was obliged to maintain control in the territory.

When Simpson had reached Fort Ellice at the junction of the Assiniboine and Qu'Appelle rivers on his way west, he learned that the Sinclair party of twenty-three families (120 people) and their fifty-five carts, had passed through, on the twenty-second of June. "Each family," he observed, "had 2 or 3 carts...drawn either by horses or oxen, together with bands of horses, cattle & dogs; the women & young children rode in the carts, while the men & boys travelled on horseback...." Along the trail between Fort Carlton and Edmonton House, where the parties met, Simpson and Rowand counselled Sinclair about the wintertime perils of the overland route they had intended to take across the southern plains and recommended instead that the party use the Athabasca Pass.
Simpson subsequently recorded in his journal that the "subject was keenly discussed, & the difficulties about [water] craft considered but they [the Sinclair party] finally saw the necessity for & agreed accordingly to the change of their plans."

Sinclair may have diplomatically agreed with these suggestions from Simpson and Rowand, yet he had no intention of using Athabasca Pass for his crossing of the mountains. With the assistance of a Cree chief named Maskepetoon, whose offer to act as guide to Simpson had been spurned just weeks earlier, Sinclair was able to convince his party that they should attempt to cross the Rockies by a southern pass. Many, if not most, of the Red River carts were abandoned, winter clothing and extra pemmican obtained, and poor horses discarded in favour of sound mounts. With supplies and baggage reduced to a minimum, the Sinclair party set out from Fort Edmonton during the second week of August, 1841.

At a speed of 22 to 33 kilometers per day, the cavalcade moved southwest from Edmonton along the same path that George Simpson's party had taken. Upon reaching Lake Minnewanka, they rested several days before undertaking the crossing of the mountains. From there, their exact route has always been somewhat uncertain, the subject of enduring debate among historians. Some say Howse Pass, others North Kootenay Pass, and still others
the Vermilion or White Man passes. There are, as well, references to Sinclair Pass, a name which is now applied only to a pass between the Stanford and Brisco ranges to the west. Simpson did report, however, that they crossed via "a still more Southerly pass than we pursued, not only shorter but better in every respect, so that even with families, and encumbered with baggage as they were, they effected the passage of the Mountains with infinitely less labour, & in a shorter time than we accomplished it."

On this basis, it is believed that they followed the White Man Pass. As Spry wrote, "the party is presumed to have travelled down the Cross River on the west side of the Rockies to the Kootenay and then up the Kootenay, a short distance, to the defile now called Sinclair Pass and through this, up Sinclair Creek between the Stanford and Brisco Ranges east of the Purcells, to the lakes which are the source of the Columbia."

Four years after the epic traverse of the Sinclair Party, the southern Rockies again became indirectly involved in British efforts to control the Oregon Territory. Tensions between Great Britain and the United States had continued to increase over the territory, and the British deemed it wise to send out a small party to examine Oregon from a military point of view. Such information would have been extremely valuable had open hostilities erupted in the far west. Upon the recommendation of the Commander-in-Chief of the Forces in
Canada, Lieutenants H.J. Warre and Mervin Vavasour set out on a clandestine mission in the guise of gentlemen of leisure seeking sport hunting and amusements. Sir George Simpson agreed to equip them at his trading posts en route and to provide them with all available information pertinent to their task. After crossing the plains from the Red River settlement, it is believed that Warre and Vavasour negotiated the Rockies through the Bow Valley and White Man Pass. They used just 700 words to describe their entire passage through the mountains, noting that

Without attempting to describe the numerous Defiles (passes) through which we passed, or the difficulty in forcing a passage through the burnt Forests, and over the high land, we may venture to assert, that Sir George Simpson's idea of transporting troops...with their Provisions, stores, etc., through such an extent of uncultivated Country and over such impracticable Mountains would appear to Us quite infeasible.48

As it turned out their expedition was in vain, as Great Britain and the United States settled their boundary dispute by treaty in mid-1846.

While returning from Oregon via Athabasca Pass, Warre and Vavasour encountered a Jesuit priest, Father Pierre-Jean de Smet, who was travelling in the opposite direction, having ministered to the Blackfoot Indians of southern Alberta. De Smet had reached the plains through a southern pass but again, the route undertaken is less than clear. It is believed that he crossed via the Cross River Valley to White Man Pass, and then to the
Spray Lakes Valley and the Bow River. From there he descended with his Kootenay guides to Rocky Mountain House, where he is said to have worked amicably with the Reverend Robert Rundle, an itinerant Wesleyan minister who had preached at Peigan Post. Rundle was pleasantly surprised by the Jesuit and recorded his impressions in his journal:

I found him very agreeable and we parted with each other when we left on very friendly terms. He did not interfere with my Indians at all, though he had an opportunity of doing so....Perhaps a Roman Catholic Priest and a Wesleyan Missionary never before met and parted on such good terms.50

Two years later Rundle again passed by the ruins of Peigan Post on his way up the Bow Valley, where he held a service at the foot of Cascade Mountain before proceeding to Lake Minnewanka. He does not seem, however, to have ever crossed the mountains.

There had been rumours as early as 1843 that the Hudson's Bay Company would ask James Sinclair to lead another party to Oregon, but nothing came of this. Sinclair did make a solitary crossing of the mountains in 1850 to determine whether the operations of the company's posts in the Columbia River Valley could be improved, but it was not until 1854 that he led his second expedition of emigrants over the mountains. At that time it was the intention of Governor Simpson to rid Red River of many opponents to the company's increasingly anachronistic trade monopoly, whose renewal in just a few years would
undoubtedly be challenged. Sinclair accepted the leadership of the party and informed Simpson that he should try to obtain the services of a guide named La Grace (or La Grasse), who was familiar with the mountains. In addition, Sinclair secured the assistance of two Mountain Stoney guides (Assiniboines) as guides. This latter decision reflected a recent change in tribal territories within the foothills region. As John Larner explains:

A survey of late eighteenth and early nineteenth century Hudson's Bay Company post journals and expedition records fails to indicate Stoney presence in the Bighorn-Kootenay Plains district until the late 1820s. There are indications in these same records that from the late 1820s onward, Stoney made frequent if not constant use of the North Saskatchewan headwaters area. By the 1840s, Stoney seem to have travelled, camped, and hunted throughout the foothills and Rocky Mountains from the Athabasca River southward to the Bow River.53

The last of the great tribal movements was concluded with Stoney occupation of the foothills region. With the assurance of help from guides of this tribe, Sinclair prepared for departure in 1854.

Near the end of May, the party of about a hundred people left the Red River settlement. They reached Fort Edmonton late in July, now accompanied by La Grasse from Fort Carlton and Chief Maskepetoon who had guided Sinclair through the mountains thirteen years before. Although Maskepetoon assured Sinclair that the Red River carts could be taken safely through the mountains, Sinclair
expressed doubt and decided to go only as far with them as practicable. Again the expedition followed a southwesterly course from the North Saskatchewan to the Red Deer Crossing, but then departed from the 1841 course and went past Lone Pine (Olds) to the Bow Valley. They travelled along the Kananaskis River (Strong Current River), across the mountains through North Kananaskis Pass, which had not been used for some time and had to be cleared of fallen timber, and down into the Kootenay Valley. John Campbell, one of the expedition members, noted with a certain bitterness that "our mountain guide took a new route across the mountains which took us thirty days whereas we could have gone by Mr. Sinclair's old route in ten days."

Two years after the party's arrival at Fort Walla Walla in Oregon, their leader was killed in an Indian attack on the post. Disheartened and frightened, a few of the emigrants decided to return to Red River. They journeyed through the mountains by way of the North Kootenay Pass in nine days, during which they exhausted their food supplies and were obliged to consume one of the horses. This was the final recorded transmontane crossing by white men until the famed Palliser expedition of 1857-60.

Conclusion
It is clear that even at mid-century, the southern passes
of the Rocky Mountains remained mysterious to white travellers. No journeys were undertaken at any time during the previous sixty years without the assistance of a native or mixed blood guide, and even then great confusion about the route could result while on the trail.

Deliberately denied information about the passes by the knowledgeable yet hesitant local natives who wished to contain the fur trade to their benefit, and prevented from using Howse Pass, Euro-Canadians had no alternative but to resort to the distant and arduous Athabasca Pass. For these reasons, this transmontane route retained its significance between 1810 and 1840.
Mapping the Southern Passes, 1857-1883

Introduction

The middle years of the nineteenth century were a time of nation building in Canada. Discussions were already underway that would lead, by 1867, to the confederation of British North America. With respect to the North West, which was still under the control of the Hudson's Bay Company, there was increasing awareness that the territory was not an arctic wasteland, but an untapped agricultural frontier. The venerable fur trading company did nothing to alter the former view of its vast hinterland, for it wished to obtain swift trading charter renewal in 1856 and felt that any notions cherished about the agricultural potential of the land would only harm its case for extension of the charter. Nonetheless, there were already isolated cries for the construction of a continent-wide railway to link the Orient with the West to the greater good of the British Empire, which involved not only a challenge to the supremacy of the Hudson's Bay Company, but also implied the spread of settlement throughout the newly-opened region. While these far-fetched schemes had little immediate effect, the British government did deny the renewal of the Hudson's Bay Company's exclusive right
to trade in the North West and accepted the principle of eventual Canadian annexation of the territory. The ferment for annexation had begun in earnest.

It was within this rapidly changing climate of opinion that the Royal Geographic Society of Great Britain elected to sponsor an exploring expedition to the Canadian North West. The plan issued from a member of the Irish gentry named John Palliser, who had been through the western United States on a hunting expedition some ten years earlier and had decided that not enough was known about the character of the British possessions north of the boundary. Ultimately, this expedition was to serve as a complement to the work of the Dawson-Hind party, which was sponsored by the Canadian government in 1857-8. While the Society liked Palliser's scheme to investigate the nature of the western prairies and mountain passes, it suggested that he should include scientists as members of his expedition team. With this he quickly concurred. His party consisted of James Hector, geologist and naturalist; Eugene Bourgeau, botanist; John W. Sullivan, astronomer; and Thomas Blakiston, magnetical observer. With additional financial help from the British government and the promise of assistance from Sir George Simpson of the Hudson's Bay Company, the expedition team departed London in May of 1857.

Upon arrival by packet in New York City, the members
of the party travelled to Sault Ste. Marie, where Sir George Simpson had arranged to have two canoes available for their use. Following the traditional route of the voyageurs of the fur trade, they hastened to the head of Lake Superior to begin their investigations. These studies were to include three distinct regions of the North West. The first covered Lake Superior to the Red River, the second those lands between Red River and the Rockies, and the third the mountains to the Pacific coast.

Palliser in the Rockies

No member of the expedition reached the foothills until early 1858. James Hector, the geologist, had travelled from Fort Carlton to Edmonton House with an advance party to engage mixed bloods from Lac Ste. Anne for the next summer's work, but found that all were away on the buffalo hunt. Rather than sit idle, he decided to trek to Rocky Mountain House to inspect the countryside and to engage mountain guides. He not only found the guides he needed, he discovered coal veins, cutbanks where he was able to study geological formations, and vast stands of merchantable timber. As his little party travelled, he accurately mapped the area for the first time.

While Hector undertook these practical preparations for the season of 1858 Palliser, who was still at Fort Carlton, decided upon the duties of each party member. In June he wrote to the Secretary of State to set forth his
plans:

I am now about to start with the main branch of the Expedition to the Forks of the Red Deer and Medicine Rivers, and despatch Lieut. Blakiston with a branch expedition via Forts Pitt and Edmonton, in order to carry on the magnetic determinations at those posts, as well as to bring us supplies overland in carts, ordered up in boats from Norway House last winter, to meet us at the Forks above mentioned. Lieut. Blakiston, with the supplies, will join the main branch of the Expedition, and we shall proceed to an old Fort at the foot of the Rocky Mountains not far from the [international] boundary line, thence I shall trace the boundary line to the westward, and afterwards take a course to the northward in search of a pass practicable for horses over the Rocky Mountains within British territory.4

By August there were four separate expeditions in the mountains. Palliser, Sullivan and some guides rode to the international boundary, near Chief Mountain, and explored the lands lying eastward of the mountains to the distant Cypress Hills. He sent Hector, Bourgeau and Blakiston to the site of Peigan Post, from which he expected each to undertake a separate expedition. Hector and Bourgeau were to take several men each and organize geological and botanical visits to the Rockies, while Blakiston received orders to explore the "two known Kootenaie passes, returing by the southern one," so that their railway grades could be assessed. All four journeys produced prodigious results.

After he had instructed Sullivan to seek a southerly pass, Palliser hastened onto the plains and was sorely disappointed at the agricultural prospects of the country he encountered. Seeing "nothing but prairie of the
poorest kind, and destitute of timber," he quickly returned to the rendezvous at the ruins of Peigan Post. There he recorded, undoubtedly with the assistance of his rather fanciful guides, that "the chimneys of the old place are still standing. The Hudson's Bay Company have long abandoned the post, many of their servants having lost their lives in its defence." While awaiting the return of Sullivan, Palliser received the unwelcome news that Blakiston had resigned from the expedition.

The expedition leader purported to be surprised by this turn of events, yet tension had been rife in the relationship between the two men from the start. As a former military officer, Blakiston was accustomed to precision in the manner in which his duties were assigned and to obedience from those of lesser rank and civilians. Thus, he was very annoyed when Palliser selected Dr. Hector as second in command on the expedition. Regardless of the precise reasons for Blakiston's departure, which may never be known, he did carry out the assignment which Palliser had set him.

In the company of three mixed bloods, an Indian guide and ten horses, Blakiston set out from Bow Fort (also called Peigan Post) and proceeded up the Kananaskis River to the Highwood, taking magnetic observations as he travelled. Journeying via the Belly, Oldman, Crowsnest, Castle and Carbondale rivers, the party reached the mouth
of the Kootenay Pass, where they "found a narrow but well worn trail ascending towards the summit...." Climbing the pass along the course of the Carbondale River, the explorer named it the 'Railway River' "from the striking advantages offered by its 'Levels' for the entry of a railway into the mountains...." Ultimately, the party reached the valley of the Flathead River, one of the tributaries of the Kootenay. There they encountered Kootenay Indians who told them of a pass that terminated near Chief Mountain, which they used to hunt buffalo on the plains. Blakiston deliberately sought this pass (Boundary Pass) on his return journey through the Flathead Valley and entered British territory near Waterton Lakes. In his report, which he refused to submit to Palliser, he also noted that the Indians had told him of a pass along the Crowsnest River, but this he dismissed as "a very bad road and seldom used." He then departed for China.

Blakiston's resignation, according to Palliser, caused him to decide to winter on the eastern side of the mountains, rather than proceed to the coast as planned. Nonetheless, he did undertake the exploration of another pass, the Kananaskis, which James Sinclair had recommended to him during Palliser's 1848 visit to the west. Under the guidance of a Mountain Stoney, they threaded their way through much burnt timber along trails that had evidently been seldom used, until they had climbed to the height of land that marked the start of the Pacific slope. Here
they turned back for Old Bow Fort via the North Kootenay Pass.

Palliser's party arrived back before Dr. Hector, which was the cause of considerable apprehension. Shortly Hector did return, however, and gave an accounting of his explorations. He had travelled up the Bow Valley with Bourgeau, who decided to linger in the Cascade Mountain area collecting botanical specimens while Hector pressed on, past Castle Mountain and on to the Vermilion Pass. Here they missed the feeder of the Bow that ran down a gently sloping valley, and instead passed into the valley of the Little Vermilion River, where they came upon the first westerly flowing waters. They crossed the Vermilion Plain and entered the Kootenay Valley, where Hector was seriously kicked by a pack horse that had fallen into a stream. In commemoration of the incident, they named the nearby defile the Kicking Horse Pass. Having discovered two new passes, both within British territory, they left the mountains via the Bow and North Saskatchewan Rivers.

Palliser was greatly impressed by the work of Hector, and commended him to London as "the most accurate mapper of original country I have ever seen." He recommended that during the season of 1859 Hector be allowed to pursue his investigations in the mountains to determine the geological nature of the main range. This was important work, as Hector had noted the low height of the Vermilion
Pass, which led him to "report very favourably upon the facilities of this pass for the clearing of a waggon road, and even that the project of a railroad by this route across the Rocky Mountains might be reasonably entertained." In his report to London, Palliser also commented on the supposedly accurate information that could be obtained from the local natives:

The fact is that the knowledge the Indians possess of the mountains is very small, even among those said to 'know the mountains,' their knowledge is very limited indeed. This is easily accounted for by the scarcity of game, which offers no inducement to the Indians even to go there.

That the great tribal migrations were at an end might also have had much to do with the small numbers of journeys which the Indians now undertook through the mountains.

Late in 1859, the expedition's last season in the field, Hector undertook considerable exploration in the Rocky Mountains. In August he and his small party had come to the foothills from the Cypress Hills area. They rested several days with some Mountain Stoneys near the Highwood River and experienced the destitution that was creeping over the plains as the buffalo declined. They then set out for Old Bow Fort and then, as Hector reported,

followed up my track of the preceding summer, along the valley of the Bow River, until I reached Castle Mountain opposite the Vermilion Pass. Instead of crossing the watershed at this place, the hope of procuring game and adding to my stock of provisions, to which up to this time we have avoided having recourse, induced me to get to the N.W. as far as possible, keeping on the eastern slope of the
mountains. I accordingly passed from the South to the North Saskatchewan [River] by the Pipe Stone Pass, which is further to the east than the Little Fork Pass, by which I crossed this traverse divided in the preceding summer. This pass follows up a small tributary to Bow River from the north, and after having traversed a height of land at an altitude of about 7,000 feet, descends what I name the Siffleur River to the north branch of the Saskatchewan at the Kootenaie plain.17

Leaving most of his Indian companions at this point, Hector pressed on farther to the south west, followed the Saskatchewan to its source and searched for a pass to the Columbia River. This he found at an altitude of over 1,450 metres. Having accomplished his goal, he descended the Blaeberry River where "we found traces of an old trail, which had evidently been out of use for many years, so that I have no doubt that this was the pass traversed by Howse in August, 1810." The steep valley restrained their movements and took them another nine days to reach the mouth of the Blaeberry. From there Hector had wished to turn north and proceed to the Boat Encampment on the Columbia but, fearing insufficient provisions, he reluctantly turned south instead and ascended the Columbia to its source. He reached Kootenay House on 7 October.

While Hector made his way through Howse Pass, Palliser and Sullivan journeyed to the southward through the North Kootenay. The thickness of the underbrush on the Kootenay track made it clear that this was a seldom used defile. With considerable effort and little more to eat than berries found along the trail, they finally
reached Kootenay Lake, where they gorged themselves on salmon. They then proceeded to the Columbia and descended it to Fort Shepherd, opposite the mouth of the Pend'Oreille River. After some time during which Palliser and Sullivan explored different sections of the Columbia Valley, they met Hector and proceeded together to Fort Vancouver.

In three years of work, the Palliser expedition had redrawn the map of the North West. For the first time, particular sites could be identified with some degree of accuracy on the mapsheets, making subsequent travellers much less dependent on native and mixed blood guides and ensuring that those in power could gain a reasonably correct view of the geography of the North West without having to visit the territory. To some observers, the immensity of the territory was sufficient to conjure notions of great economic potential and of the need for adequate and immediate manifestations of national sovereignty.

The expedition had another important result. It shifted attention from the arctic regions of the North West, which due to the course of the fur trade canoe routes were best known in both British North America and in Great Britain, to the southern plains and the mountains. The plains were seen, for the first time, as possessing agricultural potential, while the mountain passes identified by Palliser and his men came to be
understood as the corridors through which wagon roads and railways would be built across the continent to create trade and to unify its economy. Palliser and his party were, as Owram has suggested, "original observers of the land." 

The Rising Annexation Movement

As both the Dawson-Hind and Palliser expeditions lauded the agricultural potential of the northern plains, the perception of those empty lands as merely a passageway to the Orient became subordinate to a vision of them as a frontier of European farm settlement. The Red River settlement, which had always had an undesirable reputation as an isolated outpost of colonists, now assumed the stature of a gateway to a future agrarian empire that would, quite incidentally, supercede the increasingly anachronistic fur trade. Certainly this notion was cherished and fostered by many of the residents of the settlement who, having British ties, wished nothing more than to see their colony united with the Canadas. The union of British North America in 1867 gave great impetus to their cause, and made many Canadian nationalists conclude that annexation of the entire North West was in the best interests of trade and security.

The Red River Resistance of 1869-70 made Canadian de facto sovereignty over the North West a reality. Alarmed
by the apparent lack of interest of Great Britain, Canada and the Hudson's Bay Company about their concerns regarding participation in local administration and security of land tenure, the mixed bloods of the colony rose in armed rebellion at Fort Garry in 1869. An agreement between Canada and Great Britain for the surrender of the Hudson's Bay Company charter and sale of the North West to Canada had nearly been concluded and, after the execution of one citizen, the Canadian government sent in troops to quell the disorder. Once the transfer was completed, the government created the Province of Manitoba to handle administration of part of the annexed territory. No better manifestations of Canadian sovereignty over the region can be imagined.

The creation of Manitoba was but one small and, some felt, premature act in the opening of the prairie west to farm settlement. Of more significance was the concern evinced among expansionists in eastern Canada about the construction of a transcontinental railway linking east and west. The inclusion of British Columbia in Confederation in 1871 was, in fact, premised on the achievement of this rail link. This idea was far from new. There had been much idle discussion of such a prospect in the early 1850s and, by the time of Palliser's expedition, the notion had achieved such credibility that the explorer was instructed to seek out possible railway routes across the Rocky Mountains. The union of British
North America in 1867 had provided an economic framework in which such construction might take place in the east, while the subsequent inclusion of Manitoba and British Columbia in the confederation had extended the concept of a railway from sea to sea. It remained only for a bold demonstration of political will to meld these disparate elements into a coherent strategy of nation-building. "The problem for Canada after 1870," as Owram expressed it, "was to convert the visions of earlier years into concrete and detailed policies and to make the region a centre of growth and population."

The sheer vastness of Canada's new inland empire demanded that adequate east-west lines of communication be developed for its political and economic integration. The Canadian government responded to this need by planning the Canadian Pacific, a railway to span the continent. The first of the official expeditions in search of a suitable route for such a railway embarked in 1872 under the leadership of Sandford Fleming, a noted railway engineer, and the Reverend George M. Grant, a Methodist minister who served as secretary to the exploring party. Grant, who later wrote the official report on their travels, expressed the hopes of all nationalists when he wrote that

All this Country is a single Colony of the British Empire; and this Colony is dreaming magnificent dreams of a future when it shall be the "Greater Britain," and the highway across which the fabrics and products of Asia shall be carried, to the Eastern as well as to the Western sides of the Atlantic. Mountains were
once thought to be effectual barriers against railways, but that day has gone by; and now that trains run between San Francisco and New York, over summits of eight thousand two hundred feet, it is not strange that they should be expected soon to run between Victoria and Halifax, over a height of three thousand seven hundred feet.21

The Fleming expedition was undertaken so that the chief engineer of the line could inspect the proposed route and talk personally to the surveyors in the field. The party members met in Toronto in mid-July and left for the North West. The tentative route that had been laid out by the surveyors proceeded through the Precambrian Shield to the Red River, then veered northwesterly through Fort Edmonton and on down into British Columbia through the Yellowhead Pass. After covering this tremendous extent of territory in record time, Grant's optimism was still high:

We are satisfied that the rugged and hitherto unknown country extending from the upper Ottawa to the Red River of the north, is not, as it has always been represented on maps executed by our neighbours, and copied by ourselves, impracticable for a Railway; but entirely the reverse; that those vast regions of Laurentian and Huronian rocks once pronounced worthless, are rich in minerals beyond conception, rich in gold, silver, copper, iron, tin, phosphates of lime, and — strange as the assertion may appear — probably coal; that in the iron back-ground to the basin of the St. Lawrence, hitherto considered valuable only for its lumber, great centres of mining and manufacturing industry, shall in the near future, spring into existence; and that for the development of all this wealth, only the construction of a Railway is necessary. Beyond those apparently wilderness regions we came upon the fertile belt, an immense tract of the finest land in the world, bounded on the west by coal formations so extensive that all other coal fields are small in comparison.22

The plentiful resources of the Shield and the western
plains and parkland regions were to prove the rationale for settlement and the sustenance of the railway. All that was now required, as Grant put it, was "a standing army of engineers, axemen and brawny labourers...men who will not only give 'a fair day's work for a fair day's wage,' but whose work shall be ennobled by the thought that they are in the service of their country and labouring for its consolidation." In uniting their nation, those men were inadvertently to open the Rockies as a frontier for development as well.

The original intent of the northwestern railway route across the western interior and the mountains was avoidance of what both Hind and Palliser had believed was an arid triangle of infertile land with its base on the international boundary. In the field season of 1872, 800 men were scattered along the intended route, blazing trails, clearing brush, surveying. This preliminary work continued after 1873, even though the government of Sir John A. Macdonald had fallen in a scandal involving the construction of the railway. Macdonald's successor as prime minister, Alexander Mackenzie, moved slowly and cautiously on the building of the railway, in accordance with what he felt was the country's ability to pay for the immensely expensive transcontinental line. But when Macdonald regained power in 1878, it was with the conviction that the line would be built as quickly as
possible. One of the first changes made to the earlier plans, once a private Montreal-based syndicate had been engaged to construct the line, was a dramatic shift in the direction of the route through the unpeopled lands of the western interior.

Whether a re-assessment of the agricultural potential of the southern plains or considerations of competition from American northern lines prompted the change of route may never be known, but the effect was the same. The southern mountain passes resumed a strategic importance they had not possessed since the Peigans drove Thompson's brigade north to the Athabasca defile in 1810. All the company's surveying efforts were to be concentrated on four passes, the Kicking Horse, the Kootenay, the Vermilion, and the Howse. Only the Howse Pass had been investigated by the government survey crews under Sandford Fleming, who had dismissed it perfunctorily. Then, before much work could be done, the syndicate members rather arbitrarily chose the Kicking Horse Pass. This was done despite the absence of information about passes through the Selkirks that paralleled the Rockies on the west. And, although scant information is available about the method in which the Kicking Horse Pass was selected, it is not inconceivable that James Hector's glowing account of the defile's potential as a railway route swung opinion in its favour. Surveys conducted in 1882 confirmed the wisdom of the choice and the presence of a suitable
railway pass -- Rogers Pass -- through the Selkirks. There remained no insurmountable obstacle to the construction of a southern transcontinental line.

The Cave and Basin
By the end of August, 1883, the end of steel had passed the railway base camp at Padmore, located on the Kananaskis Flats in the Bow Valley. Soon the Canadian Pacific designated one of its workcamps, situated some 109 kilometers west of Calgary, as a divisional point named Canmore. This ensured that Canmore would grow to be more than just a station along the line, as divisional points included facilities for refueling and switching locomotives. The stability that this ensured quickly led to the development of a small commercial section, churches, a school and a residential district. Its stature as a divisional point survived only until the introduction of coal-burning locomotives around the turn of the century, which removed the need for closely-spaced refueling points.

As construction crews pressed up the valley of the Bow in 1883, they made what they thought to be the first discovery of a series of hot springs across the Bow River, just over two kilometers southwest of Cascade Mountain. This series of sulphur springs, which had long been known to the Indians who passed through the mountains and had
first been recorded by James Hector of the Palliser expedition in 1859, quickly became the centre of a vigorous dispute over ownership among men who smelled more money than brimstone in the mountain air. The chief claimants were Frank McCabe, the section foreman, and William and Tom McCardell, section gang workers.

There was nothing sudden about the claims of ownership. McCabe and the McCardells had built a rough shack at the springs, but this appears to have been for their own use and perhaps for that of their fellow workers. Certainly they made little or no effort to protect or even demonstrate the claim of ownership they would soon make to the federal government, although other section gang workers had built similar shacks at the base of Sulphur Mountain. Nor does there seem to be any corroborating evidence of William McCardell's much later statement (1938) that he and McCabe had cut a statement of their discovery on a nearby tree stump. In fact, in early 1885 a another claimant, Theodore Sebring (usually spelled incorrectly as Seibring) informed the government that although dated 1883, the stump had been cut and marked since his previous visit to the site in February of 1885. McCabe swore that it was January of 1884 before they were able to approach a well-known Calgary surveyor, A.W. McVittie, for instructions on how to apply to the government for recognition of their claim. McVittie informed them that a legal survey was required, which they
shortly learned might cost as much as $1,000. Lacking the money to proceed, they had no alternative but to leave the matter in abeyance.

There the matter seems to have rested until the late winter of 1885. On 20 March the Minister of the Interior received a letter signed by McCabe, William McCardell, Archie McNeil and C.W.N. Sansom applying for the rights to the hot springs situated some 3.2 kilometers southwest of Banff Station, which was then at the base of Cascade Mountain. Several days later, Seebring applied for rights to a second hot spring (the Upper Hot Springs), some 2.2 to 2.7 kilometers southeast of that discovered by McCabe and the McCardells, where he said he had constructed a shack and taken a rheumatic man for treatment. The man recovered splendidly. When Seebring returned to Sulphur Mountain and found that McCabe and the McCardells had erected their "1883" stake, he grew anxious that they might also try to deny him his claim. They want, he wrote, "only [to] give me trouble."

These claims to hot springs about which the government knew nothing prompted the assistant secretary to the Minister of the Interior to request J.M. Gordon, the Dominion Lands agent at Calgary, to investigate and report on the matter. Gordon travelled to the mountains, inspected the site, reconsidered the correspondence in his file on the springs, and presented a
report to Ottawa in late July. In his letter, he clearly established the existence of the two springs claimed. He then referred to his correspondence file which indicated that McCabe had claimed the second spring prior to Seebring and that both men had erected shacks at the site. He therefore recommended that the right of discovery should go to McCabe.

About one month later, the Calgary Land Office received a letter from one David Keefe, who claimed that on the 16th day of October, 1884, while out hunting, "I observed a vapour rising in the air on the mountain above the Bow River Falls and the Spray River, and on approaching the spot, I discovered what has since been known as the High Hot Springs of Banff, I at once blazed a trail to the point and have continued to hold same. The Hot Spring to which I have reference is about two miles on the mountain above those known as 'McCabe's Springs'...." Two weeks later, William Pearce of the Land Office received a second letter from Keefe, suggesting that both McCabe and Seebring were trying to bring his claim into disrepute. Those men, he wrote, "who are claiming as the original discoverers of the spring only got there by following the road I cut and blazed up the mountain." Pearce, who was well aware of the statements of McCabe and Seebring, informed his superiors in Ottawa that if what Keefe said was true, "certainly neither McCabe or Sebring [sic] have any claim thereto by
virtue of original discovery. He states that he is prepared and will shortly prove by indisputable evidence that his assertions are true." Until Keefe brought forth his evidence, Pearce recommended the government take no action on the claims of the other parties.

While waiting for Keefe to come forward, yet another claimant entered the dispute over the right of discovery. This was Willard Burrel Younge, who informed the government that he had wintered in the valley of the Bow in 1875, discovered the springs, and erected a shanty at the site. In the following year, "compelled by poverty," he abandoned the site to find employment elsewhere in the country. Nonetheless, he continued to regard the hot springs shack as his "regular home," and fully intended to homestead the land as soon as his service in the North West Rebellion was concluded. He was greatly distressed to hear of all the claims upon the springs, and felt that "great injustice will be done me if I am now deprived of them."

The dispute then became a contest of affidavits. Keefe managed to secure the sworn testimony of Dr. George Orton and engineer William Hamilton Merritt. Younge managed to secure the affidavits of Calgary livery stable keeper Alexander G. McDonald, the Reverend John McDougall of Morley, D.M. McDougall of Edmonton (the brother of the Reverend John McDougall) William Inkster of Edmonton, and
Andrew Sibbald of Morley. Later he received further assistance from one Donald McLeod of Edmonton, who regrettably referred to him as 'Peter Young'. Undoubtedly, the other claimants were able to bring forth equally impressive witnesses to their supposed finds.

The exertions of these claimants were all to be in vain. Even as they plied the government with requests for recognition of their 'discoveries', officials at Ottawa were planning to make the hot springs a public domain. As early as July of 1885 A.M. Burgess, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, was writing to his counterpart in the United States for information on the manner in which the American government had set aside the Arkansas Hot Springs. His first letter suggested that the Canadian government had already made up its mind to reserve the hot springs near Banff station:

Some explorers in our Rocky Mountain country have discovered within 3 miles of the Canadian Pacific Ry, what promises to be very valuable hot sulphur springs. I understand the Hot Springs in Arkansas are the property of the United States Government, as I propose those in the Rocky Mountains shall be the property of the Domn. Government administered for the public benefit. I shall be greatly obliged if you will cause some of your staff to send to me...the terms and conditions upon which the privileges of the Arkansas Springs are administered.41

Some five months later, Burgess again corresponded with Major Powell, informing him that "I am just now thinking out the details of a scheme for making them [the Banff hot springs] available for the public benefit," and that it "would greatly assist me in this work if I could obtain a
copy of the plan of the grounds surrounding the Arkansas Springs." By this time, the government had already declared a ten square mile tract around the hot springs a public reserve "of great sanitary advantage to the public," which could only be developed under government regulation. In early 1886 Burgess instructed one of his staff to travel to Arkansas to report upon the manner in which the springs there were managed. In the interim, the government moved to dispose of the private claims to the hot springs. In April of 1886, the Minister of the Interior instructed a senior official, William Pearce of Calgary, to conduct an investigation into all claims so that they could be settled. In July Pearce placed an advertisement in the Calgary Herald to inform all prospective claimants that he would be receiving evidence of claims at the Banff springs on 24 June. The date was later changed to 8 July, and at that time five separate claims were made. McCabe and William McCardell attended, as did D.B. Woodworth, a Member of Parliament from Nova Scotia, who was represented by lawyer James Lougheed and claimed that McCabe and the McCardells had assigned their rights to him. David Keefe, Willard Younge, Theodore Seebring and a newcomer named J.R. Grant each put forward a claim.

Willard Younge's case was the first to be heard. Pearce learned that Younge, with a partner named Olof
Johnson, had not only built an $18 shack near the springs, but had discovered both the cave and basin and the upper hot springs and had surveyed a 121.5 hectare plot around the cave and basin. Younge and Johnson had kept their discovery a secret while they attempted to interest someone with capital in development of the springs. Johnson had since quit all claim to the springs, while Younge continued to press for recognition of his mineral rights. Pearce indicated that in the case of hot springs, which are not minerals that can be extracted in the same manner as ore bodies, the claimant would have had to develop the resource in terms of amenities and accessibility. As Younge "contributed not in the slightest" to the development of the springs, Pearce ruled that Younge be allowed no claim whatever.

Next came the new case of J.R. Grant, a native of Brussels, Ontario, who said he had visited the springs in September of 1883 and taken a bottle of spring water away for analysis. On the return trip to Ontario, he had the misfortune to break the bottle and thus lose its contents and all evidence of his visit to the springs.

David Keefe, a CPR sectionman, had "done more to bring the springs into notice and render them accessible than any other individual." By this, Pearce referred to Keefe's efforts to build a raft of railway planks and ties. Yet he noted that Keefe's actions were not undertaken without self-interest, as he maintained a
boarding house in the CPR section house. In lieu of Keefe's failure to make any claim earlier and his inability to bring forth witnesses on his behalf, Pearce felt that he could not allow Keefe more than $100.

Although McCabe and McCardell were claiming the cave and basin and the upper hot springs, Pearce dismissed all consideration of the upper hot springs on the grounds that no improvements had been made at the site. With respect to their efforts at the cave and basin, he granted them a cash settlement of $675.

Turning to Woodworth's claim of assignment, Pearce noted that since neither McCabe nor McCardell had any legal right to the lands, they could not assign the property. "It may therefore best be left to the courts," he decided, "to grant Mr. Woodworth any redress he may be entitled to as against either McCabe or McCardell." On the question of some $4,400 which Woodworth paid to the partners for purchase of the property, the ferry, improvements to the site, roadbuilding, surveys and travelling expenses, Pearce felt it expedient to grant Woodworth $1,000 as compensation for costs actually incurred.

The Pearce enquiry was the denouement of the episode creating a 'sanitary reserve' for public use. As he indicated quite explicitly during the hearings, the government saw the utility of the hot springs solely in terms of development. Any claimant to them who had not in
some manner developed the springs was tersely dismissed. It is equally clear that Pearce understood that adequate transportation was a necessary corollary of development, which indeed it was in the remote mountain regions. It was not for nothing that he pointed out to McCabe, McCardell, Seebring and Keefe that their supposed claims on the springs would have been impossible without the unwitting assistance of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This government perspective on the springs was unquestionably shaped to some extent by the interest that general manager William Van Horne of the Canadian Pacific had expressed as early as 1883 about creating a park reserve around Lac des Arcs (Bow Lake). As R. Craig Brown has pointed out, national park creation and economic development were synonymous in late Victorian Canada.

Conclusion

The reawakening of interest in the southern mountain passes in the last half of the nineteenth century arose from the dream of nation-building. From the Palliser expedition to the surveys of the Canadian Pacific field crews, the intent was the same: to locate mountain passes suitable for construction of a railway that would span the continent from east to west. Such construction implied economic development along the line. The Banff Hot Springs were to be but one tile in the expansive mosaic of western Canadian development.
Introduction

Taking the waters was a peculiarly Victorian passion. True, medicinal visits to hot springs had been undertaken for many centuries, but during the reign of Queen Victoria the habit was raised to an agreeably indulgent level. An entire code of behavior grew up around the great spas of Europe, like Baden-Baden, Aix-les-Bains, Bath, and Bad Gastein. Custom ordained the appropriate time of year to visit the spas, propriety dictated the character of the people with whom one associated while there, and the spa doctor authoritatively selected the cures one would take. These could range from lounging in the hot mineral waters or drinking ample quantities of it in bottled form each day to subjecting oneself to hot mud poultices and blanching steam baths. Dedicated pursuit of the 'cure' seemed to lead inevitably to the restoration of health, if the innumerable testimonials of spa frequenters are to be believed.

As the nineteenth century wore on, the considerable social status of spa visits diminished in accordance with the ability of the commoner man to take the cure that had previously been the solitary preserve of high society. Of
course such activities demanded more leisure time and money than was available to members of the labouring classes, yet as the ranks of the professional and middle classes grew and railways provided accessibility, taking the waters began to lose its patina of gentility and exclusivity. This influx of people of the 'inferior' classes could be detected most in the declining quality of the services and architecture at the springs. While palatial surroundings and impeccable services had previously been synonymous with the spas, cheaper hotels and tasteless service establishments had since become increasingly common.

Of course touring was implicitly an element of taking the waters, although its attractions never distracted the seasoned spa visitor from the central objective of a restorative cure. Many of the finest spas of Europe were located in alpine regions, where the consumptive, the over-indulgent and the bored could incidentally experience the uplifting sublimity of nature at its finest. Yet once the tourist was in the field, as Paul Shepard has written, "a high proportion of [his] time was devoted to securing accommodations, conveniences, and safety." These people carried their civilization with them, and fully expected that a complete complement of urban amenities would await them at the spa, regardless of its remoteness. They also expected to be amused once they arrived. Those who enjoyed natural history (and who did not in the nineteenth
desired nothing more than hiking trails, vista observation platforms, and zoos filled with exotic creatures. To the more sophisticated and less ambulatory visitor, an opera house was a must and chamber music a suitable accompaniment to dinner. To tour was to experience the familiar in an unfamiliar, sublime setting.

In Canada in the late nineteenth century, the attraction of touring lay in escape from the tensions of industrialism, urbanization, and materialism. It was a typically North American reaction, fostered by anxiety about deteriorating health and the loss of spiritual well-being. "Worry," as one medical practitioner of the day stated unequivocally, "is the disease of the age." By the turn of the century, it would be widely acknowledged in Canadian society that only a return to nature could save the nation from the morass of rampant materialism that threatened to engulf it. Only nature could heal the ailing city dweller. It was in this atmosphere of anxiety about public degeneration that the federal government set about establishing the Banff hot springs as a public sanitary resort.

The Government Role in Creating a Spa Community

The federal government moved swiftly to create a fashionable spa community near the Banff hot springs. Above all else, this meant placing and then enforcing
strict controls on the nature of development at the health resort. The Canadian Pacific Railway may have been responsible for making the future Banff townsite accessible, but it was unquestionably the federal government which provided the community with its enduring character.

During the summer of 1885 the Department of the Interior instructed Dominion Lands surveyor P.R.A. Belanger to determine precisely the location of the hot springs while surveying mountain townsites along the mainline of the CPR. Belanger arrived at Banff in the final week of September and ran his meridian lines. In the course of this work, he seems to have discovered the middle hot springs, about halfway between the cave and basin and the high, or upper hot springs. He also visited the other two springs and reported, quite significantly from the government's perspective, that "the medicinal properties of these spring[s], are so highly praised and their reputation so widely spread that they are daily visited by patients suffering from debility, rheumatism, blood and skin diseases and many other sicknesses, many of whom boast of having been cured by the marvellous virtues of these waters."

In order to test the efficacy of the cure, the government had already provided two wine bottles and two large jars of spring water from the cave and basin and from the upper hot springs to the Public Analyst of the
Dominion, H. Sugden Evans, for scientific analysis. Both emitted a strong sulphurous odour that dissipated upon exposure to the air. In the main, the samples contained a preponderance of sulphuric and calcium salts. Evans searched in vain for evidence of lithia (lithium oxide), which was believed to be beneficial to sufferers of gout, a common malady of the time. Nonetheless, on the basis of his investigations, department officials felt confident enough to declare that "the remarkable curative properties of these waters having been made apparent, immediate steps were taken...to make a topographical survey of the lands included in the reservation, and upon the plan prepared for that purpose, to commence the construction of roads of bridges and other operations necessary to make of the reserve a credible National Park."

The task of surveying the townsite fell to George A. Stewart, a surveyor and civil engineer. When he arrived at the site in February of 1886, such settlement as there was in the area was concentrated at Banff Station, the Canadian Pacific station near the base of Cascade Mountain. He first surveyed a road from the siding to the cave and basin, established the boundaries of the new reserve, and then platted two suitable townsites. One was at Lake Minnewanka (formerly Devil's Lake), which was expected to become a major tourist attraction, while the other was situated along the banks of the Bow River, just
downstream from the cave and basin. Most of the work on these projects was completed by the winter of 1886.

Stewart felt that his first responsibility was the provision of better access to the lower hot springs. There was only a rough path from the railway station through the heavy timber along the river, which proved difficult even for those visitors in good health and impossible for many invalids. At the river, canoes and small rafts were the only means of ferrying the ill across. Stewart immediately had his small crew of men cut timber for a temporary 'float' bridge that was put into place in mid-June, where it would remain until replaced by a permanent stone and iron truss bridge in 1887. With this link in place, the men set about clearing a road (Mountain Avenue) from the station to the upper hot springs. By early July, carriages carrying the ill passed "with ease from Banff Station to the Hot Springs over a very fair road." Stewart's crew then turned to construction of a mile-long road to the cave and basin, which attracted the greatest public attention. In the remaining summer months, the workmen also pushed a road as far as the Bow Falls and another that returned from that point along the bank of the Bow.

While his men built roads, Stewart busied himself with the creation of a townsite on the flats on the north side of the river "at a place well suited for the business transactions of the future inhabitants of the park."

These were narrow lots with limited backyard space, implying a high density of building construction. The engineer intended to segregate all commercial activities of a mundane nature from the exclusive residential part of town, which he planned to place across the Bow on the lower slopes of Sulphur Mountain. His townsite straddled a main street that paralleled the course of the CPR tracks leading toward town from the station. This he called Banff Avenue since it led in from Banff Station. On either side of it, he imposed a standard grid pattern of streets. In 1888 a new street called Station (later Lynx) would be cleared from the relocated CPR station site near Forty-Mile Creek to strike Bear Street at an oblique angle for the transport of passengers and freight to the newly-completed Banff Springs Hotel near Bow Falls.

The considerable public interest in the cave prompted Stewart to provide better access than the 14-meter ladder that had been lowered through a natural opening at the top of the formation. Not only was the means of access dangerous, it actually discouraged the ill and infirm from bathing in the restorative waters. Furthermore, the McCardells had refused to move from their site on top because they had not yet received an award from the government. Stewart asked Ottawa for guidance on the proper procedure and received permission to tunnel through the cave wall from the abutting terrace. This decision did
not meet with approval from many Calgary residents who protested to the government by forwarding a lengthy petition. There seems to have been some agreement among them that an iron spiral staircase was the proper solution to the question of access. Despite the petition, Stewart carried out the work in the winter months, when few people visited the cave. Contrary to public opinion, he felt that the tunnel "added much to the attractions and natural curiosity of the Cave, as well as affording a perfectly level and easy mode of access to its waters."

The government devoted much effort to selecting the proper type of hot springs commercial development. The journey that John Hall of the Interior Department had taken to Hot Springs, Arkansas in 1886 furnished officials at Ottawa with the information necessary to formulate an appropriate set of regulations. Hall visited Arkansas at a propitious time, for the U.S. Senate was debating a bill to regulate the distribution of hot water at the springs which elicited the contrasting opinions of legislators, leaseholders and the visiting public on the issue of suitable administration of such a resource. The local administrators were most helpful in providing him with all available information concerning the operation of the springs.

There were ten 'regular' bath houses, as Hall termed the commercial establishments, and a single free one called the Mud Hole. While construction of the bath
houses varied somewhat, most could be described as rectangular structures that were divided into one or two tiers of compartments, according to the number of tubs. Adjacent to the main bath rooms were a ticket office, sweating and cooling rooms, and a general office that also served as the waiting room. Tubs came in all sizes and types, including painted and unpainted wood, sheet iron, zinc, slate, and porcelain. Hall felt that the latter, if of good quality, was preferable as it was "susceptible to a higher degree of cleanliness than any of the other materials." Water for the tubs was simply piped in from the springs or from adjacent reservoirs, with the water rental being assessed at a flat $15 per tub per annum.

Hall was not hesitant to condemn the lack of adequate supervision at the bathing houses. He commented that there is no management at all. The owners of the houses are seldom seen about the premises; the clerk, who is sometimes a mere boy or young woman, only sells the tickets; and the invalid is turned over to the care of an utterly ignorant attendant. There is no attempt at classification of bathers, and consequently a person suffering only from rheumatism may enter a tub immediately after it has been vacated by someone afflicted with a contagious disease. It is true the possible danger from this unregulated bathing may be lessened or entirely avoided by strict cleanliness, but under the present system the bather has no assurance that such will be observed.

Hall was also disturbed by the failure of owners to pay wages to their attendants, which gave rise to a situation in which individual bathers became responsible, through the disbursement of varying amounts of money, for the
provision of suitable bathing equipment, such as chairs, mirrors, scrub brushes, and so on. Such laxity seemed all too typical of conditions at the springs, and Hall felt he could not "refrain from expressing my opinion that absolute government control, and management under medical supervision, is the only solution of the question that will ensure the maximum benefit of those sufferers requiring the aid of the Hot Springs of Arkansas."

Shortly after receipt of Hall's report, Thomas White, the Minister of the Interior, filed his recommendations for development of the Banff hot springs. These, he assured his colleagues on the Privy Council, were formulated "to secure to the public the utmost benefit which can be derived from the waters without loss to the revenue." He put forward two alternatives for development of the springs. To ensure complete control over the facility, White recommended that a government bath house might be constructed and managed by proper attendants under the strict supervision of a qualified physician, who would be permitted to charge enough to net a reasonable return after management costs. The main problem with this suggestion was the high cost of the bath house, which might run to some $50,000. Alternately, he put forward the idea of leasing the use of the waters to private entrepreneurs willing to erect bath houses of suitable quality. This would cost the government very little, and yet ensure that proper control of the
facilities was maintained through the promulgation and enforcement of appropriate regulations. Of the two recommendations, White felt "disposed to recommend" the latter.

The government accepted the second recommendation made by White, and later despatched the veteran hot springs inspector, John Hall, to Banff in the spring of 1887 to report on the facilities that had been erected under the supervision of park superintendent George Stewart. Hall found two bath houses in operation at the upper hot springs, one owned by Dr. R.G. Brett and the other by Mr. McNulty. Brett's facility consisted of a bath house with ten tubs and two plunge baths (still under construction), as well as an adjoining boarding house or hospital. McNulty had erected a combined bath house and hospital, with but two tubs and a nine foot square plunge bath. The hot water for both was obtained through iron pipes. Brett also operated a large hotel called the Sanitorium on a site on the south side of the river that faced the proposed permanent bridge location on Banff Avenue.

At the Basin, Hall found the original log shanty offering accommodation "of the rudest kind," yet it seemed that this pool retained its popularity due "to some extent to the popular notion that a bath with a mud bottom possesses some peculiar virtue." Stewart had already
prepared plans for a "pretty cottage" to be built at the entrance of the tunnel. This would contain waiting and dressing rooms. Similarly, dressing rooms were planned for the Basin. Halfway between the Cave and the Basin, Stewart hoped to erect a small caretaker's cottage. Hall shared his opinion that the caretaker should be "a very trustworthy married man whose wife could take charge of the female dressing rooms."

Prior to his departure from Ottawa, Hall had been informed that the government planned to pass an act creating a National Park around the springs. "Permit me to suggest," he ventured, "that the act should contain very stringent provisions for the protection of fish and game and, if possible under existing treaties, should prohibit Indians hunting in the Park." Such regulations were deemed essential to the maintenance of the proper atmosphere at the health resort. Passage of the Rocky Mountains Park Act of 1887 enabled the federal government to regulate these affairs and many others within the hot springs reserve as it wished. The park was "set apart as a public park and pleasure ground for the benefit, advantage and enjoyment of the people of Canada...." This legislation empowered the government to make regulations to preserve and manage all local flora, fauna and minerals, to control the management and utilization of the hot springs, and to control mining activities, trade, and leaseholds.
Even before passage of the Act, Superintendent Stewart had found it necessary to seek advice on several administrative matters that seemed critical to the success of the hot springs as a resort. In June of 1886 he corresponded with Ottawa to outline the pernicious nature of the local whiskey trade. "It may be thought that the question of the Liquor Traffic in no way comes within my duties or instructions," he wrote, "but having a large body of men at present under my employment, and whose welfare I am to some extent responsible for [,] I anticipate the evil effects of intoxicating liquors being allowed within their reach, particularly as there are many families of helpless women and children temporarily [sic] living here, who could not easily be protected from the evil designs of a drunken mob." These fears prompted Stewart to prohibit the importation of liquor into the reserve upon penalty of the law. He simultaneously called for the establishment of a local North West Mounted Police detachment, citing as evidence of its need a "disgraceful row [which] took place there nearly resulting in murder, Revolvers and knives being freely displayed."

No sooner had Stewart attempted to act, however, than the park reserve became the scene of a suspected drunken murder. On the morning of 13 July 1887, Constables Dee and Raven of the Banff North West Mounted Police detachment, found a body on the east bank of the Cascade
River some kilometers west of the small coal mining community of Anthracite, northeast of Banff. The skull was lacerated and badly bruised, as was most of the upper body, pointing distinctly to the possibility of foul play. Dee immediately informed Stewart, who received instructions from the Crown prosecutor in Calgary to await the arrival of the coroner. After hearing the preliminary findings of Dr. Byers of Anthracite, coroner Dr. J. Grant McKay of Calgary immediately launched an inquest into the cause of death. He learned that the victim, William Swanson, had been last seen on 5 July, drinking heavily in the company of John Shaw and Harry Ober at Blanche Maloney's house, a local brothel. "This place," as the Lethbridge News reported, "has been for some time a rendezvous for whiskey pedlars, gamblers and other bad characters and...it is more than likely that Swanson fell into the hands of the gang that frequent the place."

Eventually the men left Blanche's and were seen crossing the railway bridge over the Cascade River. Later Shaw arrived at a house downstream, his clothes completely soaked, but unable to recall how he had fallen into the river. Swanson was not seen again until discovery of his body in the river. After interviewing several witnesses, the coroner found there was sufficient evidence to commit John Shaw for trial.

At this point, the North West Mounted Police sent Inspector Constantine to Banff to conduct further
those of the coroner's inquest. He found nothing in the behavior of Shaw to suggest murderous intent and felt that he was in such a state of intoxication at the time that it was not surprising he could not recall falling into the river. In addition, his working companions were quite prepared to vouch for his fair character. He also found that Swanson's injuries were consistent with those of a man who had fallen off the bridge, struck his head on a rock, and remained in the turbulent waters of the Cascade for eight days. On the basis of this re-examination of the evidence, the Crown prosecutor felt compelled to have Shaw released.

Although Shaw was never formally arraigned for trial, the publicity that the case had engendered seriously damaged the reputation for security that the government wished to promote in its new national park. It also added unnecessarily to the tension that already existed between George Stewart and the local members of the North West Mounted Police. Their mutual dislike had erupted six months earlier, when Stewart had embarked on his first campaign to discourage the use of liquor in the park. Forest Ranger Connors, who was under Stewart's supervision, had been instrumental in having a local whiskey pedlar named Brown arrested and fined $200. This caused an uproar in Banff and led Dr. Brett to post bail for Brown and to organize an 'indignation meeting' at his
hotel. William Pearce, sent in to review the situation on behalf of the government, reported that the chief topic of the meeting "was whether Connors should be lynched, ducked, or otherwise shown he had incurred their enmity and had better not repeat it." Similarly, Pearce had little praise for the behavior of the local constables, who not only resided at the Brett Sanitorium, but who

the greater portion of the time have their slippers on, or [occupy] themselves playing billiards...they shut their eyes to everything and it was with the greatest difficulty that Connors could get them to make the arrest, was afraid to tell them where he was taking them fearful the culprit would be advised the whiskey [was] found. They did not prove slothful in taking half the fine, Connors getting none.34

H.H. Smith, Pearce's superior at Winnipeg, notified the Minister of the Interior immediately after receiving Pearce's report on the situation at Banff. Smith felt that the matter deserved swift correction, "for if it becomes known that the Whiskey or Rowdy Element have acquired preponderance in that vicinity [Banff] it will be impossible to get tourists to visit the park and thus its usefulness will be destroyed and all the efforts of the government to buy it out and improve it will be thrown away."

Obviously the government did consider it a serious matter, as White arranged at once for the construction of proper North West Mounted Police quarters. Until such time as new accommodations were provided, department officials felt, "we cannot expect discipline and efficient
service." Considerable effort was expended in selecting the proper location for the new barracks. John Hall of the Department of the Interior thought that a location near the train station was preferable, as "this would enable the police to keep a strict watch upon the incoming trains, and in this way, control the illicit importation of liquors into the Reservation." The Police agreed, but noted that a final site for the station had not yet been selected. In view of this fact, a temporary barracks location was found between Banff Avenue and Marten Street.

The main sources of the 'rowdyism', in the view of the government, were the numerous collieries situated along the CPR line near Banff. The North West Mounted Police carefully monitored the number and origins of the men in the camps through correspondence with the coal companies and tried to adjust the size of the local detachments accordingly. Under the new park regulations of 1890, however, such enforcement became legally impossible. The government had declared that mining villages like Anthracite were to be subject to the regulations, which could only be enforced by park officers. The NWMP immediately contacted Ottawa to see if its detachment officers could not be made officers of the park. The Department of the Interior was pleased to comply with the request, which assured proper control within the park.
Of course not all of the Police's duties involved the control of violence and drunkenness. They were equally responsible for the investigation of local fires and accidents, implementation of fish and game regulations, and even the enforcement of the Lord's Day Act. The latter duty sparked considerable local debate in 1897 when the Police prohibited the playing of hockey on Sunday afternoon. A local minister had complained that Sunday sports represented a 'profanation of the Lord's Day' and demanded action. The result was a spirited bout of correspondence between local residents and the Police regarding the nature of a hockey 'game'. Ultimately, Superintendent Perry of Calgary placatingly offered that "the mere fact of skating and knocking about [of] a ball would not constitute a game. A game is where sides are chosen and oppose each other and contest the game." Superintendent Ashton of the Banff detachment nonetheless stoutly defended his action in the matter and declared that "it was the intention of the Banff Hockey Club to make Sunday afternoon their big day for playing games with sides...." However correct the local superintendent's action, it did nothing to endear him to local residents.

The comfort, convenience and amusement of visitors to Banff played a major role in the formation of the park regulations. Not only was Stewart instructed to put down rowdyism and unseemly behavior, he was expected to clear all dead trees in the area to lower the risk of fire,
continually upgrade roads in areas where prospective leaseholders wished to build homes, keep meteorological records to apprise possible visitors of the wonders of the mountain climate, and seek out new attractions for visitors. Even the government's policy on wildlife in the park seemed a response to the perceived needs of the tourist.

In 1886 W.F. Whitcher, the former Commissioner of Fisheries of Canada, was asked by the Minister of the Interior to conduct an investigation into the park's flora and fauna and make recommendations concerning the appropriate manner of husbanding these resources for the benefit of the tourist. He found that previous depredations had seriously imperilled the survival of many species within the park and felt that a strong policy of preservation had to be implemented. As he wrote in his peculiarly orotund style:

Paucity of fish and game will undoubtedly deprive the National Park of something of its many wild attractions; whilst plenteousness will be a source of profit and pleasure to Canadians interested in its development as a free popular resort for health and recreation, as also to strangers attracted thither by the natural features of scenic beauty and hygienic excellence which it assuredly embodies in an eminent degree.

Whitcher believed that preservation policies should be applied only to suitable animals, however, such as the herbivorous elk, deer, sheep, goats, squirrels, and hares, as well as "countless innocent and gay plumaged birds,"
that "form part and parcel of living ornaments interesting to visitors on every public reservation." Even the grub-eating black bear might be defended from hunters, unlike those "lupine, vulpine and feline vermin that prey upon furred and feathered game with savage impartiality." Among the latter he included wolves, coyotes, foxes, lynxes, skunks, weasels, wild cats, porcupines, badgers, eagles, falcons, owls, hawks, loons, mergansers, kingfishers and cormorants, all of which should be destroyed by park staff. With respect to fish within the park, Whitcher felt it imperative that such devices as explosions, nets, and "the improvidence of Indian fishing" be outlawed.

Not content with the natural scenic beauty of the park, Whitcher recommended that wild rice be sown in the Vermilion Lakes, Devil's Head Creek (now submerged), and at the mouth of the Sun Dance River in order to "supplant much of the rank weeds and wiry grasses now covering unflooded portions," and to provide sustenance for local waterfowl. He held strong the hope that the birds would naturally carry the seeds to distances of more than 20 miles and thus spread the rice to other waterbodies where it could "vegetate as regularly as if sowed by hand." The construction of dams at selected locations would also do much to permit fish restocking, preferably with rainbow trout. He conceded that many of these recommendations might "appear somewhat fanciful or experimental," if
applied to a location other than one devoted "to the pursuits of pleasure rather than to those substantial objects of proven usefulness for which the public funds are ordinarily expended." Clearly Whitcher was convinced that his wildlife management plans would greatly enhance the attractiveness of the hot springs reserve to visitors.

The same degree of concern about the visitor's perception of the park as an attractive locality was apparent in the care with which a system of land tenure was formulated. Rather than sell land outright to persons interested in residing at Banff, the government chose to implement a regulatory leasehold system which would guarantee the Treasury an annual, escalating return that could be used to defray maintenance costs within the park. The Rocky Mountains Park Act of 1887 had left the matter quite open to refinement by saying merely that the Minister would have the power to regulate "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."

While there was general agreement about a leasehold system, the government was concerned about the possibility of inducing quality construction on leaseholds with a
limited term. Ultimately, it was decided that an initial term of 42 years might be set on all leases, but with the right of renewal in perpetuity. Leases could not be transferred between parties without the permission of the government, and all lessees had to erect "satisfactory" structures in which no obnoxious activities would be conducted. By strictly controlling land use in this fashion, the government hoped to create an attractive community in which wealthy individuals would wish to reside at least seasonally.

To accommodate the desires of those wealthy patrons, the government instructed George Stewart in 1889 to proceed with additional road construction throughout the prestigious villa lot section of the Banff community on the south side of the Bow River. Work commenced on Spray Avenue, since it was the main road leading to several lots that had been taken up during 1888. The importance of this road was evident in Stewart's comment that it "may now be considered as second to none in the park." The gravel taken from the Spray Avenue ditches was used to upgrade the surfaces of Glen and River avenues. The beginnings of an intricate pattern of crescents and the large lots created by this work reflected the stature of the intended community, which at least one authority has likened to contemporary planned spa communities in Europe. Similarly, Stewart instructed his crews to grade and ditch Buffalo Street as far along the Bow River as lots had been
leased. Although on the north side of the river, these were considered to be desirable villa lots because of their waterfront location. As Prime Minister Macdonald had said, "a portion of the park offers some beautiful sites for villas...to be leased to people of wealth, who will erect handsome buildings upon them."

The government had formulated its policy of enforced exclusivity in just a few years after passage of the Rocky Mountains Park Act. It remained a highly speculative programme of development, as wealthy individuals were not yet arriving by the trainload to select an appropriate villa lot on which to reside seasonally in the mountain wilderness. Nonetheless, because of its certainty of vision in creating the hot springs resort the government would always be the beneficiary of this early policy of controlling development while recouping its investment.

Private Investment and Public Control at the Springs

While the federal government led the way in providing an administrative framework in which to operate a national park, private investors dominated the establishment of service industries for incoming tourists. These services, operated under strict governmental guidelines, gave the community its distinctive character. Among the private investors, none was more powerful in determining the public image of the hot springs reservation than the
Canadian Pacific Railway, yet there were many other, much smaller investors whose actions were equally important in establishing the true and rather more prosaic character of this frontier community. From the beginning, the Banff townsite was a community divided between the upper and the middle classes, between dream and reality.

It is axiomatic that without the Canadian Pacific Railway, or some equivalent line, there would have been no Rocky Mountains National Park and no Banff townsite. As the nineteenth century form of mass transportation on land, the railway provided the essential link between the remote mountain community and the great population centres of eastern Canada and the United States from which its visitors were drawn. But the Canadian Pacific Railway did not confine its investments to the provision of transportation facilities. Rather, it sought to identify the mountain reserve (and indeed the entire Rocky Mountain and Selkirk ranges) as closely as possible with itself through extensive publicity and through the provision of elitist tourist services at the townsite.

The erection of suitable tourist accommodation facilities came first. William C. Van Horne, the indomitable general manager of the railway company, selected an impressive site for a hot springs hotel that overlooked the confluence of the the Bow and Spray rivers. As his architect he chose Bruce Price, a New Yorker who would be remembered for giving Canada a
distinctive national style of architecture known as chateauesque, a reference to its derivation from the elegant sixteenth-century chateaux of the Loire River valley. Work began on the hotel during the autumn of 1886 and was completed by the summer of 1888. Van Horne christened the stunning edifice the Banff Springs Hotel.

It was a remarkable structure, given its isolated location. Three full storeys high, with a gabled roofline that echoed the surrounding mountain peaks, it was an H-shaped building of cream-coloured veneer and cedar shingles. To take advantage of the engaging view of the Bow and Spray rivers, a rotunda was placed on the east flank of the hotel. Inside, the hotel was splendidly finished in pine and fir with a huge glass-covered octagonal rotunda which serve as the main lobby of the building. The upper floors of the structure opened onto the central hall in balconies in successive galleries, making it possible for the guests to leave their bedrooms "and gape down at the company assembled there." A large reading room, various parlours, dining rooms, smoking rooms, offices and a few guest rooms occupied any ground floor not taken by the central rotunda, while most of the area in the upper two storeys was devoted to guest accommodation, many of the rooms being en suite.56

While the Banff Springs could not live up to Van Horne's claim to being the finest hotel in the world, despite having cost some $250,000, it would long serve as the epitome of luxury in the Canadian Rockies.

Since an expensive hotel was useless without paying guests, the Canadian Pacific Railway naturally included
the Banff Springs among those services being promoted by its new publicity department. Aside from staffed promotions offices in Europe and the United States, the company's chief vehicles for advertising the mountains were illustrated pamphlets and annotated timetables. In the latter, among the dull pages of arrival and departure times, were inserted bombastic descriptive items that vaunted the natural wonders of the mountains, the luxury of the railway cars and the waiting hotels, and the varied delights appealing to sportsmen and adventurers. Illustrated with the finest engravings and the work of the nation's greatest photographers, these promotional materials proved seductive to thousands of tourists from home and abroad, who were actively encouraged to remember the Canadian Pacific Rockies.

The company made every effort to provide for the continuing pleasure and amusement of the tourist upon arrival at the Banff townsite. Because some two kilometers separated the Banff Springs Hotel from the railway station, the CPR established the CPR Transfer Company to provide suitable conveyances for tourists. These buggies and coaches came in a variety of sizes and served diverse needs. There were two- and three-seater and democrat buggies, as well as elegant town 'buses' said to be more luxurious than those on Fifth Avenue in New York City. In the 1890s the four- or six-horse tallyho was added to the fleet of conveyances. In winter, cutters
and sleighs saw service. Increasingly, these vehicles carried visitors to natural attractions throughout the small park. Under the supervision of Superintendent Stewart, touring roads had been cut beyond the townsite to Lake Minnewanka, to the Hoodoos of Tunnel Mountain, around the base of Peak Mountain (Mount Rundle), to the Sundance Canyon, and to the Vermilion Lakes. Beginning in 1890, the park laid out bridle paths to many other interesting features, which again expanded the list of experiences available to the local visitor.

When asked for information about the possibility of more extended tours of the countryside around Banff for the purposes of hunting, fishing or sightseeing, the railway had usually referred the interested guest to a local odd-job man and former packer for Major Rogers named Tom Wilson. Wilson had always kept quite a few horses on his homestead near Morley that he could bring into service on little notice, but by the early 1890s demand had increased to the point where he found it advantageous to open a commercial paddock at Banff townsite. It was not long before the small town could boast several packers willing to take touring parties deeper into the mountains. The CPR itself became directly involved in this expanding trade when it decided to erect a small overnight chalet for the adventuresome at Lake Louise, a scenic spot northwest of Banff that Tom Wilson had discovered in 1882.
A rough road linked the rustic log chalet to the train station at nearby Laggan after 1891. Two years later fire destroyed the chalet, obliging the CPR to replace it, this time with a finer, more substantial structure. The manager of this establishment seized the initiative and hired local Stoney Indians to construct a system of bridle paths and to guide visitors throughout the area.

Lake Louise soon became a haven for mountain climbing enthusiasts who had had their fill of Switzerland, the Himalayas and the tamer peaks of the United States. Once again, the CPR was instrumental in promoting a valuable tourism activity. This was particularly true after 1899, when the company engaged Swiss climbing guides to assist incoming expeditions. Prior to their arrival in the Rockies, the guides were the centrepiece of numerous promotional activities in Europe and eastern Canada designed to reinforce the notion of a Canadian Switzerland of magnificent, unclimbed peaks. As Hart has written, the CPR made a concerted effort during these years to develop the mountains "as a destination rather than promoting them as scenery en route...." Just as the company needed freight and passengers to make its prairie lines pay, it needed guests to justify its increasingly elaborate network of mountain resort hotels.

While the Canadian Pacific Railway was unrivalled in its development of tourist facilities in the Rockies, there were many other, less renowned entrepreneurs who
contributed greatly to the establishment of Rocky Mountains National Park as a first-class resort and to Banff as a community. Among the most prominent in early Banff were those businessmen who operated the bath houses.

Dr. R.G. Brett was unquestionably the most successful of the bath house operators. By virtue of his position as surgeon to the Canadian Pacific Railway at its collieries at Anthracite, Brett was uniquely placed to take advantage of the commercial opportunities at Banff, just 62 kilometers away. In 1885 he applied for permission to establish a combined hotel and hospital called the Banff Sanitorium, where he would serve as medical director for decades, on a site at the south end of the Bow River bridge. He promised that in exchange for a 99-year lease, or preferably on the basis of outright land purchase, he would erect "Bath Houses, a Summer Hotel, & other requisites for a first class summer resort for invalids...." All lumber for the structure was subsequently brought in by rail from the Lake of the Woods, Ontario, unloaded at Forty-Mile Creek, and floated 63 to the construction site. In 1886, he erected the Grand View Villa at the Upper Hot Springs. Shortly after, he added political muscle to his commercial strength in the community. In 1888 he was elected to the first Legislative Assembly of the Northwest Territories, where
he sat until 1901 and served as president of the Assembly from 1889 to 1891. Ultimately, he would become Lieutenant-Governor of Alberta.

Despite the urgency with which government officials felt it necessary to grant permission for the erection of private bath houses and other hot springs facilities, they were also very conscious of the need for regulation of all such operations. Superintendent Stewart was particularly active in advising them of local conditions and in soliciting their immediate comments. By May of 1886 there were enough invalids visiting the springs that he felt it timely to make several suggestions for the erection and conduct of bathing and medical establishments. Sensibly, he recommended that all plans for such structures be submitted to the Department of the Interior for approval prior to construction and, interestingly, that "the mode of laying out their grounds should be under the supervision of the Government agent as a safeguard against the disfigurement of the adjacent grounds of the Park generally." Furthermore, he believed that in the interests of sanitation and safety the government should install a main water pipe from the springs to which leaseholders could connect their own pipes for proper water distribution. His advice came none too soon. By the late summer, the Brett Sanitorium was well under way and the number of invalids seeking a cure had risen considerably. Stewart was pleased to report that the
"advantages of having a medical man on the ground to advise patients as to the proper mode of taking their baths is very manifest." During the next few years, the number of bath facilities increased markedly. The Banff Springs Hotel, which opened for business in 1888, was equipped with several bath tubs. A second hotel, called the Beatty House, soon joined the Grand View Villa at the Upper Hot Springs. Unfortunately, both burned only a few years after their erection.

While hot spring facilities on the right bank of the Bow were the raison d'être of the park, there was considerably more commercial activity on the opposite side of the river. This was the area in which most service establishments had been built, freely intermixed with the residences of business proprietors and their employees. Until the spring of 1886 there had been no permanent residents in Banff, just railway section men near Cascade Mountain and a few invalids who lived temporarily in tents near the hot springs. The town grew quickly, however, in response to the influx of visitors and the assurance of commercial opportunity. In 1887, Superintendent Stewart estimated that some 3,000 visitors had come to Banff. Most were from Canada and the United States. In the same year, 180 lots had been leased and there were about 650 permanent residents. Businessmen had opened two hotels at the townsite and four across the river, nine stores,
two saloons and boarding houses, two blacksmith shops, and two drug stores. There were also two post offices (one in town and one at the railway station), two churches, and a school with 25 pupils. Wooden sidewalks adorned the main streets and would, in 1890, be extended as far as the new railway station. The town expanded so rapidly, in fact, that in 1888 Stewart was obliged to disinter several bodies and relocate the cemetery beyond the fringe of the community.

The Devil's Lake (Minnewanka) townsite that Stewart had laid out began to grow when a hotel was erected in 1888. Some two years earlier the Canadian Pacific Railway had investigated the potential of the lake as a resort, but had taken no action. In 1889 the hotel proprietors, Disbrowe and Ryan, placed a steam launch on the lake, which proved extremely popular among guests and Superintendent Stewart improved matters by erecting a suitable wharf on the lakeshore.

The number of visitors to Banff rose steadily in response to the attractions and facilities put up by private investors and government alike. After climbing continually, the influx of visitors peaked at 7,250 in 1891. Stewart had expected that this level would be exceeded during the season on 1892, but "the small-pox found its way to Victoria and other parts of the Pacific coats in the month of July and the panic caused thereby told at once on the travelling public." Rather
unscrupulous railway operators in the northern United States exploited the outbreak to the fullest and brought about a significant diversion of traffic from the CPR mainline. Stewart also learned that many visitors were postponing their visit to Banff until 1893, when they could continue on to take in the World Columbian Exposition at Chicago.

Correct though Stewart may have been about the boost that the Chicago World's Fair could have given the park, he could not have foreseen the financial crisis that settled on the world in 1893. Although the superintendent tried to argue that the number of visitors was actually higher than hotel records suggested, his report failed to sound convincing. In 1894 matters worsened as serious flooding in the peak tourism months of June and July washed out much of the CPR mainline. By 1896 Stewart was reduced to commenting on the isolated position of Rocky Mountains National Park in relation to the major population centres of North America. And while the world waited out the depression, new activity at Banff virtually collapsed. Later, town pioneers would remember the period 1893 through 1897 as one in which business went "flat" and even "back some."

While business languished, it remained for the government to maintain the integrity of the national park. George Stewart seriously attempted, within a limited
appropriation, to enhance and add to the attractions of the park. In 1894 he had the upper storey of a building originally intended as his residence relocated to a central location for use as a natural history museum and library. The museum opened to the public in 1895. He ensured that the park's road and bridle path system was maintained and that extensive landscaping was conducted around all public buildings and along the main boulevards. New paint refreshed many of the government's structures as well. Later he began to petition his superiors to extend the boundaries of the park to permit the construction of additional bridle paths and to include more scenic attractions. These efforts earned him no rewards, however, as his method of administration was found to be inappropriate in 1897 and he was replaced by a younger man, Howard Douglas.

There is little evidence about the precise nature of Stewart's transgressions, but it has been suggested that both the dissatisfaction of the local community about his administration of leases and the change to a Liberal administration in Ottawa in 1896 affected his position. After his removal from the office of superintendent, the annual park report mentioned only that "complaint was made that the manner in which the affairs of the Park were being administered generally, was such as to cause much dissatisfaction amongst those who frequented the park, and more especially among persons who had business to transact
at the Superintendent's office in connection with land and other matters." About the possibility of his position falling victim to a political purge following the election of the new government, little can be said except that such official cleansings of the administrative system were common to the period.

Howard Douglas, who had been a coal and wood agent at Calgary for fifteen years, became superintendent in September of 1897 and at once revealed his enthusiastic character. In his first report on park activities, he commended Stewart's importation of three bison as a "source of great interest to tourists," and planned to bring in more head which he would keep in a paddock near Cascade Mountain on the road to Lake Minnewanka. He also indicated that he agreed wholeheartedly with Stewart's wish to expand the boundaries of the park in the interests of wildlife preservation and the cutting of more bridle paths. In fact, in this and many succeeding reports, there was little aside from unabashed enthusiasm that differentiated Douglas from his predecessor. He would, however, be the beneficiary of the return to economic prosperity with which his tenure as superintendent coincided, ensuring that conflicts between his office and local commercial interests would be minimized.
Public Response to the New Park

In 1888 CPR publicist George Ham wrote of Rocky Mountains National Park that no words "can give anything approaching a just idea of its numerous attractions -- it must be seen to be comprehended." Certainly the touring public of the Victorian era agreed with Ham, judging from the significant number of visitors that the resort received during its first two decades, but it is equally clear that many also felt compelled to attempt to write about their admiration -- and more rarely their contempt -- for the amenities at Banff. It is from their published accounts that one gains a sense of the attraction of a mountain spa in the late nineteenth century.

In those days everyone arrived by train. The train excursion was, of course, a part of the lure of Banff. Whether one came from the west coast, from the eastern seaboard, or from the northern United States, one was guaranteed a journey of unparalleled scenic variety and beauty. Many tourists seem, in fact, to have been enthralled by the very distances they had to cover to reach the resort and, in railroad timetable fashion, recorded the precise distances between each population centre. Others were equally taken with elevations and assiduously noted the height of every peak and the altitude of every major community. Still others spent most of their time documenting the changing vegetation of the plains, foothills, and mountains. Rarely was there a
mention of the boundless economic potential of the region that characterized all the available government literature. The journey was nothing if not a time of personal indulgence, of relaxation, of communion with nature.

Arrival at Banff brought mixed comments. There were those, like Stuart Cumberland, who saw not the "few log huts" that made up Banff in 1886, but rather the potential for a strikingly attractive community set in "a romantic glen." W. Henry Barnaby echoed this sentiment in 1888. He told of taking buggies to view the beauties of the neighbourhood, and drove first to the 'City', where there was more bustle going on in erecting houses than in any other place I had seen along the line. Everything was new; the 'City' consisted of at least as many tents as houses, but the preparations everywhere showed that in another year's time all this would be changed." "It is evident," he added rather unnecessarily, "that as yet Banff has not been spoilt by the tourist element." Mrs. E.H. Carbutt, a well-travelled British tourist who came just a year or so later, was delighted at the newly-opened Banff Springs Hotel and opined that "when this delicious place is better known, it will become the Switzerland of America." Unfortunately, her specific comments were seldom as favourable. When the Devil's Head was pointed out to her on a trip to Lake Minnewanka, she sniffed that
she "could not see any likeness to a head at all." As for a shop said to be operated by one of her countrymen from the South Kensington Museum, she was certain that "Professor Flower would faint if he saw those atrociously stuffed birds and beasts. There was a live beaver in a box outside, baking in the sun, which seemed very unhappy." What one saw at the little town of Banff depended very much on what one wished to see.

The renowned sulphur springs elicited comments of all descriptions, often reflecting mixed emotions. Some suggested that the Cave was "perfectly adapted for Purgatory;" others saw a "fairy-land" of stalagmites on the floor and "a dome of gems" above. Despite the scenic splendour of the springs, one British tourist with the unenviable name of Mrs. S.M. Somerset St. Maur was less than convinced by the pair of crutches she had seen hanging above a sign at the Upper Hot Springs that proclaimed "The owner of these has left the springs -- cured!" and was not reluctant to add that she had met persons suffering from abuse of the spring waters at Banff. The rustic log buildings that Superintendent Stewart had erected met with favour among most visitors, although Edward Roper was quick to add that while functional, they were "but the barest accommodations," which, "to us who had seen the way such places [spas] are provided and managed in older lands...looked supremely miserable." He did, on the other hand, feel strongly
about the curative powers of the spring water. During his stay he met many patients who could vouch for the correctness of the government claim of "benefits...to those suffering from various forms of rheumatic affections, skin diseases, malarial poisoning of long standing, anaemia, and the countless troubles which have their seat in weakness of constitution....sciatica, and other neuralgias are greatly benefitted." Roper was, however, less than enamoured of the healthy patrons of the resort. "On the whole," he remarked, "I don't think I was ever amongst such a dull, uninteresting lot of people."

They were not at all 'sick', far from it; they had merely come there for a holiday, a rest. The general occupation was to sit on the verandahs on the front of the hotel, doing nothing but smoking -- staring straight ahead. A few -- a very few -- read newspapers. I only recollect one man who was reading a book, and he, I believe, was an Englishman. One or two men talked occasionally, generally early in the day; towards afternoon they all got so weared that they appeared to become speechless. No one went fishing. No one took any interest in natural history; very few even plucked a flower. No one took the slightest notice of any natural object about, or if they did, they were ashamed of their weakness, and kept it very dark. I use to create a bit of wonderment by lighting my pipe with a burning-glass.93

Undoubtedly there were few visitors who cared to equal that particular talent.

Contrary to Roper's scathing indictment, most affluent visitors to the park engaged in a round of leisure activities restricted only by the rigidity of the trail system and the limited number of amusements. The
experiences of W.H.H. Murray, an American who passed through in 1887, are not at all unusual despite his reminiscing in what can only be described as the style of an arrested juvenile:

We never enjoyed a happier week than we spent at Banff. We rolled leisurely over the fine roads that the government had constructed, winding in and out along the bends of the Bow River, running along the base of the gigantic mountains and through the cool forests of the firs. We explored, with the curiosity and eagerness of boys, the secluded places, and followed the dim by-paths, not knowing or caring whither they led us, happy, whether they conducted us to some noble prospect or terminated suddenly at some dripping ledge. We searched for curious minerals in the sides of the mountains, translated the geological records of the cliffs, and collected polished pebbles from the bed of the foaming Spray. We slept to noonday under the pines, lulled to sleep by the Falls of the Bow, and fished, not in vain, for its noted trout in the rapids.

There were, at the same time, those who thought that the park did not offer enough amusements. Charles E.D. Wood, founder of the Macleod Gazette, visited Banff in 1890 and left with the impression that "life at the hotels soon become[s] very monotonous. While there is nothing to make Banff a big town, it does seem as if some means might be devised by the government of securing for visitors a greater variety of amusement."

The season for visits to Banff stretched from 15 May to the beginning of October, during which the Banff Springs Hotel remained opened. If descriptions of visits to the springs and of carriage excursions up Tunnel Mountain and to Lake Minnewanka seem to have been popular,
disquisitions on the quality of the two main hotels at Banff were a must. Even the sublimity of the surroundings appeared to pale before comments on the easy informality and rusticity of the Banff Springs Hotel. Charles Wood revelled in the view and the architecture:

The C.P.R. hotel is beautifully situated on the highest point in the valley, and is reached by a long, winding road. Outside, a verandah extends entirely around the building. From this verandah at the rear of the hotel, there is almost a sheer drop to the Bow River, several hundred feet below. From this height one can see several miles down the valley of the Bow River. At this point also, the Spray River rushes down to join the Bow. The view is a delightful one, and is beyond my power to describe. The interior of the hotel is beautifully finished in native polished wood. Rising up from the rotunda are four or five circular galleries, extending entirely around, from which open out drawing-rooms, bed-rooms, etc. The walls are painted in various patterns. The hotel cost an immense amount of money, some $200,000 I was told, and is certainly a model of perfection in every respect. Mr. Mathews is the popular manager. The charges are high, but not more so than one might expect in such a place.

British tourist J.W.C. Haldane was delighted more by the simplicity and informality of society at the hotel than by its visual ambience. She could scarcely believe that the ladies and gentlemen entered the hotel by the same door. They sat at the same tables. The former actually favoured those in the writing and reading rooms with their presence. They wrote and read with and talked to them with the greatest ease, and seemed delighted to do it too. They unitedly formed walking, and driving, and boating parties, etc....Oh, my! how these dear good people mixed with and talked with each other in the happiest manner possible, and yet in most cases they had never met before.

Few who saw the Banff Springs seemed critical, although Mrs. St. Maur did complain that the management turned the privately-generated electric lights off at ten o'clock, "a
most awkward custom."

All who mentioned Brett's Sanitarium referred to it as an ordinary hotel that had been erected principally to capitalize on the needs of invalids. Still, at half the price of the Banff Springs Hotel, it was palatable to many. One who thought he might find it so was the incorrigible Edward Roper, who subsequently seemed as displeased with his room and the service he received as he was with the remainder of the park. After being conveyed to the Sanitarium by the hotel bus, he and his companions were provided with rooms. "I can't say much for my room;" he complained, "it was very meagerly furnished, but it was 'good enough'." Similarly, the lobby was without a descent chair or lounge. In the morning, a clanging bell announced breakfast and he decended.

The room was almost in darkness, and we could just see that the cruet-stands were enveloped in gauze, and each sugar-basin covered with a piece of muslim. Why is this thus, we asked, and why this dim religious light? "To keep out flies," was the rejoinder; "besides, it keeps the place cool."

When we got our food we did not rejoice, though we were hungry. The salmon was baked till it rattled on the plate as if it were a bare bone. The steak was dried to the consistency of a chip, ditto the mutton-chop. The English breakfast-bacon was a fraud; one couldn't bite it. The coffee was a delusion, and we always wondered what rare herb they used to make the "English breakfast tea." But there were plenty of eggs. What a blessing it is they are always plentiful in that glorious land! There was very decent bread, so we did not starve.100

But even the misanthropic Roper had to agree that the view from the hotel was breathtaking. W.S. Caine, a British
member of Parliament who visited the park prior to the opening of the Banff Springs Hotel, related that Dr. Brett took him to the top of the hotel to "take in the general prospect."

We saw stretching out before us a broad, flat valley, about two miles wide, filled with primeval forest. The sombre green of pine and spruce contrasted with the brilliant yellow of the fading poplar and the vermilion of dying maple leaf; while the Bow River -- the loveliest on earth -- winds through the whole in a bright blue ribbon. Right in front towers the snow-capped Cascade Mountain....On the left the Castle Mountain range -- a magnificent panorama of eternal snow, reminding me somewhat of the Jungfrau group as seen from Lauterbrunnen; on the right the Devil's Head group, with the singular rock towering above the whole mass, justifying by its remarkable outline the Indian name of which this is the translation, while behind are the pine-clad Sulphur Mountains, and a terrific row of lofty crags known as "The Twins." The whole forms a panorama of mountains from 10,000 to 11,000 feet high, which for beauty and grandeur can only be equally by the Cortina dolomites in the Austrian Tyrol.101

Even with allowance for the good-natured exaggeration that colours most travel accounts, such were impressive comments on a national park less than a half decade old. That the writers were not unseasoned is evident in both their pedigrees and in the unconscious manner in which they continually alude to the world's resorts and natural attraction. These were veteran tourists, in the main, and their early enthusiasm for the nascent national park did much to ensure its future as a health resort of international stature.
Conclusion

The Canadian Pacific Railway had been constructed to open new resource regions of the country to development. To the government at Ottawa, the hot springs of Banff were yet another natural resource in a region of seemingly unlimited economic potential and, from the start, the government chose to evaluate the Rocky Mountains National Park in terms of profit and loss. The annual reports of superintendents George Stewart and Howard Douglas are replete with references to the percentages of return on the hot springs and leaseholds of Banff. In the language of the day, resources were 'useful' to the extent that they were utilized economically.

Of course no suggestion of profit reached public scrutiny, except when government members were reluctantly obliged to defend the park's existence in Parliament. Development of Rocky Mountains National Park was, on the contrary, cloaked in images of restorative cures and natural curiosities. There was nothing deceptive in this form of publicity, for there existed genuine concern among a growing number of Canadians that the natural resources of the nation had to be carefully husbanded to forestall their elimination. Yet such was the climate of the day that no undertaking that employed considerable public funding could be justified unless it turned a profit.

The earning of a profit was construed as a joint responsibility of government and private investors. In
this case, the Conservatives were extremely fortunate to be partners in development with the Canadian Pacific Railway, whose construction of the palatial Banff Springs Hotel established Rocky Mountains Park as a world-class resort. The railroad had its own balance sheet in mind, of course, yet it must be said that it spared no effort in providing visitors with various amusements on which to expend their generally ample funds. Few tourists complained, even during Banff's most primitive stage of development, of not receiving fair value during their stay. As for the invalids who frequented the springs in the hope of miraculous cures, there was undoubtedly some solace in the mere promise of good health and, to judge from numerous first-hand accounts, many earnestly believed that their health had been redeemed through travel to the Banff springs.

As development advanced at Banff, the government played a more indirect role in creating the community. Rather, it elected to control the nature of development through an elaborate system of regulations that dealt with matters of every description. This provided the government with the degree of management desired at any particular time and with the ability to modify regulations at will. As long as the Canadian Pacific Railway was the principal developer, the government had few reservations about the quality of the community at the springs. But as
the number of private investors increased, so too would tensions about the most appropriate forms of growth.
Seeking a Mandate for Rocky Mountains Park: Residential and Resource Development, 1902-1920

Introduction

From the beginning, Rocky Mountains Park was an anomaly. It stood as an island of conservation amid the torrential stream of natural resource development that swept through the North West in the wake of the Canadian Pacific and other rail lines. During the park's earliest years, there was little appreciation of the implications of this situation. But, as the twentieth century dawned and the conservation ethic began to permeate the consciousness of the nation's rising professional class, pressure arose to define more precisely the purposes of a national park.

It took years for the seriousness of the conflict to become apparent to those in power. This is not to say, however, that concern about preserving local wildlife and landscape did not exist within the civil service. The 1902 extension of the park boundaries to include an additional 10,360 square kilometers may be said to represent a considerable, if not particularly well conceived, triumph for the conservationists. Their inability to enforce the new mandate over such a vast territory was of course another matter. Yet this decisive
action had the ironic effect of heightening the sense of conflict between resource mandates, inasmuch as the park subsequently included dozens of new timber berths, collieries and other extractive industry sites.

The process of defining an appropriate mandate for the park occurred not in the field where the practical conflicts were well understood, but rather in the rarified atmosphere of Ottawa government offices where it was reduced to an academic exercise, to a contest of will among people of profoundly different philosophical positions. As administration gradually passed from strictly political appointees of dubious ability to individuals recruited for their academic and administrative merit, the issue became one of prominence in the Department of the Interior, which was responsible for park administration. The ensuing debate resulted in the creation of an entirely autonomous Dominion Parks Branch within the Department of the Interior in 1911.

This bureaucratic reorganization did not, however, resolve the issue of conflicting mandates. Like all new administrative units, the Dominion Parks Branch underwent a period of self-definition coupled with a search for suitable mechanisms through which to enforce its viewpoint. As a result of this policy interregnum, Rocky Mountains Park remained a place where conservation and development ethics constantly vied for dominance. All the park administration could do was attempt to minimize the
seriousness of the conflict at the local level through agility of compromise.

Resource Development in the Park

The relationship between construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the development of natural resources in the park area was profound. Until the line was built, it was clearly impossible to deliver any raw materials to the distant markets of eastern Canada and the United States. That this relationship was taken to be axiomatic by entrepreneurs is evident in the haste with which economic development followed the driving of the last spike.

Although most of these ventures were mining operations, one of the earliest involved the opening up of timber berths. Beginning in 1883, the Eau Claire and Bow River Lumber Company of Eau Claire, Wisconsin, obtained permission to cut timber from 259 square kilometers of land in several berths along the Spray and Kananaskis rivers. Even without a finished railway or good access to those rails already laid, this enterprise stood to be successful since its chief market was the growing community of Calgary on the fringe of the foothills, to which the logs could be floated down the rivers. In 1886 the firm established two mills in the mountains, one on the Kananaskis River and the other near the booming mining
town of Silver City near Castle Mountain. By 1892 the company possessed cutting rights in at least seven berths in the mountains, one of which was partially situated along Forty-Mile Creek within the Rocky Mountains Park. Three to five million board feet of timber were cut annually and mostly floated downstream to Calgary.

The mining town of Silver City, for which Eau Claire supplied much of the construction materials, sprang up quickly after reports of silver and copper discoveries there in 1881 reached the outside world. By 1884 the town had a population of some 350 and could boast a brick and lumber yard, a lime kiln, five stores, three hotels, two saloons, three butcher shops, a livery stable, and 153 residences. Four mines sustained the building euphoria and it has been claimed that the population ultimately reached 3,000. But when no silver was found and the other ore bodies rapidly ran out, the town was abandoned. By 1886 all that remained were empty buildings.

More permanent were the coal mining centres of the Bow Valley. The Canadian Pacific Railway, needing an assured supply of coal for its locomotives, proved instrumental in their development. The earliest minesite to be reserved was at Canmore, just east of the townsite of Banff. There mining began in 1884. Even four years later, however, the community was not much to see. It remained the railway divisional point it had become in 1883. D.D. Galletly, who would later become famous as the
custodian of the Cave and Basin, recalled that it was then still "a small insignificant centre. Entirely a railway hamlet. No Church, no school, no jail, and most astonishing but one hotel...." By 1890, Canmore had changed considerably, as the Canadian North West Coal and Lumber Syndicate had been working a mineface just a short way upriver from the town with great success. It had just diversified its operation to include a coking plant, which soon proved its downfall. In the same year, it sold its interests to the Canadian Anthracite Coal Company.

This firm had been formed in 1886 to interest some British investors in a coalface some 6.4 kilometers east of the townsite of Banff, directly on the CPR mainline. Around this colliery developed the community of Anthracite, which became a town of 300 people by 1887. Soon the company also purchased the Canmore Coal Company, a minor colliery that had been active across the Bow River from the townsite since 1887. With guaranteed contracts from the CPR, the future of the company seemed certain. But in 1891 financial difficulties intervened and it was obliged to lease all its operations to the H.W. McNeill Company. This move, as Lewis has suggested, "marked the beginning of a period of expansion in Canmore's fledgling industry." By the middle of the decade, some 54,420 tonnes of coal was being produced annually. Coal mining remained the principal economic activity at Canmore, even
after the townsite was included in Rocky Mountains Park after the boundary alteration of 1902. Anthracite did not fare as well. After both the town and the mines were inundated by a serious flood in 1897, the company began losing money which led to closure of the mine as a commercial operation in the opening years of the new century. Of course the demise of one coal-mining community augured well for the fortunes of the next, and in that sense the development of Canmore and Anthracite can be said to be linked.

Bankhead was the site of a third major colliery, situated about 6.4 kilometers north of Banff along the Lake Minnewanka road. The Canadian Pacific had become particularly interested in the possibility of re-opening an old coal seam near Cascade Mountain since it disliked the notion of total dependence on the Canmore mines, particularly with the threat of miners' unions on the rise. In 1902 the Brewster packing outfit of Banff was retained to freight in the supplies of a party of 14 'prospectors' to a former Cascade coal mine. Later it was learned that the prospectors were investigators from the CPR Natural Resources Department. As a result of their studies, the railroad decided to develop the seam. By 1905 an entire industrial complex had arisen on the flats below Cascade Mountain, while a model mining community was taking shape on the hill above. One 1905 account described the emerging town as follows:
All the houses in the town will be connected with a water system, which gets its supply from the pure mountain waters of the Cascade River. An up-to-date sewer system has been put in, and every house will be supplied with baths, etc. Twelve of the more expensive houses are supplied with hot-air furnances, etc. One of the neatest and most attractive general offices to be seen in the west is located here, and a large general store carries a line of goods equal to many cities of five times the population of Bankhead. A large hall is used for school, churches, etc. until the coming summer, when a large school and many churches may be built. The town will soon have one of the finest brass bands in the west, and, although not one year old yet, can claim a population of over 600 people, and numbers among its amusements curling, hockey, skating, tennis, football, baseball, and even a dancing club.

It was rumoured at the time that the town and related mine operations had cost the CPR some $7 million to establish.

At nearly the same time, the community of Exshaw was being built farther east down the valley to take advantage of the tremendous limestone deposits near Lac des Arcs. A group of prospectors from the Cement Company of Hull, Quebec, had discovered these deposits in 1904 and formed the Western Canada Cement and Coal Company in the following year to exploit them. Significantly, Sandford Fleming, the former chief engineer of the Canadian Pacific, was president of the company. A 2.8 hectare industrial plat and the adjacent townsite of Exshaw were laid out in a 243 hectare tract under Limestone Mountain and the company simultaneously acquired the rights to 144 hectares of coal-bearing land near Anthracite. All this occurred as the demand for cement in Canadian construction
escalated rapidly.

Resource communities literally peppered the expanded Rocky Mountains Park in this era of beginning industrialization. When the first coal seam of the Canmore Coal Company was exhausted in 1908, the firm opened a second some two kilometers away. This gave birth to Prospect, a hamlet of about 20 houses, which were linked to Canmore by a poor dirt road. Just two years later a British investment syndicate opened a mine about 4.8 kilometers west of Canmore and started the community of Georgetown to house the miners who supplied ocean freighters with fuel. Financial difficulties and widespread flooding ultimately led to the abandonment of the Georgetown collieries in 1916, when most of the buildings were either dismantled or moved to Canmore.

The copper shortage created by the Great War was sufficiently serious that the government felt that such mining might be justified within Rocky Mountains Park. Quartz deposits containing copper ore had been discovered near Castle Mountain by the Geological Survey of Canada in the 1890s and the government allowed staking of these claims for development in 1915. The Eldon Mining Company seems to have been most active in this work, with no fewer than six separate mineral claims staked. The scale of their operations compared to all others is suggested by the fact that the local railway siding was
called Eldon.

The impact of extractive mineral development within the park in the early years of the twentieth century is equaled only by the exploitation of its water resources for the purposes of generating hydro-electricity. In this undertaking, the conservation interests of the fledgling Dominion Parks Branch were scarcely considered in view of the desire of the federal Water Resources Branch to create an efficient (which meant monopolistic) hydro-electrical utility in southern Alberta. After the turn of the century, Calgary grew astonishingly in size which, coupled with growing regional industrialization, spawned an insatiable demand for electricity that could not be met by the plant owned by the Calgary Power Company at Horseshoe Falls on the Bow River. Consequently, beginning in 1910, the federal government received entreaties from the company to develop a second dams site at the Kananaskis Falls. Three years later, after amendments to both the Parks Act and the Indian Act which allowed development to occur in Rocky Mountains Park and on the Stoney Indian reserve, the company was granted permission to begin construction.

In 1912 the Calgary Power Company also received permission from the federal government to proceed with construction of an intake dam on Lake Minnewanka to store the waters of the Cascade River and Devil's Creek for its Horsehoe Falls plant. While this impaired the scenic
quality of the landscape as much as the Kananaskis Falls development, it was more serious because of its effect on the community at Lake Minnewanka. In fact, the raising of the water level of the lake was such that a part of the community had to be relocated. Devil's Creek also disappeared. The only stipulation the government seems to have made in relation to the park, aside from the issue of compensation for affected leaseholders, was that Calgary Power had to provide a power thimble for the provision of electricity to the townsite of Banff.

That timber berths, collieries, and power generation plants were developed within Rocky Mountains Park between its establishment and the conclusion of the Great War reflected in no uncertain terms the ambiguity of the park's purpose. While it is possible to explain the lack of concern about industrial developments lying outside the immediate Banff townsite area in the early years of the park's existence by reference to the park's small size and its limited objective of developing the hot springs, it is more difficult to appreciate the complacency with which such decisions were made after expansion of the park to include more than 1782 hectares in 1902. It has been argued, however, that this enormous expansion of the park was undertaken merely in anticipation of the difficulties that might ensue in attempting to reserve park lands once the province of Alberta was created in 1905.
This clear lack of concern about the preservation of the park's landscape and other natural features at the turn of the century betrays the youth of the conservation movement in this country. But the lack of government enforcement of such an ethic must not be taken to imply that none had been espoused at that date. Within the immense Department of the Interior bureaucracy that ruled Rocky Mountains Park, there was an increasingly vociferous minority who possessed a remarkably different view of resource utilization within national parks and attempted repeatedly to articulate it in a meaningful way through park regulations. Because these individuals were compelled to deal with a bureaucracy that had been established explicitly to assist the development of natural resources in the west, their struggle to have their voice heard was protracted. In the interim, the park administration continued to deal with issues that confronted it on an informal basis that was primarily concerned with the needs of the casual visitor and of the townsite leaseholder.

The Evolution of the Community

With the return of prosperity in the final years of the nineteenth century, the sagging fortunes of Rocky Mountains Park received a much-needed boost. As a result, the community of Banff grew in size and complexity and the annual tourist population rose considerably. Banff
matured as a community in these years. It acquired a sizeable resident population which perceived its interests as quite different from those of the surrounding mining towns, a distinctive architectural style, the formal organizations associated with comparably-sized towns throughout the west, and the mechanisms through which to articulate its special concerns. Accordingly, the tasks of the local administrators multiplied. It was not simply a matter of management that confronted the park authorities; new demands had arisen for a greater number of urban amenities such as water, electricity, and others, which could not be ignored. Local administrators found most of their time taken up by the practical matter of providing these and other services to the town resident and visitor. Consequently, there was ever less time to worry about defining a broader mandate for the park that could be pushed upon the officials at Ottawa. The power of local authorities to effect policy within the park rapidly eroded in the face of the mundane concerns that would soon provide the basis for a class of professional in-park administrators.

Several of George Stewart's townsite improvement policies continued after his dismissal in 1897. From the time of his arrival in 1886, he had tried strenuously to beautify Banff and the surrounding area through numerous tree plantings and annual dead timber cleanup campaigns.
With the assistance of officials from the Dominion Experimental Farm at Ottawa, he even tried to establish a permanent nursery at the foot of Cascade Mountain as a representative mountain 'garden' and as a source of plantings for the rest of the park where fire or man had damaged the natural scenery. There was some hope that through such actions the park might begin to resemble the scenic wonder that the federal government made it out to be in promotional literature. The continuation of this natural beautification programme led, by 1910, to the replacement of the townsite's former barren 'flats' look with a much more verdant and picturesque appearance.

Stewart had also taken the first steps to create an animal paddock, or zoo, for the park, and this too came to fruition in the early years of the twentieth century. His initial stock of animals grew from three bison to sixteen through the generosity of Lord Strathcona of Winnipeg and later included 30 bison, elk, Rocky Mountain sheep, moose, 20 deer, antelope, Angora goats, and yak. The gift of eight or nine varieties of pheasant from the vice-president of the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1904 then led to the establishment of an aviary and zoo, which was situated at the corner of Banff and Bow avenues. This site eventually included many different species, in addition to the pheasants, such as black bears, brown bears, grizzlies, red foxes, kit foxes, timber wolves, lynx, marmots, coyotes, cougars, badgers, martens,
porcupines, gophers, fox squirrels, black squirrels, Canada geese, hawks, golden eagles, bald-headed eagles, owls, pelicans, ringtail monkeys, rhesus monkeys, polar bear, raccoons, and orange squirrels. The resemblance of this inmate population to those 'verminous' animals mentioned in the 1886 Whitcher report on park wildlife is striking. The attraction proved to be an enormous success among park visitors.

The zoo and aviary were located next to the new government museum and administration building, which was erected in 1903. Erected at a cost of $7,500 with an additional $500 allotted for landscaping, this was a unique structure. Built in almost a pagoda style, the half-timbered building rose a full two storeys and was capped with a large belvedere that allowed plenty of natural light to enter the exhibit areas. The architect, John Stocks of the Territorial Department of Public Works, had tried consciously to evoke a "rustic design", and in doing so he managed to set something of a precedent for local architecture.

Possibly the first structure to emulate the museum design was meat baron Patrick Burns's new store directly across Bow Avenue. In 1906 R. Burton Deane of the local Royal North West Mounted Police reported that "Mr P. Burns is building a butcher shop of the same style of architecture as the museum." Simultaneously, the
Imperial Bank did much the same thing, although on a more elaborately scale, just across Banff Avenue from the museum. Reflecting on the grace and architectural detail of these new buildings, the police officer felt it imperative that the new police quarters being planned for Banff be a credit to the community. Certainly his sentiments were shared by many Banff residents who were erecting houses just after the turn of the century. The contemporary 'cottage' or 'bungalow' style that was proving popular in the United States was adopted as the prevalent local residential style, albeit with suitable modifications to give it a more 'rustic look.' Those modifications usually consisted of finishing in local materials such as logs or Rundle stone. In this fashion, the community achieved a distinctive architectural look that soon overshadowed the ramshackle buildings of the earlier years.

Much of this new concern about the appearance of the community stemmed from increasing pride about residing in a world-class mountain resort and the image that it projected to visitors. The formation of a Board of Trade in 1903 was perhaps the purest expression of this local sentiment. It would also be fair to say that the strong recovery made by the world economy in these years made durable the sense of attachment that many now felt toward the little community. Between 1901 and 1911 the permanent population jumped from 271 to 937, and one would be hard-pressed to find a more accurate barometer of economic
conditions in the town. By 1904-5 the spark of increasing business ignited a real estate boom in town. The peripatetic D.D. Galletly captured some of the enthusiasm with which local construction was being undertaken when he wrote to his children in the late winter of that year:

Mr. Wade is in the real estate business. He has put up a little shack on Mrs. Jack's [property] and all who have buildings to sell can leave work with him, and the price they want, and he'll do the best he can to sell them, or rent them, as the case may be on commission. Cobb's Rustle [sic] House is for sale $2,500 only, dear at $800....Dave White's brother-in-law has open'd up a Restaurant in Palmer's old place, Jordan from Calgary has an Opposition Restaurant in Lumley's old dwelling house. George Paris is putting in a large window in front of his Barber Shop, Opposition has driven George to do that. So meals at all hours is booming in Banff. The Opera House is rapidly nearing completion. Also the Brewster Departmental Store. Another large building is being erected between Palmer's old place and Brett's smithy. No one seems to know what it is going to be. Some say a Livery Stable, and others say a piano warehouse....There will soon be room for another drugstore here if the boom lasts.26

It was indisputably the era of improvement in Banff. By 1904 the character of the community had begun to change dramatically as the wooden, irregularly-scaled and false-fronted frontier look of Banff Avenue swiftly gave way to a new brick and stone block symmetry between Bow Avenue and Wolf Street. In 1904 alone, the Brewster Brothers erected new stables for their thriving packing and outfitting business, the King Edward Hotel took shape at the corner of Banff and Caribou, Dave White made $3000 worth of improvements to his general store, the Park Hotel
opened for business, and A.S. Marsh invested an additional $3000 in facilities at his Alberta Hotel, the Bow River Boat House started renting bicycles on the side, Morrison and Bradford started the Dominion Store, and the Banff Mercantile Company took over John Walker's 'Peoples' Store.' Such growth was unprecedented in the settlement.

Improvement also meant modernization, the acquisition of urban amenities such as water and sewer, electricity, and fire protection. Provision of such utilities was a task that fell to the federal government, since the community possessed no corporate autonomy within the park. When the Canadian Pacific Railway began construction of its model mining town at the Bankhead collieries in 1904, the federal government moved quickly to ensure that the town of Banff would receive electrical service. By September of the year all the needed poles and wires had been put in place and just four weeks later the current was turned on. The main power house that supplied the townsite contained generators capable of maintaining 6,000 incandescent four-watt bulbs, as well as 20 arc lamps of 60,000 candle-power, 10 of which were to be in Banff. All power for the town passed through a small electrical substation located at the foot of the cemetery on Buffalo Street. Initially, arc lighting was installed from the Banff Springs Hotel to the railway station, and from the
Bow River bridge to the Cave and Basin.

In the spring of 1905 a rumour spread through the community to the effect that the government was about to construct a modern water and sewer system. Indeed, Howard Douglas had written his superiors a year earlier to call for such works, which he felt were badly needed if poorly-drained Banff was to retain its image as a health resort. After nearly a year of deliberation or procrastination, Ottawa concurred and sent out a civil engineer from the John Galt Engineering Company of Toronto to estimate the cost of construction. A wood pipe gravitational system with iron service main came to $62,000. He chose Forty-Mile Creek as the best source of water, concluding that it could deliver 94.6 million litres per day, enough for a town of 50,000, at a level of pressure sufficient for both domestic and fire use. He also found that the cost of a satisfactory sewage system draining into the river near Bow Falls would be $33,000. Construction began in May of 1905, but was still underway as late as the summer of 1906, which did not please the impatient townspeople. The blame for this delay, according to both irate Banffites and Howard Douglas, lay squarely on the contractors, who proceeded in what was described as "an inept and sluggardly manner." As the central main neared completion in July, Douglas was barely able to suppress his excitement over his imminent ability to keep down the dust on the main streets and at the
museum grounds through regular water from the hydrants.

It seems likely that the initial installation of water lines, which was not completed until the late autumn of 1906, extended only along the central streets of the business section of town and to the Banff Springs Hotel, as the government was reluctant to service areas where revenues from water charges would be too low to recoup its investment. This is corroborated to some extent by two subsequent decisions about extension of water service in the community. The first was a 1906 decision to extend service along the kilometer-long Cave Avenue. There were only four cottages built there, but Douglas informed his superiors that nearly all the available lots had been leased and "in all probability within two years there would be enough residents along the road to warrant [sic] the extension." Douglas argued that it would be less expensive to install this line while the contractors were still in town. The second was a decision of 1908 to extend service north and west from Buffalo Street as far as Wolf and Otter. Presumably, trenching for the sewage system followed the same pattern of development. The fact that only occupied lots were serviced meant, however, that in 1913 the government was obliged to contract for installation of at least another 128 connections. But even the best efforts of the government to provide citizens with good water and sewage service could not
satisfy everyone. During an obviously slow newsweek in the spring of 1916 the local newspaper editor thought it appropriate to pen an editorial about the town's water valves:

Among the dangers of Spring in Banff are the water turn-offs which protrude from two to six inches above the sidewalks. Why these things were ever placed in the centre of the sidewalks, while they would answer the same purpose on the side of the curb, puzzles the ordinary intelligence. But they are there, a perpetual source of danger to pedestrians, and especially children. There are many skulls worth hardly anything when kept whole, but the park appropriations may have to be increased several thousand dollars to meet compensation for cracking the heads of people who stumble over these protuberances.41

An adequate water supply meant that proper fire protection was available for the growing community. This was a must now that substantial commercial blocks dominated Banff Avenue and residences were reaching up the slope of Tunnel Mountain. Hydrants had of course been installed along all the main boulevards when the water system was put in, and in September of 1906 a volunteer fire brigade was formed, consisting of 28 local men and 42 304 metres of hose. The growth of the town in the next seven years was such that an engineer with Fire Insurance Underwriters recommended that a second water main be installed to ensure that adequate pressure was available to fight a large fire. This action did not prevent Banff's seasonal frozen pipe problem, which had serious consequences in February of 1914 when the King Edward Hotel caught fire. Despite the fact that the
conflagration was detected early, the fire brigade could do little more than stand idly by as all the hydrants in the immediate vicinity were frozen. To make matters worse, when the seven-year old chemical engine got to the scene, it was found to be without chemicals. In desperation, the fire-fighters ran a long hose down to the hydrant at Caribou and Bear, only to find that the hose had rotted and was useless. The cost of the King Edward loss was placed at $47,425, while damage and looting at the Brewster store amounted to $15,000. The Board of Trade reacted to this disgusting situation by placing the chemical engine in the museum, where it belonged, and by issuing a stern warning that hydrants must be kept thawed in winter. By 1920 the initial enthusiasm for fire protection had waned, however, and the secretary of the fire brigade felt it imperative that the government agree to pay members of the brigades for their time at fires. The Dominion Parks Branch felt that it was contributing sufficiently to fire protection through the donation of all necessary equipment, for which no town resident was charged, and that the residents themselves should take a more active role in protecting what was, after all, their own property.

The administration had begun to feel that better citizen protection was needed, not just in the event of fire, but against disease and crime as well. In 1904
Howard Douglas requested that a permanent health officer be appointed to Banff. It seems that some form of arrangement had been made with Dr. Brett to act in that capacity in 1902, but Douglas felt that Brett was not taking his responsibilities seriously. Similarly, Douglas was instrumental in calling for better police protection within the park. The Banff detachment consisted of just two men, Constables Blyth and Shoebottom, and in 1904 there were additional constables only at Canmore and Laggan (Lake Louise). Douglas pointed out that there were 400 coal miners at Canmore, 60 miners at Anthracite, and 300 residents at Banff and "unless there is increased police protection, the park will not be safe for families to come to this year." The superintendent was partially reacting to local pressure about the rowdyism caused by drunken miners around town and the alleged insobriety of Constable Blyth and his "intimacy with a certain class of the population" as well as voicing his own concerns about increased tendency for local miners to dynamite fish and shoot game in the park. Upon investigation, however, the police declared that the situation had been exaggerated and that the local citizens were reacting more to the trouble they anticipated than to any that actually existed. Consequently, no increase in the size of the local police force occurred.

Between 1901 and 1911 the population of Banff had
increased four-fold and the community was poised, like most other western settlements, for another period of rapid growth. Throughout the country as a whole, the speed with which growth had occurred over the past decade gave rise to a reaction that came to be known as the City Beautiful movement. While the philosophy underlying the movement harkened to the pastoral musings of the eighteenth century, in practical terms it implied a new concern for the urban environment. For uncontrolled building and thoughtless urban eyesores, it would substitute community planning. For cheek-by-jowl commercial construction, it would substitute intermittent parkland and more recreational facilities. Gestures such as these would, it was believed, make urban centres more hospitable and healthful places to live. In a centre such as Banff, which had always been envisioned as a pleasure resort of the highest calibre, the movement gained many adherents once articulated by federal government planners.

The idea to hire a landscape architect seems to have come from Edward Deville, the Surveyor General, who was overseeing a series of surveys in the park in 1913. In May of that year he wrote to J.B. Harkin, the Commissioner of Dominion Parks, to suggest that "the services of a landscape architect be procured to advise upon a general plan of development," as "neither I nor the surveyors on our staff [are] in that line and the best results will not
be obtained without the advice of a person qualified by training and experience in that kind of work." He noted that Thomas Mawson, the renowned British landscape architect who was then developing a plan for the City of Calgary, would probably not be available and that the Branch might approach either Brett and Hall or the Olmstead Brothers, both of Boston. Either would be expensive, he wrote, but "no money could be expended to better advantage." He further noted that his surveyors were currently laying out a new villa lots area at Banff, to be called the St. Julien subdivision, and that the advice of a sound landscape architect would be of enormous benefit in maximizing the building potential of the area.

The government apparently decided to approach Mawson while he was still at Calgary and, with his concurrence, made a request to the Privy Council for an appropriation of over $9,000 to cover his fees for devising a scheme for 121.5 hectares of villa lots and another for the townsite as a whole. In December Mawson presented recommendations for the townsite as a whole, suggesting that perhaps the villa lot planning was undertaken at the same time, and perhaps not at all. There were several key elements to his plan. He recommended the establishment of a major recreational centre just north of the Cave and Basin road on marshland which the government would have to reclaim through a proper drainage system. This, he thought, should be linked to the townsite and the road system from
Calgary via a new bridge across the Bow at the confluence of Echo Creek. Within these grounds, he suggested a race track, pavilions, a baseball diamond, and a football pitch. In winter, a kilometer-long toboggan slide could be developed from the top of Sulphur Mountain to the recreation centre.

Vehicular traffic within the community was an increasing concern, and Mawson recommended creating a traffic circle of sorts at the intersection of Banff Avenue and Elk Street, with ample room allotted for new administration buildings that could be viewed directly from the railway station. He felt that Lynx Street should be carried directly through to the Bow River bridge — which was in such poor shape that he recommended its replacement with one of concrete — rather than intersecting awkwardly with Banff Avenue. With respect to access to the town, he argued for construction of a new road that would follow the benches on the east side of Tunnel Mountain, cross the Bow just east of its junction with the Spray, and then enter the townsite past the Banff Springs Hotel.

Specific recommendations about other facilities in the community included the removal of the zoo from its location near the museum to a spot about 275 metres east of the station on the north side of the tracks. There a proper plan for the zoo could be instituted, and Mawson
suggested laying it out as a ellipse with a large aquatic bird pond in the centre and animal cages radiating outward from it. This would allow for future expansion and would place the zoo closer to the buffalo paddock at Cascade Mountain. He further recommended that the government open the middle hot springs to commercial development, so that bathing facilities might be closer to the hotels of the town. Seemingly the only aspect of Banff about which he did not have an suggestion for improvement was its scenic landscape, which he felt his plans complemented.

If the opinion of the editor of the Crag and Canyon can be taken as representative (a doubtful proposition at best), Mawson's plan met with a decided lack of sympathy in town. He mused that a new bridge to the proposed recreation grounds might conceivably be a great convenience to picnickers, but he grieved about the effect of this traffic diversion on local businessmen, "to whom life is not one long continuous picnic." As far as creating a loop road around Tunnel Mountain and developing the middle springs, he felt much better but could not refrain from chiding Mawson for his lack of originality as the townspeople had been clamouring for both for years. Rather than more bridges, the editor would have preferred to see improved roads. Moving the zoo seemed all right, as long as the $1,500 polar bear pool and the monkey house that were installed just a year earlier remained where they were. And, as for leaving the local shrubbery and
other natural beauties as they were, the editor heaved a sigh of relief and said "let us offer up sincere thanks that the same old trees will shade us during summer rambles, and that the giant peaks we have learned to love will not be shuffled about until their identity is lost."

Due to slashed appropriations during the war years, the administration was not able to follow through on many of Mawson's suggestions. Two major exceptions were the development of the sports grounds complete with a recreational pavilion designed by a colleague of Frank Lloyd Wright and construction of a new Bow River bridge in 1921. The administration did, however, soon find a limited means of carrying out improvements to the park within a restricted budget, for in 1915 the base of Castle Mountain became the site of an internment camp for enemy aliens.

During the early days of the Great War, the government saw fit to incarcerate many citizens of enemy powers and others of Middle European ancestry in the hope of thwarting subterfuge by enemy agents and avoiding general disturbances. One large internment camp had been established at Lethbridge, but in the spring of 1915 it was decided to transfer most of the inmates from there to Rocky Mountains Park where their labour could be put to good use in maintaining visitor facilities. Park
superintendent S.J. Clarke, the former commissioner of the City of Calgary, had already prepared a camp site 4.8 kilometers west of Castle Siding. Captain O.L. Spencer, who had been sent out to inspect the site, found it less than satisfactory. He complained that it was set up in such a way that it would not accommodate our troops properly; no provision had been made for stores, and Government teamsters had erected their Camp -- including their stable-tent -- in the centre of the proposed Camp-site. The water supply was of such a nature that I did not consider it to be healthful. Through the continued rains -- the Camp-site being low, with no drainage, it was very wet; and in some places partly covered with water.

The supply of tents was also inadequate, and a number were in such a condition that on trying to put them up I found they were too rotten.57

Spencer was so aghast at the condition of the proposed camp that he requested his commanding officer, Major Duncan Stuart, inspect it himself, as Spencer "did not wish to have the entire responsibility of accepting or condemning a site." Stuart agreed with his subordinate and immediately relocated the campsite about half a mile to the west. There a more suitable camp was laid out to a size of 36 by 73 metres and surrounded by a 20-strand, 3.6 metre barbed wire fence to prevent escapes.

The internees began arriving in the middle of July. At first there were 60 of them, all from the Lethbridge camp, who were immediately put to work cutting brush and generally clearing the camp-site. Two days later they were joined by a second group of 60, and three days later another 71 arrived. There were 18 guards for the 191
inmates. The camp commandant reported that while the 'prisoners' showed little thought of escape, most had quickly learned that they had 'compatriots' working as sectionmen on the CPR which had led to the escape of one within days of arrival. In the main, the inmates cut brush along the tracks in the hope of lessening the risk of fire from passing locomotives as well as to enhance the park's appearance by providing a more open look. Once that work was completed, they were to begin laying out a motor road, which entailed considerable work in the dense bush and led to regular attempts at escape. Most got no further than Sawback before being captured again.

Each day the internees rose at 5:30 a.m., dressed and washed, made cooking fires, ate breakfast, and marched down the road to their day's work. They laboured from 7:00 a.m. to 11:30, took an hour and a half break, and then worked steadily till 5:00 p.m. When one work gang once arrived back at camp too early for dinner, the officer in charge decided to lock them up without food. The rest of the men refused to eat as a protest.

It is difficult to gain a clear impression of what they townspeople thought of the Castle Camp. When first told that a 'prisoner of war' camp was to be located in the park, many apparently believed that the provisioning business would compensate for the drop in tourists during the war. They were then under the impression that there would be about one guard for every four internees and,
when this proved false, they complained to Superintendent Clarke. When the camp was relocated to the townsite for the winter months, the apprehension of some citizens may well have grown as camp guards were repeatedly found drunken in the hotel bars and on the streets and had been known, on occasion, to smash windows in the orderly room.

In mid-November the officer in charge of Military District No. 13 inspected the winter camp and took the opportunity to hear complaints from the inmates. He found that they were housed in two large huts, holding 87 and 90 men respectively, on the side of Cave Avenue. Two others were in the course of construction. He agreed that the huts were too dark and recommended the installation of additional windows for light and ventilation. The men slept on handmade palliasses filled with hay. Blankets were plentiful, but many of the men said they had poor shoes and overalls and no change of underwear. While the food was good, the portions were insufficient, and many prisoners called for more ethnic ingredients like sauerkraut. Still, few had gotten ill on the bland carrots and turnips they complained of. A subsequent statement from the commander of internment operations suggested that although the 'prisoners' were indeed obliged to work outside in the cold, "if they had to depend upon themselves for furnishing their own food they would be content with much less than what is now given them."
The more personal complaints of the internees were of two types. The first involved the lack of communication with the outside world. Many wished to know what was being done about support for their wives. And, although 120 of the prisoners were Ruthenians, no translator had been provided for them and they called on the inspector to rectify this so that they could write to their friends and families. The other type of complaint turned on the behavior of the camp guards. One man spoke of being struck with a rifle butt for refusing to work when sick, another told of being shot at for staying 'too long' in the latrine, and yet another said he had been ordered to work at the point of a revolver. The inspector promised to investigate every such case. It was learned later than most of the allegations were true. This, the commander of internment operations lamented, was "to be regretted, and, I am sorry to say, by no means an uncommon occurrence at other Station[s]." Soon after the camp commander, Major 65 Stuart, was relieved of his duties.

By January of 1916 the temperature had fallen precipitously and the men began to complain of inadequate clothing. The camp journal recorded, with evident surprise about such complaints, that no men except those on firewood detail had to work outdoors once the temperature reached 24 below zero Fahrenheit. A second inspection of the camp in mid-February of 1916 determined that much of the clothing was indeed inadequate and that
no provisions whatever had been made for a hot mid-day meal in the bush, which meant that the men had to eat frozen food. The inspector also did not think much of the practise of having the men on duty about 85 hours per week simply because they had to walk 6.5 to 9.5 kilometers (and sometimes as many as 21) each way to the work sites. He strongly urged that these matters be corrected at once.

A third inspection occurred in May, mainly to determine whether conditions had improved at the camp. By then there were 429 internees, still housed in the four huts, although no one complained about these conditions. The provisions list had been modified to include substitutions such as those requested by many of the men and heartier portions were now allocated. The work still consisted of road building, quarrying and stone-crushing at a distance of some 4.8 to 6.4 kilometers from the camp, but all who worked at a greater distance were now transported daily by wagon. The inspector also reported that the men were paid 25 cents per day for their labour, which was held in trust for them until the conclusion of the war, with a monthly allowance of three dollars for tobacco, candy, and other 'luxuries.' Overall, he believed that conditions were now "very satisfactory."

In June the camp moved back to Castle and soon the escape attempts began anew. One recorded incident of August suggests the manner in which these incidents were
treated by the guards. The reference to the internees as prisoners of war is typical of the manner in which the aliens were perceived by the soldiers in command.

Prisoner of War #290 -- Pete Konowalczuk -- with two other Prisoners of War attempted to escape about 11 a.m. today west of camp near Eldon [Siding]. Pte. McAddie is charge on grubbing -- they broke into the bush, and were followed by a fusilade of shots from various guards. #290 dropped, hit -- got up, ran on and fell again -- the other two held up their hands and surrendered. [#290] was shot through the body from behind, thru the top of hip bone and thru the abdomen.70

While there are no records about the camp after December of 1916, it may be presumed that this routine of bush-cutting, complaints about meals, and attempted escapes continued to the end of the war. The park benefitted to some extent from the presence of the internees, yet the superintendent was never reluctant to fault the men for their poor attitude toward 'their work.'

The winter internment camp at Banff was not what progressive Banffites would have classed as an improvement to their world-renowned spa, yet it reflected the undeniable fact that Banff had never been insulated from the currents of world events. Like other communities in western Canada after the turn of the century, Banff experienced a tremendous economic boom that saw its population and services expand enormously in a short period of time. As in other towns, this brought the common demands for more and better amenities such as electricity and running water. The City Beautiful movement that
affected the town just prior to the war again demonstrated the extent to which Banff was fast losing its Shangri-La character. In this context, the war was merely one more ungovernable episode in the integration of Banff into the larger community beyond the splendidly remote Rockies. In the years ahead, this combination of a complete addiction to the developmental trends of other communities and the unavoidable exigencies of world events would complicate the administration of the townsite enormously.

Towards a New Philosophy of Park Administration

The local demographic and social forces propelling Rocky Mountains Park towards new forms of in-park administration came at a time when the structure of Canadian (and indeed North American) society was becoming increasingly amenable to fundamental organizational changes. Evidence of this shift was ubiquitous. Universities moved away from liberal arts programmes to a greater number of professional degrees. The civil service of the country switched to a merit basis for appointments, predicated on the writing of competitive examinations. Professional special interest groups formed lobbying associations that pressured government for specific forms of legislation and attempted to influence public perceptions of issues previously considered to have few social ramifications. Throughout society, there was a generalized movement toward the articulation of a much greater range of special
interest concerns, framed in terms that carried increasingly universal appeal. The manner in which important changes were formulated and implemented was undergoing a swift and radical alteration. Growing public and professional appreciation of the natural resources conservation ethic was one such development that had serious consequences for the evolution of the Canadian national park system.

The shift to a new view of nature was most pronounced among those whose lives and livelihood were most affected by the staggering rapid decline in available resources. Groups such as the Ottawa Valley lumbermen and the Ontario foresters organization were in the forefront of the movement toward controlled resource development, or conservation as it was known. However remote the particular interests of such groups might seem from developments within Rocky Mountains Park, they were quite the opposite. Because the depletion of natural resources became apparent first in the forests of eastern Canada, close to the heart of decision-making power in this country, its effects tended to be extrapolated to include the entire nation. This meant, in effect, that governmental officials soon began to take a somewhat longer view of natural resources development on the closing frontier as well. Once the settlement of the west was completed and the full force of industrialization was
brought to bear upon its resources, regulation of their use would become imperative if they were to be husbanded for future generations. Such an ethic may have been difficult to convey to the prairie farmer to whom most natural living things were enemies to be eradicated in the interests of better crops, but there were few obstacles to its implementation within the government-operated national parks. Just as Frederick Taylor would apply scientific management to factories to increase production in the United States, so too the Canadian government would enforce the pragmatism of the conservation ethic to maximize the productive life of natural resources. There was no contradiction in the application of a doctrine of utilization to the national park system, for it was well understood among conservation advocates that the aesthetics of nature had a definite value to all Canadian as well.

In Canada, those involved in the conservation movement were often connected with a resource development portfolio of government, to which they had gravitated in their professional lives through a firm belief in the value of resources. They tended to view resources not just as economic commodities, but also as the components of the ideal retreat from the evils of industrialism and its attendant materialism. The dualism of their perspective allowed them to appreciate the sublimity of nature's aesthetics while never neglecting the seeking of
revenues that government policy demanded. In their delicate balancing of these elements, they gradually found a means of justifying natural resource preservation and recreational development within a bureaucracy still dominated by economic development oriented individuals whose view of the nation's wellbeing tended to correspond to the bottom line on a profit and loss sheet.

Before the advocates of conservation could implement their ideas, they had either to persuade their bureaucratic colleagues of the legitimacy of their views or to gain power within an element of the bureaucracy where they could wield power and influence decisions about natural resource management. The route they followed, probably unwittingly, combined the two strategies within the crucible of rising international concern about resources management. What may well have been rather poorly articulated views of conservation coalesced into a much more meaningful programme of objectives after the National Conservation Conference that was attended by Canadian officials at Washington in 1909. This seminal North American convention dealt with the full range of resource concerns and concluded with a resounding declaration of principles that effectively delineated the need to manage natural resources effectively. More importantly, in practical terms, both the United States and Canada agreed to establish non-partisan conservation
commissions to oversee the formulation of appropriate policies. In the coming years, the Commission of Conservation provided the framework for policies on water resources, public health, town planning, wildlife, forestry, and other issues of the time.

The shift in government circles to greater appreciation of the need for efficient resource management contributed to the decision to establish a Dominion Parks Branch separate from the Forestry Branch under which its responsibilities had been subsumed. In part, this was a reflection of the growing number of national parks. By 1908 there were six. Howard Douglas, as superintendent of Rocky Mountains Park, had been appointed Chief Superintendent of Dominion Parks at that time. By 1911, however, it was evident that the administration of the park system was sufficiently complex to warrant the creation of a distinct Parks Branch. This was accomplished through passage of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act of May, 1911, which had immediate consequences for Rocky Mountains Park. On the eastern slopes of the Rockies, the government established a 6.48 million hectare forest reserve which permitted the diminution of Rocky Mountains, Jasper, and Waterton Lakes national parks. Rocky Mountain Park lost thousands of hectares and became a more manageable 729 hectare park. More important by far, however, was the appointment of James B. Harkin as the new Commissioner of Dominion Parks,
where he would remain until 1936.

Known to his friends as "Bunnie", J.B. Harkin was born in 1875 at Vankleek Hill, Ontario, just east of Ottawa, and first worked as a parliamentary correspondent to the Toronto News and the Montreal Herald. In 1893 he joined the Ottawa Journal and soon rose to the position of city editor. When Minister of the Interior Clifford Sifton asked P.D. Ross, Harkin's employer, to assist him in the recruitment of a political secretary in 1901, Ross recommended Harkin. Harkin accepted the position, which he retained after Sifton's replacement as Minister by Frank Oliver of Edmonton in 1905. He must have made a considerable impression within the vast Department of the Interior, for in 1911 Oliver advised him of the imminent establishment of both a Dominion Parks Branch and a Water Resources Branch and then invited him to choose one to head. He selected the Parks Branch.

Harkin entered into his new responsibilities at a time when the entire parks system was experiencing a cataclysmic change that stemmed from the growing acceptance of the automobile as a means of transport. The crude yet serviceable vehicles of the day wrought a revolution in visiting patterns at parks like Rocky Mountains. Thousands of tourists from centres like Calgary, Edmonton and Vancouver, as well as from the small towns in between, no longer had to plan their trips to
Banff weeks or perhaps months in advance, make train reservations, and prepare to spend considerable sums on hotel accommodations and daily meals. It became increasingly possible to undertake short trips to the mountains, especially from the booming city of Calgary, to enjoy a picnic and the mountain air for just a weekend. Within a few years, special bungalow camps would be established specifically for the use of automobile travellers. Picnic and camping grounds would proliferate. Outdoor, backcountry recreation would give way to 'sight-seeing' that was restricted to the circuit of automobile roads. All this was in the future as Harkin came to the administration of national parks, yet he was prescient enough to understand exactly the nature of the revolution taking place and worked diligently within an often indifferent government to assist it.

Harkin possessed a rare and valuable combination of attributes that contributed enormously to his success as Dominion Parks Commissioner. He was both philosophical and pragmatic, and seems to have enjoyed a sure grasp on the rapidly changing climate of opinion within the country. With his background in parliamentary reporting and in the Department of the Interior, he had an essential understanding of the realities of political life and of the prevalent view of natural resource utilization. To this widespread acceptance of the economic benefits of resource development he would always pay homage. The
difference with Harkin lay in the attitudes that conditioned his developmental priorities. In his 1914 annual report to the department, for example, he first demonstrated that tourism dollars were the fourth most important source of revenue in the country and then went on to state that while "the commercial side of parks...constitutes a real service to the people of Canada...the most important service which the parks render is in the matter of helping to make Canadian people physically fit, mentally efficient, and morally elevated." This was precisely the sentiment that informed all the valuable work of the Commission of Conservation. It was an effective plea, for it seemed to resolve one of the fundamental dilemmas of the day: the reconciliation of rampant materialism with spiritual wellbeing, commercialism with humanitarianism.

During his many speaking engagements and in his many reports and essays, Harkin used his considerable journalistic skills to elaborate on his view of the value of national parks. To him the national park was a playground dedicated to indulgence of the 'play-spirit.' This, he believed, seems to be one of the strongest instincts in the human being. People strive for wealth chiefly in order that they may provide themselves with more pleasure and more play; they emigrate from one country to another, not so much to secure better food or clothes, as to enable themselves financially and otherwise to do better, in order that they may introduce more joy into their lives. The dominant
character of this play-spirit of humanity is indicated by the gigantic sums of money people spend annually upon it. Travel, theatricals, ball games, athletic contests, golf, automobiles, clubs and race courses, -- all these and many more are sought by man through his instinct for play. The marvellous development in connection with the moving-picture business is evidence, if any were necessary, that the poorer people share equally with their richer brothers the craving for joy and recreation.

In the final analysis, people play because of the results that follow, whether the play be in the form of athletics, or entertainments, or outings, it matters not, they feel -- they know -- they have been benefitted by it; the recreation has been a tonic for them...It therefore seems that play is essential to the well-being of man; if he is weakened, play is one of the most important means to effect his restoration.

The general desire for outdoor recreation that was currently sweeping the continent originated, he believed, "through recognition of the fact that modern social and industrial conditions are resulting in a suppression or a perversion of the 'play-spirit'." Canadians should heed the lesson of Great Britain, he warned, before they became physically and morally bankrupt. National parks were an essential part of their redemption, for "contact with Nature is one of the necessities of life." For this reason, he advocated the extension of the national parks system throughout the country while land was cheap and plentiful.

The nature of the intended revolution was simpler to describe that it was to implement. Harkin began not with a pristine mountain park on which to etch his philosophy, but rather with an immense, under-staffed wilderness surrounding an enclave of growing sophistication and
opportunism known as Banff townsite. These facts, coupled with steadily rising tourist levels (and therefore demands) in Rocky Mountains Park, dictated a more pragmatic approach to local administration than Harkin would perhaps have liked to see. Many years of trial and error would be required to define a practical mandate for the park. Ultimately, its mandate became one of compromise, of tension-filled partial reconciliation of local demands and philosophical ideals.

Administrative Issues to 1920

The administrators of the park faced two main types of issues after 1911. The first involved the provision of more suitable means of enforcing regulations, particularly in the backcountry where enforcement had never been considered too seriously in the past. The other concerned the increased expectations of the town residents and the visiting public. The former had come to view the park administration as a less-than-perfect landlord, while the latter's recreational tastes and expectations of comfort were becoming quite onerous in relation to the limited government appropriation for Rocky Mountains Park.

There had been steps taken to create a formal park warden service as early as 1909, with four permanent wardens working under the direction of Chief Fire and Game Warden Howard Sibbald. But with more than 11,000 square
kilometers of park land to cover, the service was less than effective. Erratic patrols were organized into areas such as the Red Deer River district where poaching was thought to be a problem, and some fire patrols were conducted mainly along the railroad line where sparks from passing locomotives posed a major threat. In 1911-12, however, a series of incidents occurred that seemed to act as a catalyst in the reorganization of the warden service along more effective lines.

In the autumn of 1911 the Forestry Branch learned that at the start of the provincial hunting season the Stoney Indians of the Morley district were planning to enter one of the areas recently excluded from Rocky Mountains Park to "slaughter the mountain sheep and other large game which has thrived there for some years under the protection of the Parks Regulations." Officials at the Branch indicated in no uncertain terms that while the game area in question may have been withdrawn from Rocky Mountains Park, it nonetheless remained a forest reserve in which no hunting was permitted. To convey that message to the public at large, they proposed the immediate issuance of a bulletin to all western newspapers. In the next year, however, the Branch was approached by many sportsmen for permission to enter the deleted areas of Rocky Mountains Park during the hunting season. The failure of the provincial government to exercise any kind of hunting prohibition in these areas meant that the
Dominion Parks Branch was obliged to patrol the former park areas to ensure that no depredations occurred.

As a result of these increased patrolling responsibilities, the Dominion Parks Branch decided early in 1913 that it should develop "a practical and comprehensive plan, that will efficiently protect the game and forest in the park." Howard Sibbald informed Harkin that he would require two wardens in the former park lands near the Red Deer River to "keep the Indians out, and during the hunting season could transfer two from the Park to assist in patrolling and sealing of guns, these to be stationed on all trails leading into Game Preserve, from the North." In addition, he stated that he would require 12 wardens, who would have to be paid a decent salary if they were to be expected to stay on with the service for more than a season. Their political persuasions, he felt, should have nothing to do with their hiring.

Expansion of the warden service implied the construction of a better network of patrol cabins throughout the park. In 1911 there were just three cabins, one at Lower Spray Lake, another at Lower Kananaskis Lake, and the third at the mouth of Snow Creek at the Panther River. In the next four years a total of 16 more were constructed. Most were one-room structures of peeled logs with rubberoid roofs and cedar shiplap
floors, about 4.3 by 4.9 metres in size. All were equipped with some form of bed, a sheet iron cookstove and essential cooking utensils.

Better trails were needed to connect the far-flung cabins and to facilitate the patrol work. Initially, old Indian trails had been merely cleared of dead timber and widened to allow easier passage of pack horses. In 1910, however, a definite programme of construction started with the 28.9 kilometer Healy and Simpson Pass trail, a 48.3 kilometer Spray lakes trail, and an 17.7 kilometer Kananaskis summit trail. Additional trails were added each year, until by 1917 there were 21 fairly good trails throughout the park, representing a combined distance of 527.7 kilometers. Trail construction ultimately meant bridge construction. Many of the earliest park bridges outside of the townsite had been built to facilitate traffic to and from logging camps and other resource development sites, but as the necessity for regular patrols grew an increased number of crude log bridges were erected in the backcountry to ease the crossing of rivers and streams, particularly during the spring runoff.

Game and fire protection were two of the most important duties of the warden service. By regulation game could not be hunted at all within the park and, despite some depredation by poachers, seems to have increased markedly within the sanctuary. Until 1916, however, the sense of population increase among wild animals was an
impressionistic one at best and consequently Commissioner Harkin requested a special report on the population dynamics of game of all kinds within the park. In general terms, the report suggested that wildlife in Rocky Mountains was thriving. Sheep and goats, deer, bear, marten, and coyotes had increased markedly, while there was less certainty about the rate of increase among waterfowl, moose, elk, and lynx. Interestingly, the report suggested that the flight pattern of migratory birds had altered considerably since the introduction of coking ovens in the Crows' Nest Pass to the south. It also indicated that Whitcher's policy of eliminating 'noxious' animals continued, with many hawks and coyotes being killed deliberately each year. This slaughter would continue until 1924, by which time attitudes towards wildlife management had altered and a moratorium on the elimination of these species had been enforced.

Forest fire control was necessarily a preventative undertaking in these years of primitive technology and limited appropriations. In 1914 Chief Warden Sibbald succeeded in placing a fire lookout near the weather station on Sulphur Mountain, which was connected to the townsite by telephone line. He simultaneously set up forest telephone lines to Canmore, up the Spray River, to Lake Minnewanka and Stoney Creek, and to Healy Creek and Castle Mountain. With the permission of the Canadian
Pacific Railway, he was able to secure the use of a velocipede equipped with a two horsepower pump for emergencies along the railroad line. In the next year, the warden service acquired a marine gas engine with rotary pump mounted on a Ford car for patrols down the roadways of the park, as well as portable pumps that could be packed on horses during regular backcountry patrols. Soon after, a motorized launch equipped with fire fighting equipment was placed on Lake Minnewanka. For evidence of fires in extremely remote areas of the park, the warden service could do little other than rely on the propitious observations of guides who happened to be passing. Still, these precautions and the best intentions of the service could not prevent the outbreak of all fires. In 1919, for example, fire conditions were so bad that the Branch requested the temporary reassignment of some 40 or 50 Royal North West Mounted Policemen to help combat the blazes.

One of the less hazardous duties of the warden service involved the stamping out of the local mosquito menace. Townspeople and tourists alike had complained bitterly about these biting hordes for years and the locals in particular now expected the government to take decisive action. There were two areas of particular concern. The first was in the vicinity of the Banff Springs Hotel, where wealthy guests did not feel they should have to put up with such a threat to their comfort
while on vacation. The other was the townsite proper, where the recreation grounds swamp and the nearby Vermilion Lakes had long enjoyed a reputation as the worst mosquito breeding habitat in the west.

In 1915 Commissioner Harkin finally asked for the assistance of Dominion Entomologist C. Gordon Hewitt in solving this threat to Banffites and their transient customers. If a means of reducing the discomfort to visitors could not be found, the government was sure it would mean "loss of revenue and a partial failure of the object of the Rocky Mountains Park." Hewitt duly investigated and recommended several actions that might be undertaken to lessen the mosquito population. He called for the abolition of their breeding places (swamps, pools, etc.), lining all ditches with concrete, killing local algae with a solution of copper sulphate, keeping all watercourses free of obstructions and grasses and, most important of all, the regular oiling of all sources of stagnant water. The administration immediately launched a public education programme based on posters, newspapers notices, and school lectures that advised the residents to eliminate the breeding places of mosquitoes by covering water barrels with cheesecloth at night and by pouring coal-oil on all non-running water every 10 to 14 days between May and September. Harkin also solicited and received the co-operation of the CPR in spreading oil on
all waterbodies on their land near the station. In 1920 alone the park spent around $5,000 to combat the mosquito 'evil'. In the following year, the aggressors spread their war to Lake Louise, once again citing the indisputable claim that "failure to cope successfully with the mosquito nuisance is bound to involve serious financial losses for the Dominion." If testimonials from the Banff Citizens' Association and many concerned residents are to be believed, by 1922 the oil programme had achieved great success.

The government spared no effort to ensure the comfort and amusement of the park visitor. Fish stocking of local lakes was one means to that end which was employed consistently throughout the first two decades of the century. Early efforts consisted of importing game fish and unceremoniously dumping them into creeks that fed lakes like Minnewanka to add to the pleasure of anglers. When, in 1902, a strong lobby developed in British Columbia against the possible effects of introducing black bass into salmon waters, the fish were happily accepted by Rocky Mountains Park for introduction into Lake Minnewanka. In 1908 the CPR actually correlated fish stocking efforts in Rocky Mountains and Yellowstone with their respective visitor levels and decided that more fish needed to be brought to Banff. The company also claimed that without some daily limit of fish catches, there would soon be no angling in the park. The matter was taken up
with the park authorities and by 1913 a fish hatchery was in operation near Bow Falls to produce fry for the park lakes. In 1914, a second hatchery was built at Spray Lakes. In 1921 alone, almost 320,000 cutthroat trout were introduced in 15 different local lakes and streams.

Improvement of the hot springs facilities and the provision of golf links were the other two highly touted tourist attractions in Rocky Mountains Park at this time. In 1912 W.S. Painter, the American architect who had been involved in architecturally-sensitive expansions of the Banff Springs Hotel since 1903, was asked by the park administration to design a new bath house at the Cave and Basin. The need for such a facility was pressing. The old baths were unsanitary and filled to capacity by bathers. Just as importantly, the CPR had recently constructed beautiful new baths at the Banff Springs, costing about $100,000, which had begun to draw business away from the Cave and Basin at an alarming rate. The railway hotel was estimated to be earning between $75 to $125 per day from operation of the baths and the government believed that a renovated Cave and Basin might well become a money-maker for the park. "Thus," concluded an internal memorandum on the question, "on the ground of meeting the requirements of visitors in the matter of hot sulphur bathing (one of Banff's main attractions), on the ground of revenue, and on the ground that the Govt. should
not maintain cheap looking and unsanitary baths, especially when a private corporation is maintaining a high class bath, no time should be lost in the matter of proceeding with the new bath house." The work, estimated to cost about $50,000, began at once.

The CPR also contributed to the attractions of Banff through its construction of a world-class golf course in 1911, although it caused a considerable flap in doing so. In the spring of the year Howard Douglas had mentioned to Harkin that the CPR was thinking of laying out a nine-hole golf course adjacent to the hotel. When he again broached the subject in August, it was to inform his superior that construction of the course was well underway. The CPR intend to form a club to be known as the Banff Springs Golf Club. It is also their intention to construct an attractive looking club house large enough for present use, with dressing rooms, toilets, professional's quarters, etc. and sitting room and will also elect members who shall pay an annual fee, very much less, of course, than is charged by ordinary golf clubs. This will give these members the right to use the course at any time. Residents of Calgary, Edmonton, Banff [or] any other town or city will also have the privilege of useing [sic] the golf links, under an arrangement which will be made with the proprietors of any of the hotels in Banff or the Superintendent of the Park....It is not intended that the revenue will exceed the cost of maintenance and the fee will be fixed for that purpose only.101

Construction of the club house followed soon after, but when Dominion Parks Branch learned of this, it quickly charged the new superintendent, A.B. Macdonald, with responsibility for an unauthorized building that was inexplicably being erected by the Park's own engineering
staff. Macdonald retorted just as fast that the entire responsibility lay with Howard Douglas, who had made an 'arrangement' with Sir William Whyte of the CPR prior to his departure from Banff.

In 1917 the Parks Branch assumed control of the golf course, added nine holes, and retained the services of William Thomson as the resident professional. In exchange for a salary of $60 per month and course privileges, Thomson was allowed to stock, sell, and repair clubs. In addition, his wife was expected to look after the club-house, in exchange for which she was permitted to sell tea and soft drinks. The improvements to the course were undertaken by the aliens from the Castle Internment Camp. These included upgrading of the sprinkler system and the construction of an addition to the club-house. The park superintendent commented only that the men worked "absurdly slow" and only between the hours of 9:30 a.m. and 3:30 p.m. due to the distance from the camp. To encourage use of the improved facilities, Harkin recommended the issuance of free passes to distinguished visitors, and all members of the House of Commons and the Senate and their families. Nonetheless, when Harkin was approached with the idea of staging a golf tournament at the club in 1918, he replied that while a good idea, nothing could be done about it until the conclusion of the war. "The whole attitude of the Government," he stressed, "has been to encourage thrift
and to discourage anything that might appear as unnecessary expenditure." As soon as the war was over, the Branch engaged Donald J. Ross, "reputed to be the best golf course architect on this continent," at a cost of $15,000 to lay out a new 18-hole course. Harkin had been advised that "in the United States expert golfers will travel thousands of miles to reach a course which they know has been laid out by this man. The fact that our course will have been laid out by him will prove a decided financial asset."

These two streams of administration, which might be termed wilderness and tourist, were closely related as part of the unceasing effort to maintain a park in which the visitor could enjoy more than the comforts of home in a secure setting. This philosophy of administration was so pronounced that, as in the case of the new Cave and Basin bath house, the government would on occasion feel obliged to compete with the amenities offered by private commercial establishments in the townsite. The availability of the labour of the interned aliens ensured that, within limits, local officials were able to proceed with park improvements even in a time of fiscal restraint.

Conclusion

In the first two decades of the twentieth century, Rocky Mountains entered its adolescence as a national park.
When the century began, it was a park in which natural resource development policies coexisted with those relating to the provision of a recreational playground for the middle and upper classes. This was the result of an unprecedented attempt by members of a development-oriented government portfolio to create a national park. No conflict in land use was thought to exist when divergent resources uses were quite isolated from one another, as was very much the case in the nascent automobile age.

When making decisions about the propriety of any given park 'improvement', the park administrators applied the same criteria that they would have used in governing development of an Manitoba forest or an Alberta townsite. Thus it was not at all unusual for them to think of Banff as a progressive settlement, deserving of all the modern amenities that could be brought in. In fact, it is likely that they believed such amenities to be more important to a special tourist spot like Banff, whose character was thought to reflect on the quality of the nation as a whole. The decision to allow Thomas Mawson to redesign the town in 1913 was perhaps the greatest expression of this need to impress.

It was not until the creation of the Dominion Parks Branch under the direction of J.B. Harkin in 1911 that the provision of these amenities to townspeople and tourists alike was integrated into a more coherent philosophy of
the national park. Harkin's fervent belief in the restorative qualities of natural beauty and outdoor recreation led him to work assiduously for the betterment of recreational facilities and for the improvement of wilderness and wildlife management in Rocky Mountains. Always careful to broach his interests in terms of economic return to the Treasury, Harkin managed to enhance considerably the recreational resources of the park in an era of general restraint. Most importantly, he had initiated the perception of the park as a special place, not just because of hot springs or some other local attraction, but because of its social consequences. His was a loftier vision than that of both his colleagues and the vast majority of park visitors.
The Park as Playground, 1921-1930

Introduction
Immediately following the Great War, most of Canada plunged into a severe recession that did not end until 1924-5. While this constriction of credit reserves and disposal income affected most parts of the nation, in Rocky Mountains Park the money flowed like sulphur water. Wealthy tourists, having had their travels circumscribed for years by the war, renewed their acquaintance with the park and its more self-indulgent diversions. Less affluent pleasure-seekers, possessing sufficient capital to purchase an automobile, exchanged the dream of protracted lounging at the Banff Springs Hotel for the less costly but nonetheless true escape of a long weekend of fishing and respite at one of the mountain bungalow camps. More and more, the park administration catered to the needs of the latter group of visitors. The days of conspicuous consumption at Banff were ending and the government adopted a decidedly more democratic ethic to the provision of tourist amenities. In the main, this meant loosening its implicit affiliation with the
Canadian Pacific Railway through the supply of better motoring facilities throughout the park, in the form of roads and bungalow camps. The railway's monopoly on mountain traffic was broken and Rocky Mountain's character as solely a spa community began to erode.

In large measure, the administrative character of Rocky Mountains Park in the 1920s stemmed from the shifting demographic base of the country. When the results of the 1921 census were announced, it was found that Canada was definitely an urbanized nation. This was less true of the west than eastern Canada, yet the past two decades had seen the populations of centres like Calgary and Vancouver grow immensely. And, as the country looked increasingly for professional advice in every line of business, the pool of disposable income tended to deepen within the middle class. Despite the recession, many Canadians were better off and more mobile. The role of park administrators became that of serving the needs of an urbanized and motorized populace.

A generation had passed since the conservation ethic was first articulated within the government of Canada, and under the continuing guidance of Commissioner James B. Harkin the national parks system moved toward a reconciliation of principle and practice. The prosaic purpose of Rocky Mountains Park clearly remained that of servicing the changing needs of its floating population,
and the development of a good road system with related bungalow camps was perhaps the most forceful example of the manner in which visitors' changing needs were met. But increasingly the administrators within the Dominion Parks Branch also saw their park reserves as enclaves that should be sealed off from pernicious outside influences, as the special playgrounds that Harkin had always envisaged. They began to define with some precision the purpose of national parks which meant that the administration worked ever harder to exclude undesirable influences. In Rocky Mountains Park the decade of the Twenties was given over to embellishing and making concrete the philosophical concept of a national park through overt administrative action.

The Impact of the Automobile

The automobile initially found it difficult to gain acceptance within Rocky Mountains Parks. The first auto is said to have arrived at Banff in 1904 (although some dispute the claim because the auto travelled on the railway track), and in the following year the government passed an order-in-council that strictly prohibited "the use of automobiles of every kind in the park," upon penalty of a $50 fine or three months in jail. This was not technological aversion per se, but rather a realistic response to the fears of local liverymen who were only too
aware of the potential that automobiles held for ruining their thriving businesses. Because the park was mainly a summertime operation, the government placed the privileges of those in business well ahead of the possible comfort of incoming middle class tourists. This was a rare exception to the enforcement of the visitors first tenet that the government had always espoused, and it suggests the magnitude of the local opposition to the threatening automobile. Locally expressed fears about the impact on game animals and the damage that would occur to the tote-road system were simply convenient excuses for opposition to the new technology.

By 1907, however, the start of construction on the Banff coach road hinted that change was imminent. Two years later the first conventional automobile arrived, to be followed by many more that took advantage of the easier touring on the coach road. Although the government was soon prosecuting the offenders, in Banff the road crews were busily erecting street signs and paying more attention to street maintenance and dust control. In 1910 a deputation of concerned Calgary motorists met with Minister of the Interior Frank Oliver to press for permission to drive to Banff, although they stopped short of asking for the privilege of motoring through the town. In the next year they received permission to drive as far as Anthracite, where they were
obliged to hire a horse-drawn vehicle for the balance of the journey. This harsh rule was later amended to permit access to the Police barracks. Many motorists were less than pleased with this arrangement and drove around town in defiance of the regulation until the Board of Trade wired Ottawa for assistance, pleading danger to pedestrians and horses.

The uneasy truce between the townspeople and the motoring public suffered considerably in 1913 when the government permitted autos to travel on the town streets and to the Banff Springs Hotel, although not after sunset. But it was dealt a much more serious blow in 1914 when a rumour spread around town that the government had decided to allow automobiles to travel anywhere in the park, except to the Upper Hot Springs and on Tunnel Mountain. This reportedly caused "dire prophecies to be made." The rumour turned out to be substantially true, for autos were also allowed to travel the Banff-Calgary coach road, the Lake Minnewanka drive, the Cave and Basin road, and on the Loop drive around Tunnel Mountain. Local businessman Fred Ballard, seeing the writing on the wall, opened an automobile garage. Automobile dealers first appeared in 1915, clear evidence that the motoring battle was concluded.

From this time forward the automobile provided a significant means of transport into and within Rocky
Mountains Park. As early as 1917, autos brought 10,000 out of a total attendance of 67,779 visitors to the park; by 1923 the proportion had risen to nearly one-third; in 1926 almost one-half came by car; and by 1931 fully 163,443 visitors out of a total of 188,443 were motorists. The tally-hoes running between the station and the main hotels were soon a thing of the past.

If the greatest influence on local commercial fortunes was the increased number of visitors in the park, the most significant physical change was the developing road system. While the Castle internment camp was in operation, the park administration availed itself of the men's labour to improve many of the existing roads through widening and ditching, while after the Great War the government set aside larger appropriations for road improvement. This took place both in order to make the park accessible to more long-distance motorists and to open new facilities within the park.

One of the most important early automobile roads was the Banff-Windermere highway, on which construction was started during the Great War under a federal-provincial agreement. The work proceeded in a piecemeal fashion until 1919, when British Columbia's failure to finish the portion for which it was responsible induced Ottawa to suggest a compromise arrangement. The federal government agreed to complete the road to British Columbia if the
province would provide an eight kilometer strip on either side of the road for the creation of Kootenay National Park. In 1923 the road was opened, "unlocking the automobile tourist potential of the western United States and the west coast of Canada. Connections from Invermere, B.C., could be made via Cranbrook to Spokane, Seattle, Vancouver, Victoria, Portland, San Francisco and Los Angeles."

Internally, the road system led increasingly to automobile bungalow camps. This was a new concept in travel, the precursor of the 'motor hotel' or motel, where a motorist could stop for inexpensive overnight accommodations along the road. Such facilities were more suited to budgets of those tourists who would never possess the means to stay at the expensive hotels of the townsites. The CPR, which watched with concern as its rail traffic dwindled, swiftly moved into the construction of bungalow camps. In 1921 it built one at Wapta Lake in the Kicking Horse Pass, followed two years later at Lake O'Hara and at Takakkaw Falls. When the Banff-Windermere Highway opened in 1923, the company was ready with camps at Lake Windermere, Castle Mountain, Radium Hot Springs, and near the Vermilion River. For those motorists who wished to sleep in tents, the government established campgrounds.

The government's attitude toward bungalow camps was
indicative of both the rising concern about proper facilities for motoring tourists and about the appearance of the townsite. These concerns were brought forcefully to the fore in 1927 when reconstruction of the golf course necessitated relocation of the Rundle Mountain campground which had been in operation at the junction of the Bow and Spray rivers since 1923. The government carried out an inspection of half a dozen sites "from the standpoint of the visiting motorist." The inspector's deliberations are worth quoting at length:

It must be kept in mind at all times that the great bulk of the people who use our campsites come from Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba. They are our own people and our camp sites undoubtedly have been making these people good friends of the Parks organization. In this connection it is only necessary to refer to the wonderful support that Saskatchewan and Manitoba have given the Park service in connection with the question of the sanctity of National Parks.

I inquired of quite a number of people who have been using our Parks and found that there would be resentment if the motorists were compelled to camp at any point remote from the townsite. The view expressed to me was that the people came long distances to have a holiday, that the activities centering at Banff was [sic] what appealed to them most and, therefore, to be compelled to camp a long distance away from the townsite would be most distasteful and unsatisfactory to them. I expressed the view that with motor cars, a few miles away from the townsite would mean nothing. The reply was that in many cases the male member of the party took long trips and left the women at the camp and that the camp located a considerable distance from the townsite would prevent the women and children taking advantage of the opportunity for recreation and enjoyment in the town. Finally it was impressed on me that if we kept the motor camp remote from the town, the motorists would regard it as a reflection on them.8

His emphasis on the importance of automobile tourists and
deep concern about their needs cannot be missed. Still, he was far from insensitive to the perceptions of the townspeople. Most residents wanted all motor traffic routed directly through the downtown area to augment their business prospects and felt that a nearby camp would enhance the volume of business to be derived from walk-in campers. Most believed that a part of the villa lots section south of the river would be best for business and access to the hot springs.

Having weighed all concerns, the government chose Tunnel Mountain as the site of the new bungalow camp that would service the townsite. Immediately protests were received from the Banff Advisory Council, which attempted to serve as a lobby for the interests of the townspeople. D.M. Soole, the secretary, wrote to Superintendent R.S. Stronach and J.B. Harkin to inform them that the Council was greatly annoyed that it had not been consulted about the final selection of the site and urged that additional consideration be given to the Sulphur Mountain location.

After a brief interlude, Harkin set forth the precise reasons for the government's controversial decision. The Branch wished to ensure that the campsite would be permanent, given the high capital costs involved; that it could be expanded at a later date to meet demand; that it be near a good water supply and electricity; and that it be located so as to minimize the threat of fire to nearby
stands of trees and the townsite. From the visitor's point of view, the government considered the scenic outlook of the site, soil drainage for sanitary reasons, freedom from mosquitoes, and proximity to the townsite. Finally, it took into account the townspeople's desire to have the bungalow camp close to town, the degree of fire threat, the extent to which a suitable campsite would serve as an advertisement for the park, and the eventual need for townsite residential expansion. The Tunnel Mountain site seemed to meet these needs better than the Sulphur Mountain one.

The attractiveness of the bungalow camps to tourists induced other private investors to press Ottawa for the privilege of establishing additional campsites. The government was apprehensive that the summer season in the park was so short that operators might have difficulty getting a return on their investment, but American tourists in particular expected this form of accommodation at Rocky Mountains Park and they came in such numbers that the government found it difficult to resist the pressure. The singularly unattractive look of numerous tent camps scattered illegally throughout the park also spurred the government to action. In 1929 it was decided that certain camps might be created through competitive tendering, and the government immediately received a great many applications for the construction of one- or two-room
cottages that could be rented at a low daily rate by transient motorists. James Harkin, concerned with the quality of such camps, recommended that only short-term concessions be granted so that the government would be able to make any needed changes to the type of accommodation offered or the management of the campgrounds. As a policy on bungalow camps took shape, the brevity of the tourist season surfaced as a major concern, and the government decided to allow the operating of a service station, grocery store, or lunch counter in conjunction to limit the financial risk of the small investors. The administration also decided to limit the occupancy season to between 15 May and 15 October, out of concern that low winter rates for unwinterized cabins might lead to the development of small townsites throughout the park, occupied by "an undesirable class of people."

The emerging policy led to many premature applications for the establishment of bungalow camps. One of the earliest came from the McHugh Brothers, who had been removing the main buildings from the abandoned Bankhead site. They wished to convert the main office building into sleeping quarters with 16 to 20 rooms, with a restaurant in an adjacent building. Later, the brothers proposed to move some of the smaller structures closer to the main office building and convert them to
individual cottages. With water and sewage facilities already in existence, they felt that a suitable campsite could be erected at low cost. Admirable for its simplicity of design, the McHugh Brothers plan did not meet with the approval of the Branch. It was believed to be too distant from Banff and, more importantly, too elaborate to provide the type of accommodation that the government was trying to create for less affluent motorists. The CPR camps already seemed quite adequate to service the carriage trade.

While the government willingly entertained private proposals, it also undertook its own investigations to determine what was desirable in an automobile bungalow camp. During the summer of 1929 the acting superintendent, Arthur Ford, examined two such camps, one just west of the western entry to Yoho Park and the other at Windermere. His findings suggest the inclination of the government toward good quality, low cost shelters. The first, called the Wapti Falls Camp, consisted of a large central building with kitchen, dining and rest rooms and large verandahs. Very cheaply-constructed bungalows were alongside. The proprietors offered three classes of service: one where the motorist was provided with bedding and ate in the main building; a second where the bungalows could be rented with bed and mattress and meals taken at the main building; and a third when the bungalow was
offered with bed, mattress and stove and the motorist did his own cooking. Rates ranged between $2 and $4, with an extra 50 cents charged for each additional person in the cabin. At Windermere, Ford found two distinct classes of small cabins. Those erected in 1926 were rather small, painted white and green, and had no adjacent automobile shelter. Each contain a bed and stove and cooking was permitted. These rented for $1 per night. The cabins in the course of erection were more spacious and all adjacent cabins had an automobile shelter between them. Without bedding, they rented for $2.

The government did not confine its investigations to Canada, but rather sent engineer J.M. Wardle to the United States to inspect some well-established American camps. Wardle travelled as far south as San Diego and found that successful camps had certain features in common. They were privately operated, contained from 10 to 24 bungalows, and were equipped with a service station, lunch counter, and small grocery store. Rates ranged from $1 to $4, depending on both the attractiveness of the camp and the market demand. Within the American national parks, Wardle discovered that some 70 per cent of motorists utilized the bungalow camps and he felt that they would expect the same quality of facility at Rocky Mountains. Most of these camps, he noted, were located on the outskirts of townsites, either at a strategic traffic
intersection or near a scenic attraction.

The obvious range of available accommodations led the government to consider a scheme for classifying park lodgings, so that motorists would be able to select their temporary bungalow on the basis of both features and cost. Printing a simple brochure might ensure widespread distribution of such information. For its part, the government thought of creating an enforced price schedule that would apply to all accommodations falling within a certain class. This would safeguard the public from misrepresentation by camp operators and provide an avenue of redress.

By the middle of December, 1930, the government had decided that demand for automobile bungalow camps was sufficient to justify formulation of a concrete policy that would be the starting-point for camp construction. It was felt that bungalow camps within Rocky Mountains, Yoho and Kootenay Parks should be developed in concert to avoid duplication of services. Several sites were recommended for development: Banff townsite, Johnson Canyon and Lake Louise within Rocky Mountains; Radium Hot Springs and Vermilion Crossing in Kootenay; and on the Field-Lake Louise Highway near Field in Yoho. Applications had already been received for camps at other spots, but the government chose to withhold permission for the time being. Lunch counters and grocery stores were
permitted outside of the Banff campsite, and service stations were allowed if none existed in the locality. The government also insisted on proper sanitary facilities at each camp. The successful operators would be chosen by public competition, but only one facility per site would be granted on a five year lease. The issue of private monopoly struck a discordant note with many officials, but the government believed that in view of the short tourist season, operators had to be given exclusive territories in order to justify their investments. The government would of course benefit through the increased tourist traffic that would be attracted by well-appointed campsites. By 1936 there were five bungalow camps situated within Banff National Park, at Banff, Johnson Canyon, Lake Louise, Storm Mountain, and Moraine Lake. Without question, these low-cost camps did much to boost visitor levels during the depression years.

The Cascade Power Development

Under the continuing administration of J.B. Harkin, the national parks of Canada moved significantly in the direction of natural resource preservation in the 1920s. It would seem, however, that the process of defining policies that embodied the conservationist philosophy could only be developed fully in time of crisis.
Rocky Mountains Park, the movement received its greatest impetus from the issue of additional hydro-electrical power development by the Calgary Power Company on Lake Minnewanka and the Spray Lakes.

In 1921 the Montreal Engineering Company, the gigantic eastern corporation that controlled Calgary Power, applied to the government for permission to develop additional storage capacity at Lake Minnewanka within Rocky Mountains Park. Although little remains of the initial correspondence on the matter, it is clear from subsequent letters that Charles Stewart, the Minister of the Interior, was not sympathetic to the project. In 1922 Montreal Engineering undertook to address both sides of the broad public policy issue that it claimed was at stake. "On the one hand," the company suggested, "is the economic interest of the whole Province of Alberta in having made available an adequate supply of cheap power; on the other is the fear that our proposed work might detract from the scenic beauty of the Rocky Mountains Park." It then set out to explain each side of the controversy.

With respect to the availability of electrical power with the province, the company argued that during the winter Calgary remained virtually dependent on the limited flow of the Bow River. The precariousness of the situation dictated that the city maintain a supplementary
steam generation plant which provided 15 per cent of the urban power requirement at a cost exceeding that of the hydro-electricity provided by Calgary Power. Calgary officials preferred to have the steam plant as an auxiliary unit only. Not only would additional storage capacity on Lake Minnewanka alleviate the burden to Calgary, it would permit Calgary Power to supply electricity to Banff, Bankhead and Canmore. The imminent closure of the Canadian Pacific steam generating plant at Bankhead would soon leave those centres without a source of electricity. Furthermore, the company intimated that it was exploring the possibility of supplying the City of Edmonton with electricity as well. It also advised the government that the province possessed no viable hydro-electrical generation sites other than those in national parks. Therefore, it seemed sensible that a long-term plan be developed for the co-ordinated exploitation of the water power resources of the eastern slope rivers.

Turning to the preservationist concerns, Calgary Power observed that those would undoubtedly have been genuine fears had not proper planning been involved in the initial development of the Lake Minnewanka hydro-electrical site in 1912. The existing facilities had been quite well hidden from view and had been designed, moreover, to harmonize with the landscape. Furthermore, as Canadian Pacific promotional material made clear, no
one ever considered Lake Minnewanka an outstanding scenic spot. It was "only a flooded river valley," and although surrounded by mountains, "the general effect is spoiled by low-lying flats covered by scrubby growth of stunted jackpine." Raising the water level could only improve the landscape. To those who would argue that submerged trees and other features would destroy the beauty of the spot whenever large volumes of water were released from the lake, the company pointed out that this disfigurement would only occur in winter when no visitors were around. In addition, the proposed power house would comprise "substantial brick and concrete...of simple but dignified design," and would use buried transmission cables. For these reasons, the company failed to understand how there could be any objections to the plant on environmental grounds.

Calgary Power clearly underestimated the strength of the conservation sentiment within the country. Letters and telegrams by the dozens poured across Harkin's desk and presumably those of the company executives. From the Calgary Automobile Club came one recommending that the government deny the application as construction of the power plant would interfere with an important section of mountain scenery. The Banff Citizens' Council protested the attempt of water power interests to invade the park. The Alpine Club of Canada pointed out the negative impact
such a development would have on mountain tourism. The Toronto section of the Club registered one of the strongest statements when it observed that "we are of the opinion that the principle should be laid down and accepted once and for all that our national parks, which belong to the people of Canada, should be preserved for the whole people, and not destroyed or exploited for commercial purposes for the benefit of the few."

At nearly the same time Calgary Power reiterated a 1920 request for permission to develop the hydro-electrical potential of the Spray Lakes. The Dominion Parks Branch felt that this move was made in the hope that the threat of this larger project would compel the government to grant their Lake Minnewanka development. The likelihood of this suspicion is suggested by the admission of the company in the next year that development of such an extensive plant would be premature. Even the renewed hint of such a development provoked bitter comments from government officials. One memorandum to the Deputy Minister of the Interior advanced no less than seven specific reasons for denying the application to proceed. In a unique manner, it captures the evolving conservation philosophy of the Dominion Parks Branch.

The memorandum first discounted the advisability of a Spray Lakes development on environmental and aesthetic grounds, arguing that it would destroy the only natural
fish spawning ground of its kind in the province; that it would obliterate the scenic view of the Bow-Spray confluence from the Banff Springs Hotel, an event to which the Canadian Pacific was definitely not resigned; that it would impair water levels in the entire Western Irrigation Bloc of southern Alberta; that it would destroy a total of 970 hectares of wildlife habitat; and that it would damage irreparably the scenic value of the picturesque Spray Valley. The memorandum then turned to the public's rights. National parks, which had been set aside expressly for the purpose of safeguarding valuable scenic and recreational lands, comprised less that one-quarter of one per cent of the public domain of Canada. Therefore, "99 3/4 percent of the public domain is available for commercial exploitation. If the principle is admitted that even the 1/4 percent must also be open to exploitation then the issue should be faced squarely and parks abolished altogether. For piecemeal invasion will just as surely accomplish that purpose and straight abolition would be honest with the public, and prevent the waste of money on development work in the interval." It is no defence of the project, the report continued, that few visitors currently visited the site. With future road systems, access will be improved and the lakes must be preserved for that day. On the monetary side, it made sense to retain the area as parkland, for 1921 statistics
indicated that Canada had 'exported' its wilderness attractions to the tune of $18 million in revenues. This money accrued to the benefit of all Canadians, rather than a single corporation.

However threatening the pressure to construct a Spray Lakes development or to increase the height of Lake Minnewanka, the government's immediate electrical problem was the provision of power to the towns in the park once the Bankhead plant closed down. There were many possible alternatives. Earlier in the autumn, the government had learned that the Banff Springs Hotel, which was being greatly renovated, would be adding considerably to the capacity of the steam power plant that generated electricity for its own use. Discussions revealed, however, that the CPR had subsequently changed its mind about expansion. It was possible to construct a new steam power plant at Banff, but power from such a source would be more expensive than hydro-electricity and would depend absolutely on a steady steam coal supply. Government operation of the Bankhead plant was considered, but it would not have been possible to do so and deliver power at current rates without incurring a $12,000 to $20,000 annual loss. The government also looked into construction of its own hydro-electrical plant, either at Bow Falls or in connection with the power thimble that had been installed in the Lake Minnewanka dam in 1912. The former
was dismissed as unacceptable within the existing park mandate, while the latter seemed to have definite potential and was, after further investigation, accepted as the best alternative. The cost was estimated at $175,000.

Before the spring thaw, however, Calgary Power approached the government with an offer to supply power to Banff from its Exshaw station less expensively than the government could provide it. Undoubtedly the company knew that the government could not possibly have its new plant in operation before the shutdown at Bankhead. The government received this offer with incredulity, for construction of a 40-kilometer line into Banff from Exshaw would hardly add to the scenic beauties of the park. Canadian Pacific interceded fortuitously in the sense that it offered to maintain operation of the Bankhead facility until such time as the new Cascade plant was completed. This occurred in March of 1924.

The Park Boundary Issue

Construction of the Cascade hydro-electrical plant was merely an interlude in the angry debate over the Spray Lakes development. When discussions of the latter resurfaced in 1928, they were between the federal and provincial governments and formed part of the much broader issue of the imminent transfer of natural resources rights
to the western provinces. In Rocky Mountains Park, that debate focussed on a restructuring of park boundaries.

On 8 March, 1928, Minister of the Interior Charles Stewart set forth his Department's position on the Spray Lakes development. He was willing to issue a development licence to the province, he said, on three conditions. All were based on the excision of the area from Rocky Mountains Park. The first was federal retention of all mineral rights within the excised area once the transfer of ownership was concluded. Secondly, Stewart felt that instead of using Spray Lakes as a mere reservoir, the province should immediately construct a tunnel to utilize its hydro-electrical potential. Finally, the Minister insisted that any licence to use Spray Lakes water would be subject to maintaining the flow of the Spray River through the park at satisfactory levels.

The Alberta government did not agree with Ottawa's proposed retention of mineral rights in the area, and this hiatus in the negotiations compelled the Calgary Power Company to seek an alternative power source. Early in April of 1930 M.A. Gaherty of the company visited Ottawa in the hope of gaining a licence to develop a storage reservoir on the Ghost River, just below its confluence with the Bow. Unless the Spray Lakes development were approved, he intimated, his company would start
construction of this three million kilowatt plant. Premier Brownlee continued to dither about the Spray Lakes area, mainly because his administration could not abide federal retention of mineral rights there, and Ottawa granted Calgary Power permission to develop the Ghost River site. This would assure the City of Calgary an adequate supply of electricity for the next five years, albeit at higher rates to consumers than would have obtained had the Spray Lakes development proceeded instead.

The ability of the Ghost Lake reservoir to satisfy Calgary’s power needs for only five years prompted the civic government to press Stewart to allow development of the Spray Lakes potential. Mayor F.E. Osborne wrote directly to Stewart to let him know that the Ghost River would not appease Calgarians in the long term and that immediate approval of the Spray Lakes development was vital to the industrial development of southern Alberta. He vowed to keep the issue alive and immediately invited Parks Commissioner Harkin to Calgary to discuss the matter. Harkin declined, however, suggesting that the mayor should more properly discuss the power development with the Minister. At nearly the same time the Calgary Board of Trade began to exert pressure on the federal government to allow the project to proceed. Calling the Ghost River plant "makeshift," Board of Trade president T.M. Carlyle said it had come about only "through
inability to get anywhere with the Spray Lakes scheme."
He urged the federal government to excise Spray Lakes from Rocky Mountains Park at once and grant permission for the power plant that was necessary to Calgary's further industrialization and to the extension of electrical power to the rural areas of southern Alberta.

It was becoming an all-too-familiar refrain, yet the Minister refused to bow to the Alberta pressure. In part, his reluctance to acquiesce stemmed from the serious opposition to the Spray Lakes project that existed in other western cities like Winnipeg, Saskatoon, and Vancouver, where it was widely feared that Rocky Mountains Park would be desecrated by the hydro-electrical development. In part, too, if the Calgary newspapers are to be believed, the federal Liberals were attempting to use the issue as a way of gaining political ground in the other western provinces. James Harkin added further to the controversy when he hinted during a meeting with the Calgary mayor that there would be no problem at all if satisfactory terms could be reached for removing the Spray Lakes area from Rocky Mountains Park. An important breakthrough on the issue seemed imminent in mid-September of 1928 when Charles Stewart commented that the only remaining issue was Calgary Power's refusal to guarantee the rate of water flow down the Spray River through the park to maintain its aesthetic quality. But
the power company insisted that the rate of flow for which the federal government was asking would render its power project quite unfeasible.

Unable to agree on the rate of water flow, the governments and private concerns turned their attention to the resolution of the park boundary issue. No change to the boundaries of Rocky Mountains Park had taken place since 1917, when it was enlarged from 4,662 to 6993 square kilometers. In 1927 the Parks Branch had turned to the Department of Mines and the Water Power Branch for its observations on those areas that might be excluded for purposes of mineral or water power development. A letter from Charles Stewart to the Canmore Advisory Council, which had pleaded that its town be allowed to remain within the park, summarized the government's intentions in revising the boundaries:

I may say that the Park boundaries are being revised with the sole object of leaving outside the Park areas which are considered to be more valuable from the standpoint of the commercial utilization of the natural resources than from the standpoint of national playgrounds, the original natural scenic features of which are to be preserved inviolate for all time for the enjoyment of ourselves and generations to follow. The Provinces have decided that these areas should be opened to commercial development and it is, therefore, manifestly impossible to retain them in these Parks.41

By December of 1927 the government possessed quite a specific notion of the changes it seemed desirable to make in adjusting the park boundaries. In the main, the revision of boundaries considered entire areas that had
been gradually added to the additional reservation of 1885. There seems to have been little concern for particularly scenic areas within larger tracts that possessed commercial potential, undoubtedly due to the administrative difficulties that would ensue. The beautiful Kananaskis area, which had been part of the park for 35 years, was felt to be cut off from the remainder of the park by high mountain ranges and therefore too isolated for park development. It also possessed water power and timber resources. The Spray Lakes district possessed much the same scenic attractiveness, yet the struggle over hydro-electrical development there militated against its retention by the park. The Minister had made it clear that he wished to exclude all active coal-mining areas from the park and this contributed to the redrawing of the eastern boundary from just east of the summit of Mount Rundle to the ridge that formed the eastern watershed of Carrot Creek. Lake Minnewanka was retained because of its natural setting. The Ghost River watershed, which was an excellent game habitat and possessed fine mountain features, was thought to be isolated from the rest of the park and therefore undesirable. In the northerly Red Deer Valley district, the scenery was not on a par with that of the rest of park and it was felt that much of this territory should be deleted. On the other hand, the 268 square kilometer
Malloch Mountain district, which was not included in any mountain park, was deemed desirable for inclusion. Finally, it was thought advisable to include a 2538 square kilometer section of Jasper National Park to simplify administration of it and to make the sizes of Rocky Mountains and Jasper parks somewhat more equal. These deliberations resulted in a reduction of the park size to 6695 square kilometers. These new boundaries were made official by order-in-council in 1930 and at the same time the name of the park was changed to Banff National Park. This was perhaps a fortunate choice in that the government had been considering many other names, including Tannedese, Essanapis, Jatonabine, Juniata, Montepeles, Onantae, and Monticentum.

Even before these boundary changes were legally in effect, the Minister of the Interior reassured the Alberta government that his department now considered the Spray Lakes area outside its jurisdiction and that Alberta could begin negotiations with Calgary Power for development of the water powers in question if it so desired. The only qualification was that the developer would have to maintain a flow of 350 second-feet on the Spray River where it passed through Banff National Park. At about this time, Calgary Power once more reiterated its request to raise the level of Lake Minnewanka for storage purposes, arguing that imminent completion of the Ghost
River project would throw 400 men out of work. To this, the federal government reacted swiftly and bitterly, saying that this campaign was nothing but a blatant attempt "to put the Dominion Government in an awkward position through taking advantage of the unemployment situation." Another decade would pass before any effort would be made to resurrect development plans for the Spray Lakes district. For the time being, at least, the inviolability of national parks had been maintained.

The Purposes of a National Park
The protracted Spray Lakes episode suggests that the Dominion Parks Branch attempted valiantly to enlarge its newly-defined conservation mandate through further elimination of undesirable influences within the park, and to a large extent this was indeed the case. During the 1920s many illegitimate or unseemly practices were deliberately curtailed by the park administration in the hope of more closely aligning the practice and theory of national park management. Just as importantly, the Branch placed increasing emphasis on the provision of better services to the public and the townspeople. These steps harkened back to the golden spa period at Banff, in which visitors' needs dictated all in-park policy.

The types of conservation initiatives instigated by the park staff defy categorization, yet all were directed
at reforming the administration of Rocky Mountains Park. None were particularly significant in themselves, which perhaps explains the dearth of information about them, but collectively they expressed eloquently the desire for change that pulsed through the park administration in the 1920s. They ranged from strict monitoring of the cutting of 500 Christmas trees on Sulphur Mountain in 1925 to the denial of applications to extract silica sand from within the park, from concerted efforts to redefine a predatory wildlife policy to a firm decision to prohibit expansion of the existing townsites within the park. These seemingly unimportant gestures, when taken together, amounted to a rationale for practical park management. They were the commonplace deeds behind the spirit of the new National Parks Act of 1930.

If the essence of the administrator's intent can be captured in a single moment during the 1920s, it came at the national park superintendents' conference held at Banff in January of 1928. Park superintendents from across the nation gathered to discuss common problems and to find satisfactory administrative vehicles for the enforcement of park regulations. The results of their deliberations set the tone for a nation-wide national parks administrative system. For perhaps the first time, administrative uniformity could be said to exist with the Canadian national parks system.
That attitudes were changing was obvious from the superintendents' views on many matters. Their approach to wildlife management was a case in point. The predatory animals slaughter advocated by Whitcher in 1886 and followed assiduously ever since lost credibility in light of a new determination to kill park animals only when absolutely necessary. For example, bears were now to be left alone as long as they did not become a nuisance and threaten the public. In fact, it was felt that the park superintendent must "all times exercise the best judgment with a view to protecting the public and at the same time see that there will be enough of non-dangerous bears to provide the thrill that tourists get from seeing live bears in the open." At the same time, they decided to try to educate the public about the dangers of animals in the wild through lectures and the distribution of published material. In addition, warning posters were to be erected in all the park campgrounds. The one exception to the prohibition on predatory animal destruction was the cougar, which was felt to be a serious negative influence on the resident sheep and goat population.

The seriousness with which this policy of non-interference with wildlife was adopted in Rocky Mountains Park was plainly illustrated in the 1923 controversy over attacking deer. The editor of the local newspaper had received numerous complaints about deer that roamed the
streets of Banff at will, attacking school-children, scaring ladies and destroying gardens. Under the rather unsubtle guidance of editor Norman K. Luxton, the Banff Citizens' Association actually passed a resolution demanding that the administration prevent wild animals from entering the townsite. Superintendent Stronach was convinced that Luxton was simply seeking a way of allowing his dogs to run freely within the community, and declared that "I am for dogs on a chain and for the deer running at large in the townsite. I consider the deer running around the streets of Banff is the greatest asset we have." It seems that the real cause of the so-called 'attacks' was the injudicious feeding of deer by the public.

With respect to damage being done to timber along the roads by beaver in Waterton and Jasper parks, the superintendents decided that no killing of the animals could occur without consultation with provincial wildlife experts. They resolved that they were in favour of trapping the animals for relocation to areas in which they could not do so much damage. At the same time the superintendents decided to end the long-standing practice of allowing wardens to retain the pelts of trapped animals for sale, which contributed to unnecessary destruction of wildlife. These concerns about wildlife arose from specific administrative issues, yet in every case a decision was made on general policy grounds. Ad hoc
administration was coming to an end.

As the number of visitors to the parks and the size of in-park townsites increased, the superintendents felt that more effective forest fire protection was essential. This was not simply a matter of adding or updating equipment, but rather one of providing adequate fire detection systems and of formulating satisfactory fire fighting plans. Each park was required to develop a fire plan that would locate an outbreak as soon as possible and then dispatch a crew of two men with equipment to the site within two or three hours. Furthermore, all fires were to be plotted on a fire map, which would show the number of fires burning and the sites of greatest potential outbreak. In addition, a separate map showing all potential water sources was needed. These maps would aid greatly in the detection and suppression of new fires. In conjunction with the Dominion Meteorological Bureau, the parks maintained daily weather reports that focussed closely on relative humidity levels. It was also decided that public education was a vital ingredient in the prevention of forest fires, and the superintendents were instructed to give short talks from time to time on the importance of fire safety in the parks.

Engineering matters received considerable attention at the conference because of the new importance of park road systems. Again, the prevention of undesirable and
expensive incidents was stressed. The resident engineers were instructed, for example, to install new guard rails on all curves where accidents had been recorded. All principal roadways were to be standardized at 5.5 metres wide, with permanent bridges and culverts. Furthermore, the conference chose to restrict the speed limit in all national parks to 48 kilometers per hour on highways, 19 kph on curves and at intersections, and 32 kph within townsites. Within the contiguous mountain parks, the superintendents decided to implement a comprehensive, integrated plan of road construction "with a view to making readily accessible every outstanding scenic and other attraction."

In their wide-ranging discussion of park regulations, the superintendents strove to accomplish one main goal: control of the public for the benefit of the park. This could be detected in any number of their resolutions. All taxi drivers were required to carry public liability insurance for the first time. Cats and dogs were prohibited from running loose upon penalty of destruction. Townsites would henceforth be properly zoned to regulate the type and pattern of development. To reduce the number of complaints about one particular commercial practice, the superintendents went so far as to declare that all bread loaves had to be a standard 0.6 kilograms weight. Finally, they chose to standardize the dress of those
working for the park, so that the public would always know where to turn for assistance or information.

Conclusion

The outstanding characteristic of administration within Rocky Mountains Park in the 1920s was the concerted effort to put the conservation ethic into practice. It had taken more than two decades for the philosophy of parks as special places to filter through the bureaucratic system and it is unquestionable that during the 1920s the Dominion Parks Branch was fortunate to have the sympathetic Charles Stewart as its minister. With J.B. Harkin continuing to articulate his philosophy of 'parks as playgrounds', and with Stewart to contribute ministerial clout to the enforcement of that mandate, the Branch was able to withstand even the repeated commercial assaults of powerful corporations like the Montreal Engineering Company, working in conjunction with provincial and civic interests. The result was establishment of the principle of the inviolability of national parks.

In 1930 this principle was enshrined in a new National Parks Act that set the legal parameters of park management for the next three and a half decades. This act was the statutory incarnation of Harkin's philosophy of national parks as preserves set aside in perpetuity, as
sacrosanct tracts in which the conventional views of natural resource development simply did not apply. Within less than two decades of assuming control of the national parks system, James B. Harkin had revolutionized the public perception of national parks.
Depression and War, 1931-1945

Introduction

The depression of the 1930s was a central event in the development of Banff National Park. It was a time of involuntary financial restraint that compelled the government either to abandon, or to seek novel ways of carrying forth, its development projects. This was especially true with respect to the national park system, which in time of national crisis was seen as an extravagance. When people are starving, the argument went, no government of compassion would waste public funds on the provision of services to the idle rich.

Yet the services offered by Banff National Park underwent a renaissance during the depression. Its administrators proved agile in obtaining permission to proceed with a great many large-scale projects that simultaneously thinned the relief rolls and prepared the park for the return to prosperity. Road construction figured most largely among these projects. It is no exaggeration to say that the present infrastructure of Banff National Park was created during the depression.

The world war that followed the depression produced an inevitable decline in park tourism and, perhaps more
importantly, the resumption of efforts to exploit natural resources within the park for the war economy. Once again, the park's nemesis was the Calgary Power Company at Lake Minnewanka. This incident was, however, a wartime aberration that only strengthened the resolve of the administration to enforce its recreation and conservation mandate.

The Park in Depression

The residents of Banff were particularly vulnerable to the vicissitudes of the world economy. Theirs was largely a seasonal economy and it is clear that although visitor levels did not decline until the mid-1930s, less money was being spent in the Banff townsite. By the winter of 1929-30 local unemployment had become a serious problem. Not only were fewer dollars being spent in town, fewer construction jobs were available. J.B. Harkin and his staff accepted their share of the responsibility for this situation and quickly mobilized to ameliorate it.

Harkin vigilantly maintained a personal awareness of local conditions. In September of 1930 he began to correspond with Arthur Ford, the acting Associate Superintendent of Banff National Park, regarding the unemployment situation. Ford informed him that the park currently employed 103 Banff residents, and that an additional 54 would be seeking employment after the end of
the tourist season on 1 October. Then there were another 62 men who usually worked at odd jobs outside the community each year, but who would most likely be returning to Banff for winter work. Only 18 of these were needed for routine winter maintenance jobs, thus leaving a pool of 201 without employment during the winter months. In a town of only 2,500, this was thought to be quite unacceptable. The Parks Branch, as the only form of local government, assumed responsibility for the welfare of these people.

With the assistance of the Banff Advisory Council, the local administration drew up a list of potential unemployment relief projects for the park. These were categorized as Schedule A projects, those necessary tasks which could be carried out economically at the present time; Schedule B projects, which could be deferred if necessary; and Schedule C projects, which could only be undertaken at above-average costs at the present time. Schedule A projects were estimated at $61,000; Schedule B projects at $40,000, and Schedule C projects at $25,500. To this Parks Branch estimate of $126,500, the government added the $133,200 estimate of the Advisory Council, which provided a total of more than $258,000 worth of relief projects for the winter of 1930-1.

Because the object of the relief programme was to provide as much employment as possible, the administration avoided capital-intensive relief projects. Thus, the
list of scheduled projects included such items as revision of the Banff-Calgary road between the hoodoos and Duthill, which would absorb $34,000 and 260 man-months of labour. A new building was proposed at the Upper Hot Springs, to cost $50,000 and employ 156 man-months of labour. The new enthusiasm shown for skiing in the park led the administration to recommend construction of a new road up Stoney Squaw Mountain at a cost of $31,000. It was believed this would involve 225 man-months of labour. To upgrade the townsite streets, it was proposed to operate a rock crusher on Mount Rundle, employing 135 man-months of labour at a total cost of $15,000. The increase in airplane use pointed to the advisability of establishing an aviation field near Banff for commercial and personal planes. This required $20,000 and 100 man-months of labour. The complete list for 1930-1 comprised 16 different projects, all of which were designed to provide needed employment for local residents while enhancing the facilities of the park.

Very often the work was to be done well outside the townsite and in 1932 permission was granted to establish temporary winter work camps for all the unmarried men employed on relief work. These camps, usually designed to hold 50 to 100 men, were set up at Castle Mountain, Healy Creek, Cascade River, and Spray River. The latter was reserved for local single men, while the others housed
single, homeless men from Calgary. Accommodations in the camps were very basic, and included log bunkhouses, combined kitchen-dining rooms, laundry houses, latrines, and a foreman's office and sleeping quarters. Where the camp was well-sheltered, tents with board floors were substituted for the log bunkhouses. Permission was granted to establish commissaries wherever demand warranted it, but under no circumstances were the men to be given credit that exceeded their monthly earnings of $5.50. Board was allowed at a rate of $15 per man per month, and clothing was supplied to all who needed it. All provisions for the camps could be purchased only from stores on an 'approved list', which included local outfits to the extent possible.

The distribution of relief work was laid down by the Engineering Service of the Parks Branch. In general, it was the policy of the department to provide work first to bona fide residents of the park, and only secondarily to transients. Mere unemployment was not sufficient grounds for hiring labourers, however, as it was recognized that some who were without work nonetheless had other resources on which to depend. In addition, those who had depended exclusively on the government for employment before the depression were to receive preference over those with seasonal occupations. Finally, the government felt it had more of a responsibility to married men and veterans than to single workers.
In return for relief assistance, the government expected somewhat more than a full day's work. It also expected the men to behave responsibly and took steps to ensure that they did. For instance, it actively discouraged the purchase of alcohol at local liquor vendors by circulating a list of relief workers, whose purchases the vendor could restrict or eliminate altogether if he thought them excessive. Similarly, it tried to curtail the travel of the men. When it became apparent that many of the transient men wanted to return to their distant homes for Christmas in 1932, Chief Engineer Wardle instructed his subordinates to inform the men that the 24th and 26th were working days and that if absent beyond the evening of the 27th they would be considered to have left their jobs and would be ineligible for reinstatement. This seemingly harsh dictate stemmed from Wardle's concern that the men should be saving their meagre wages for more essential purchases.

By the winter of 1933-4 Banff National Park was accommodating about 450 men on relief, engaged mainly in construction of the Banff-Jasper Highway. James Harkin had considered the possibility of linking Banff and Jasper National Parks with an all-weather road in the 1920s, but nothing had come of the idea. Its labour-intensive character seemed, however, particularly suited as a solution to the social conditions of the depression and in
1931 the Branch received permission to conduct the work as an unemployment relief measure. Construction began from both ends of the projected route in September of 1931. The crews ran locational surveys that autumn and established construction camps. Some clearing and grading was undertaken. In order to maximize the amount of available work, machines were deliberately shunned in favour of manual operations. All labour was classed as relief work until 1934, when normal wages were introduced. That year also saw the introduction of additional motorized equipment. In 1933 alone, 800 men working 48-hour weeks were employed on the road during the summer months. The highway was completed in 1939.

The desperation of local people dependent on relief often exceeded the capacity of the Parks Branch to assist them through unemployment relief or the provisions of the Public Works Construction Act. For example, the failure of the government to pass the 1934 relief bill before the Easter recess frightened town merchants, who quickly drafted a telegram of protest to J.B. Harkin. At the same time, there was unrest in the relief camps throughout the park that threatened to end in a general strike if the men did not receive their wages by 1 May. Superintendent Jennings managed to diffuse this volatile situation by travelling to the individual camps within the park and advising the men that if they failed to show up for work they would immediately be returned to Calgary. When a
vote was taken at the Healy Creek camp on the issue of the strike, only two men voted in favour of it. The strain on park resources was increased further that autumn as unemployed people from other centres rented quarters at Banff in the vain hope of receiving employment on one of the park relief projects. The park barely had enough work available to assist the married men of the park and could do nothing for these newcomers.

Many locals who were not engaged in construction of the Banff-Jasper highway worked at various smaller jobs throughout the park. Beginning in December of 1931 a crew of 25 men cleared the right of way for a scenic drive over Stoney Squaw Mountain to the new ski camp on Mount Norquay. By 1937 it was complete, much to the pleasure of the merchant members of the Banff Advisory Council, who felt that the improvement would strengthen the foothold that skiing had already made in the park. Other crews of men worked on the upgrading of various trails throughout the park, in an effort to make them wide enough to accommodate tractors and trailers that might be needed in case of a forest fire. This work also benefitted the Trail Riders of the Canadian Rockies club that had been formed by the CPR some years earlier as a tourist attraction. Smaller scale projects included the realignment and widening of the Banff-Castle road near the 11-kilometer hill, underbrush thinning along the Banff-
Jasper highway to prevent forest fires, improvements to local bridges, clearing of an airfield near Cascade Mountain, and fence repairs at the animal paddock.

When considered as a particular class of work, the construction of new public buildings in the park rivalled the Banff-Jasper Highway work in terms of its ability to create employment during the depression. Work on the new Upper Hot Springs bath house commenced in 1932 on the site of the old Grand View Villa Hotel, which afforded an excellent view of the Bow Valley. The Rundle stone structure was completed in time to open for the 1933 summer season, and resulted in a great increase in the number of patrons. In 1934 sufficient monies were appropriated for construction of an adjacent caretaker's cottage.

A fire which destroyed the old Bretton Hall Hotel (formerly the Brett Sanitorium) just south of the Bow River bridge in 1933 opened the way to erection of a new park administration and post office building under the Public Works Construction Act. Under the supervision of architect Harold C. Beckett of Windsor, the $150,000 building took shape during 1935-6. This work was to be complemented by landscaping that included artificial ponds and casts of prehistoric animals, but this was subsequently modified by the architect to include elaborate rock and floral gardens known as the Cascades of Time, inasmuch as they purported to depict the geological
evolution of the mountains and contained representative mountain flowers.

Harold Beckett designed the new eastern gateway buildings at the same time. Since the eastern boundary had been moved some 35 kilometers to the west in 1929, it was thought that the time was opportune for the construction of a new visitor registration building and caretaker's quarters. In February of 1935 the sum of $22,000 was appropriated for the work. Ultimately, a third building was added to act as a service and staff building. All were constructed of Rundle stone with rough-hewn timber trim and heavy cedar shakes.

During the same period the government allocated a further $50,000 in relief monies for extension and renovation of the Cave and Basin buildings. Designed by the Architectural Division of the National Parks Branch, the new building replaced a thirty-year old frame structure and provided office and storage accommodation, 27 new dressing rooms for men and 36 for women, shower baths, lavatories, and a first aid room. As construction of the addition came to an end in the spring of 1936, the park superintendent recommended that the Branch proceed with extension of the hot pool as a relief project that would actually produce revenue for the park. This work was carried out by special warrant later in the year. In these projects, as in all Public Works Construction Act
jobs, local labour was used to the fullest extent possible.

As the depression wore on and relief funds dwindled, it became increasingly difficult for the administration to identify essential jobs for married men within the immediate vicinity of the townsite. By January 1936 local officials were reduced to recommending work such as the dismantling of an old Cascade River bridge, hauling firewood to the campgrounds on Tunnel Mountain, and quarrying rock for footpaths at the new administration building. At the same time, work was offered only to those in need who had been resident in the park prior to 1 October 1934. By November of the same year the list of winter works projects included only demolition of three buildings at the former isolation hospital and another on the administration grounds, thinning of lodgepole pine on the west slope of Sulphur Mountain, the creation of parking stalls on Tunnel Mountain ("urgently required to protect the trees in the vicinity"), demolition of the old laundry building, building of a recreational area at the Lake Minnewanka campground, and preparation of an area for animals pens at the zoo. Nonetheless, over the winter months the administration managed to keep 115 married and 65 single men employed at a cost of just over $23,000 for wages.

It also became necessary to set limits on the amount of relief that any one family was entitled to receive. In
1937 the Branch declared that each applicant had to appear before a board of officials including the park superintendent, the resident engineer, and the local magistrate to demonstrate need. For married couples fortunate enough to receive work, the maximum annual income was set at $600, with an additional $60 per annum for each child. Single men who were seasonally employed by the park were expected to agree to a holdback of 15 cents per hour on earnings, which would be paid out in monthly installments of $20, with the intention of assisting them through the winter months. Those who failed to comply with this request were not to be employed again. When the Banff Workingmen's Association requested permission for representation on the Relief Board, the government turned it down, saying that since the Banff community had made no contribution to relief monies it had no right to such representation. When a small appropriation for the park was approved in January of 1938, the resident engineer received a departmental memorandum which cautioned

that the authorization of this programme of work is not to be taken as any indication that [the superintendents] are to relax in any way from scrutiny of the applications for work which come before them. It is only those clearly entitled to work under the instructions issued who are to be approved for necessary work quota.26

Fortunately, the employment crisis eased before these stricter regulations had to be enforced vigilantly. In
the third week of April of 1938, for example, there were 27,000 Banffites on relief; one year later there were only 28,499. The same proportions held true for other months of these years. These glad tidings came just in time, as near-completion of the Banff-Jasper Highway had many officials extremely worried about the prospects for local employment.

For some of those who still required financial relief, the federal government had developed a new scheme called the National Forestry Programme which sought to alleviate unemployment among urban youth, assist their physical conditioning, and further forestry conservation. The programme was open to all young men between the ages of 18 and 25 who were unemployed and in "necessitous circumstances." This the government took to mean several things. It included youths whose families had been on relief, those who had been unemployed for a long time or never gainfully employed, those who had been rejected for enlistment in the armed services, and those who were unfortunate enough to have had only a few years of education. The government offered them $1 per day for a five-month period, plus room, board, and medical care, with the proviso that all but $10 in wages would be withheld each month. Three camps were established within Banff National Park, one at Bow Summit, a second at Red Earth Creek, and the third at Stoney Creek. The 35-39 enrollees in each camp assisted with various matters that
were both educational and utilitarian, including trail improvement, silviculture, fireguard clearing, bridge construction, and haying. As the government prepared to open the Banff-Jasper Highway to public use in 1940, the camps were relocated to the Saskatchewan Trail, to the mouth of the Alexandra River, and to a site between Camp Parker and the summit of Sunwapta Pass. There the programme enrollees carried out similar park development work along the highway. At bottom, the programme was most concerned with 'rehabilitation', preparing the youthful unemployment for a return to participation in the productive life of the nation. The funding available for the programme in Dominion parks expired in the spring of 1940.

As the depression decade closed, unemployment in Banff National Park ebbed markedly. This was due, in great measure, to the decided upturn in the volume of motorized tourist traffic. During just the first months of the tourist season (April through July), almost 52,000 automobiles had passed through the eastern gateway alone. This represented a tripling of the previous year's entrants. The reasons for this remarkable change, according to the editor of the Crag and Canyon, were not difficult to find:

Due to the hard-surfacing of the major highways and the generally improved condition of other roads throughout the province and publicity work, people are becoming more and more Alberta conscious. The
brighter crop outlook is also responsible for much of
the increased travel.32

By the end of the year, the visitor population had reached
157,767, which did much to boost local business
fortunes.

Banff as a Year Round Resort

The foundations for winter recreation at Banff were laid
during the first two decades of this century. Like all
small communities, Banff had its curling bonspeils, its
ice hockey, and its sledding hills early in its history.
These were the spontaneous, fraternal organizations that
formed an integral part of life throughout the sparsely
populated west during the relative isolation of the cold
winter months. In 1910 the Canadian Pacific began to
advertise Banff as a year-round resort in the hope of
taking advantage of the new wing of rooms that it had
constructed on the Banff Springs Hotel in 1903, but the
effort failed. Seven years later the start of the annual
Banff Winter Carnival augured well for the initiation of a
winter tourist trade, but for years attendance by visitors
was slight. It was not until the depression decade that
the movement to winter recreation began in earnest.

In the earliest years of the depression the Winter
Carnival remained principally a locally celebrated event
and hardly figured in the annual reports of the park
superintendent. When he did comment on it, it was only to
say that weather conditions had been favourably and that its organizers reported it a success. The Indian Days festivities that had been held annually since the beginning of the century continued to be the main yearly attraction. Some local organizations, such as the Banff Curling Club, tried to benefit from the staging of the Winter Carnival by inviting rinks from other clubs to participate in gala bonspeils, but as was the case in 1933 "the representations from outside clubs were not as large as the Club hoped for, this no doubt was due to economic conditions." During many other years, the weather conspired to limit attendance at the event.

What success the Winter Carnival did enjoy on occasion was greatly overshadowed by the development of alpine skiing in the Banff area. Skis of any description were rare at Banff until a ski jumping event was included in the sports itinerary of the first Winter Carnival in 1917. Following that event, a Norwegian ski jumper from Camrose named Gus Johnson decided to remain in Banff and organize the Banff Ski Club. For some years this remained a distinctly amateur organization, mainly for children, and taught mainly cross-country skiing and ski-joring. Throughout the 1920s the chief skiing event during the Carnival remained jumping, with the Buffalo Park Hill becoming a regular stop on the American Professional Ski Jumping circuit after 1921.
The development of downhill skiing in the Rockies received considerable impetus from the formation of the Mount Norquay Ski Club and its construction of a small ski hut on Mount Norquay in 1927. The proximity of the slope to the Banff townsite and the growing local enthusiasm for all forms of skiing seemed to assure its success. By 1930 a competitive ski development programme was in place at Banff under the auspices of the Ski Club and the first official slalom race was held on Mount Norquay. This was held on a slope described as "a long, open and exceedingly tricky 300 feet." Henceforth, flagged courses were regularly laid out on Mount Norquay on weekends.

Clifford White and Cyril Paris, two Banff businessmen with a deep interest and involvement in local skiing, were convinced of the potential that the Rockies held for professional downhill skiing and consequently undertook a detailed survey of the Banff-Lake Louise area during the spring of 1930. They covered over 800 kilometers of country on skis in search of a suitable location for development as a ski hill. Finally, they settled on the Ptarmigan Valley, which was easily accessible from the CPR mainline at Lake Louise, could be developed into an excellent downhill course, and did not pose the avalanche hazard of other potential sites like Mount Assiniboine. In June they approached the acting park superintendent, Arthur L. Ford, for permission to erect a log cabin in
the Skoki Valley, which was the nearest point at which suitable timber could be obtained. They planned to model it on the log Mount Norquay ski chalet, but with sleeping accommodations. They also made it clear that the development was to be financed privately and shrewdly added that "when not in use it would be kept locked, and a key supplied to the Warden's department for their use." Ford contacted Harkin in Ottawa and provided him with the advice of the chief park warden and the local timber inspector, both of whom endorsed the proposition. Ford himself added, rather long-windedly, that inasmuch as the demand for cross-country trips on ski has been increasing from year to year and the fact that the Mount Norquay Ski Club has proven a great success as a winter sports attraction[.] I have no doubt that should the Department grant permission for the erection of their proposed cabin it will add a further attraction to the Banff National Park as a winter playground for the tourist, as the Ptarmigan Valley is easily accessible from the Canadian Pacific Railway main line and opens up a wonderful panoramic view of the mountains surrounding the Lake Louise district, and in consideration of the success and able management of the Mount Norquay Ski Club I would recommend that, subject to specific requirements being laid down by the Department, that permission be granted to Mr. White for the erection of this proposed cabin in Skoki Valley.40

The negative reaction from Ottawa came as a surprise. Before considering the application, Harkin wanted to know if White was petitioning the Branch in his role as president of the Mount Norquay Ski Club or as a private citizen. When assured that White and Paris were planning to finance the development themselves, the Commissioner
refused to grant the necessary permission because the Branch could not be seen to be furthering private interests within the park. Undaunted, White approached the Mount Norquay Ski Club for its backing and then reapplied to the Department on behalf of the Club, which would finance the development with 'assistance' from White and Paris. Under these terms, the Branch permitted them to erect a cabin at Ptarmigan Pass during the winter of 1930-1. In the next year White and his associates incorporated the Ski Club of the Canadian Rockies to take over the assets and management of the Mount Norquay Ski Club and the Banff Ski Club. This was done with a view to "properly advertise the skiing facilities, give instruction and provide accommodation for the increasing numbers of persons coming to the mountains each winter for this sport." Simultaneously, the new Club sought permission to construct a halfway cabin in Ptarmigan Pass because winter train service made it impossible to reach Skoki before evening, as well as two additional sleeping cabins and a kitchen addition to the existing cabin. Already the demand for accommodations had exceeded their ability to provide proper quarters. Superintendent Jennings believed that these proposals could have a significant beneficial impact on the development of the park as a winter resort and strongly urged Harkin to grant the necessary licence. Permission was granted.
No sooner had construction begun than the Ski Club encountered financial difficulties. It was fortunate to secure the assistance of wealthy Banff residents Peter and Catherine Robb Whyte, who agreed to lease the Skoki cabins and promote the development of local skiing in proper fashion. But once again Commissioner Harkin felt unable to condone developments for private gain outside of a townsite. Reluctantly, he agreed to allow a sublease of the property for one year only, at which time he made it clear he would demand justification for continuation of the unorthodox arrangement. The Whytes engaged an experienced Swiss ski mountaineer and a couple of Banff residents who were familiar with the mountains to provide instruction and guidance to their 40 guests. They also provided such equipment as was needed to deal effectively with any emergency that might arise. Their determination to operate a first-class ski resort at Skoki earned them a renewal of their operating permit in 1933.

While the Whytes worked to ensure the success of Skoki, another prominent Banff family, the Brewsters, began development of the Sunshine Valley as a skiing facility. In 1928 the CPR had erected a small cabin in the valley to accommodate members of the Trail Riders of the Canadian Rockies horseback riding club that it had formed some years earlier. While the Branch granted the railway company a one-year licence to operate the cabin,
in the same fashion as it had the Whytes, Harkin made it clear that renewal would never be a problem. In 1934 the Brewsters sought and obtained permission from the CPR to use the Sunshine cabin as a ski camp. In the spring of 1935 staff were retained to operate the cabin and weekly all-inclusive ski excursions were offered for $30. The facility proved popular and in 1936 James Brewster approached the Branch for permission to erect a log skiing lodge at the site that could accommodate additional guests. By September of 1937, before the Branch's permission had been obtained, a gang of men had cut sufficient logs to construct a seven by twelve meter, two-storey addition to the original cabin. This did not please the Branch, yet it did nothing but admonish the park superintendent for not properly enforcing the regulations. By 1938 Brewster had even installed a wireless set (call number CZ7Z) at Sunshine in connection with his winter tourism operations.

In 1934 Erling Strom, a well-known skier from Lake Placid, New York, who had previously brought parties of skiers to the Rockies, leased the Mount Assiniboine hiking camp from the Canadian Pacific Railway. He planned to operate it as both a summer hiking camp and a winter ski resort. This brought to four the number of skiing camps in Banff National Park. Just a year earlier the CPR, never a company to miss an opportunity to provide additional recreational pastimes for its guests, started
the Ski Runners of the Canadian Rockies. Membership in this somewhat elite club was restricted to those who had established a record of not less than 80 kilometers on skis in the park area and had made a descent of at least 2742 meters on a mountain or glacier. After 1936 the club sponsored local racing training programmes and handled the technical aspects of all Banff ski meets.

As early as the middle of the depression decade, the park superintendent was convinced that much of Banff's future as a resort lay in winter recreation. "That Banff is rapidly developing into an important winter playground," he wrote, "cannot be denied. People from all parts of the continent and many from overseas have visited Banff and the ski camps located in the park area. Banff young people have taken up this winter sport with enthusiasm and the town has already developed several outstanding ski-runners and jumpers." In April of 1935 a team of Banff men representing the Ski Runners of the Canadian Rockies participated in skiing events at Seattle, and one member won both the downhill and the slalom races. Later in the same month a downhill competition was held at Skoki to compete for the Lady Rankin Downhill Cup, a trophy contributed by one of the earliest Skoki Lodge guests. Calgary and district skiers became regular visitors to the Mount Norquay facilities as soon as daily bus service was initiated between the communities. The
completion of the Stoney Squaw road by relief workers also stimulated use of the slope. The crowning achievement of the park came two years later, however, when it hosted the Dominion Ski Championships. Within less than a decade, Banff National Park had emerged as a pre-eminent international ski resort.

No statistics have survived to indicate the proportion of winter visitors that Banff enjoyed during the 1930s, but it would be surprising if it exceeded or even equalled the summer trade. The promotional techniques of the Canadian Pacific Railway remained as potent as ever and continued to generate enthusiasm for summer visitors to the park. The long-standing attraction of the mountains to climbers continued unabated throughout the 1930s. Conventions of special interest groups began to find Banff a congenial atmosphere in which to meet for several days of intense discussion and equally intense amusement. The artistic community took up residence at Banff with a passion. The public's infatuation with the automobile, though somewhat tempered by the effects of the depression on disposable income, continued to be an important ingredient in the success of not only Banff but all national parks throughout Canada. The auto's ability to move four to six tourists as cheaply as one train rider undoubtedly enhanced its popularity. Those statistics which are extant make it plain short-range and short-term trips to Banff National Park remained within the financial
range of thousands, and bungalow camps for motorists advanced in both number and quality throughout the depression years. In short, summer recreation in the mountains was a mainstay for both the affluent from afar and the less wealthy from Banff's immediate hinterland.

The Canadian Pacific Railway had laid the groundwork for much of its summer season recreation in the 1920s. In 1924 the company publicist, song-writer and horseman John Murray Gibbon based the concept of the Trail Riders of the Canadian Rockies upon the traditional activities of local commercial outfitters and packers. He democratized the notion of backcountry excursions on horseback and instituted annual trail rides that began and ended near CPR hotels or bungalow camps. He also conceived an award system in which any member could share by reaching certain milestones in their rides. This was undoubtedly the precursor of the merit badges of the Ski Runners of the Canadian Rockies. A similar organization, called the Sky Line Trail Hikers of the Canadian Rockies, was formed by the company in 1933 for those who preferred walking to horseback riding. While both were rather derivative concepts, they did initiate the commercialization of mass outdoor recreation within Banff National Park.

By the 1930s both summer and winter climbing among the peaks of Banff National Park were venerable activities. The promotion of this sport by the Canadian
Pacific around the turn of the century had given it a foothold in the Rockies that never faltered. In 1906 the Alpine Club of Canada had been formed and after 1912 Lake Louise was widely known as the guiding capital of the Rockies. Throughout these years, however, mountaineering remained the province of the expert international climber and, if one were not particularly experienced, a guide was deemed absolutely essential. During the 1920s and '30s, something of a rebellion against guided climbs occurred and amateur climbers increasingly insisted on tackling the peaks by themselves. Most of those who continued to use guides tended to be "tourists with little knowledge of the mountains and less of climbing." Like most activities in the Rockies, mountaineering had lost its exclusivity but not its popularity.

The less exotic attractions of Banff -- the hot springs, the museum, the zoo and animal paddock, Indian Days, the view from the Banff Springs Hotel -- continued to draw the less athletic and less adventurous by the thousands. One important contributing factor in this phenomenon was the professionalization of society that had occurred since around the turn of the century. Out of this widespread movement developed the concept of the annual convention, preferably held in an exclusive and distant location. Banff National Park offered just such a setting and played host to many conventions each summer.
In 1933 alone, it welcomed representatives from the Institute of Pacific Relations, the Fifth Pacific Science Congress, the Oxford Group Movement, the School of Dramatic Art, the Order of the Eastern Star, and the Alpine Club of Canada.

Not just professionals convened at Banff during the 1930s. Beginning in 1935 the Canadian Youth Hostels Association, an organization dedicated to the physical and moral wellbeing of the nation's young people, offered short-term hostel accommodation to their national membership and American affiliates in Banff National Park. Initially their camp was located at the YMCA grounds and later at the old Spray River relief camp, but in 1938 the Department, feeling that the movement should be supported, decided to renovate two or three small log buildings within walking distance of the townsite for use as hostels.

The depression years also witnessed the emergence of Banff as a cultural centre of note. In 1933 E.A. Corbett, the head of the University of Alberta's Extension Department, secured a Carnegie Foundation grant to underwrite the costs of establishing a school of the Arts Related to the Theatre in Banff. Although the school operated out of makeshift quarters for several years, by 1936 it had grown to include painting and music instruction, and would soon expand to encompass other fine
arts. Under the leadership of Donald Cameron after 1935, the Banff School of Fine Arts, as it came to be known, won international recognition.

Skiers, conventioneers, hostlers, artists -- these were the new clientele of the park in the 1930s. The majority of visitors continued to be motorists who came to camp overnight or for a weekend, or merely drove through the park on their way to the west coast, Calgary, or other points. By 1930 the automobile touring and camping phenomenon had developed to the point where there was general agreement upon the extension of the much-favoured bungalow camps throughout the park. The tentative policy that had been worked out in the late 1920s seemed generally appropriate, although no steps had yet been taken to clarify issues such as the disposal of leases for such camps, their precise locations, the nature of regulations regarding their construction and appearance, the appropriateness of granting related concessions, and the extent to which the government was obliged to service them with utilities. Not the least incentive for the establishment of a definite policy on bungalow camps was the constant barrage of requests from town residents for permission to accommodate visitors in backyard tents and shacks. In addition, there was general agreement that completion of the Trans-Canada highway would undoubtedly increase the flow of traffic through the park and make such camps inevitable. Consequently, it permitted the
establishment on a tender basis of camps near Banff, Johnson's Canyon, and Lake Louise along the lines suggested by earlier debates on this policy. These were felt to be locations that would most likely reward the investors for their efforts. Not until 1932, however, was the decision to allow bungalow camps legalized through the passage of an order-in-council.

By 1936 the government had turned its attention to the Banff-Jasper highway, parts of which were already open to the travelling public. Commissioner Harkin instructed the chief engineer of the park, T.M. Mills, to survey the open sections of the road with a view to selecting appropriate locations for camp sites and service stations and to make some tentative judgments about the placement of similar facilities on the uncompleted sections. Mills found that motorists were already camping at various spots along the road, which raised the threat of fire during what was a particularly dry season. He immediately recommended that two sites be slated for development: Bow Lake and Saskatchewan River Crossing. He felt that a bungalow camp was required at Bow Lake to supplement the lodge that former packer Jimmy Simpson had established there in 1921. Saskatchewan Crossing seemed a natural site for a large campground, as tours of the Columbia glacier were bound to be popular among park visitors. In the spring of 1937 the Department issued
tenders for a bungalow camp at the Crossing only; Simpson forestalled competition at Bow Lake by agreeing to add some bungalows to his chalet-hotel development. Two years later permission for yet another bungalow camp was granted, this time at the junction of the Lake Louise and Banff-Windermere highways.

Any lingering doubts among park administrators about the end of the depression were alleviated utterly in 1939 when the Associated Boards of Trade of the Rocky Mountain District informed the director of the Lands, Parks and Forests Branch that accommodations for motorists within Banff National Park was wholly inadequate. Additional complaints from the Banff Advisory Council, the Vancouver Tourist Association, and other concerned agencies were enough to convince the government of the seriousness of the situation. American motorists reportedly had to sleep in their cars if they wished to remain in the park; otherwise they had no alternative but to travel on to Canmore, Cochrane, or Calgary for accommodations. More detailed investigations indicated that the accommodations shortage only occurred on a few weekends in the year, but the government felt nonetheless that some additional camps might be in order, especially in view of the high visitor levels expected in 1940. This effort to provide adequate numbers of comfortable lodgings for visitors was one that would occupy park administrators for decades.
Major Policy Initiatives in the 1930s

The administration's preoccupation with relief work and expenditures during the depression decade tends to overshadow its initiation of several more prosaic, but nonetheless significant, policies related to general park management. These were related to townsite building controls, biological resources within the park, and forestry management.

The administration's decision to allow more bungalow camp and campground development during the late 1930s was more than a facile reaction to the incessant public clamour for more and better tourist accommodation. Just as importantly, it reflected the desire of the park management to clean up the townsite of Banff. Banff had become a considerable eyesore during the depression. Initially the problem was one of accommodation for single residents, family members or friends on relief, and summer business staff seeking low-cost housing. As the depression lifted, many of the same tents, garages and backyard shacks that had served as temporary homes were converted into a source of profit as the supply of tourist lodgings failed to meet the rising demand. The aesthetic deterioration of the townsite was such that the government thought its appearance singularly inappropriate for an international resort community.

The issue was broached indirectly at the national park superintendents' conference held at Banff in January
of 1937. There had been protracted public agitation for special low-cost subdivisions within the national parks. In Banff the minimum value of improvements to a residential lot was $1,000, but many residents had expressed the feeling that this should be decreased by half. Many different arguments had been used in defence of the idea: that parks were designed to let people regain health without spending excessively, that parks must cater to all income levels, that $1,000 was too much to spend on summer homes, that permission to erect cheaper housing would eliminate tents and backyard shacks, and that the government would benefit from additional revenues from new permanent residents.

The superintendents were unanimous in their disapproval of the concept. Some believed that the issue of accommodation for all classes had been well addressed through the provision of lodgings that ranged from luxury hotels to tent campgrounds along the highways. Others felt that to open one low-cost sub-division would be to invite a flood of lot applications that would threaten to expand the townsites indefinitely. All agreed that such sub-divisions would be nothing but a detriment to the appearance of the parks.

The Banff administration acted decisively in the summer of 1937 by conducting a thorough townsite survey to assess the nature and extent of the problem so that
remedial actions could be initiated. The surveyor, G.E.B. Sinclair, had an unenviable task. In the presence of disconcerted leaseholders, he was obliged to measure and sketch rough lot plans showing individual buildings and to photograph all unsightly structures within the townsite. For each lot, he was to prepare both a written report that included current information on all extant structures, sanitary facilities, fire conditions, architectural characteristics, and electrical and plumbing services, as well as a precis of the leasehold history, and a summary card that would be dated and signed by the leaseholder to validate the surveyor's examination. The leasehold summary card was an intriguing touch, for through it the department could determine whether any structures were erected without its permission.

Sinclair's report was condemnatory, both of Banff residents and the administration of the previous decade. He found only 31 authorized cabins in the townsite and well in excess of 400 unauthorized ones. He wrote that there has developed in the townsite of Banff during the last ten or twelve years a condition which reflects great discredit on the administration of this, the premier National Park of Canada. This condition has resulted from the construction of many cabins and shacks on lots upon which it was originally intended no more than one building should be erected.

It is no exaggeration to say that parts of Banff townsite now consist of slums, and that along...at least one street almost pure continuous roof [sic] could be built over these small buildings, so close together are they.

The surveyor went on to state that matters were made worse
in many cases by the lack of proper sanitary facilities. It was not uncommon to find three or more families living on a single lot for the summer which resulted in, as he delicately phrased it, "a consequent creation of nuisances on the lot." There were also many instances in which illegal connections had been made to town hydrants and electrical services. In detailing the secondary structures he found throughout the townsite, Sinclair distinguished among four types. Bungalow cabins which represented a better class of accommodation (with showers and all electrical conveniences) and catered mainly to American tourists were found to be in generally good condition. Cabins, most of which were old and without indoor sanitary conveniences, usually had excellent interiors but unacceptable exteriors. Tenthouses, summer dwellings which the department had first allowed in 1921 and which called for a canvas roof and walls, had usually been converted into poor cabin accommodations that were rented out even in the winter months. Finally, shacks created from garages, storage sheds and the like, without any conveniences, were invariably in precisely the condition that their name suggested.

The government was understandably appalled at the ubiquity of these unauthorized structures and took immediate action. The park superintendent, P.J. Jennings, relayed some interim recommendations to the National Parks
Bureau for consideration in November. These included immediate collection of cabin accommodation licence fees from all those residents who operated unauthorized rental lodgings during the previous summer, informing the resident engineer of the fact that principal buildings often encroached on adjacent lots so that he could deal with the matter, and discussing the various regulation violations with individual leaseholders to achieve a satisfactory and swift resolution to the slum problem. The superintendent also indicated he was willing to deal with each case on its own merits and, when warranted, grant temporary permission for winter occupancy. This last suggestion did not meet with the approval of his superiors at Ottawa. F.H.H. Williamson, controller of the Bureau, notified Jennings in no uncertain terms that he had no authority whatever to make such arrangements with those who were in direct and flagrant violation of the townsite building regulations and that his actions would only serve to complicate the situation by setting undesirable precedents. Jennings, never one to surrender a principle easily, retorted that Ottawa was taking a myopic view of the situation, one that did not consider the longstanding nature of some of the illegal townsite living arrangements or the onset of winter. "It is my understanding," he argued, "that a Park Superintendent in the administration of the many problems which are from time to time presented in a park with a
townsite and a permanent population, must use a certain amount of discretion and deal with the problems fairly and humanely." His appeal was to no avail, yet in the course of personal interviews and general meetings with leaseholders throughout the winter and spring he attempted to be as fair as possible in enforcing Ottawa's wishes. Nevertheless, Ottawa remained committed to the eventual elimination of all backyard accommodations.

Many Banff residents clearly did not appreciate the action taken by Ottawa with respect to backyard lodgings. Few disagreed with the effort to clean up the townsite, but there was no general agreement about the wholesale clearance of cabins. The editor of the Crag and Canyon indicated that the town was split in opinion, primarily along financial lines. He summarized the feelings of many by commenting that the cabins produced an annual revenue of some $50,000, which not only diminished the relief rolls but also helped fill the coffers of local businesses and the government. Others felt that such backyard slums had no place in a national park with the international stature of Banff.

It did not help that the government soon attempted to impose a new leaseholders' policy, which would reduce the period of renewal from 42 to 21 years and simultaneously raise business rental rates. The earliest intimations of the difficulties that would ensue in implementing these
changes were brought home to Superintendent Jennings when he spoke to two local real estate agents in the late winter of 1939. Those men indicated that there was considerable discontent among leaseholders that they could never own their properties outright, despite having paid annual rental fees that often exceeded the value of the property. With respect to the halving of the renewal period, both men felt that it would create a feeling of insecurity among leaseholders which would deter them from making improvements to their property. The local editor, who learned only enough about the impending changes to suggest that the renewal period would be ten years, poured out his animosity in an editorial which declared that all building in Banff would end in light of the drastic action contemplated by Ottawa, mainly because no lender would advance construction monies to mere tenants. Even once the actual 21-year renewal intention became known, the Banff Advisory Council protested it as a breach of the original lease agreements, which stipulated that leaseholders could renew on the same terms as long as the rent was up to date and the building regulations complied with. Furthermore, the councillors contended, such a short term lease would depreciate the value of the property and discourage improvements. In this case, the government reconsidered its position, continued to issue 42-year leases, and merely modified them to state that the lease rental might be subject to review after 21 years.
The government was no less concerned with the more remote parts of Banff National Park than it was with the townsite. In 1936 it decided to initiate a major examination of the park's fish culture, for there was some apprehension that because angling had become so popular that even stocking could not satisfy the demand, there existed the possibility that fishing stocks were being depleted. Certainly, visiting anglers had begun to complain repeatedly that it was growing impossible to catch anything, despite the hundreds of thousands of fry deposited into the lakes each season. This of course raised the issue of lost revenues from disgruntled fishermen, and the National Parks Bureau engaged Dr. D.S. Rawson of the University of Saskatchewan to conduct the investigation with a view to establishing a definite policy of fish culture for the park that would benefit anglers.

In July of 1936 Rawson began a preliminary study at Lake Minnewanka, the largest lake and principal angling spot in Banff National Park. This was followed by examination of many local streams and other lakes. He then questioned all visiting anglers, park wardens, and guides about current fishing conditions and quickly learned that angling was very poor except in generally inaccessible locations. This corresponded to his scientific findings, which indicated that fish stocks were
abnormally low in most streams as well as in the lake. Without further study, he was hesitant to suggest a reason for the low fish populations, but did mention that as long as Lake Minnewanka was subject to annual depth variations of six meters due to its hydro-electrical development, little improvement in stocks could be expected.

Rawson devoted most of his preliminary report to outlining a feasible programme of work. He stressed that to assess the fish stock properly, he would require a full season of three to four months. This would permit him to evaluate the various lakes and streams when at different water levels and temperatures. He recommended further investigation of lakes Minnewanka, Louise, Boom, Altrude, Bow, Marvel, Baker, Two Jack, Third, Herbert, Mistaya and Peyto, as well as of the Bow and Spray rivers and Pipestone Creek. This programme was completed in September of 1938.

Rawson's final report proved extremely satisfying to the Parks Bureau because it was specific in its policy recommendations. After presenting a mass of data and a host of technical suggestions about more appropriate fish stocking procedure, the scientist recommended that the government publicize more extensively the excellent angling available at lakes like Boom, Marvel, Egypt, Sawback, Mystic and those in the Ptarmigan Valley. This would relieve pressure on over-fished waterbodies while providing superb recreational angling. In fact, the
Bureau went farther and imposed the first angling licence in the history of the park to render its record-keeping less difficult. As was usual when a longstanding policy was changed, the public reacted poorly and condemned the government for charging anglers to fish barren waters. Nonetheless, the administration had taken a small, but important, step towards more direct environmental management.

A similar concern was evident in the federal government's unequivocal support of the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board. This Board developed from federal-provincial discussions during the late 1930s about the water resources of the eastern slope. The disastrous prairie drought that had coincided with the economic depression had made many officials more sensitive to the need for planned and co-ordinated water resources management. The situation was particularly acute on the eastern slope since it was from that source that the prairie provinces received most of their water for domestic use, hydro-electricity, and agricultural irrigation. If the forest cover of that area were not properly maintained, it was likely that the watershed would be imperilled. This possibility was raised in 1937 when the government of Alberta indicated that due to financial constraints it would no longer be able to provide any fire protection to the eastern slope areas
under provincial jurisdiction. The proximity of these forests to Banff and Jasper National Parks awakened fears in the National Parks Bureau about the hazard of fire.

Disagreement about the appropriate manner in which to allocate responsibility for the forests of the eastern slopes stalled the talks. Both sides agreed that protection was necessary, but the federal government could not accept the only proposal put forward by Alberta. It recommended that the federal government might again assume control of the lands in question, but without jurisdiction over sub-surface minerals. In 1943, Ottawa withdrew its objection, only to find that Alberta was no longer able to back its original proposition unequivocally.

Consequently, a more complete list of administrative options was drawn up for consideration by the Dominion Forest Service.

The first alternative remained revesting control of the eastern slopes in the federal government without sub-surface rights or responsibility for game management. The officials at Ottawa believed that this would best serve the public interest, as existing administrative machinery could be utilized to exercise complete control over the resource. A second alternative, an annual federal subsidy to the province for fire protection, would not permit Ottawa to control the degree of protection. The final proposal -- establishment of a joint commission to administer logging, grazing, and fire protection within
the watershed — was felt to be the weakest alternative of all. It would involve the creation of a separate staff that implied hiring 'raids' on both federal and provincial forestry agencies, a lack of co-ordination with broader provincial and prairie forestry objectives, and might set an unwise precedent for similar actions in eastern Canada. The Forestry officials opted for the original proposition.

When the federal government again raised this option, the Alberta government replied that it had no intention whatever of returning the lands to federal jurisdiction and that it fully expected federal financial assistance in dealing with watershed protection. Ottawa concluded that a joint commission seemed the only acceptable vehicle of administration. The province agreed with the concept but insisted that the commission be advisory only, devoid of administrative powers. Months of negotiations followed on the details of the commission, and by mid-1947 it was agreed that a three-member commission, known as the Eastern Rockies Forest Conservation Board, would be appointed with the power to advise upon and carry out all necessary measures for the protection of the eastern slope forests. This agreement, which was to be in effect for 25 years, assured the prairies of an adequate water supply and guaranteed Banff National Park effective forestry management both within and outside of its boundaries.

The establishment of the Conservation Board, no less
than the government's enforcement of leasehold regulations or execution of a major fish culture study, signalled the start of much more direct participation by Ottawa officials in affairs related to the administration of Banff National Park. This was a significant departure from the tradition of semi-autonomy that had characterized previous decades of park management. Superintendents found their role diminished, just as townsite residents had became more concerned with the issue of 'absentee landlordism'. Seen in perspective, however, the shift towards more centralized park administration was merely one small aspect of increasingly interventionist government policies in Canada.

The Park and the War
While not a central event in the history of Banff National Park, World War II did leave its imprint on local administration. Inevitably, the park's participation in war-related activities compromised its recreational and conservation mandate. Alpine troops trained on skis within the park. At Lake Louise, a secret engineering study of ice bridges took place. But more importantly, the park was expected to accommodate enemy aliens until the conclusion of hostilities and to permit additional hydro-electrical development of its water resources for industrial purposes. The single benefit the park received
as a result of the war was the use of conscientious
objectors who helped fill the local labour vacuum left by
the overseas conflict.

The pattern of alien internment was almost identical
to that of the Great War: the federal government sought
an isolated location away from urban centres where the
inmates could perform useful labour. In June of 1940
Controller F.H.H. Williamson of the National Parks Bureau
asked Superintendent Jennings to recommend a location for
600 men. Jennings did not hide his hostility toward the
idea:

In the first place the National Parks should not be
used for this purpose for many and obvious reasons.
The Parks are national playgrounds and are areas set
aside for the preservation of natural conditions and
large camps of men seriously disturb these conditions
-- particularly the wild life.

Outlying areas, that is to say areas lying away
from Banff and which could only be serviced over our
fire roads, cannot be recommended; the upkeep would
be very costly and the areas difficult to protect.

Past experience in this Park has proven that the
work done by enemy aliens has been so very
unimportant and the disturbance to the surrounding
areas so extensive that it has taken years to adjust
and repair. It is therefore impossible for me to
recommend that we re-establish such conditions while
knowing the inevitable result.

As a practical alternative, Jennings recommended that the
camp be established on the prairies where servicing and
surveillance would be simplified. His opinion was taken to
be inappropriate in wartime, yet perhaps because of his
opposition the camp was established outside the park, a
few miles from Ozado, on the north side of Mount Barrier,
where a forestry work camp had been developed as a relief
measure in the 1930s. It was known as the Kananaskis Prisoner of War Camp.

The camp was intended for 600-650 prisoners, yet it ultimately held closer to 1,500. Most were enemy aliens, but later it housed German officer personnel. These men were obliged to establish their own prison. They cleared the compound of trees and underbrush, laid water pipes, constructed most of their own shelters, and built a 12,000 watt power station. Around the site, they erected a high barbed wire fence. The principal activity of the men was the clearing of an entire valley bottom that was flooded after the war to form Barrier Lake.

The Kananaskis camp also held some conscientious objectors after 1941, who became responsible for providing the camp with firewood. By amendment to the National War Services Regulations in 1940, anyone who refused to serve in the armed forces was relocated and compelled to perform alternative work. Most were accommodated at four camps within the park: one at Healy Creek, another at Lake Louise, a third in the Cascade Valley near Stoney Creek, and the fourth in the Spray Valley. In December of 1941 there were 135 prisoners in the camps. Most were Mennonites or Seventh Day Adventists, and nearly half were of Dutch origin. Prior to the war, most had been farmers. Later, many Hutterites and Jehovah's Witnesses would also be interned and the total camp population would exceed
The conscientious objectors performed various tasks for the park administration which tried, whenever possible, to assign them to conservation activities. In just the last six months of 1941, for example, they renovated the wardens' equipment building, demolished an old isolation hospital, rebuilt the Lake Louise campground, cleared and fenced the wardens' pasture sites, dug a canal to the animal paddock at Cascade Mountain, renovated the youth hostel buildings, cut cordwood, improved several roadways and bridges, restrung a telephone line, erected a radio reception aerial, maintained or developed 11 trails, packed materials through the mountains for construction of fire towers, cruised and treated forested areas for insect infestations, and constructed a teahouse on the summit of Sulphur Mountain. Moreover, the men did the work willingly and well. Without this assistance, the maintenance of the park would clearly have suffered during the war years.

While the labour of conscientious objectors was accepted gratefully by the park administration during the war, there was no sympathy for the new hydro-electrical development proposed by Calgary Power. In October of 1940 the company submitted an application to raise the level of Lake Minnewanka through diversion of the Ghost River in a manner quite similar to that proposed in 1922
and again in 1930 for the purpose of supplying electricity to the Alberta Nitrogen Company of Calgary, a unit within the British-Canadian Explosives Programme. The power utility also offered to take over the government power system within the park on an exclusive franchise basis. Although the explosives plant required the power only as a backup system, the Dominion Power Controller did not hesitate to request permission to investigate the power potential of streams within the park. Simultaneously, the Department of Mines, Lands and Forests examined the application in detail on behalf of the National Parks Bureau.

When the Department's examination was complete, it seemed impossible to escape the conclusion that the main intent of the application was "to strengthen the Company's power situation for ordinary business." There were several alternatives that had not been considered, among them the development of a steam generation plant that would be most suitable for the declared purpose and would incidentally benefit the stagnant provincial coal industry. Then there was the hydro-electrical capacity of both the Spray Lakes and Lower Kananaskis Lake. Power could be obtained from either, although the company indicated that construction would take too long.

In its application, Calgary Power had requested authority to proceed under the War Measures Act. The
Department noted that no hydro-electrical development could take place in a national park without amendment to the Parks Act of 1930, and sought more detailed legal advice from the Department of Justice. Its lawyers recommended that excision of the Lake Minnewanka area from the park seemed the most appropriate course of action. Unsatisfied, Parks officials pointed out that the proposed development would not leave the park unimpaired for future generations and that such an action would be contrary to all precedent. Furthermore, the loss of Lake Minnewanka would mean a loss of almost half a million tourist dollars annually, while the Calgary Power project would benefit only the company.

These objections, like those of Superintendent Jennings with respect to prisoner of war camps, were set aside due to the war. The Minister of Munitions and Supply declared that the hydro-electrical development was urgently required if the explosives plant was to be constructed and issued the required construction licence. The only concessions to the National Parks Branch were provisions for compensation to cottage owners, re-landscaping, an annual rental charge dependent on the quantity of power generated, and guaranteed electrical service to the park.

Conclusion

During the depression and the war, the administrators of
Banff National Park consolidated the reserve's conservation and recreation mandate which had been conferred upon them by the 1930 National Parks Act. They encouraged the development of downhill skiing facilities that would soon earn Banff an international reputation, and thereby fostered the growth of the park as a year-round resort. They developed a policy framework within which private entrepreneurs could create numerous roadside bungalow camps and campgrounds to service the influx of motoring tourists. This both generated additional revenues in the form of rental fees with which to pay for routine park maintenance and encouraged the travelling public to remain in the park longer than would have been the case had they been obliged to stay at the more expensive townsite hotels. Their support of a detailed scientific examination of local fish resources was similarly designed to assist the tourist trade through the provision of additional and better recreational opportunities. These and other significant policy decisions tended to be obscured by the massive relief programme of the 1930s, yet there is no doubt that they indicate the unequivocal support that now existed within the bureaucracy for a national park system dedicated to the twin aims of public recreation and natural resources conservation.

Of course there were several incidents that
threatened to diminish the integrity of this decidedly entrenched administrative philosophy. Chief among these was the insistence of Calgary Power on further development of the hydro-electrical potential of Lake Minnewanka. The company's success in the early years of the war signified the intensity of the resolve about assisting the war effort that permeated the highest levels of government. As significantly, perhaps, this important inroad into the new national parks mandate reminded all those in the National Parks Bureau of the callowness of their agency, its vulnerability to political pressures, and the distance yet to go before their mandate was accepted as redeeming in itself.

The contemporary juxtaposition of both tremendous success and dispiriting failure in regard to that mandate illustrated the degree to which the federal government had adopted interventionist philosophy during the crisis of the depression. The government's actions during that decade were on a par with the decisiveness with which it acted during the war. Both episodes indicated that the Canadian public fully expected its national government to take a more aggressive role in policy-making at all levels. Its actions were not always appreciated by the public, as evident from the issue of leasehold rentals, yet few would have argued that all its decisions were retrogressive or ill-conceived. The federal government emerged from the era with a new mandate of its own, one of
incredible power that could as easily harm the national parks system as benefit it.
Introduction

The history of Banff National Park in the first two decades of the postwar era was characterized by concerted governmental efforts to elaborate on the concept of the park as a year-round recreational centre and natural resources conservation preserve. Expansion and improvement of the road network led to unprecedented annual levels of tourist visitation, encouraged further by a much more aggressive and direct government publicity campaign that stressed the pleasures and benefits of outdoor recreation. This public popularity largely defined the administration's approach to local management and visitors' recreational needs clearly preceded the interests of townsite residents in the hierarchy of official concerns.

Prior to 1958, however, policy formulation was very much like a pendulum that swung in response to public opinion. If the interests of any one group were not sufficiently weighed against desired park values, there was always the threat of park impairment. Consequently,
the park administrators had to monitor their own behavior with vigilance. Before the period was over, however, they were able to reaffirm the traditional philosophical basis of park policy. The early 1960s witnessed a definite shift away from the interests of special lobbies and towards an administration comprised of guardians of national park values.

Postwar Reconstruction Programmes

Following the Second World War, all levels of government in the country initiated specific reconstruction programmes. These possessed the common goals of easing the re-integration of returning soldiers into society and the conversion of wartime economic strengths into peacetime policies, projects and jobs that would forestall the usual postwar recession that all expected. Banff National Park, like most Canadian polities, launched its own reconstruction programme.

Shortages characterized immediate postwar Canada. There were shortages of foodstuffs, gasoline, clothing, housing, and other vital commodities. In Banff National Park, the lack of accommodations for returning soldiers was particularly acute. When the Special Committee on Veterans' Affairs made it known that it expected all towns to make a special effort to find housing for returning soldiers, the controller of the Lands, Parks and Forests
Branch did not react with enthusiasm. The Banff townsite, he pointed out, was different from other communities. Practically all of the lots were already occupied and the administration had no interest in expanding the size of the townsite merely to accommodate veterans who would not likely be able to find work locally. In fact, the Branch was making a concerted effort to discourage soldiers from returning to Banff on a permanent basis, an important step in view of the provision of the Veterans' Land Act that prohibited the awarding of grants except to veterans with assured livelihoods. Furthermore, as the park maintained a waiting list for lots that might become vacant and had always disposed of these through public tender, the controller could see no justification for an abrupt change in this longstanding policy.

While there is no record of the reaction of the Special Committee on Veterans' Affairs, by the spring of 1946 the Director of the Lands, Parks and Forests Branch, R.A. Gibson, had communicated with J.M. Wardle, now director of the Surveys and Engineering Branch of the Department of Mines and Resources, about the nature of the veterans' housing that would have to be constructed in the park. The Canadian Mortgage and Housing Corporation agreed to provide funds for the erection of 20 family units of temporary nature and all related facilities to a maximum of $25,000. The only stipulation was that these
structures would not be rented to tourists without the express written consent of the Housing Corporation, suggesting that the Parks Bureau had managed to reach a compromise with the officials on the Special Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

The development was to be located on Tunnel Mountain, immediately north-east of the existing campground. That site provided adequate space for an uncrowded layout of structures and possessed excellent drainage. All necessary utilities were already in place because of the campground and it was believed that eventually the buildings might make a fine addition to those tourist facilities. The proposed quality of construction was low, however, not just as an economic measure but to ensure that private bungalow concessionaires would not one day face competition from superior units. If, in fact, the units turned out to be of better quality than any of the privately-owned structures on the mountain, the administration was quite prepared to allow the entrepreneurs to bid for the right to operate the government units as tourist quarters. All construction was to occur during the summer of 1946 so that veterans and their families were able to occupy the units in 1947. In addition, the park agreed to move ten of the former prisoner of war cabins from Kananaskis to the same site to increase the amount of available accommodation.
Construction and operation of the units did not go smoothly. The bid accepted by the government was for $32,000, which required an additional grant from the Canada Mortgage and Housing Corporation, as the department professed to have no funds available to cover the overrun. Later, however, the difference was refunded to the Corporation. Work then began on 5 July, but the successful bidder, Shoquist Construction, had only a small crew and took more than twice the allowed time to build the units. After the twenty units were completed, only six were occupied by ex-servicemen and their families, while the rest remained empty. By mid-1948 it was clear to all concerned that no additional demand for the units existed and with the concurrence of Veterans' Affairs, the Parks Branch decided to turn the vacant properties over to local veterans who were already engaged in the operation of bungalow camps. The new proprietors were to furnish the cabins and make them available to tourists at a reasonable rate, which was to be agreed upon in consultation with local officials. Even this met with no success, and the Parks administration considered making the empty units available to private concessionaires as emergency overflow tourist accommodation. By 1954 the Department was attempting to decide whether to maintain the buildings as bungalow camp facilities or to relocate some of them for use as wardens' cabins and youth hostel buildings and to demolish others for salvage materials. In sum, the
effort to provide returning veterans with temporary accommodation in the townsite was a decided failure.

Throughout the unhappy episode of the veterans' housing on Tunnel Mountain, the park administration never strayed far from its preoccupation with tourist facilities. Certainly a shortage had developed during the latter years of the depression, one that local investors were unprepared to let the government forget. The administration's simultaneous effort to remove the more unsightly backyard cabins and shacks that town residents had erected or developed reflected the same official concern with the needs of the tourist. An unattractive community was no asset, to which an increasing number of disparaging comments by visitors attested. Because the Banff townsite remained the chief stopping-point of all travellers, its appearance was of paramount importance. In an effort to establish the first comprehensive and unambiguous policy for the townsite, the administration engaged Edmonton architect Cecil M. Burgess to develop a townsite development plan in 1945.

Burgess's report was submitted in August of 1945. It was a brief, yet wide-ranging document that touched upon the existing tourist accommodation situation, residential districts, the lay-out of the community, general recreational facilities within the townsite, and its architectural characteristics. Its author did not
hesitate to note that the report's purpose was to address "the adequate provision for [sic] the necessities and the amenities of life for visitors who come for residence, for health, or for holiday." In general, Burgess felt that good housing had to be pleasantly situated, that the town's layout had to be both functional and attractive with ample informational services and recreational facilities, and that basic considerations such as automobile parking and circulation had to be addressed. It was, in short, a planner's document.

In 1945 Banff's population was approximately 2,000, with tourist accommodations for 5,600 guests. Hotels rooms comprised 17 per cent of the total, private lodgings some 47 per cent, cabins about 27 per cent, and adjacent bungalow cabins eight per cent. If the tenting campgrounds on Tunnel Mountain were added to this listing, another 2,000 tourists could be accommodated. Still there was not sufficient room for the tourist population during the peak summer months, and many visitors were obliged to spend the night in a car or return to Calgary or intermediate points. Moreover, many adverse comments had been recorded about the quality of accommodation within the park, particularly that at the lower end of the cost scale. Consequently, Burgess recommended not only the improvement of existing cabins, but the addition of an innovative style of accommodation which he called bungalow automobile courts. By permitting the
construction of adjoining units across adjacent lots, he believed that the administration would be able to develop low-cost one-storey facilities of a coherent design facing an open court area that would provide ample parking. The attractiveness of such an integrated complex would contribute greatly to the enhancement of much-desired downtown accommodations.

Burgess recognized that the demand for permanent accommodation within the community was high, and made a concerted effort to tabulate the available building lots by district and their approximate residential capacities. He felt that the St. Julien sub-division, which had been laid out on Tunnel Mountain in 1917, would become much more popular as a residential district if the administration would permit the leasing of several lots as one, mainly due to the irregularity of the ground surface which made it difficult to select a good building site on the existing narrow lots. Once the needed utilities were installed, he predicted the construction of 200 family residents housing about 1,000 people. In the Villa Lots subdivision south of the river, he similarly found 211 unleased lots with room for another 1,000 residents. Between Fox and Marmot streets, facing Banff Avenue, there were 39 unleased lots to accommodate another 200 people. Finally, he identified 22 more lots near Whiskey Creek which might be developed once the area was properly
drained. In short, Burgess found room for an additional 2,300 permanent residents -- enough to double the town population -- a statistic which seemed to belie the current outcry about the lack of building lots. Of course the architect did not consider the cost of the lots as a limiting factor in their immediate development.

Burgess did not agree with the many criticisms that had been voiced about the dowdy appearance of the town in general and the blandness of Banff Avenue in particular. The views of Cascade and Sulphur mountains were, in his view, unparalleled assets. As for the main street, he thought it pleasant, well-kept and spacious, and recommended only that those blocks containing store-fronts be improved through the addition of finishing materials more sympathetic to the mountain setting. Native stone was preferable. In addition, he suggested that the administration impose specific regulations regarding roofstyles, awnings, paint, and commercial signs, in the hope of eventually creating a distinctive form of continuity in the streetscape. Further enhancement of both the commercial section of the town and its subdivisions could be achieved through the maintenance of property fencing and the planting of flowers and hedges.

Burgess recommended that the park expropriate all of block 11 and 6 lots of block 13 to provide room for a central bus station and automobile parking lot. No provision had ever been made for these essential services
in the downtown district and yet travel to the park by both means had increased enormously in the last two decades. He allayed fears of unsightliness by recommending that the parking area be adequately screened with trees and that its interior include a floral park with pool. The bus station should contain informational services as well as an upper-floor restaurant that capitalized on the scenic vistas from the townsite. If this recommendation were implemented, the park could solve its perennial accessibility problem in the town core while beautifying some generally unused commercial lots.

Finally, Burgess addressed the issue of townsite recreation. His plan focussed on two specific sites: the Bow River bridgehead and the recreation grounds. He saw the bridgehead development as part of a re-development of the museum and Central Park, which had been created by the closure of the zoo for humanitarian and financial reasons in 1937. While he did suggest outright that the old museum should be dismantled, he did recommend that a new museum-library complex be constructed that could house natural and human history exhibits, local artwork and crafts from the Banff School of Fine Arts, and a library devoted to the opening of the west. Within the complex, he wanted to see a public lounge with several fireplaces and perhaps a coffee shop to which the public and children in particular could resort on rainy days. Part of the
remainder of Central Park could be used as a parking lot. On the river side of the property, he recommended construction of an elevated viewing terrace some 3 or 4 meters wide, which would have to be complemented by cosmetic improvements to the unsightly south bank. The promenade could be continued on the east side of the bridge, where it might terminate in a memorial garden with shelter next to the Canadian Legion building.

Burgess lamented the razing of the recreational pavilion that had occurred in the 1930s on the grounds that the town badly needed a recreational centre. To protect the grounds from the flooding that had destroyed the pavilion, the architect recommended construction of an embankment as a continuation of Birch Avenue on the river side to join the Sundance Canyon road about half a mile beyond the Cave and Basin, as well as improvements to the old embankment that ran southwards from the riverbank to the east of the Cave and Basin. The top of the embankment, he believed, would make an excellent bicycle path and pedestrian walkway. Along it, picnic spots could be developed to meet the needs of the many boaters who used the Bow on weekends. His idea of a recreation centre fell somewhat short of the architectural vision that had inspired the original pavilion. Burgess thought that "two mess halls with kitchen between them on an 'H' plan like some army mess rooms would probably meet the requirements well." Within the recreation grounds themselves, he
envisioned a golf course, and plenty of room for competitive outdoor sports, such as baseball, tennis, lawn bowling, and curling.

While the reaction of the administration to the Burgess re-development plan has apparently not survived, it is clear that few, if any, of his recommendations were implemented. This need not imply disapproval of his concepts; it could just as easily have been a reflection of the limited park appropriations available following the war. The latter seems more likely, as the administration did not hesitate to continue its search for more appropriate ways in which to direct the development of the Banff townsite. One of the best examples of this policy was the establishment of a federal commission on leasehold rentals in 1950.

In the late 1930s the administration had tried in vain to tie a leasehold rental increase to the clean-up of the townsite. In 1940 it succeeded in implementing an increase in the rentals on business lots, but residential property rentals remained unchanged due to adverse public reaction. In all leases signed in recent years, a clause had been inserted that provided for rent review every ten years and in 1950 the government was determined to make a satisfactory adjustment of local rents. The costs of providing all townsite services had doubled in the past decade and yet in both Banff and Jasper, where year-round
residence was permitted, lot rentals were lower than in national parks which permitted only summer residence. One memorandum provided the following example of the discrepancy between Banff rents and the taxes that an owner would have to pay in an ordinary municipality:

A typical example is the case of a property involving three lots (Nos. 8, 9 & 10 in Block 4, Banff) which was sold for $14,000 in December, 1949, to close an estate. On these lots were located a residence, garage and fuel shed. The yearly rental for the three lots is $24 at the rate of $8 each. The property was assessed for school purposes at $2,535, consequently school taxes at 18 mills would be approximately $45. Water, sewer, and garbage assessments under Parks Regulations would amount to about $35 so that the total taxes on this property for 1949, including ground rental, would be about $105. In a municipality such as Ottawa, the taxes would be in the neighbourhood of $250.10

To remedy this situation, Ottawa first asked all national park superintendents for their views on appropriate rental levels for the next ten-year period. In general terms, the Banff superintendent recommended only minor increments in the case of residential properties, in the region of 20-25 per cent depending on location.

There was general agreement in Ottawa that rents would have to rise, but officials also recognized the difficulty that would attend implementation of such a change after decades of rent stability. R.A. Gibson, the director of the Development Services Branch of the Department of Resources and Development, felt that an investigation by an independent authority was required. This feeling extended to the Minister, Robert Winters, who
believed that the Department had to find a judge to conduct an enquiry into rentals in all national parks within the four western provinces. Discreet enquiries were carried out, but ultimately it was decided that a judge would not take the practical approach necessary to the success of the commission. Instead, the Department opted for a chartered accountant in Edmonton, Harry O. Patriquin.

In August, the Department laid the ground-rules for the enquiry. The scope of the commission would be limited to Banff and Jasper parks, with the understanding that its findings could then be extrapolated to other western national parks. Rather than holding public hearings in which all aggrieved leaseholders might present their cases, it was decided that Patriquin would meet only with representatives of the Banff Advisory Council and the Chamber of Commerce. This would limit the time needed for the enquiry and quite possibly the difficulties of implementing the inevitable rental hike. Patriquin's commission was designed more to find an appropriate level of increase and a plan for implementation than to judge the merits of such a rise.

Patriquin did not disappoint the Department. He began his report with a recommendation that Banff leases be made to conform to those in other national parks. Most residential leases renewed or issued after 1940 were for a term of 42 years, with a provision that rents might be
reviewed every 21 years. All other national parks issued leases that provided for review every ten years, and Patriquin thought this disparity should be removed. The bulk of his report, however, focussed on discovery of a suitable formula for implementing rental increases. His deliberations were complicated by the fact that only about 21 per cent of Banff leases would come up for revision in 1950 and just about half of them by 1960. The other half could not be altered until after 1961, and in most cases not until 1966-7. Thus, he decided on a sliding scale of increase, dependent on the date at which the lease was due for renewal. All expired leases would follow his recommended increase, all 1951 leases would be at the recommended level plus ten per cent, all 1952 leases at the recommended level plus 20 per cent, and so on until 1955, when current rates would have been more than doubled. If the government desired, it could of course extend the ten per cent annual increase to 1959. While the recommended rent differed depending on the location of a lot within the townsite and its use, Patriquin generally suggested that residential rates be increased between 26 and 57 per cent, and business lots between 33 and 50 per cent.

The Deputy Minister was not in agreement with Patriquin's recommendations. He felt that "the proposed new rents for Banff and Jasper -- particularly for Banff
-- are a good deal lower than the value of the benefits to be derived from the use of the land. In other words, the taxpayers of Canada, who own the land and whose money is spent in the development of the Parks, do not seem to be getting a fair return on their property." 15 If Patriquin had conducted any comparative study of townsite rentals with ordinary municipal bodies, he would have recognized the advantageous level of rentals in national parks. Furthermore, the fact that people were willing to pay a purchase premium beyond the appraised value of townsite lots clearly indicated that current rents were lower than the true value of the property. Those premiums ranged between $400-1,000 for a residential lot and $5,000 for a business lot. In addition, the Deputy Minister did not find convincing the accountant's argument that to raise substantially the rents of those whose leases were expiring immediately was discriminatory when viewed against the situation of those whose leases would not expire for perhaps 35 years. He offered a personal example and several others to make his point:

I have fairly recently built a house, and one of my immediate neighbours has a house just as good as mine, but built in 1933, which cost just half what mine cost. It is an essential part of the free enterprise economic system that people who are fortunate enough to have a long-term contract on favourable terms benefit in comparison with those who do not have such a contract. The person who borrows money for twenty years at a time when interest rates are high has no grounds for claiming that he is discriminated against by the person who, a few years later, is fortunate enough to take advantage of a decline in interest rates.16
He closed his letter to Patriquin with the hope that the commissioner might wish to reconsider his position. In a lengthy rebuttal, which addressed all the points raised by the Deputy Minister, Patriquin defended his position without hesitation. Within a month, the Deputy Minister had recommended that Patriquin's original recommendations be presented to the Minister for his approval.

Reconstruction activities in the park comprised direct actions as well as the formulation of new policies. The extensive road construction programme launched after the war was the most visible and important example of such actions. As early as 1942 discussions were being held at the directorate level within the federal government about the advisability of implementing additional highway construction through the national parks as a post-war rehabilitation programme. It was felt that better roads would not only bring more visitors to the parks, but would encourage them to remain longer. This view was not surprising, for in the late 1930s there was much negative comment within the bureaucracy about the condition of many of the park roads and wonderment that more accidents had not occurred. Excessive dust, potholes, and 'washboard' surfaces contributed, for example, to the sarcastic renaming of the Lake Minnewanka drive as the "rocky road to Dublin." The problem, of course, was the lack of funding for road maintenance and upgrading that had
prevailed during the depression years.

The road maintenance issue became more complex during the early 1940s as heavy-duty commercial vehicles increasingly passed along the Trans-Canada highway through the park. The Branch was confronted with deciding whether to allow use of the road system by buses and transport trucks or to compel such vehicles to take the Crow's Nest Pass route through the Rockies. Because they did not believe that the government as a whole would sanction the latter solution, Branch officials investigated the possibility of reconstructed the highway to eliminate bottlenecks. They concluded that "we must keep our park roads commodious enough to accommodate all traffic and still give the tourist an enjoyable trip. It looks as though the dual highway, where feasible without too much cost may be justified...."

By June of 1944 Chief Engineer T.S. Mills had had an opportunity to investigate the concept of a multi-lane highway through the park. He initially considered the merits of a three-lane highway, but was forced to conclude that it was unfeasible because of the impossibility of ensuring adequate visibility given the irregular topography. He was not altogether in favour of a four-lane highway because of cost and lack of sufficient traffic flow, but did believe that a divided four-lane road could enhance substantially the safety of the system. Even if the four-lane route were constructed, it would
nonetheless be necessary to restrict all traffic to a maximum speed of 80 kilometers per hour. The question of whether current and projected traffic flows justified the considerable expenditure needed to widen the existing highway system was quite another matter. Mills found that even if they projected a 300 per cent increase in park motoring after the war, the maximum hourly traffic flow would be 340 vehicles. As the recommended upper limit for traffic on a two lane road was 200 vehicles per lane per hour, the engineer did not feel that a multi-lane highway could be justified.

With the issue of a multi-lane highway through the entire park seemingly disposed of, Branch officials turned their attention to specific improvements to individual roads. Parks Controller J. Smart believed that several improvements were immediately necessary. Clearly a four-lane highway from the east boundary of the park to Anthracite was justified in view of the extremely heavy flow of cars and buses into the Banff townsite, but beyond that point a 'super' two-lane highway would suffice. Within the Branch, there was general agreement on these points. It was also felt, however, that some two dozen other road improvements had to be made. These included reconstruction of the Moraine Lake road, widening the Lake Minnewanka road, construction of new bridges across the Bow River at Lake Louise and the Spray at Banff, and the
hard surfacing of many stretches of road throughout the park to eliminate the dust nuisance.

Implementation of this ambitious programme of road reconstruction was delayed repeatedly throughout the 1950s. It was not until 1952 that reconstruction of the Trans-Canada highway began at the east gate of the park, and six more years would elapse before work was completed. The Norquay traffic circle was added in 1959. Improvements to other roads within the park occurred, but no expansion of the existing network took place. Throughout this decade, the administration's intent in inaugurating it would never falter. As the new park superintendent, J.A. Hutchinson, expressed it in 1947:

We have the resources, scenery, wildlife, splendid climate, but unless lines of communication such as good roads and trails are established and maintained on a high standard and unless accommodation reaches a satisfactory state of development I am afraid that other competitive territories will draw a large number of tourists.24

The Response to Tourist Demand to 1960

The post-war years brought the type of economic recovery to Banff National Park that its optimistic administrators had foreseen. Visitor levels skyrocketed and the demands for services multiplied at a terrific rate. In concert with private investors, the administration attempted simultaneously to promote and keep pace with the demand for improved accommodation and recreational opportunities.
Significantly, however, the administrators were increasingly less prepared to sacrifice park values to the demands of the tourists. Rather, they attempted to accommodate both needs within a broad policy of maintaining the integrity of the park as an unimpaired reserve.

Accommodation was a priority that went hand in hand with the expansion of the park road system during the 1950s. As in the previous decade, low-cost automobile bungalow camps remained the predominant form of new accommodation. Demand remained high for these roadside conveniences, in contrast to the more basic tenting campgrounds, and since 1937 the administration had had another reason for promoting their development. In that year it passed a new regulation that called for all concessionaires to give the government a share of gross revenues.

Attempts at construction proceeded apace both during and after the war years. Late in 1939 the government had called for tenders to construct a new bungalow camp on the east end of Tunnel Mountain, which would be rented for the low price of $2 per night. Three years later two different grades of cabins (with and without indoor plumbing) were permitted at a new site near Lake Minnewanka. The situation following the war was more difficult. Shortages of construction materials plagued the concessionaires and temporarily threatened the
administration's ability to provide adequate accommodation for the anticipated throngs of park visitors. This also meant that the Tunnel Mountain site experienced increasing congestion. The three campsites on the mountain possessed a common access route, which choked the road with traffic, and the volume of both automobile and pedestrian traffic had seriously impaired the ground-cover.

By 1950 the government was beginning to view the problem somewhat differently. It was cognizant of the shortage of bungalow camp accommodation that usually prevailed during the months of July and August, but that there was a need for caution in the erection of additional camps. Visitor levels could not be predicted and the administration feared that additional bungalows might threaten the viability of the 18 camps already in operation. In addition, the focus of attention had become the route of the Trans-Canada Highway, where bungalow camps would clearly be needed most once the reconstruction was completed. As J.A. Hutchinson expressed it, "on completion of the Trans-Canada Highway I can conceivably see a change of trends both with respect to locations that are considered favourable for operators of bungalow camps or motels and in respect of our own view of where such future developments might be located."

As construction of the Trans-Canada Highway through the park was slowly completed over the decade of the '50s,
the government's policy on roadside accommodations continued to evolve. Considerations other than those of visitor needs rose in importance for the first time. As the Deputy Minister wrote to a group of prospective Lake Minnewanka hotel developers in 1957:

"...in administering the National Parks we have to take into consideration not only the needs of the moment but the probable needs for many years to come and it is therefore necessary for us to proceed with the greatest care. We have to do our best to channel development into those areas which will meet the needs of visitors and which will cause the least impairment to the natural beauties of the Park. We also have to consider our own timetable for the development of access roads and other facilities which make possible the erection of accommodation facilities at outlying points.31"

In correspondence with the same group early in 1958, he further suggested that government policy on accommodations along the Trans-Canada was not finalized, but that one of the chief traffic safety features that would have to be considered was the desire for limited access to the highway. No applications for the construction of roadside accommodations of any sort could be entertained until a final policy had been established.

No construction of accommodations proceeded while the government tried to arrive at a suitable policy. The need for a policy was becoming pressing in light of the new demand for motel accommodations, and late in 1958 the National Parks Branch had compiled a list of recommendations for the new Minister about in-park accommodations. Chief among its recommendations was one
for the grouping of visitor facilities in specific sites, so that automobile service stations, grocery stores, and the like would be clustered with bungalow camps, motels, and campgrounds. "The object of such an arrangement," as the Minister expressed it, "would be to minimize impairment of the natural beauty of the Parks and to simplify servicing such as electricity, garbage disposal, and water and sewer systems...such developments, or 'satellite' areas, would not only be of benefit to the Parks themselves, but to the concessionaires located within those areas as well." This viewpoint was not notable for its originality, but rather for the conviction with which it was expressed at the highest government levels. It boded well for the reconfirmation of traditional natural park values.

The caution with which the administration selected new developmental policies stood in marked contrast to its eagerness to promote visits to Banff National Park. After the Second World War, governmental park promotion became an art form that rivalled the traditional Canadian Pacific attempts at advertising. Pamphlets distributed through the Information Centre at Banff or through the mails had been the most popular form of governmental advertising until the Second World War but subsequently films became the favoured promotional medium. One of the first was "Family Outing", made by Crawley Films Limited under a sub-contract from the National Film Board at a cost of
$2,200. This 14-minute, 16-mm film, with sound and colour, focussed on the experiences of an average family on vacation in Banff National Park while camping on Tunnel Mountain. In addition to showing the variety of camping facilities available, it stressed the range of summer recreational activities in which visitors could indulge: swimming, boating, riding, golf, wildlife study, and so on. The film was widely distributed through the offices of the National Film Board and was a considerable success. The Branch seemed particularly pleased with a letter it received from an American named Mr. Bauche, who had seen a showing at the Portland, Oregon, Public Library, and was so impressed that he persuaded four other families to journey to Banff by car.

The success of "Family Outing" as promotional material encouraged the government to sponsor a second film in 1948 that focussed on winter recreational activities. Called "Ski Holiday", this 11-minute film considered just about every conceivable winter sport and tourist activity at Banff, including the crowning of the Winter Carnival Queen. The tone of the picture was easily captured by the film director: "Try and have all activity in gay, carnival mood where there are crowds and in close shots combine fun and radiant health." The success of the effort, according to the reviewer of the Saturday Review of Literature, was not as great as that of "Family
"Although it gives some useful tips on ski techniques, clothing and equipment," the reviewer commented, "it is little more than a series of calendar picture settings complete with two lovely girls in their red and yellow costumes taking various poses before the camera. The colour quality of the photography is excellent, and so are all the other trimmings. There just isn't much to hold them together." It is doubtful, however, that there existed another promotional medium in which the government could have realized so much return on its investment. Certainly there was no doubt in government circles about the importance of promotional films; in 1954 it even sponsored a short course on techniques of national park film programming, presentation, and utilization. In 1959 alone, more than 55,000 visitors viewed 312 promotional, educational, and interpretive films in the park.

In the late 1950s and particularly during the 1960s, the concept of outdoor park interpretation mushroomed from an infrequent impromptu occurrence to a planned annual programme. Initially, the administration experimented with self-guided nature trails. The first was to the Hoodoos on Tunnel Mountain in 1959. In 1960 a second was started at Peyto Lookout, and in the next year a third was begun along the shores of Lake Agnes above Lake Louise. After 1961 Banff National Park possessed a permanent interpretive staff with two main tasks: to increase the
pleasure of park visitors and to strengthen public appreciation of the park environment.

Outdoor recreation on an increased scale began during the 1950s and nowhere was this trend more evident than in the provision of new conveniences for the enjoyment of alpine skiing. In 1948 the local industry received a major boost when Mount Norquay promoters installed the first chair-lift in the Rockies. With a length of 975 meters and a vertical rise of 400, the 59-chair facility was capable of taking skiers to the summit in just seven minutes. This was a considerable improvement over the previous rope-tows. The expense involved was such that the developers felt the government should not allow other poma-lifts until theirs had paid for itself. Even though the operation was not earning much profit, the government did not feel it could legitimately advance the interests of one private investor over another and permitted competition. By 1954 both the Sunshine Lodge and the Mount Temple resort near Lake Louise had installed comparable equipment. Imminent completion of the Trans-Canada Highway to Lake Louise prompted the installation of a gondola tramway up Whitehorn in 1958.

The accommodation of tourists needs in the post-war era points out the increasing tension that was being felt within the government about appropriate administration of national parks. While it is evident that pioneer
administrators like J.B. Harkin would have been enthralled at the degree to which public recreation had become the chief purpose of reserves like Banff National Park, it is less clear how they would have felt about the emerging conflict between the level of visitor use and the natural environment. That contemporary officials had not yet resolved the conflict to their satisfaction is abundantly evident from the degree of difficulty they experienced in formulating satisfactory policies on such critical matters as that of roadside accommodations, which happened to coincide with their zealous promotional campaign to encourage park use. That there remained considerable ambiguity of purpose in their actions could scarcely be denied.

Towards a New Park Mandate, 1957-1965

The redefinition of an appropriate mandate for Banff National Park, which had occurred only haltingly since the war ended, achieved new focus in 1957 as a Planning Section was developed in the National Parks Branch. Park administrators became concerned with long-range development plans that concentrated to a large extent on the townsites of Banff and Lake Louise. This was not so much a question of seeking basic principles as it was an adjustment of the existing mandate for public recreation and natural resource conservation to suit contemporary
conditions.

It was not surprising that within Banff National Park the redefinition of broad management policies turned mainly on the townsites. With a 1961 permanent population of more than 3,400 people, the Banff townsite formed the single largest concern of the local authorities and held the greatest potential for undesirable impacts upon the park environment. Lake Louise was emerging as a major ski resort and hoped to become the site of the 1968 Winter Olympics. The prospect of over-development was fast becoming a genuine concern. There could be little doubt that the new trend would be toward greater governmental control of many traditional in-park activities.

One of the most significant policy changes related to leasehold policy. The government was concerned with the reconciliation of traditional leasehold practices and the stated purposes of national parks. In particular, it wished to see leases restricted to those whose residence was necessary for operation of a park business. Those who possessed residences which they used only as summer cottages were singled out as a prime example of undesirable tenants. In 1959 the government chose not to accept any further lease applications for the purpose of constructing a summer residence.

Local agitation about the common complaints of leasehold insecurity and high rents persisted throughout these years, and in response to this longstanding problem
the government engaged administrative expert K.G. Crawford of the Institute of Local Government at Queen's University to investigate the situation. His terms of reference allowed him to make recommendations with respect to self-government for townsite residents, business controls, and the nature of leasehold regulations and the annual leasehold rentals. Professor Crawford reported to the Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources in 1960 and set policy precedents that would have a profound impact on daily life in the park for years to come.

With respect to the issue of self-government for permanent park residents, which had been of local interest since the 1940s at least, Crawford found that little support existed for the concept. This was principally because of widespread belief that the relatively low level of taxation could not be maintained without substantial governmental subsidy or a considerable diminution of services. This was not to suggest, however, that there existed general satisfaction about the manner in which the townsite was administered. The inherent conflict in the interests of business people and a government concerned principally with restricting the level of local commercial activity spawned a variety of complaints, but no one seriously thought these could not be resolved. Crawford recommended that better channels of communication be developed between the local administration and the
townspeople, but he refused to endorse any form of self-government for Banff.

The discrepancy between the flat annual rentals paid by the leaseholders and the percentage of gross receipts rental charge levied on owners of bungalow camps and motels had long been a point of contention and grievance in the park. Crawford agreed that it was discriminatory and recommended that all annual rentals be henceforth calculated on the basis of six per cent of the assessed value of the property. In response to local complaints about the related matter of varying terms of the leases in force and their renewal clauses, the consultant felt that no lease should be for a term that exceeded the economic life of the improvements on the property but understood that leaseholders required sufficient time in which to recoup their investments. Ultimately, he recommended retention of 42-year leases within the townsite and 21-year leases outside, with a maximum of three consecutive renewals. More than a year of study followed these significant recommendations, but in the end the government endorsed them without much amendment.

This effort was in vain, however, as a change in the federal government in 1963 caused further revision of the existing leasehold provisions. In particular, the new minister took issue with the longstanding policy of uncritically agreeing to transfers of park property. Arguing that the townsites should contain only commercial
establishments that provided essential services to visitors, the minister urged more stringent control of lease transfers to help create a new commercial character within the national parks. This was an effective, if paternal, approach to the problem of anomalous businesses within the parks. Simultaneously, the minister prohibited in-park residence by anyone not providing an essential commercial or administrative service. The days of the spa community were definitely at an end.

In 1958 another major shift in townsite policy had been initiated as the government decided to concentrate certain visitor services, such as gasoline stations, grocery stores, and motels, in special areas known as Visitor Services Centres. Both Lake Louise and Banff assumed this new identity, which at least contained commercial development within the park. In 1959 the Planning Division, in co-operation with the Engineering Services Division, prepared a preliminary concept plan for the Lake Louise townsite which dealt with traffic circulation, parking facilities, access from the Trans-Canada Highway, relocation of unsightly structures, water and sewage improvements, and the upgrading of tourist accommodations. Most importantly, this plan was based on a land-use zoning concept that made provision for visitor services, accommodations, a works compound, and an industrial area that could service the railway.
It is unquestionable that additional government control was the central objective of the preliminary plan. Banff superintendent D.B. Coombs, commenting on the plan in early January 1961, repeatedly emphasized the degree to which the administration would be able to control the nature of local development if the plan were implemented. For example, with respect to the proposed lower townsite commercial area, Coombs liked the idea of government construction and leasing of all commercial space, because this "would give the Department the very desirable control over architectural design; standards of operations and remove the problems of vested interests represented by private ownership." Similarly, the concentration of staff dormitories, kitchen and trailer space in an industrial compound was "very desirable from the point of view of effective control over these." At the same time, he stressed the need for fairness in all matters dealing with private entrepreneurs. For instance, he could see no reason why additional expensive accommodations should be permitted in the upper town where only the rich could enjoy the local scenery, and he commented at length on ways of equalizing access from the main highway to the lower town motels and cabins. If government control was becoming more stringent, it was also tempered with greater benevolence.

The similar planning exercise for the Banff townsite dwarfed efforts at Lake Louise. In 1961 the government
commissioned H. Peter Oberlander of Vancouver to undertake a re-development plan for Banff. Exhaustive studies were conducted to determine building characteristics, utilities servicing, traffic analysis, and all present uses of townsite lands that could serve as a data base for his recommendations. Dr. Oberlander premised his entire plan on a recommended national parks policy that had not yet been officially approved. For this reason, it reflected the current desire of the government to seize the initiative in community redevelopment in no uncertain terms.

Oberlander's plan was based on the development of Banff as a Visitor Services Centre and assumed the desirability of maintaining the present size of the community through the restriction of residence to those providing essential business or administrative services. More pointedly, he observed that "the National Parks administration can and ought to exercise full control over development at Banff...since every aspect of construction or reconstruction affects the use and quality of the National Park." He also challenged several sacrosanct assumptions about the nature of community development. He reversed the commonly accepted thinking that only financially viable businesses should be permitted and stated instead that public need should dictate the establishment of visitor services and facilities.
Likewise, he argued against further expansion of automobile services and encouraged development of a pedestrians' community. Finally, he recommended that the leasehold mechanism would be most effective in changing the character of the community.

The Oberlander plan had Banff Avenue at its centre. The consultant wished to turn the main street into a pedestrian mall between Cariboo and Buffalo streets so that the park visitor could enjoy "at his leisure shopping, meeting friends, eating and drinking, both indoors and out, and contemplating the National Park setting without dodging vehicular traffic." To this end, commercial kiosks and rest benches could be erected each spring and dismantled before winter. Adequate automobile parking would be placed both east and west of the mall. On the east side of the street, between Wolf and Cariboo streets, Oberlander envisioned a large civic and interpretive complex that provided information of all kinds to the visitor in written and display formats. Extensive landscaping would further stimulate use of the mall.

The entire townsite would, in fact, be linked by a system of walkways that took advantage of the natural setting. The shoreline of the Bow River, for example, would be developed with a boardwalk that could provide "a variety of stimulating visual experiences including boat landing areas, viewing bays and displays of water plants.
in lily ponds or swamp gardens. This will provide an opportunity of integrating the waterfront with the foreshore itself, and thereby bring together Park landscape with the River front landscape, reflecting the unique setting of a National Park."

If commercial development were to be restricted to Banff Avenue, then the remainder of the community might be divided in unique residential subdivisions. Oberlander divided all existing structures into two categories. The first would be for the exclusive use of permanent residents and would be restricted to one- and two-storey houses. The other would be rental accommodation for both permanent and transient residents and would comprise mainly low-rise apartment dwellings. The plan allowed tourist accommodation only in specific areas related closely to the redefined traffic patterns.

Elsewhere in the community, Oberlander recommended the development of the lands south-west of the train station as a natural landscape display area that could serve as a scenic 'gateway' for incoming visitors. On the west side of the Bow, he saw redevelopment of the recreation grounds. On Tunnel Mountain, he preferred to see the retention of the Banff School of Fine Arts, but on a restricted scale that corresponded to the size of the community as a whole.

Successful implementation of this ambitious
redevelopment plan would depend on proper capital budgeting, development of a comprehensive building code, and on-site supervision by a responsible agent of the government. While these aspects of the project were beyond the consultant's terms of reference, Oberlander did express the hope that the government could develop a means of inducing private investment for the redevelopment of Banff Avenue. He also suggested the appointment of a resident townsite manager, who might work under the responsibility of a Banff Townsite Development Board.

Department officials perused Oberlander's report with some enthusiasm, principally because it did little to challenge their own general attitude on appropriate townsite use within a national park. They concurred with his recommendations about controlling the size and character of Banff, but felt that at times the consultant merely espoused platitudes that were without substance. For instance, they certainly agreed with limiting the size of the community through residency restrictions, but felt that implementation of such a policy would be fraught with difficulties. Similarly, they agreed that the community needed redevelopment of a national park 'character', but were disappointed that Oberland had not put forth any concrete suggestions as to how this might be accomplished. Personally, they favoured development of an unmistakeable architectural theme or motif that could be insisted upon in all construction. These sorts of comments pervaded
their critique of the Oberlander report. Their feeling, in short, was that while the author's sentiments were admirable, his concrete recommendations left much to be desired. More to the point, Oberlander presented little information on the manner in which these goals might be achieved.

If the government remained at a loss as to the best ways in which to implement their desired policies, the townspeople were equally confused about how to prevent too much disruption of their lives and businesses. The Banff Advisory Council took the lead in criticizing the Oberlander report. It pointed out that the consultant premised his entire study on providing tourists with those services the government felt they should have, rather than those they need and want. Because tourism was such 'big business', the Council could not stand by and see the deliberate erosion of the townspeople's livelihood. While the Council was prepared to argue many of Oberlander's points, it reserved its harshest criticism for his recommendation that the size of the townsite be restricted. Instead, it suggested that townsite development take place immediately wherever serviced lots were available and that the number of businesses be allowed to increase accordingly. The Council also restated its longstanding opposition to any modification of current leasehold regulations. The only comment of the government
on the Council's position was that its members opposed "any changes that would not be of immediate benefit to the residents and small business operators of the Park. They appear to have overlooked the ultimate goal of the Development Plan."

The ultimate goal of all this planning remained the enhancement of visitor opportunities that were in keeping with the original intent of leaving the park unimpaired for future generations. Certainly the government was not predisposed to accept all of Oberlander's recommendations, any more than it had implemented those of any other recent consultant. It remained committed, nonetheless, to the discovery of suitable administrative mechanisms that would maximize park values without jeopardizing the established interests of those operating essential visitor services. And it was fully aware that this would be drawn-out process, requiring ingenuity and adequate consultation.

Conclusion

In the late summer of 1964 the Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources announced a new policy statement on national parks. In essence, this was the policy that had informed the Oberlander study of 1961. It reaffirmed the government's commitment to maintaining the natural integrity of the national parks while providing sufficient opportunities for public enjoyment and
education. This policy statement became "the guiding principle behind the reappraisal of the parks policy and... behind the administration and management of townsites and concessions in the parks..." In practice, it meant restrictions on park residence, limitations on the number and kind of permitted businesses, and the discontinuation of renewable leases. Outside the townsites, the policy as implemented consisted of an elaborate land-use zoning system that controlled impacts on park lands.

This statement was the culmination of the trend that the national parks administration had been evolving since the Second World War: the reversal of the attitude of development at any cost. In many ways, it reaffirmed the federal government commitment to controlled development of the hot springs reserve in a manner that had first been espoused in the early 1880s. Times had changed, of course, and the notion of an exclusive spa community had changed with them, but the administration nonetheless remained committed to the provision of recreational opportunities for the Canadian people in an unspoiled natural setting. In principle, at least, the original philosophy of national parks had come full circle.
Conclusion

The history of the Banff National Park area since the late eighteenth century has been characterized by shifting Euro-Canadian perceptions of its utility. Initially, the Rocky Mountains that frame the park area were seen as an obstacle to the fur riches of the Pacific slope; later their plentiful passes became gateways to the attainment of transcontinental political unity. The natural resources of minerals, timber and water which the railway opened to commercial exploitation through active mining, harvesting, and harnessing subsequently became more valuable for their pristine aesthetic qualities. The natural splendours of the park, which at first seemed unthreatening only when viewed from an elegant hotel terrace, eventually became enthralling destinations in their own right. From the beginning, people have repeatedly redefined the image of the Rockies and their resources in light of contemporary social expectations.

Similarly, the administrative history of Banff National Park can be seen as the product of altering national and local needs and perceptions. During the century that Banff has existed, public opinion about its
purpose has been variegated and has inevitably conditioned government policies for its operation. Sensitivity to the needs of the public has been manifest. Yet, it is equally clear that administrators themselves have often been on the leading edge of opinion about national parks such as Banff and have, quite effectively, introduced the public to new and bold concepts of park use. This administrative dialectic between public and government, marked indelibly by tension and compromise, has been the governing principle behind national parks management in this country.

Historically, national parks administrators have used the device of strict land use regulations to govern their fiefdoms in what they understood to be the national interest. These controls have traditionally been opposed by some element of society. Townsite residents, for example, whose interests are primarily commercial or recreational, have not usually agreed with the administration on matters such as the need to maintain the landscape's aesthetic integrity. In a similar manner, the provincial governments whose jurisdictions abut Banff National Park have seldom been sympathetic to the broader objectives of the federal government in creating and maintaining national parks, particularly where the expenditure of provincial funds are involved. The difficulty of securing adequate fire protection beyond
the perimeter of the park is a good example of this trend. Then, too, the expectations of different classes of tourists traditionally affected the nature of the park reserve and its amenities, although the erosion of the spa community concept at Banff by the 1920s brought quite a sharp resolution to this conflict. Another source of pressure has been the commercial sector, whether represented by the Banff Board of Trade or by the Calgary Power Company. In this case the problem has never been government prohibition of commercial activity per se, only of certain types of that activity. A further source of pressure upon the administration has been the conservation movement. Instrumental, at least by way of example, in the formation of a distinct Dominion Parks Branch in 1911, conservationists have traditionally held views that conflicted seriously with those of other private sector groups. Finally, pressure has come from the very environment of the park, whose natural resources have always been rich and, since the advent of the railway, available for exploitation. To resist the desire to develop a resource, be it a coal seam or a ski hill, has proven most difficult.

If the administration of Canadian national parks can be said to have been liberal, in the sense that it usually straddled the extremes of policy, it is clearly attributable to the many pressures with which the administrators have had to contend. The history of Banff
National Park reveals an abiding capacity, desire and need on the part of its administrators, whether in the townsite or several thousand kilometers away at Ottawa, to compromise whenever issues were clouded by controversy. This is not to say that the administrators have been unprincipled; indeed, the reverse is patently evident. Rather, it is to note the breadth of the national park constituency, the consideration with which diverse views have been received by the federal bureaucracy, the complexity of political decision-making, and the abundant opportunities for folly in matters as complex and delicate as national parks administration.
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