# THE HISTORY OF
# WATERTON LAKES NATIONAL PARK, 1800 - 1937

A research paper prepared for the
National and Historic Parks Branch

by

Ian Allison Ludlow Getty, M.A.
(University of Calgary)

March, 1971
Revised February, 1972

*FOREWARD*

The following study into the history of Waterton Lakes National Park and its immediate vicinity since initial Indian-European contact in that area was commissioned by the National and Historic Parks Branch in the spring of nineteen seventy. The study was written with the intention of providing background material for the historical exhibit in the Waterton Lakes National Park interpretation centre. To facilitate the park's interpretive program the report is organized into four chronological-topical groups. Within these four chapters a specific topic or subject is treated thematically so that it may be adopted for the park's human history exhibit.

The primary material pertaining to Waterton Lakes National Park is overwhelming but there is a paucity of published works. A list of the most important sources is provided in the bibliography. Many of the park files prior to nineteen thirty-seven have been destroyed. Most of the remaining documents are either on deposit with the Public Archives of Canada (PAC) or classified as current or "live" files by the National Parks Branch and stored at the Public Archives Records Centre (PARC), Ottawa. Without exaggeration, the quantity of documentary material for the decades after nineteen forty equal the total amount of material for the

period up to that year. However, access to government files falling within a thirty year limit is restricted. Many of the old documents and printed sources referred to herein, and acknowledged in the footnotes, were purchased or copied and are on deposit in the Waterton Lakes Park Interpretive Library. The following description and analysis of the history of Waterton Lakes Park is based upon the official records and files of the National Parks Branch. Other studies outlining the growth of the larger mountain parks would shed further light on administrative problems facing the National Parks Branch. The federal government's park policy was undoubtedly applied differently, and probably enjoyed a greater measure of success, in a cosmopolitan park such as Banff. Parks with bigger budgets could experiment with new ideas and approaches to park management. The presence of commercial enterprises, such as the Canadian Pacific Railway, along with larger tourist numbers, might dictate a different response by park officials. The attitudes and importance of other interest groups requires closer examination than is offered in this study. An analysis of pressure exerted by clubs and organizations such as the Y.M.C.A., churches, the Alpine Club of Canada, road associations, conservationists and other public groups would further elucidate the evolution of park policy. The establishment of the Canadian National Parks Association in nineteen twenty-three provided an influential sounding board for provoking changes in the park

system. Inter-departmental conflicts and the different goals of the various branches within the Department of the Interior give a further insight into the formulation of government policy. Some of the more important departments were the Wildlife Division, Irrigation Branch (or Reclamation Service), Fisheries Department, Dominion Lands Branch, Geological Survey, Forestry Branch, Indian Affairs, Department of Agriculture, and Department of Justice. A closer examination of corresponding provincial bodies would illuminate the federal governments relationship and cooperation with the provinces. Reports of the United States Department of the Interior would give the American view of Canada's park system. The files held by Glacier National Park should receive special attention to determine the impact of American ideas and policy upon developments in Waterton Lakes Park. The personal papers of prominent politicians such as James B. Harkin, R.B. Bennett, John Herron, J.S. Stewart and W.A. Buchanan would reveal their work in promoting the growth of the park. Finally, the experiences of early residents still living would add another dimension to the park's history - the meaning and impact of park policy for the private citizen. The role of some of these people, organizations, and federal departments in the development of Waterton Lakes Park is briefly mentioned, but additional research is required to realize the true import of their work in determining park policy and in contributing to the growth of Waterton Lakes National Park.

*ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS*

The tracking of the documentary material for this report depended upon the assistance and interest of many people. My work was made easier by those who gave generously of their time and knowledge in uncovering material for this study. To the Archivists, Librarians, Researchers and Staff of the Public Archives of Canada (Ottawa); of the Departmental Library, Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development (Ottawa); of the Provincial Museum and Archives of Alberta (Edmonton); of the University of Alberta, Special Collections and Archives Section (Edmonton); and of the Glenbow-Alberta Institute, Library and Archives (Calgary), I owe many thanks for their courtesies and professional advice in tracing diverse sources of information.

I am pleased to acknowledge the assistance of Mr. A.L. Helmsley, Chief, Interpretive Section, National Parks Branch, and his assistants Mr. G. Avent, Administrator, and Miss M. Dwyer, Interpretive Specialist, for their help during my stay in Ottawa. Through their cooperation I was extended many courtesies in examining National Parks Branch files. It was a pleasure to discuss the history of Canada's national parks with Mr. W.F. Lothian who directed me to several important sources. Mr. H. Webster, Regional Naturalist,

Calgary and Superintendent T.L. Ross, Waterton Lakes National Park, granted me access to regional files. I wish to make special mention of Mr. D. Barrus, then Assistant Park Naturalist, Waterton, and to Mr. K.E. Seel, then Park Naturalist, Waterton, whose unfailing help and infectious enthusiasm in uncovering the history of Waterton Lakes Park made my task a most enjoyable one.

I wish to thank Dr. B.O.K. Reeves, Department of Archeology, University of Calgary, for his interest during my stay in Waterton, and Dr. D.P. Gagan, Department of History, McMaster University, Hamilton for his perceptive criticism in reviewing this report. Without the help of all these people this report would have been much more difficult. Finally, I would like to thank Mr. H. Sorrells Mrs. Sheila Betke and Miss Lynn Paquette for their technical assistance.

*TABLE OF CONTENTS*

*ABBREVIATIONS*

| | |
|---|---|
| Glenbow | Glenbow - Alberta Institute, Historical Library and Archives, Calgary, Alberta. |
| PMAA | Provincial Museum and Archives of Alberta, Edmonton, Alberta. |
| PAC | Public Archives of Canada, Ottawa, Ontario. |
| PARC | Public Archives Records Centre, National and Historic Parks Branch, Ottawa, Ontario. |
| Waterton Library | Waterton Lakes National Park, Park Library in the Administration Office. |
| W.R.O. | Western Regional Office, National and Historic Parks Branch, Calgary, Alberta. |

*LIST OF TABLES*

## *PREFACE*

The history of Waterton Lakes National Park (or any national park) is the story of governmental and public attitudes regarding the role which national parks are to play in Canadian society. The oft-quoted dictum of the national parks set down in the nineteen thirty Parks Act, states that Canada's national reserves are to be preserved for all future generations. This philosophy was current when the first national park was created in eighteen eighty-seven but it was not effectively implemented until the nineteen twenties. This study focuses its attention on the particular circumstances which determined the establishment and development of Waterton Lakes National Park. But in the broader perspective, it is a narrative and an analysis of the attitude of Canadians and their leaders towards the preservation of select mountain forests in the Canadian Rockies for the dual purposes of conservation and recreation.

This history of Waterton Lakes National Park is divided into four chronological-topical chapters. The period from eighteen hundred to eighteen eighty-five was dominated by the exploratory work of fur traders, geographers, and boundary surveyors who visited the Waterton Lakes area. These men did not realize the implications of their discoveries, but they were the forerunners in opening up and publicizing the Waterton district through their narratives of adventure

and through their official government reports.

The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway in eighteen eighty-five inaugurated a new era in the settlement of the western plains. The railway promoted and made possible the unhindered exploitation of Canada's natural resources. In order to regulate the rapidly expanding mineral, lumber and other commercial enterprises, the federal government created new departments, enacted restrictive legislation and reserved large blocks of forest land. One such area set aside in eighteen ninety-five was the Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve. As the industrialization of Canada dramatically progressed at the turn of the twentieth century, the activities of concerned conservationists reached a crescendo. Their pleas to preserve the North American wilderness struck a responsive cord in the hearts of government officials and the public alike. The result was the passage of a comprehensive national parks policy in nineteen eleven which reserved large tracts of wilderness from commercial exploitation in the interests of conservation and recreation.

The period nineteen eleven to nineteen thirty-seven focuses on the growing pains of Waterton Lakes Park as it developed in the shadow of its prominent sister to the north, the Rocky Mountains Park (Banff). The Canadian government's

omniscient presence was felt everywhere and its control was complete: the National Parks Branch in Ottawa formulated policy; it provided for the protection of wildlife; it financed the opening of new scenic attractions by building roads and trails into the wilderness; and it made provision for leasing commercial and residential sites. The Parks Branch first emphasized controlled development of the natural resources in the mountain reserves. Concomitantly, the reserves were promoted as exclusive tourist resorts and recreational centres. Eventually all industrial activity was disallowed, but the commercial potential of tourism was developed to its fullest extent. Following the turn of the twentieth century, several exclusive game reserves were established in Alberta and the national parks came to be regarded as natural areas to be preserved for their educational and scientific value. Briefly, these ideals were the justification for Canada's national parks.

# THE

# HISTORY

# OF

# WATERTON LAKES NATIONAL PARK

# 1800 - 1937

## *CHAPTER 1*

## *THE FIRST EXPLORATIONS, 1800 - 1885*

The early history of British North-West America is the story of the fur trader and explorer. Many of their names are forgotten and the trails they followed often remained unnamed or unmarked and are confusing to trace. It was left to the geographers, geologists, and boundary surveyors commissioned by the British and Canadian governments to rediscover and record accurately the rivers, lakes, transmountain passes and mountain peaks. The exploration of the Waterton Lakes district by European visitors is the story of this progressive assault on the uncharted wilderness.

### *1) The Fur Traders*

By the latter half of the eighteenth century the fur trade industry had penetrated into the Rocky Mountain foothills.[1] One of the legendary pioneers was the celebrated explorer, trader and geographer, David Thompson.[2] It was two members of David Thompson's trading party who were the first English speaking men believed to have visited the Waterton Lakes area. Representatives from the Kootenai[3] Indian tribe of southern British Columbia visited Fort Edmonton in 1798, and the North West Trading Company subsequently built Rocky Mountain House to trade with the transmountain native people. In 1800 a larger representation

from the Kootenai tribe established trade relations with David Thompson. Under Thompson's instructions two half-breed employees, Le Blanc and La Gasse, returned with the Indians to verify reports of rich fur areas in the British Columbia interior, and to promote trapping and hide tanning among the native inhabitants.[4] Claude Schaeffer, a noted anthropologist, speculated that the two entrepreneurs likely spent several winters with the Kootenais until they were killed in 1906.

The most direct trans-mountain pass employed by the Kootenais to reach the buffalo herds was the North Kootenay Pass (see Map II). It is possible that Le Blanc and La Gasse also travelled the equally popular South Kootenay Pass on their trade expeditions and would have been the first white men to have viewed Waterton Lakes. Archaeological evidence and historical references indicate that the South Kootenay Pass offered the easiest and most direct route across the mountains. It was extensively employed by the Kootenai, Nez Perce, Flathead and other tribes to reach the buffalo.[5] Traditionally these clearly blazed trails were adopted by the fur companies as the most convenient means to communicate with the natives in the British Columbia interior. Unfortunately, Le Blanc and La Gasse left no description of their travels and it

is only conjecture as to which mountain passes they employed in crossing the Rocky Mountains.

For the next fifty years the written record is silent. The union of the North West Company and the X Y Company in 1804 led to increased trading activity, and several new mountain passes were discovered. The Peigan Indians closed all the trans-mountain trails leading from Southern Alberta in 1810 to prevent the Kootenai Indians from buying guns and ammunition from the fur traders. The situation did not appreciably affect the fur traffic which tended to follow the richer northern river routes ( notably the Howse and Athabaska Passes)[6] because it was easier to obtain supplies from established trading posts. But the hostilities between the native bands did deter prospective traders from travelling the more hazardous and less profitable trails opening into Southern Alberta. It is doubtful that any white men other than Le Blanc and La Gasse penetrated as far as the Waterton Lakes area. It was a relatively poor source of fur bearing animals, and the reputed hostility of the Blackfoot federation likely frightened any prospective trader or adventurous explorer. The only exceptions were a few obscure frontiersmen, such as Hugh Monroe,[7] who wandered among and lived with the native people of Southern Alberta. There are no documented accounts of their travels, and it is

unknown if they explored the southern mountain passes of Alberta or camped in the vicinity of Waterton Lakes.

*2) The Explorers*

The first systematic reconnaissance and the first unquestionable visit by an European to Waterton Lakes is recorded in the official reports of the John Palliser Expedition (1857 - 1860).[8] The expedition was commissioned by the British government to explore the region extending from Lake Superior to the Rocky Mountains. Its task was to record geographical, meteorological and scientific data, to examine all possible transportation routes through the mountains and, generally, to appraise the prairie region for future settlement.

During the late summer of 1858 the main expedition split into three groups to explore the numerous mountain passes. Lieutenant (later Captain) Thomas Wright Blakiston, magnetic observer to the group, led the party that explored the south western Alberta mountain routes. Lieutenant Blakiston crossed the Rockies by way of North Kootenay Pass, which he believed to be the major trail employed by the Kootenai Indians at that time.[9] Upon his arrival at Kootenie Post, a Hudson's Bay Company trading cabin located in the Flathead River valley of southern British Columbia, the Indians informed Blakiston of a more southerly pass which

was not so steep as the route just traversed. The party returned by way of the South Kootenay (which Blakiston called Boundary Pass), following a stream called Lone Brook, past Red Rock Canyon, and down Pass Creek (Blakiston Brook) where the group pitched camp on the Dardanelle flats.

Lieutenant Blakiston recorded the trip in a narrative describing his explorations:

> "After two hours travelling on level ground along Red-Stone Creek we emerged on the Saskatchewan Plains, just six geographical miles north of the forty-nineth parallel, and camped at Waterton Lakes, two miles east of the mouth of the pass".[10]

Until then the South Kootenay Pass had not appeared in any published document nor upon any map, and the explorer believed that he was the first European to travel the Kootenay Passes. He disregarded the local name Kootenay and re-named the lakes after the English naturalist, Charles Waterton.[11] He was the first visitor to mention the high winds which swept across the lake. He observed that "This corner of the mountains appeared to be a very windy spot",[12] obviously underestimating the persistence and force of these "gales". The scenery was "grand and picturesque", and "game was abundant, including grizzly bears, and we obtained both fresh meat and fish".[13] It was unfortunate (or perhaps fortunate from a conservationist's point of view) for the future development of the Waterton Lakes area that Blakiston's recommendations with

respect to the North Kootenay Pass as a potential rail route were not followed by the government. His report concluded:

> "I should premise that I have not sufficient evidence to be able to state that the Kootanie Pass is absolutely the most advantageous place for the crossing of a railroad from the Saskatchewan Plains to the Pacific, because the mountains to the north have not yet been sufficiently explored; but I am able to say that it is the most southern line within the British territory and, as yet, by far the shortest; moreover, I have every reason to believe that the most suitable portion of the mountains for the passage of a railroad will be found to the south of Bow River".[14]

Although Blakiston did not explore the Crowsnest Pass, the Indians described it as "a very bad road, and seldom used".[15] Ironically, when the railroad did come to Southern Alberta in 1897, it was in fact built through the Crowsnest Pass. The selection of the more northerly route left Waterton Lakes Park outside the mainstream of traffic.

After considering the many obstacles to transportation and evaluating the apparently poor quality of land, Captain John Palliser concluded that a transcontinental railway across British North America was not practicable. The publicity resulting from the expedition did, however, reinforce the British-Canadian presence in the West. The need for further exploratory work in the western plains and mountain region was recognized by contemporary writers. The importance of a line of communication across British territory was frequently

discussed by politicians and the newspapers. As one writer observed, "for so long as there is no Overland route, any communication with British Columbia must remain a myth and the Red River Settlement continue isolated".[16] The initiative displayed by the British government prompted the government of central Canada to send out its own scientists and surveyors to report on the material resources of the North-West Territories. The first team, named the Red River Expedition, was led by Henry Youle Hind, a geologist from the University of Toronto. He was commissioned to examine the resources and climate of the Red River and Assiniboine valleys. This interest was a reflection of the growing awareness by central Canadians to the vast potential of the western plains.

### 3) *The Boundary Surveyors*

At the time the Palliser Expedition was conducting its survey, the United States government appointed a boundary commission to survey the British Canadian-American border from the Pacific North West coast to the Rocky Mountain divide. The American party was selected in 1857 as provided by the terms of the Buchanan-Pakenham Treaty of 1846, and they began work immediately along the Pacific coast.[17] In the summer of 1858 the British representative, Colonel John S. Hawkins of the Royal Engineers, arrived from England with his survey party. Although the American and British parties camped and worked separately,[18] it would appear that both groups visited

Waterton Lakes. A map appended to the American report, indicates that the United States party crossed the South Kootenay Pass and travelled up Oil Creek, where it pitched tent at "Camp Akamina" on the shores of Cameron Lake. The party evidently journeyed the entire length of Waterton Lakes.[19] The British observers listed the elevation of a "River about 2 miles below the lower end of Chief Mountain Lake,"[20] and they explored the surrounding terrain. The eighteen sixty boundary commission members were apparently the second group to explore the Waterton Lakes valley and traverse the South Kootenay Pass.

The first international boundary survey was completed when the British North American provinces confederated in 1867; but the border was still an imprecise line between the United States and the new Dominion of Canada. In 1870 the two countries agreed to sponsor a joint survey of the forty-nineth parallel from the Lake of the Woods (Ontario) to the Rocky Mountains.[21] Canada had recently acquired title to the Hudson Bay Company's territory (Rupert's Land) and the young dominion was anxious to have her new possession surveyed. This would preclude any further encroachment by Americans on Canadian territory,[22] and Prime Minister John A. Macdonald was formulating a plan to have a transcontinental railway built parallel to the border entirely within Canadian territory.

The British Boundary Commission arrived with its equipment in the fall of 1872. The party consisted of Major

Donald R. Cameron, Chief Commissioner; Captain Samuel Anderson, Chief Astronomer; Captain Featherstonhaugh and Lieutenant Galway, Assistant Astronomers; Lieutenant Rowe, Surveyor General; and fourty-four (44) Royal Engineers. The Government of Canada appointed its own contingent of surveyors, including Mr. Boswell as Veterinary Surgeon and George Mercer Dawson as Geologist.[23] (See Figure 1).

The joint commission slowly progressed westward making an elaborate series of observations, comparing their independent results, and then striking a compromise as to where the international line should be drawn. The boundary was demorcated by iron pillars erected one mile apart along the Manitoba border and by stone cairns or earthen mounds piled every three miles across the great plains, but only two points were marked in the mountain area. (See Figure 2). The commission reached "Chief Mountain" Lake (Waterton Lake) in 1874 and located the eastern terminus of the 1861 Boundary Commission. (See Figures 3, 4, and 5).

> The old boundary-cairn was found to be in perfect preservation, the remains of an old flagstaff, around which the stones were built, being still in position and standing out conspicuously above the top. There was no appearance of any Indian or white man having visited the spot since the boundary parties were there, 13 years ago.[24]

The commission erected one boundary marker at the crossing of

the Belly River, and another at "Lake Waterloo" (Waterton Lake).[25] It was here that Captain James F. Gregory, the leader of the American party, reportedly made his pioneering boat trip across the lake in a rickety makeshift craft "composed of wagon boxes with covers of tent canvas".[26] In August 1874, the Commission completed its explorations and returned East.

The importance of these boundary commission surveys was succinctly pointed out by the President of the Royal Geographical Society.

> ... the survey in which Captain Anderson had been engaged over nearly 1000 miles of territory, had not been a mere labour of love, or even an exclusively scientific operation, but a greater political arrangement. ... Now that there was a definite line and definite pacific relations between the two countries, he trusted that trade would be developed and the resources of the country brought to market.[27]

The reports compiled by the various Commissions presented a tantalizing picture of the vast timber and mineral resources of the foothills region. This prompted the Government of Canada to commission a more thorough reconnaissance of the mountain region. George Mercer Dawson,[28] who joined the Geological Survey of Canada as chief geologist in 1875, returned to Southern Alberta in 1881 to explore the Bow, Belly and St. Mary Rivers,[29] and again in 1883-84, he travelled the Rocky Mountains from the international border

to the Red Deer River. Dawson exalted the tremendous potential of the Southern Alberta plains and foothills, especially the "inexhaustible stores of coal and lignite". He concluded that "there are few regions which can excel, or indeed equal" the Porcupine Hills region north of Waterton Lakes.[30] His flattering descriptions of Southern Alberta undoubtedly convinced many settlers to build their homesteads and ranches in this beautiful territory as yet untouched by technology.

The geological surveyors were more than government appointed geologists and scientists. These explorers were often the first Europeans to journey the meandering river valleys and the cragged mountain trails. Their scientific training also gave them a distinct advantage. They frequently made their own maps or revised old ones, [31] and they recounted the natural history and mineral resources of the regions they explored. George Dawson, in particular, held a wide range of interests. His reports contained not only the usual geological information but also included sections on geography, natural resources, botanical and wild-life observations, meteorological readings, and the history of the area.[32] During his travels through the Waterton Lakes district, the young scientist was impressed by the beautiful body of water that "lies between grand and rugged mountains, and constitutes without doubt the most picturesque locality in the whole district". He concluded, however, that the river

valley "offers little land suited for cultivation" because it contained timber along its entire length; hence the paucity of settlers in the immediate vicinity of the Waterton River valley. But as settlers entered the outlying district during the 1880's, the quiet picturesque mountain lake quickly gained a reputation as a favorite picnic and camping ground.

## *CHAPTER 11*

## *EARLY SETTLEMENT AND DEVELOPMENT, 1870 - 1907*

### *1) Fire and Game Protection*

Once the western plains had been explored by the surveyors and scientists, the face of Southern Alberta began to change rapidly. In 1870 the Hudson's Bay Company turned over Rupert's Land to the Dominion of Canada, and within two years engineers and surveyors began mapping the route for a transcontinental railway. The North-West Mounted Police arrived in 1874; treaty agreements were negotiated with the Indian tribes of the western plains; and constitutional government was introduced with the passage of the North-West Territory Act of 1875. Ranchers and settlers started to fill the empty prairies and foothills, although their advancement was sporadic and fraught with the many hardships of frontier life.

The first European settler to reside permanently within the area that is today Waterton Lakes National Park was John George "Kootenai" Brown.[1] (See Figures 6 and 7). The stories of his deeds are found in several works,[2] but none of the sources are entirely reliable. Kootenai Brown came to Canada in 1865 to work for the colonial government of British Columbia. That summer he was stationed at the

gold mining district of Wild Horse Creek, near the present city of Cranbrook, British Columbia. Brown left the employ of the government to try his luck at prospecting, but when it was evident that there was little gold left to be found, he and several unnamed companions set out for the Flathead plains of Montana. They crossed the Rocky Mountains by way of the South Kootenay Pass and journeyed down Pass Creek (Blakiston Brook)where they "reached the prairie shore of a large lake at the further side of which a mountain rose to a sofa-like peak among the clouds".[3] The frontiersman spent the next two years on the Canadian prairies hunting buffalo and selling whiskey to the Metis and Indians before crossing into the United States in the summer of 1867. He took on several adventurous jobs before marrying a young Metis girl, Olive Lyonnais, in 1869. The next few years were occupied working for the United States government and travelling with Metis bands hunting buffalo and trapping wolves. By 1877 the buffalo were practically exterminated and wolfing was no longer profitable. That year was the most harrowing in Kootenai Brown's life. During a quarrel he killed a fellow trader in Montana, and he was placed under arrest at Fort Benton. He attempted suicide while confined in jail, recovered from his injury, and then was acquitted of the murder charge by jury. The tired wanderer immediately took his wife and two daughters to the quiet, peaceful lake where he had first

hunted buffalo twelve years before.

Kootenai Brown settled with his family in a log cabin that had been built by H.A. "Fred" Kanouse on the shore of the middle Waterton Lake. (See Figure 8). Fred Kanouse was a notorious whiskey trader who came to Alberta in 1871 and established a trading post on the Elbow River up-stream from Fort Calgary. He moved to the Fort Macleod area and reputedly was the first man to introduce cattle into Southern Alberta. To support his family, Kootenai Brown went into partnership with Kanouse. They operated a small whiskey post on the eastern shore of Upper Kootenay Lake and illicitly traded with the Indians.[4] Kanouse in particular was infamous for his altercations with the natives, which often ended in bloodshed.[5] Kootenai Brown subsequently became a famous guide to survey and hunting parties travelling in the Kootenay Lakes district. One visiting Englishman, A.S. Hill, was especially impressed by the picturesque landscape which he viewed during his hunting and fishing adventures with Brown.[6] Brown also netted fish from Waterton Lakes to sell to neighbouring ranchers or to market them at Fort Macleod. When he terminated his association with Kanouse, Brown registered his own homestead on the flat delta at the mouth of Pass Creek.[7] The famous frontiersman was forced to take up farming to feed his family because there was little game

left in the Rocky Mountain foothills.[8]

Kootenai Brown was only one of many pioneers who applied for a homestead along the foothills of Southern Alberta. By 1880, "several farmers" had settled along the Belly and Waterton Rivers, and they were successful "in raising good crops".[9] G.M. Dawson described the Waterton River area as "fine country, with luxurence of grasses in the valleys which we have not yet seen equalled".[10] Southwestern Alberta was ideal for cattle grazing and several large ranching companies, such as the Oxley, Walrond and Cochrane ranches, leased thousands of acres of range land.[11] In 1882, W.A. Henry received the lease to the grasslands surrounding the middle and lower Kootenay Lakes, and the Cochrane Ranch leases stretched north from the lakes.[12] (See Figure 9). The cheap grazing land attracted several prominent British investors, including Lord Lathom and A.S. Hill, and they were joined by numerous smaller leaseholders. Cattle men resented the encroachment of agricultural settlers upon their territory but they were unsuccessful in their attempts to dissuade the federal government from its campaign to open the Canadian plains to immigrant settlers.

The largest agricultural community near Waterton Lakes was the Mormon settlement at Lee's Creek (Cardston).

Charles Ora Card,[13] leader of the Mormon settlers, filed claim to farm-land which, until then, had been leased to the Cochrane ranch. Soon a town of experienced seasoned settlers had erected buildings, constructed roads and irrigation canals, and proved that farming and dairying could be profitable in the arid plains of Alberta. Many of these early families were the first citizens of other district towns such as Mountain View, Twin Butte, Magrath and Raymond.[14] The opening of the district is also closely associated with the Galt family,[15] whose political influence and wealth opened the coal mines of Lethbridge and financed railroad and irrigation projects. Without these enterprising pioneers and entrepreneurs there would have been little agricultural development in Southern Alberta.

The Galt enterprises built a narrow gauge railway to carry coal from its mines, but it was the construction of the Canadian Pacific Crowsnest Pass Railway in 1897-1898 which brought new life to the foothills. The trans-mountain rail line connected the coal fields of Alberta with the smelters in British Columbia.[16] Several coke mines were opened in the immediate vicinity of the railway throughout the Crowsnest Pass district. Miners poured into the area and the subsequent expansion of the agricultural and ranching community in Alberta resulted in the growth of large communities on the outskirts of the park. Alberta farms were the major source of grain

foods, meat and dairy products for the thriving mining communities.[17] The Canadian Pacific Railway actively promoted settlement and the company financed several irrigation schemes in hopes of increasing traffic in agricultural produce to fill empty box cars. The prosperous farm lands were rapidly occupied as immigrants surged into the west to take advantage of the federal government's liberal homestead policy.

This commercial activity had many ramifications for the mountain forest reserves. The park was not a prosperous tourist centre because the railroad passed thirty-five miles to the north. The railroad was promoting one recreational playground at Banff and it would not have been economical to develop another resort. The encroachment of the railroad indirectly precipitated the depletion of wild-life, fishing and hunting in the foothills. Miners working in the Crowsnest Pass and railway employees were frequently arrested for poaching game out of season.[18] Local newspapers called for more game wardens to enforce hunting and fishing regulations.

The growing threat to wild-life was further aggravated by the railroad directly. F.W. Godsal, a local fire guardian, complained that "the locomotives on the Crow's Nest Pass railroad are daily and hourly starting prairie and forest fires". The engines had no spark arresters on their

smoke stacks and the furrows plowed along-side the tracks were not properly maintained.[19] Thus the railway posed a serious threat to forest protection, and indirectly, the accompanying boom in population threatened the natural habitat of the wildlife. The federal government decided upon its first measure towards conservation in the mountain forests: two fire rangers were hired to patrol the hills south of the Bow River to register travellers and to detect forest fires.[20] Since their patrol area did not include the Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve, on January 1, 1901, John George "Kootenai" Brown was appointed Fishery Officer to patrol the Waterton Lakes area to guard against poachers and to investigate any fires in the area.[21] It was the frontiersman's first government position and it later lead to his office as Chief Fire and Game Warden for Waterton Lakes Park.

*2) The Oil City "Boom"*

One of the most exciting and the most prominently publicized discoveries in the Waterton Lakes district were the oil seepages along Oil Creek (Cameron Creek). Stories relating the initial discovery of petroleum in the Waterton Lakes region are contradictory and mixed with inaccurate statemenets. The hopes and optimism surrounding the establishment of Oil City, and the subsequent failure to strike a rich

well, gave rise to many fanciful accounts. The speculators who lost their life savings wished to forget, while the newspapers perpetuated unsubstantiated rumors in their attempts to add drama to the local history.[22]

The Indian people had long been aware of a black sticky substance which oozed from the banks of the stream flowing from a small mountain lake (Cameron). It is believed that Kootenai Brown and other early settlers periodically used the oil as a lubricant for their wagons and as a medicant for their horses and cattle. Presence of the oil became general knowledge and, inevitably, it created a flurry of excitement. The most successful scheme for collecting the oil on a commercial scale was devised by William Aldridge, a settler from a nearby ranch.[23] He constructed a system of trenches which siphoned the oil slicks into a pit. The crude petroleum was then soaked up with gunny sacks and squeezed into barrels. It was sold in neighboring communities for one dollar a gallon and used as fuel, for lubricating machinery and for medicine purposes.[24]

The first government official to examine the oil seepage discovery was Dr. J.H. Selwyn, Director of the Geological Survey of Canada, who visited Alberta in the summer of 1891.[25] He was pessimistic that oil would be found in any

significant quantity. A local body of speculators formed the "Alberta Petroleum and Prospecting Company", but prophetically, all attempts to reach the oil beds were unsuccessful. William Pearce, Superintendent of Mines for the Department of the Interior, travelled through the area in November to inspect the petroleum explorations, but he found one company still at work - the "Southern Alberta Land Development Company Limited" operating in Pine Creek valley.[26] Two holes were sunk in the Waterton Lakes area but without any success. The first oil boom in the "Kootenai petroleum fields" quickly petered out.

One of the most significant effects of the building of the Canadian Pacific (Crowsnest Pass) Railway was the resulting search for gold, oil and other minerals in the mountain valleys. A.P. Patrick, a former Dominion Topographical Surveyor, was the first to apply in 1897 for land in the Cameron Creek area. A group of investors from British Columbia registered oil claims in the Sage and Kishanena Creek valleys west of the present park boundaries.[27] In 1901 A.P. Patrick, John Lineham and G.K. Leeson formed the "Rocky Mountain Development Company" (R.M.D.C.).[28] The company issued public shares, many of which were bought by local residents amid the excitement of the period. The company shipped in by rail a pole-tool drilling outfit from Petrolia, Ontario, to Fort Macleod. Access to the oil site

was restricted to a narrow horse trail and therefore a crude wagon trail was blazed across Pass Creek, past Blue Lake (Crandell) and then along the valley to Oil City. The oil derrick and drilling machinery were quickly assembled and drilling started November, 1901. Progress was slow owing to poor equipment and inexperienced workmen, but the crew struck oil on its first attempt September 21, 1902.[29] A flow of three hundred barrels of high grade oil per day was attained at a depth of one thousand and twenty feet and continued for some time.[30]

The success of the R.M.D.C. explorations naturally aroused a great deal of attention and a small boom followed in wake of the news. The town site of Oil City was immediately cleared - cabins, a bunkhouse and a dining hall were erected and streets were surveyed. (See Figures 17 and 18). The prevailing enthusiasm was reflected by the plans of one builder who laid the foundations for a large hotel, part of which are still standing. The first post office for the Waterton Lakes district was opened at Oil City by H.J. MacKenzie, but it was removed to Waterton Mills in 1905.[31]

The oil discovery on Cameron Creek resulted in the establishment of several rival oil companies. The "Pincher Creek Oil and Development Company"[32] held rights to the property adjacent to Lineham Creek where oil slicks had been

observed on the water surface. The only other significant drilling enterprise was the "Western Oil and Coal Company" of Vancouver, which set down two holes in the vicinity of the present park townsite.[33] The company was managed by J.B. Ferguson, who had purchased Kootenai Brown's homestead, situated at the mouth of Pass Creek. The Ferguson base camp was an impressive operation which included a crew of ten workers, a cook, kitchen, bunkhouse, blacksmith shop, stable and office.[34] Some oil was discovered but never in any great quantity, and eventually the lower townsite field was abandoned.

At the height of the boom the Rocky Mountain Echo (April 25, 1905) optimistically reported: "As to the existence of a large body of oil worthy to rank with any of the big fields of America, that has now been provied without a shadow of a doubt. It is merely a question of sinking wells". In 1906, the "Alberta Oil, Coal and Wheat Railway Company" was incorporated to build a feeder line from Oil City, down Cameron Creek, to join with the Crow's Nest Pass Railway at Pincher Creek.[35] The R.M.D.C. incorporated the "Northwest Coal and Coke Railway Company" in 1903,[36] which was scheduled to run from Oil City to Pincher Creek. In spite of the grandiose visions none of these projected ventures were realized.

Despite the publicity, the numerous borings, and the excessive rhetoric, by 1907 all drilling activity in Waterton had stopped. The abrupt change occurred when a report by I.C. White, a visiting American geologist, determined that the local rock stratigraphy was not an oil bearing type.[37] Indeed, other than the initial discovery at Oil City by the R.M.D.C., all the sites were essentially unproductive. Even the first hole was producing only a trickle of some one to twenty barrels a day. The drilling stem had been blocked by tools imbedded in the well casing and all attempts to unplug the well proved fruitless. Moreover, the difficulties in transportation for bringing in equipment and supplies and in taking out oil were prohibitive. Finally, the "oil boom" ended when the initial investment was expended and people refused to risk their money for the low returns. After five years of furious excitement, all that was left of Oil City were empty buildings and shattered dreams.

Nevertheless, the dreams of wealth from oil had a stimulating effect on the park's development. The anticipated boom attracted numerous speculators to south-western Alberta and many settled in the district. As the population grew, the number of visitors to the camp grounds rose proportionately. The park was renowned for its hunting, fishing, and scenic attractions but it was also apparent that wildlife was becoming scarcer, and the once teeming lakes and streams were being

fished out. The hills, forests and streams were being depleted by prospectors, lumbermen and sportsmen. Under the assault of the farmer, the rancher, and the entrepreneur the breeding sanctuaries of wildlife were destroyed. The detrimental effects of new technological innovation employed by extractive industries prompted the federal government to formulate a new parks' policy to protect the remaining mountain forests.

## *CHAPTER 111*

## *THE FORMULATION OF NATIONAL PARKS AND FOREST RESERVES POLICY*

## *1872 - 1911*

### *1) The Establishment of the First National Park*

In 1872 the Congress of the United States of America established its first protected national park at Yellowstone, Wyoming. Canada soon followed the American example and a close liaison was maintained between American and Canadian park officials. The annual reports of the Department of the Interior (Canada) acknowledge the advice received from American sources through official correspondence and parks service publications.[1] William Pearce, Superintendent of Mines in Canada,[2] admitted that the Canadian park system was based upon the United States administrative structure.[3] Superintendent Pearce was responsible for investigating all land claims in the North West Territories. He was one of the first people to urge the federal government to reserve the Banff mineral springs in 1883,[4] and he supported its later expansion and development as a tourist centre.

The commercial possibilities of the hot springs were brought to Pearce's attention by Sir William Van Horne, the famous director of the Canadian Pacific Railway.[5] Sir Sanford Fleming, the engineer in chief for the Canadian

Pacific Railway also suggested that a national park be established in the Canadian Rockies, along with a second park in Eastern Canada.[6] During the fall of 1885, William Pearce visited the hot springs to investigate various land claims, and he proceeded to protect the popular resort from commercial exploitation by private individuals.[7] On November 25, 1885 an order in council was passed setting aside for public use ten square miles surrounding the Banff hot springs. The legislation was popular with the local community because the springs were already famous for their "great sanitary and curative qualities".[8] On June 23, 1887 the area was officially designated Canada's first national park - the Rocky Mountains Park (later renamed Banff National Park). Dominion surveyors mapped the area, roads and bridges were constructed, hotels were built (notably the Canadian Pacific Railway hotel, Chateau Lake Louise) and a resident Superintendent was appointed - George Andrew Stewart, a Dominion land surveyor and civic engineer.

The creation of the Rocky Mountains Park manifested the government's determination to regulate and to share in the development of Canada's natural resources. R.C. Brown has pointed out that the intent of the 1887 Parks Act was to manage the national parks as a commercial enterprise. The Federal government acted upon the principle that it was its

duty to share with private enterprise the responsibility of developing Canada's resources.[9] The 1887 Act gave the Minister of the Interior the authority to issue lumbering, grazing and mining permits within the park. Some Members of Parliament pointed out the incongruity of having game preserves alongside mining industries,[10] but their objections were overruled by the obvious need for government sponsorship, and sometimes outright cash grants, to develop the West's vast mineral resources. The coal, copper and timber reserves in the Banff area were exploited along the Canadian Pacific Railway line, regardless of their close proximity to the park.[11]

As the Rocky Mountains Park was enlarged, game management played a more prominent role in park planning. The buffalo and the majority of the beaver had disappeared, and the elk, moose, deer and small game were clearly on the decrease. Their natural habitat was repeatedly ravaged by forest fires; so-called "sportsmen" slaughtered game needlessly ;[12] and the Indian tribes of Alberta hunted big game animals more earnestly after the buffalo were exterminated. The newspapers vehemently blamed the Indian people for the scarcity of game, in particular the Stoney and Sarcee bands living west of Calgary. Editorialists repeatedly called upon the Department of Indian Affairs to prohibit hunting out of season and to restrict native peoples to their reserves.[13]

The Indians were accused of destroying young saplings for fire wood, of killing wildlife while still young, and of taking "every duck egg" from the nesting grounds.[14] One writer bitterly suggested that since Calgary was famous for its petitions to the government, perhaps another one should be sent entitled, "A memorial from the ranchmen to prevent the Sarcees from getting all the rabbits".[15] The cries from the Calgary, Lethbridge and Fort Macleod newspapers reached a crescendo in the late eighteen eighties: "The country is getting settled up too fully, game is getting too scarce ..."[16] They pressed the territorial government to revise the grossly inadequate game regulations and to employ wardens to enforce the laws.

In response to the public outcries, the government appointed W.F. Whitcher to report on game conditions in the Rocky Mountains Park. The "alarmist" reports of the newspapers were upheld by Whitcher's report but he did not apportion any blame.

> "Large game and fish, once various and plenty in this mountainous region, are now scattered and comparatively scarce. Skin-hunters, dynamiters and netters, with Indians, wolves and foxes, have committed sad havoc. The rapid settlement now progressing in that vicinity will add other elements of destruction. Therefore, the necessity for promptness and efficiency becomes a vital urgency in the adoption of any scheme for saving and increasing what is left".[17]

The government enacted new Regulations which placed stringent restrictions on fishing within the park, and it prohibited hunting except for special permits issued by the Park Superintendent. When it became apparent that the crisis affected the entire mountain region, the government set aside larger tracts of forest lands, which not only preserved the lumber and mineral wealth, but which also served to safeguard the natural habitat.

*2) The Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve*

Perhaps the most prominent individual who represented the government's position, and who was instrumental in shaping government policy, was William Pearce. As early as 1886 Pearce had noted the promising potential of the Waterton Lakes area.

> "There are many other points [besides Banff] in the Rocky Mountains which, in the near future, it would be well to reserve; among which may be mentioned the vicinity around those lakes which rise near the 49th parallel and empty by the Waterton River into the Belly River; also portions of the Crow's Nest Pass and approaches thereto".[18]

Pearce wanted to protect the mountain forests and streams, not necessarily as national monuments, but for their tremendous resource potential. It has been pointed out elsewhere that William Pearce is viewed as the major promotor of irrigation in Alberta.[19] One of his priorities was "to reserve all lands valuable for watering purposes, hay and shelter" for stockmen.[20]

Cattle ranching was the foremost industry along the foothills, and the Federal government did its utmost to aid the struggling rancher.

The government's concern with water management along the Rocky Mountain watershed during the 1890's was clearly evinced by the expanding responsibilities of the Department of the Interior. The North West Irrigation Act was passed in 1894 and the Irrigation Branch issued volumous reports on its reclamation work. Numerable surveys were conducted of the river systems to assess their utilization for reclaiming unproductive land. The Waterton Lakes watershed was of primary importance to the Irrigation Department's plans for controlling the water resources of South-western Alberta. One of the largest reservoirs was to be the main Waterton Lake. The scheme was not seriously considered until nineteen twenty, and the resulting controversy is examined in Chapter IV.

A proposal to set aside the Waterton Lakes as a park was forwarded to Ottawa in 1893 by F.W. Godsal, a prominent rancher in the Pincher Creek area.[21] Godsal was Vice-President of the Western Stock Growers Association, and later he was appointed a fire guardian. He warned the government that, if it did not act upon his suggestion immediately, there would be increased friction between ranchers and settlers

over the land. In a paper read before the Historical Society of Calgary in nineteen twenty-four, William Pearce acknowledged that F.W. Godsal was the first citizen to suggest that a park be established in the Waterton Lakes region. William Pearce was a major proponent of stock reserves along the foothills, and he asked his ranching friends to lobby in Ottawa in support of his schemes.[22] This might explain Godsal's letter and Pearce's enthusiastic endorsement of the rancher's proposal to set aside the Kootenay Lakes region as a forestry reserve.

The idea for the park was raised at a fortuitous time because the Department of the Interior was conducting a survey of the water resources of the mountain lakes and rivers for later inclusion into its irrigation program for Alberta. Two areas surveyed as possible reservoir sites were the Belly and Waterton Rivers. It was essential that these vital watersheds be guarded against forest fires, and that settlement in prospective flooded areas be forestalled. The Chief Inspector of Timber and Forestry, E. Stewart, acknowledged that the Kootenay Lake Reserve was established because a considerable amount of money had been spent "in establishing a system of irrigation for the semi-arid tract east of these hills, and it is a matter of the utmost importance to the success of the undertaking that the forest covering along the valleys of the streams from which the water is taken should not be destroyed".[23]

The government realized that the public might oppose the reservation of large forest and grazing areas. A.M. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior, suggested as an alternative that "it would be far better to have only one or two parks at important points, and to have them faithfully and well protected, than a larger number of reservations none of which the public would regard".[24] On the other hand, William Pearce endorsed the scheme because the proposed park area was "of no value for cultivation and of very slight value for grazing purposes".[25] The best approach would be to preserve these "useless" forest areas for water and resource management. The government subsequently passed an order in council on May 30, 1895 which set aside an area of fifty-four square miles centred around the Waterton Lakes named "Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve".[26] The Minister of the Interior, T.M. Daly, prophetically noted, - "Posterity will bless us".[27]

*3) The Creation of the National Parks Branch*

The preservation of unique scenic attractions and the protection of wildlife was a fundamental part of park policy. These basic principles were applied only to the national parks and not to the forest reserves. It was a vital distinction because during the period 1895 to 1911, the Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve was still under assault by oil and mine developers, sawmill operators and ranchers. The detrimental affects of these industries upon the natural

resources and the wildlife became increasingly obvious to visiting campers. Pressure was exerted upon the government to have the Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve enlarged and proclaimed a national park to preserve its unique landscape.

Once again it was a letter from F.W. Godsal, complaining of activities by the Western Oil and Coal Company, which prompted the government to investigate conditions in the Forest Reserve. The Forestry Branch had little information on this section of the mountain forests, and it directed Chief Forest Ranger, W.I. Margach, to report on developments in the reserve. The promise of a valuable oil strike led the ranger to express his unequivocal support for commercial development in the reserve while, in the same breath, recommendating the reservation of the lakes as a park.

> "Owing to the development of the oil wells I think the area of the park quite large enough as, in my opinion, play grounds come second with development of the mineral wealth and industries of the country, and can see no area in close proximity to the present reserve that would add value to it as a game preserve, or has any feature that the present area has not. The present area reserved as a Park is an ideal spot for its natural beauty, game and fishing, and I think in the interest of the public who make it the resort for a few outings from Pincher Creek, Mcleod, Magrath, Lethbridge, Raymond, and Cardston, from which those Kootenay Lakes draw visitors every year, every consideration should be given to preserving its natural beauty and keeping it open to the public, no rights of any kind should be given to the waters edge of any of the Lakes and if possible surface rights be held only giving leave such area as required by companies doing development of mineral wealth ... The gate and the notices complained of by Mr. Godsal were there".[28]

The Chief Ranger's opinion reflected the prevalent attitude which accepted the development of a park's natural resources while also recognizing its recreational and aesthetic value. The government was concerned with regulating unscrupulous speculators, and it was constantly on guard against large land owners. There was some friction already between park visitors and the oil companies in Waterton.[29] The following year (1907), R.H. Campbell, Superintendent of the Forestry Branch, directed Chief Ranger Margach to determine the number of people residing in the Kootenay Lakes Reserve, and to note improvements they had made on their property. The government was preparing "to make provision for the proper administration of the reserve... and if necessary to take steps to obtain possession of all the lands within the reserve".[30] The largest privately owned land within the park was the quarter section sold by Kootenai Brown to J.B. Ferguson.[31] The Hudson's Bay Company also owned several quarter sections of land within the reserve which were accorded to it in eighteen seventy. The government purchased the Ferguson land in nineteen twelve, and it exchanged land outside the park for the Hudson's Bay Company sections.[32]

Perhaps the decisive factor which convinced the Government of Canada to pass the National Parks Act in nineteen eleven was the world wide conservation movement, which made its first great impact in the new decade of the

twentieth century. The conservation movement had its deepest roots in the United States,[33] and a close liaison was established between statesmen and conservationist lobby groups on both sides of the border. One of the most influential organizations was the Alpine Club of Canada, which disseminated much information on the Rocky Mountains through pamphlets and the club's magazine. Several prominent members of the society published books on their explorations of little known mountain passes, and on their conquering of famous peaks in the Canadian Rockies. Their accounts describing the beauty and challenge of the Rocky Mountains served to publicize the national parks as recreational centres.[34] Significantly, none of the books dealt with mountain climbing in Waterton Park because of its relatively unknown terrain in comparison to the internationally popular Banff and Jasper National Parks.

The Forestry Branch was established in 1889 under the auspices of the Department of the Interior to manage Canada's forest resource program. A Chief Inspector of Timber and Forestry was appointed to supervise the expanding lumber and forest industry. Although large blocks of land were leased to sawmill operators, experiments were progressing in reforestration and surveys were organized in connection with water shed management programs. In 1906 the Dominion

Forest Act was passed, and the first Canadian Forestry Convention met to study the effects of forest conservation in conjunction with water resources and irrigation.[35] Following the 1908 general election, the government's policy towards forest reserves and parks was more clearly defined. Howard Douglas, longtime Superintendent of the Rocky Mountains Park, was named Commissioner of Dominion Parks on April 1, nineteen eight. All the national parks and buffalo reservations in the West[36] were placed under his supervision, but in an attempt to centralize the administration, the Parks Branch were placed under the jurisdiction of the Forestry Branch headed by R.H. Campbell.[37] The move clearly reflected the government's attitude that the national parks and the preservation of resources were united in their objectives.

From nineteen eight to nineteen eleven the Dominion Parks Branch remained a relatively minor department with no real decision-making powers in administering the forest reserves and parks. The parks department suffered from a chronic shortage of funds which restricted its rate of expansion and the development of more commodius facilities. The main practical advancement was the appointment of additional fire and game wardens to enforce timber, fishing and hunting regulations. The parks were receiving greater recognition and the role they were to play in modern society was discussed openly. In accordance with a resolution passed by the nineteen

nine North American Conservation Conference, both Canada and the United States established a permanent Conservation Commission.[38] The Declaration of Principles formulated by the Commission noted the need for the two countries to cooperate in conserving the forests, waters, lands, minerals, and wildlife "for the benefit and health of mankind". The following year the vast Rocky Mountains Forest Reserve was established. It encompassed the entire eastern slope of the Rocky Mountains, including the Dominion parks, and was designed to centralize the government's water, mineral and wildlife mangement programs.

The climate of opinion clearly supported the conservationists, who drew their strength from many diverse sources: the Canadian Alpine Club lobbied for the inclusion of more wilderness areas; private citizens, such as F.W. Godsal, were concerned with the forest reserves disappearing into the hands of developers; and sportsmen and guides, such as Kootenai Brown, were complaining of the scarcity of wildlife. Some politicians like John Herron, Conservative-Liberal Member of Parliament for Alberta, worked within the government to have the mountain forests and landscape protected from further exploitation.[39] In response to the agitation of these interested parties advocating the selection of more national parks, the Superintendent of Forestry, R.H. Campbell,

decided to act on the proposal forwarded by the Inspector of Forest Reserves, H.R. McMillan, that the Kootenay Lakes be named a resort park.[40] The Forestry Department submitted a memorandum to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, W.W. Cory, approving the transfer of Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve to the Superintendency of the Commissioner of Dominion Parks. The relatively powerless position of the Parks department during the years nineteen eight to nineteen eleven was evident by the fact that Howard Douglas had no voice in establishing the new park. His role was essentially to centralize the administrative process for the various mountain parks, and to act as the liaison between the Superintendents of the parks and the Forestry Branch in Ottawa. Commissioner Douglas was simply informed by Superintendent Campbell that "it had been decided" that the Kootenay Lakes would now be "under your superintendence".[41]

The function and role of the new park was clearly defined:

> "Its purpose is mainly that of a pleasure resort similar to the other parks along the Rockies..A good many people have been using the lands in the vicinity of the lake within the reserve for camping purposes and considerable additional demand for this purpose and for the erection of summer cottages will probably occur in the near future. I think it would be advisable to arrange for the survey into lots suitable for residence and camping sites should be made by a surveyor early next season....

> It has also been recommended that some person should be placed in charge of this park, and the name of Mr. J.G. Brown who lives in that district and who is already, as I understand, game guardian and fishery inspector, has been suggested for the position".[42]

The suggestion was approved by Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, and on December 31, 1909 the Governor-General in Council proclaimed the area "a forest park instead of as a forest reserve".[43] Kootenai Brown was appointed "Forest Ranger in Charge" March, 1910 and the order in council officially setting aside the reserve as a summer resort was consented to April 13, 1910.

Waterton Lakes Forest Park, its official title until the nineteen eleven Parks' Act was enacted, was now administered under regulations enacted for the Dominion Parks. They provided for the absolute protection of game, and fishing was limited to sportsmen. Only certain areas could be surveyed into building lots and camping sites. An annual rental for the lots was set and leases were issued for a forty-two year period but the Crown reserved all timber and mineral rights. No intoxicating liquor could be sold within the park and, finally, a Chief Game Guardian was appointed to enforce the regulations.[44] Nevertheless, the utilitarian motive played an important role in convincing the Forestry people that the area be set aside as a park.

> "The lands included in the proposed reserve being elevated and rocky, are generally not suited for agriculture, but are of great value for the supply of wood and timber to the prairie country east of the mountains, for the requirements of coal mines and for the protection of the sources of the main streams of the central west, and it is proposed to administer them so as to protect the water supply, while at the same time providing for the proper utilization of the reproduction of the forest".[45]

The following year the Dominion Parks administration was completely reorganized into the system which remained essentially the same until it was again revamped in nineteen thirty-seven. On June 8, 1911 the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act set aside all existing forest reserves and national parks for the protection and reforestration of timber stands, the conservation of minerals, the protection of wildlife, and generally, to maintain those conditions essential to a continuing water supply. Only the Minister of the Interior, by order in council, was empowered to authorize the removal of timber, the mining of resources, the use of pasturage, the establishment of water reservoirs or power sites, or the granting of leases in the parks. In recognition of its increased powers and its vital role in preserving Canada's natural resources, the National Parks Branch was granted an independent status and its new director, James B. Harkin, was given the title "Commissioner of National Parks".

The nineteen eleven Parks Act clearly stood for the preservation of Canada's unique and scenic natural features. Equally important was the conservation of animal and plant life. Modern fire fighting equipment was purchased and more wardens, assisted by seasonal employees, were hired to enforce the fire and game regulations. Oftentimes park policy came into conflict with other government branches, which sought to exploit the mountain water and forest resources for their own benefit. J.B. Harkin was determined to preserve the park areas in their "natural state", and to exploit them only along certain limited lines. The first objective was to program the health and recreational potential of the mountain parks. Decisions outlining the development of recreational areas were based on the criteria whether or not the project would enhance the park's potential as a tourist resort. The selling of scenery to tourists was regarded as one of the most important functions of the Parks Branch.

During the period nineteen eleven to nineteen thirty-seven, the administrative structure of the National Parks Branch underwent a gradual transformation. (See Appendix 1). The transfer of natural resources to the provinces in nineteen thirty inaugurated a series of changes in the organizational structure. The Department of the Interior passed into obsolescence since its basic function had been to administer the

resources of the prairie provinces. In nineteen thirty-one W.W. Cory, Deputy Minister of the Interior since nineteen five, retired and was succeeded by H.H. Rowatt, who had been in government service since eighteen eighty-seven primarily with the Mines Branch. In December 1936 the former Departments of the Interior, Indian Affairs, Mines, Colonization and Immigration were united under the Department of Mines and Resources. It was headed by a Minister of the Crown, a Deputy Minister, and the five branches were each placed under the supervision of a Director.

Duties formerly the sole jurisdiction of the National Parks Branch were now partially managed by the Lands, Parks and Forest Branch and partially by the Surveys and Engineering Section. Maintenance and construction work in the national parks was now the responsibility of the latter section. The Superintendent of a park no longer directly supervised townsite services such as the water and sewer system, the electrical and telephone network, roadwork, or building maintenance. His task was to administer the operation of park services such as camp grounds, bathhouses, recreational facilities like the golf course, playgrounds, and swimming pools. But every program, any change in plans, staff promotions, or directives on general park policy such as the decision on

predator control or the construction of a new road, all emanated from Ottawa or required its official sanction. The final decision was usually dictated by the fiscal budget, and Waterton Lakes National Park was near the bottom of the list of priorities.

During this period of change, Waterton Lakes evolved from an inconsequential resort, important mainly for its water and land resources, to an internationally famous peace park. This transformation within a relatively short period of time gave rise to numerous crises. Many of the growing pains were unique to the park owing to its isolation from the mainstream of the tourist traffic, while on the other hand, it was the natural half of a renowned American park. Its unique position within the Rocky Mountains system as the vital link with the lucrative tourist traffic in the American national parks was the major reason for its exceptionally rapid development in later years.

## *CHAPTER IV*

## *WATERTON LAKES NATIONAL PARK: ADMINISTRATION AND DEVELOPMENT, 1911 - 1937*

### *PART 1 - THE FORMATIVE YEARS 1911-1919*

#### *1) The Land Question*

The immediate problem facing the Dominion Parks Branch, once Waterton Lakes was named a national park in 1910, was to open negotiations with persons still owning property in the reserve. Commissioner Douglas visited the grounds in November, 1910 to make a detailed survey of all the existing buildings within the park.[1] He made note of several stables, barns and abandoned shacks which were remnants from the oil boom days; and he described the old sawmill buildings on Maskinonge Lake, the J.B. Ferguson homestead, and various abandoned structures of no value. The Commissioner directed Chief Ranger Brown to appraise the buildings on the Western Coal and Oil Company's property, and to suggest a reasonable offer for the land J.B. Ferguson had purchased from the ranger during the oil rush days.[2] The department was anxious to acquire all private lands to prevent speculators from sub-dividing the land into villa lots to be leased to the public. Since there was "ample money" in the 1911-1912 appropriation, Ottawa agreed to pay J.B. Ferguson's asking price of twenty-five hundred dollars, and the transfer was signed in the spring of nineteen twelve.[3]

Another major landholder was the Hudson's Bay Company, which had received several quarter sections of land as stipulated by the terms of the eighteen seventy transfer. The Company was fully amenable to relinquishing its land patents, and in nineteen twenty-four it surrendered all its holdings in the forest reserves, dominion parks and Indian reservations in return for an equal quantity of Crown land elsewhere.[4] Little difficulty was encountered in these negotiations,[5] but elsewhere there was a protracted and acrimonious clash between the Parks Branch and a Sawmill Company situated on Maskinonge Lake near Waterton Mills. (See Map 1).

During the years when Waterton Lakes was operated as a forest reserve, a lease was obtained by a private milling firm from the Hudson's Bay Company to operate a sawmill on Maskinonge Lake. The mill was in operation until nineteen seven, when spring floods destroyed the company's log boom across the Waterton River, resulting in the closing of the sawmill. When Waterton Lakes was named a national park in nineteen ten, the mill operators applied to continue their lease at Waterton Mills.[6] Commissioner Douglas suspected that the company wanted to retain the land to build a boat house and dance hall catering to campers. To forestall any such plans, the Commissioner recommended that a two year lease be granted, with the provision that if the mill was

not operational at least sixty days a year the lease would be cancelled.[7] Instead, Ottawa decided not to grant a lease, claiming that it had no authority to do so while the Forest Reserves Act was still under revision.[8] The Company again petitioned the government, demanding an explanation for the delay and threatening that "if they weren't allowed to locate there, the Company would move the mill to the head of Waterton Lake, where the logs were cut".[9] At this time the Forestry Branch decided to erect a ranger station on the mill site, using lumber from the old buildings. Most of the machinery had been removed in October nineteen eleven, when the company went into liquidation and several of the buildings sold under sheriff's sale. The only structure remaining was "a small shack" occupied by the mill operators and a small stable "entirely suitable for use of the Forestry Branch".[10]

Ottawa agreed that Waterton Mills was the most suitable site for the proposed ranger station, and subsequently the milling company was notified that, if it wished to retain title to its remaining buildings, it had ninety days in which to remove them.[11] When the Company took no action, the buildings reverted to the Crown. The Forestry Branch then asked the Justice Department to proceed with evicting the residents because it planned to use the mill as a temporary house for the district Forest Ranger until a

permanent structure was built. The Company asked that it be permitted to rent the property until July, nineteen fourteen since time was needed to find another residence and to apply for permission to move the post office, which it operated under contract with the government. Meanwhile, the ranger was living in a tent, but the Forestry Branch agreed to an extension if the Company promised to vacate by June nineteen fourteen.[12]

In the spring of nineteen fourteen the mill owners again applied for renewal of their lease through a Pincher Creek Barrister, saying that it could begin operations as soon as new equipment was moved in. The Forestry Branch, for its part, was willing to reinstate the licence provided that the Company had proof of its timber rights in Glacier.[13] Apparently, on December 3, 1909 the company had entered into a contract with the United States Forestry to cut timber in the Blackfeet Forest Reserve, with the agreement to expire on December 1, nineteen ten. On May 11, nineteen ten Glacier National Park was established and the park boundary enclosed the area in which the Company claimed its holdings. The United States Parks Service refused to renew the contract, but by claiming vested interests in the land before the park was established, the milling Company hoped to have its timber lease renewed. A court hearing was set for the late spring of nineteen fourteen. Meanwhile, while awaiting the courts

decision, the sawmill came under the jurisdiction of the Canadian parks sytem later that summer when Waterton Lakes was enlarged. The operators soon ran afoul of park wardens who suspected them of fishing and hunting out of season. As a result, the Warden recommended that the mill owners be evicted since they were unlawful squatters.[14]

Apparently, the Park Superintendent took no action on the Warden's report because the operators were still living at Waterton Mills when Chief Superintendent P.C. Barnard-Hervey visited Waterton the following spring. He recommended that the family be given a month's notice to vacate,[15] but the period was extended when it appeared that the mill might re-open after all. The United States Supreme Court reportedly upheld the Company's right to continue cutting in Clacier Park.[16] Nothing came of the scheme, and finally, that fall (1915) the Department directed the Superintendent to have the entire case reviewed before the Royal North West Mounted Police when the mill owner was convicted of killing a furbearing animal.[17] By now the Parks Branch was exasperated by the delays in having the Company evicted and it asked the Commissioner of Police to report on the situation. He too recommended their removal from the park.[18] On May 1, nineteen sixteen the mill operators came before Police Commissioner Carpenter and they were given twenty-four

hours to leave the park on pain of being imprisoned. The family thereupon moved to a farm just outside the park.

Another area of land enclosed by the park's boundary when Waterton Lakes was enlarged in nineteen fourteen was the patented property in Oil City. Over the years there were successive attempts to re-open the original No. 1 hole first drilled by the Rocky Mountains Development Company in nineteen two. In nineteen nine the "Pincher Creek Oil and Refining Company" reserved eight more quarter sections of land next to its original site.[19] The Company drilled three more holes, but these were abandoned even before its lease expired April, nineteen fourteen.[20] Then the "Original Discovery Oil Company Limited" was organized to revive the first Lineham well.[21] The company began its operations but, again the driller left tools in the hole, permanently closing the well.[22] Following this, John Alexander, a barrister in Fernie, British Columbia. applied for oil and gas rights adjacent to the Lineham lease on Cameron Creek, but his application was turned down by the Department of the Interior.[23] The request was renewed five years later by W.W. Ross of Vancouver, British Columbia, following a notice in the newspapers that the old Lineham well was producing oil. In support of his claim, Ross reminded the Federal government that "the imperial policy with reference to prospecting to replenish reserves lost in the Great War,

as well as to the general public's opinion, would seem to favour an invasion of the Forest Reserves".[24] Also in nineteen nineteen, W. Livingstone, President of the "Southern Alberta Oil Company, Limited" began to drill on land he already leased and he applied to the government for another quarter section next to the Lineham property. The Forestry Department opposed the granting of new leases on the grounds that "there was no particular demand for oil rights in the reserves, and it was not considered advisable to throw open the reserves to all prospectors during the excitement attending the Oil Boom [of the pre-war years]".[25]

At the time, the National Parks Regulations contained no provisions for governing oil and gas explorations in areas under its jurisdiction. The general policy was to discourage "promiscuous prospecting", but if park land was proven to be "of sufficient commercial value to justify developing", then "provision might be made for the development of such".[26] The government's main concern was to prevent "a flood of prospectors and speculators" who would present a fire hazard and ruin the park as a game preserve. The concern with forest fires was given dramatic effect in September, nineteen nineteen when fire swept through Cameron Creek Valley as far as Crandell Lake, narrowly missing the oil rigs. After raging for twenty-three days, only the fortuitous arrival of rain and a heavy snow-storm saved the situation.[27]

As a compromise, J.B. Harkin recommended that the government issue permits to develop clearly delineated areas, not to exceed forty acres, which were of definite commercial value.[28] However, the Minister of the Interior, Arthur Meighen, decided not to allow any mining or oil explorations in the mountain national parks.[29] This new policy completely reversed the traditional approach, which had been to "encourage the development of such natural resources, provided such can be done without unduly interferring with the main purpose of parks. ..We do not wish to prevent the development of any legitimate natural resources simply because it happened to be within a park".[30] The government did not feel that the W.W. Ross and W. Livingstone applications met its requirements. Ross' claim was based on a single geological survey report, while Livingstone simply wanted to protect his existing claim. Both were turned down owing to the precedent it would set by letting prospectors into the national parks. Ottawa was willing to accept bona fide developers under close supervision, but it would not contemplate wild speculative ventures.

On May 31, nineteen twenty-one the Lethbridge Herald carried a report: "Oil is being encountered at every foot of descent by the drillers of the Livingston (sic) No. 1 well, Waterton Park... This well is being drilled on the only lease let by the government". (See Figure 19). The report prompted J.S.T. Alexander to apply again for a lease. The department

refused to allow another drilling operation because all the wells had failed thus far, and there was no evidence of oil in commercial quantitites to justify further exploration.

By the nineteen twenties the Parks Branch was evincing a new determination to oppose the exploitation of natural resources within the parks. It was vigorously fighting the Irrigation Department regarding a plan to build an irrigation reservoir on the Waterton Lakes and hydro-electric schemes in other parks, notably Banff. The total area of the national parks consisted of only "one-quarter of one percent" of public lands, and these it was determined to maintain in their natural state for the recreational and aesthetic benefit of the public. Commissioner Harkin argued that tourism would soon bring in more revenue than the utilization of the forest and mineral resources.[31] This was a dramatic change for the National Parks Branch; only three years before the Commissioner had been willing to allow industrial developers into the parks. A new park policy, the basis of today's wildlife and resources programs, had been born.

During the nineteen twenties and nineteen thirties the Oil City property took on new significance as the Waterton Lakes townsite expanded and as the park became a popular

recreational resort. New trails and roads were extended to many of the high altitude lakes which attracted fishermen and hiking enthusiasts. In particular, the Akamina trail passing by Oil City was frequently travelled by sportsmen wanting to reach the British Columbia interior. The old derricks and run-down buildings were an unnecessary eye-sore so far as park officials were concerned. Superintendent W.D. Cromarty suggested that the structures be removed since they were a potential menace to public safety.[32] No action was taken, however, and the townspeople continued to cut timber on the land for construction work and for fire wood. One resident even applied for a permit to trap fur-bearing animals in the vicinity.[33] This would have contravened provincial game regulations which designated all land within national park boundaries game preserves.[34] Although the Park Regulations did not apply to patented lands (such as Oil City), any private land surrounded by a national park automatically became a provincial game preserve.

In nineteen thirty-one the park opened negotiations with the Trusts and Guarantee Company for a right-of-way through Oil City property for the proposed Akamina Highway.[35] The park was determined to clean up the Oil City mess, because it was not only unsightly, but the close proximity of the site to Cameron Creek was a threat to the town's water supply. (See

Figure 20). The old buildings were being used to stable horses by big game outfitters and by farmers cutting timber. Over the years a large pile of manure and refuse had accumulated which conceivably might be swept into the nearby stream during heavy spring run-off. The park offered to tear down all the old buildings, at no cost to the Trust Company, to prevent their being used as stables.[36] It is not clear from the records whether any further action was taken by the company or by the park Superintendent.

The last significant effort to find oil in Waterton Lakes Park was instigated by Larry Patrick and a Miss Theo. F. Crewer in nineteen thirty-two.[37] Patrick applied to the Department of the Interior for a drilling permit to clean out the first Lineham well or to explore in a location nearby.[38] Ottawa raised no objection provided that the drilling did not obstruct the Akamina road right-of-way which the park had negotiated with the Lineham Estate.[39] The Parks Branch recognized the validity of petroleum and gas right claims on private property, but it expected assurances that recovery of the oil would not interfere with "the beauty and welfare the Park".[40] Money for the venture was raised by a new organization, Oil City Royalties Limited, which brought in a new derrick. Drilling commenced on October 5, nineteen thirty-two some thirty feet from the original oil producing hole.[41] (See Figures 21 and 22).

In the summer of nineteen thirty-three, the well reportedly struck oil saturated sand at five hundred and eighty-five feet, and petroleum was observed flowing from the old Lineham hole.[42] The possibility of polluting Cameron Creek was casually raised by Acting Superintendent Herbert Knight. The drilling operations were less than one hundred feet from the creek and, if oil were struck, some would undoubtedly spill into the stream and endanger not only aqatic life but also the town's water supply. Even though he recognized the potential danger, Superintendent Knight dismissed the problem by saying - "should any question of this [pollution] arise, I should communication with Mr. Calder [in charge of the drilling], who would be able to adjust matters to our satisfaction".[43] The danger was not taken seriously until October, nineteen thirty-three when the Chief Engineer for western parks, J.M. Wardle, again brought the matter to Ottawa's attention.[44] Thereafter a closer watch was maintained on the drilling operations by the engineering staff to ensure that any gusher would be quickly capped. The company was ordered to excavate a series of settling basins along the stream bank, and to provide natural filtration for sludge resulting from the drilling.

During the entire operation, the enterprise was sporadic owning to poor equipment and the lack of funds. Drilling stopped in October 1933 to adopt the new precautionary

measures against pollution, and then it resumed for a brief period in November. Some borings were conducted in July nineteen thirty-four but operations were suspended in October until coal and other necessary supplies were hauled into camp. Drilling continued the next summer but the hole now reached the 2,435 foot level without any sign of oil.[45] Oil City still remained a monument to failure.

On August 16, nineteen thirty-eight the Lethbridge Herald summarized the current situation in the park:

> "Oil City on the Akimina HIghway shows no sign of activity this year, and the derrick and building seem to be gradually falling to pieces. All machinery has been dismantled this spring [1938], and the site looks as if it will fall into disuse again after brief activity during the last two years.

In nineteen forty the Inspector of National Parks ordered the dilapidated derricks and shacks removed. They were dangerous to unwary visitors and an eyesore to travellers on the Akamina Highway which passed only a few feet from the site. The rusted scrap iron from the boiler and the inoperable machinery was salvaged for use in the Second World War. All that remained of Oil City was a few old timbers, strands of steel cable, and a stone foundation from the uncompleted hotel.

*2) The Early Administrative Structure*

In the summer of nineteen ten the office of the Surveyor General of Canada made arrangements to survey a townsite in Waterton.[46] The work was performed in early November by W.F. O'Hara, D.L.S., in attendance with Howard Douglas, Commissioner of Dominion Parks. One hundred and fifty lots, each 75 x 150 feet, were surveyed along the lake front at three different points.[47] The main townsite was situated at the present location because it had always been the most popular camping spot, near the wooded area surrounding Cameron Falls. The lots extending from Lake Linnet eastward around the lakeshore were located in an open area described as "a muskeg and creek bottom [with] no trees whatsoever. These lots will never be taken up within the next fifty years, no matter how prosperous the Park may become".[48] The third area near Knight's Lake was too distant from the business section to attract any prospective buyers.

Following his visit, Commissioner Douglas allotted one hundred and fifty dollars to clear a good horse trail along the shore of the main lake to the International Border. This would provide a direct link with Glacier and give easy access to the interior valleys for fire protection.[49] Other than this, little attention was paid to the park during its first years. There was a lengthy wait before Ranger Brown received boundary notices for the park and there was an

inordinate delay in sending his "Badge of Office" as Forest Ranger. For the month of July nineteen ten he reported: "There are over 500 visitors here and I am in the saddle every day".[50] Altogether, approximately two thousand visitors entered Waterton Lakes during its first season as a national park.

The following year (1911) the park advertised villa lots for sale at a yearly rental of fifteen dollars for water frontage and ten dollars for rear lots. The public response was overwhelming. Howard Douglas acknowledged receiving applications for fifteen lots from six different individuals,[51a] but a map of the proposed townsite was not printed until late that season. Ranger Brown was instructed to accept applications but the leases were withheld until the department made sure that its surveyor had reserved a one hundred foot strip along all lakes and rivers. A discrepancy arose over the definition of the shore line, but finally the matter was resolved and the staff proceeded to lease town lots. One of the earliest structures was a livery stable erected by John W.C. Lancaster.[51b] The first major hotel in the park was built by Jack Hazzard (See Figures 23 and 24), and a dance hall was constructed by Ernie Haug.[52] (See Figures 25 and 26). A second hotel was built by C.F. Jensen, who also operated an automobile passenger service from Cardston.[53]

Initially Ottawa was content to leave the responsibility for overseeing building operations to the Superintendent's discretion. But complaints were registered that cottages and business establishments of poor quality were detracting from the beauty of the parks. In nineteen twelve, all Superintendents were instructed to have projected construction plans filed with head office. No dwelling costing less than three hundred dollars would be approved,[54] and its appearance had to be "neat" and "attractive". A book of building receipts was sent to each park, and a prospective contractor could receive a permit only upon presentation of proper blue prints, these being forwarded to Ottawa for approval.[55]

Although the building regulations and the procedure for approving construction work was clearly outlined, the system provied inoperative at first. Frequently the Superintendent neglected to ensure that all the requirements were fulfilled, and many owners began construction while awaiting formal approval from Ottawa. In one case, the Superintendent simply presented a rough sketch drawn by himself in place of the regular blue print. Commissioner Harkin admonished him to submit "full particulars and specifications drawn to scale".[56] The department repeatedly reminded the Superintendents that no building permits could be issued until it had approved the construction plans.[57]

Regulations for leasing lots within the townsite were purposely lax to attract prospective investors. The national parks were primarily recreational resorts set aside for the benefit of the public. It was therefore necessary to provide accommodation and businesses to cater to visitors. But too many structures were erected hurriedly and the department was concenred with the proliferation of inferior buildings. (See Figure 24). The provisions of the 1911 Act were too liberal and too broad in scope.[58] The construction standards code was revised in nineteen thirteen, and lease holders were required to start work within one year or relinquish their lease. The department was determined to prevent land speculation in the park,[59] which had been a very troublesome problem in Banff.[60] The Parks Branch was willing to lend every assistance to summer residents and to local businesses and it offered liberal lessing terms, but it insisted on retaining full control over the type of structure, its location and the mineral rights.

These restrictions retarded somewhat the growth of Waterton Lakes during its earliest years. Superintendent Robert Cooper described some of the obstacles:

> "Unfortunately this Park is situated back from a direct line of communication [and] in order to get in touch with the majority of applicants a letter addressed to almost any of the towns in southern Alberta takes from two to three weeks to reach its destination, also, some of the choicest timbered lots here

> can be reached only on snowshoes during a period of about four months in winter, all material has to be freighted in from either Pincher Creek or Cardston [;] the roads are not at all times in the year suitable to haul a load over. A leaser should have at least six months to start operations from the acceptance of application.[61]

The Superintendent objected to a more stringent building code because, although they might benefit other parks, "here building operations have just commenced [and] owing to the situation they appear to [sic] stringent [,] which might prohibit the advancement of the townsite".

There was no master plan for the townsite separating businesses from private cottages. Building Regulations implemented by P.C. 2875, November 27, nineteen thirteen, reserved lots exclusively for business purposes and set apart others for residential use. Ordinarily only one lot was rented to an individual but several lots could be obtained for commercial purposes in certain area. Over the years the building codes were revised and the department became more critical of blue prints submitted for approval. It directed all Superintendents to strictly enforce the building regulations. Only those plans approved by Ottawa could be used and any alterations required official sanction.[62] Nevertheless, the Superintendent retained a large measure of responsibility, and his saction of a proposed building site practically guaranteed Ottawa's

approval, provided all the regulations were adhered to by the contractor. The government did not wish to "relieve the Superintendent from the responsibility of seeing that these lots are intelligently disposed of... [The department is] rather reluctant to enforce any hard-and-fact rules and to endeavour to regulate from Ottawa all possible contingencies which may arise. The solution of this difficulty lies in the employment of a Superintendent who has sufficient ability to dispose of lands to the satisfaction of the Department".[63]

Following nineteen twenty, Waterton Lakes Park enjoyed a minor building boom. There were several clashes with residents over proposed cottage sites or business ventures, but this was a reflection of the firm enforcement of the regulations by a conscientious park staff.

Under the Superintendency of Kootenai Brown, from nineteen eleven to his retirement in the summer of nineteen fourteen, the park underwent many changes. On June 8, nineteen eleven (P.C. 1338) Waterton Lakes Park was reduced from its original fifty-four square miles to a mere shadow of thirteen and a half square miles. All five mountain parks were officially designated Dominion Parks, but their areas were drastically reduced ostensibly to promote efficient management by the admittedly small park staff. As Professor Brown points

out, "the main business of the nineteen eleventh legislation was to re-order and more clearly distinguish between the hodge-podge of forest and park reserves that had been acquired since 1887 and especially to provide more definite purpose in the regulatory powers of the Government in the forest reserves".[64] The reduction in the area of the national parks, however, was also a result of inter-departmental rivalry within the Department of the Interior. The Forestry Branch was an older institution which feared the usurpation of its authority by the new National Parks Branch. The manoever was a calculated demonstration of the power wielded by the Forestry Branch to keep the Parks Department in a subservient position.[65]

The reduction of Waterton Lakes Park boundary was not well received by the general public, reported Chief Ranger Brown, because it cut out the best game breeding grounds and most of the Upper Lake.[66] William Pearce predicted that the reduction would be "calamitous" to the protection of game,[67] and the Alberta Fish and Game Protection Association expressed its fear that the Indian people would slaughter the game. Chief Superintendent Howard Douglas supported Chief Ranger Brown in a submission asking the government to reconsider its decision.[68] Kootenai Brown repeatedly impressed upon Ottawa that the park was too

TABLE I

BOUNDARY REVISIONS FOR WATERTON PARK

| Legislation | | |
|---|---|---|
| Order in Council No. 1621 May 30, 1895 | | 54.0 Square Miles |
| Order in Council No. 1338 June 8, 1911 | | 13.5 Square Miles |
| Order in Council No. 1165 June 24, 1914 | | 423.0 Square Miles |
| Order in Council No. 1298 April 20, 1921 | | +.5 Square Miles |
| Order in Council No. 2556 July 20, 1921 | | 294.0 Square Miles |
| National Parks Act | 1930 | 220.0 Square Miles |
| National Parks Amendment Act (11 Geo. VI Chap. 66 July 17, 1947) | | 204.0 Square Miles |
| National Parks Amendment Act (3-4 Eliz. II Chap. 37 June 28, 1955) | | 203.0 Square Miles |

small, and he suggested that it be enlarged to adjoin Glacier National Park.[69] He contrasted the Canadian park with its American counterpart where "thousands of dollars are being expended, miles of good roads built and even Swiss cottages put up in desirable places for the use of tourists".[70] The Member of Parliament for Calgary, R.B. Bennett, also took up the cause and supported the petitions calling for enlargement of the park as a game preserve.[71]

Bowing to this pressure, the government revised the boundary in 1914 to incorporate an area of four hundred and twenty-three square miles.[72] The increase was larger than anyone had anticipated, and the park now comprised one of the continent's largest game preserve in conjunction with Glacier National Park. The contiguous boundary line between Waterton Lakes and Glacier was uppermost in the minds of the Ottawa staff, who were cognizant of the benefits which would accrue to the Canadian Park if the stream of tourists might be turned northward.[73]

Shortly after the park was enlarged, P.C. Barnard Hervey, the new Chief Superintendent of Dominion Parks, arrived to inspect conditions in the reserve. He recommended that a new Superintendent be appointed immediately because "Ranger Brown cannot exercise proper supervison over [the]

extended area owing to extreme age".[74] The question of Kootenai Brown's age had been a sore point for a long time. The issue had been raised previously by R.B. Bennett, M.P., who wrote the Commissioner:

> "It is apparent that the Superintendent of Waterton Lakes Park is absolutely unfit for his position. He is an old man of 73 years of age and much addicted to the use of intoxicants. I think something will have to be done towards making other arrangements".[75]

Commissioner Harkin replied that there was no point in removing any park officials because the season had just ended, but he promised to investigate the matter before the next parliamentary session opened. When Chief Superintendent Hervey's critical report reached the Commissioner, the result was immediate. On September 1st, nineteen fourteen Ranger Brown's one time assistance, Robert Cooper, was appointed Superintendent with George Allison as Chief Fire and Game Warden. Three assistant wardens and three seasonal rangers were appointed to patrol the park[76] and Kootenai Brown was retained as a full time warden.[77] He continued his patrols as regularly as was physically possible. He died on July 18, nineteen sixteen and was buried on the west shore of Knight's Lake alongside his first wife. In nineteen thirty-six a cairn was erected in the townsite in memory of the park's first "Superintendent", John George "Kootenai" Brown.

*3) The Superintendent and the Park Wardens*

The administrative headquarters for Waterton Lakes Park were moved from Waterton Mills in nineteen fourteen to the gentle sloping plain above Lake Linnet. Some of the abandoned cabins throughout the park were made habitable for the wardens, who were each assigned a specific district to patrol against poachers and for fire detection. The work of park wardens was onerous and often thankless. They were expected to do "practical things of the wood", build cabins and stables, erect telephone lines, clear and maintain trails, act as fire fighters, be expert horsemen, and respond to emergency calls at all times. Each officer was to "faithfully patrol" his district and "conscientiously" keep a diary.[78] They were empowered to search campers in the park, to confiscate unsealed weapons, and to arrest any person found hunting or illegaly possessing game. No intoxicants were permitted and government property was to be returned "in reasonable condition". They were required to wear their badge whenever on duty and to use their authority "to win for it public respect and public endorsation".[79] At this time there were no accommodations for a town warden, but the campgrounds were patrolled periodically to collect camping fees, and to watch over the buildings and open fires. Temporary wardens were hired every summer for fire and game protection to augment the permanent staff.

The warden's diaries were the most vital point of contact between the park and Ottawa.[80] By this means it was possible to keep in close touch with staff problems, complaints, and the progress of their work. A warden even carried his diary on patrol to record all his observations promptly. They were required to describe the route followed on patrol, to explain the reason for trips into town, and to give separate entries for each job, including the time involved and the location, with holidays and sick leave marked as such.[81] The Commissioner's office carefully perused every diary and monthly report, and any discrepancies between the journals and the monthly summaries were questioned. For example, Commissioner Harkin commented that if Warden H. Marquis went to town for mail and supplies, and then remained in camp owing to bad weather, then "actual patrolling in the district amounted to very little". On another occasion when Warden R.C. McDonald did not mention the number of hours on duty but did list the planting of a garden as "maintenance", Commissioner Harkin directed that the time be charged against his annual leave because it was not connected with fire and game protection. Work performed by other officers was to be re-classified under their proper headings. In conclusion, the Commissioner warned that "if the Warden's diaries and summaries are not filled in, in the proper manner, it will be necessary to withhold their salary cheques, until they have done so".[82]

Arrival of the diaries in Ottawa invariably precipitated a flurry of memos for more complete and precise information. If local names for creeks and mountains were employed, headquarters would ask for clarification if it had no account of the name on file. But even though the department was meticulous and demanding in its requirements, this punctilious concern also worked to the employee's advantage. The inadequacy of their accommodations, and the dilapidated condition of stables and other buildings was frequently commented upon by the staff in their reports. Warden William Henderson described the Belly River Station cabin as a "most miserable cabin for civilized men to stay in, half of [the] house leaks. Our horses have to graze and they stand shivering in the cold rain. The stable has a roof of poles and the rain runs through".[83] Ottawa took immediate note of the situation and without a formal request from the warden, it promised to authorize repairs to make the cabin habitable as soon as funds were available. A general review of all existing accommodations was made and in nineteen seventeen a new Warden's cabin was built at Waterton River Bridge, near Waterton Mills.

Part of this Warden's responsibility was to clear a twenty acre section behind his cabin for growing oats and timothy. Although "the farming operations were not a very great success", the department wanted a larger area ploughed

the following year to save money on horse feed.[84] Farming operations were considered essential for Waterton Lakes because of the prohibitive cost to ship in hay and oats. The department realized that farming absented Wardens from fire and game protection but, on the other hand, cutting hay reduced the risk of grass fires. Commissioner Harkin therefore directed that "Fire and Game protection must have precedence in so far as C.[hief] Warden is concerned. It is up to the Supt. to see that farming operations go on & if C.[hief] W.[arden] not available [,] he must get someone else to do it".[85] Farming operations were continued in Waterton Lakes for many years thereafter to reduce operational expenses.

The ultimate responsibility for managing the park lay with the Superintendent, and he was held responsible for the actions of all employees. Wardens obtained a requisition from the park office before making purchases, and the Superintendent was held accountable for all expenditures.[86] While the Superintendent managed the administrative matters, paperwork, finances, and made the final decisions, it was the Chief Warden who supervised the park rangers. He saw that they conducted their patrols regularly; he supervised all construction and maintenance work; he posted fire and other park notices; and he examined all fire fighting equipment monthly. He inspected all park structures and cabins once a month. His yearly report noted all worn out equipment, and

he recommended additional tools required by the wardens.[87] It was essential that a close liaison be maintained between the Superintendent and the Chief Warden. The Chief Warden had a better knowledge of the immediate problems and requirements of the park, and the Superintendent's task was to incorporate these needs into the park's long range plans.

In its early years Waterton Lakes Park had its share of both good and bad employees. Several staff members were released for possessing liquor, which was strictly prohibited. One Warden proved "very slack in the discharge of his duties" and he carried "petty tales from one Warden to another". Another resigned after five days because a one room cabin was the only accommodation for his family.[88] In most cases, however, the Wardens were well qualified, many being ex-Mounted Policemen or returned soldiers. The majority were local residents familiar with the local terrain and experienced horsemen. The delinquent employées were quickly weeded out and the park enjoyed a relatively high caliber staff of Park Wardens.

The decision making process and the enunciation of park policy was centred in Ottawa, but the implementation of those guidelines depended upon leadership in the field. Problems arising from day to day management were resolved by

the Superintendent and he wielded an impressive amount of authority in applying the decisions emanating from Ottawa. There were, however, few checks and balances to ensure that the park system was in fact what the Parks Branch meant it to be. When problems arose, it was evident that there was a wide chasm between theory and reality. Staff appointments were often political; Members of Parliament were asked to supply the names of "four or five persons who would be suitable for the work", and "the order of priority".[89] R.B. Bennett, a Member of Parliament, was asked to submit a list of "reputable hay-dealers who would be able to supply hay of good quality for the horses and buffalo at the [Banff] park this winter".[90] The park administration was still young and subject to political sincere.[91] Promotion was not necessarily based on ability; for example, the staff in Waterton Lakes did not understand how to enter accounts in the ledgers, and the Superintendent did not keep a correspondence index.[92] Consequently Commissioner Harkin frequently sent follow-up letters to the Superintendent asking him to furnish a particular report as previously requested.[93]

Aside from inadequate training in office procedure, the working conditions partially accounted for the poor organization. The Superintendent performed his work on "a decrepit table and has absolutely no facilities for keeping his papers in order", and the office filing cabinet was an

old wooden box. The administration office was "an old log building containing two apartments, one of which is used as a storeroom and the other as a living-room-office-room, while there is a small clap-board, lean-to-kitchen at the rear".[94] In the summer the Superintendent's family lived in tents while in winter they moved to Pincher Creek. The conditions were primitive, the work demanding, and the remuneration barely adequate. Funds were severely limited due to austerity measures implemented during the Great War. It was not until nineteen nineteen that a better equipped park headquarters was constructed.

During the war years (1914-1918) the expansion and growth of Waterton Lakes Park was hampered by organizational problem and by restrictive fiscal policies placed on all government departments. One particularly contentions local administrative question involved the Superintendent and the Chief Warden of the park. Chief Superintendnet P.C. Barnard Hervey investigated the situation and discovered that the Superintendent had expended money without departmental authority and had not correctly recorded it. Cheques were not properly entered in the accounts, and dues from cattle grazing had not been collected every year.[95] Chief Superintendent Hervey suggested that Commissioner of Police, Silas M. Carpenter, be sent to Waterton Lakes to investigate the matter.[96] The department wanted to expose any negligence and

obviate the lack of communication within park staff.

On January 10, nineteen sixteen the Police Commissioner held a preliminary investigation and, on the basis of his findings, several charges for dereliction of duty were brought against the Superintendent and the Chief Warden. Inspector Carpenter concluded that both parties had "not been working in harmony for some months past, owing largely to their being too familiar with each other at first, and in part, to both being ignorant of their duties and responsibilities in the park". The Chief Warden did not always follow the Superintendent's directives particularly in regard with the issue and collection of fees for grazing permits. The Chief Warden had not exercised proper supervision over wardens under his jurisdiction but this was mainly because the Superintendent had laddled him with other duties. Neither official was confident where his main responsibility lay. The Superintendent had not purchased certain equipment as head office had directed, and he had charged some office equipment to another appropriation. In conclusion, Inspector Carpenter recommended that the two men be given six months to reconcile their personal differences, to demonstrate greater interest in their work, and to familiarize themselves with park regulations and their respective responsibilities, or else be replaced.[97]

As far as Ottawa was concerned, the Superintendent was responsible for the administration of the park. Any negligence on the part of the Chief Warden was a reflection on his administrative ability since he was responsible for supervising all park employees. Commissioner Harkin also reprimanded the Chief Superintendent for not having properly instructed the two officials in their duties, and for not having reported "the unsatisfactory conditions" earlier when he had visited the park.[98]

The matter remained dormant for a year, giving the two employees an opportunity to reconcile their difficulties. During the six month probationary period, the park was run more satisfactorily. Officers came from head office to coach the park personnel and to help organize the accounts. Then, for no apparent reason, matters began to grow worse. In February nineteen seventeen an inquiry was instigated by B.W. Collision, Commissioner of Police, Lethbridge Detachment, to investigate alleged irregularities in connection with the administration of the park.[99] The Superintendent was charged with negligence in erecting a cabin and stable for a Warden which proved inhabitable because it was exposed to high wind damage. There appeared to be an excessive charge for materials, some items were missing although receipts were received and the quality of construction was below government standards. In addition, there was an unaccountable shortage

of oats, blankets and other equipment. The Wardens complained that the Superintendent had rejected their requests for equipment such as rope, snowshoes, lanterns and horse blankets. There had also been an inordinate delay in the construction of field telephone lines.

The Superintendent countered that the department had not appropriated adequate funds to purchase sufficient supplies, that it was windy everywhere, and that he did not hire men to construct the telephone line owing to adverse weather. Police Commissioner Collison concluded that "the whole matter to my mind, has arisen over a difference of opinion between the Chief Superintendent and [the park] Superintendent as to the most desirable location of this cabin". As to the Superintendent's delay in ordering supplies and construction material, he "is evidently under the impression that he is bound by the rules of Party patronage, or the rules of his department ... to get any supplies in the town in the riding in which Waterton Lake Parks [sic] forms a part". The shortage of oats was not a question of dishonesty, but of "gross carelessness". The Superintendent was doing his best but was influenced in his decisions by "listening to friends who perhaps had something to do with getting him the position he now holds". Inspector Collison concluded that the trouble was not entirely the Superintendent's fault and that with "proper office assistance, the work would be

gotten along with all right". Again the problem of establishing an efficient administrative procedure was left in abeyance.

The department's trouble in the park came to a head in the spring of nineteen eighteen. H.E. Sibbald, Chief Game Warden for Rocky Mountains Park, was asked to investigate conditions in Waterton Lakes Park and to make suggestions for improvement.[100] He concluded that the relationship between the Superintendent and the Chief Warden had not improved. The Superintendent still did not correspond with his Chief Warden; instead, he dealt directly with the Wardens. The Chief Warden did not have access to office files and consequently was entirely ignorant as to his duties. So far as Warden Sibbald was concerned, the Chief Warden had done his best under the circumstances and the blame lay with the Superintendent. The Superintendent collected grazing fees directly from the ranchers, a task originally performed by the Chief Warden, without consulting the district Wardens to verify the number of cattle. Warden Sibbald noted in his examination of telephone construction in the park that the poles erected did not meet government specifications, a matter already under investigation by the department. He ended his report with the cynical comment: "In conclusion I may say that a change in the administration is necessary,

and it appears to me that it has been the custom to find out which was the wrong way to do a thing and then do it that way".

In his own investigation, the Chief Superintendent substantiated Warden Sibbald's charges that the Superintendent had allowed rancher friends to graze more cattle and horses on park land than had been paid for in dues. The account books were not kept up to date, and park equipment had not been properly maintained in working condition. It was therefore recommended that a change in the Superintendency take place at an early date.[101]

The climax came when the Chief Superintendent instituted legal action against the Superintendent in connection with a contract let for telephone construction in the park. The notice for tenders had been drafted by an Acting Clerk at park headquarters, who was directly connected with the company which received the contract. The ten percent deposit normally insisted upon was not collected; the poles erected were below standard and the holes dug for them too shallow; and the Superintendent had not inspected the finished work to ensure that the work met government standards. Commissioner Harkin subsequently ordered an investigation into the entire administrative structure.[102]

In June nineteen eighteen, F.E. Maunder, Superintendent of Revelstoke Park, was instructed to proceed to Waterton Lakes to reorganize the park "on an efficient basis". Superintendent Maunder was given a free hand:

> "Your position will be practically that of Superintendent of the Superintendent. I want you to assume full charge of and responsibility for the affairs of the park [,] taking action however through the Superintendent, not acting over his head or without reference to him. He will be instructed that he is to carry out all directions that you give him".[103]

Superintendent Maunder concluded that the long standing difficulties among the park staff were irreconcilable, and he recommended that the Chief Warden be dismissed.[104] Commissioner Harkin personally inspected the park when he visited Waterton in September and October. He recommended that both officers be dismissed because they had proved to be "hopelessly incompetent in their work".[105] In June nineteen nineteen, George Ace Bevan was appointed Superintendent of Waterton Lakes Park, and F.E. Maunder returned to Revelstoke in December once the department was sure that its new appointee was settled in to office.

The years nineteen fourteen to nineteen nineteen saw little advancement in Waterton Lakes. Finances were tight during the war years, and all Superintendents were ordered to reduce their expenditures and authorize work that was "only absolutely necessary".[106] These economic stringencies

delayed the majority of construction projects in the park. The administrative problems which plagued Waterton Lakes Park in its infancy was symptomatic of the early years of park administration when political sinecure was prevalent. At the end of the war, park employees came under the Civil Service Commission, which substantially reduced political favouritism. It was not until the financial position of the Parks Branch improved after the Great War that Waterton Lakes finally emerged into its own.

*4) The Park Trails and Roads System*

As in all mountain national parks, a well constructed network of trails and roadways was essential to the success of Waterton Lakes as a tourist resort. The park was not serviced by a railway, and as early as nineteen sixteen H.E. Sibbald, Chief Fire and Game Warden for Banff predicted: "This park will never be a tourist resort unless their [sic] is a railroad, but will be used a great deal by the residents of Southern Alberta as a Summer Resort".[108] The first roads leading to Waterton Lakes were dusty or muddy, pot-holed wagon trails. A camping trip by saddle horse or wagon meant at least a three day round trip. Few businesses or private residences were built in the townsite owing to the prohibitive cost of freighting in construction materials. The town's development was handicapped further by the poor mail service,

the stringent government building regulations, and the lack of telephone communication.[109]

In the years immediately after nineteen eleven the greatest share of the park's budget was devoted to trail, road and bridge construction. The emphasis was on clearing trails rather than roads because, as J.B. Harkin explained, "there is not likely to be much wheeled traffic there for some years to come, [and] probably the picturesqueness of the place would be better maintained by having only trails out, instead of regular streets for the time being".[110] A trail system was needed for fire protection, but with the growing emphasis on tourism, Waterton Lakes was forced to construct numerous roadways to attract American travellers. In nineteen twelve a timber bridge was built across Pass Creek (Blakiston Brook) to connect with the road leading to Pincher Creek. The following season was especially noteworthy:

> "So well has Supt. J.G. Brown of Waterton Lakes Park utilized the $10,000 allowed by the park's branch for the construction of new trails and the betterment of existing roads and trails that tourists will hardly know the place..."[111]

A pony trail was completed to the International border to provide a link with Glacier National Park; another trail was cleared to Bertha Lake; and the wagon trails were straightened and widened for the "safe and convenient passage of automobiles". Each year additional trails,

bridges, and other imporvements were made to the roads system. The Superintendent travelled over each road in the spring to note what repairs were needed in preparation for the season's traffic.

The department set down a rigid format for constructing trails in the national parks. The size and grade were standardized: changes in the route needed written authorization from the Superintendent; only a certain type of corduroy was permitted; and the size and style of each bridge was analyzed.[112] At first, the Chief Warden managed all construction work. A few labourers were employed but the majority of work was performed by the Warden's staff until the year nineteen twenty. Thereafter, the Parks Branch let out tenders for road work since it would be "more economical and convenient". The Superintendent and Chief Warden were relieved of detailed supervisory responsibilities and the Wardens were freed to devote more time to their primary task of fire and game protection.

A scheme often discussed from the inception of the national parks system was a road meandering through the Canadian Mountains linking Banff National Park with the United States. The most comprehensive survey of the trail and road network throughout the Rocky Mountains was a meticulous and thorough brief compiled by William Pearce in nineteen thirteen.[113]

He outlined the critical need for better roads throughout the entire Rocky Mountains Forest Reserves and Parks. As an executive of the Canadian Pacific Railway, he was particularly interested in extending the highways network to facilitate "the promotion of tourist traffic". "Every Tourist is to be a considerable extent a small gold mine to the country in which he spends his money in travel, and I think one might confidently anticipate that not many years ahead the amount spent annually will be in the millions". He listed the routes already constructed, and he noted those horse and wagon trails which might be suitable for future development. The ultimate aim was an automobile route from the United States to Jasper Park because of the incalculable economic benefits to be accrued from tapping the mainstream of the American tourist traffic. A transmountain highway would benefit all the parks and would be "particularly valuable" to Banff, and incidently, the Canadian Pacific Railway's investment there. The road would make the administration of the parks and forest reserves much easier, and it would be invaluable for fire patrol units. The presentation was an extensively researched chronicle of the various roadways in the Rocky Mountains, and for many years it was cited by road associations lobbying for better highways. Commissioner Harkin himself acknowledged its important contribution, but he regretted that there were not sufficient funds to implement the program.

In recognition of the growing motor traffic throughout the mountain parks, the Rocky Mountains Park Motor Regulations were applied to all national parks in nineteen fifteen. That same year , Chief Superintendent P.C. Barnard-Hervey visited Waterton and recommended that road connections be established with the neighbouring American park.

> "The Great Northern [Railway] has undertaken a large development scheme in hand [to make Glacier Park accessible to the tourists] and we should endeavor to make our [Waterton] Park which adjoins the International Boundary part and parcel of the scheme by building roads which will be open to automobiles from our Western boundary and linked up with the roads on the other side of the Line".[114]

The recreational grounds were inadequate and the few visitors who came stayed only a short time "owing to the poor Hotel accommodation". Although roads would be expensive to build, they were essential if Waterton Lakes hoped to attract large numbers of tourists, who in turn would attract investors to provide services for park visitors.

Commissioner Harkin's response was cautious agreement. He recognized that such a road would be a boon to tourism, and he therefore had an engineering crew survey possible routes and secure the estimated cost; but he also cautioned that "We have to bear in mind that such linking up would have the effect of making Waterton Lakes Park a sort of adjunct to the United States Park and on that account there

might be some criticism from a Canadian view point".[115] It was several years before a firm commitment was made to secure a connecting roads system between the two parks.

During the remainder of the war years, the question of a road to Glacier was left in abeyance. The Rocky Mountains Park roads and the east-west transmountain highways (the most important being the Banff-Windermere highway which today forms part of the Trans-Canada Highway) absorbed practically the entire budget alloted to road construction. The Chief Engineer, J.M. Wardle, was permanently stationed in Banff and each spring he drafted a work program for the parks. Up to nineteen sixteen, no funds were delegated to Waterton Lakes. Then in 1917 Engineer Wardle wrote: "If circumstances permit during July and August it is proposed to visit Waterton Lakes Park to inspect general road conditions and requirements during the summer season in this park".[116] That summer a bridge was erected across Waterton River near Waterton Mills, which permitted motorists to enter from nearby towns. Several of the pot-holed roads were gravelled and plans were drawn by the Chief Superintendent to build a road completely encircling Lake Linnet. The existing road straddling the hillside was prone to washouts and it was expensive to maintain.[117] The plan was not acted upon due to lack of funds. Despite constant attention by the Wardens and road crews, it took only "a little rain" to put "the roads into an impossible condition."[118]

The following year, the old wagon trail to Oil City[119] was extended to the British Columbia-Alberta boundary, and in the nineteen eighteen season, an engineering crew built a new bridge and road diversion across Pass Creek. The old Upper Pass Creek Bridge had collapsed under the winter's snow, and although it was park policy not to start new jobs owing to war-time restrictions, Chief Superintendent P.C. Barnard-Hervey approved the work. He argued that it was more important to ensure the "safety and comfort" of the tourists rather than "haggle over the construction of a small bridge" across the creek.[120]

Another group that was influential in having the new bridge completed were the oil companies which still held property in Oil City.[121] The arrival of the engineers was significant because, hitherto, the Superintendent had always supervised road and bridge construction. By nineteen eighteen as many as one hundred cars were entering the park on the week-ends,[122] and it was essential that safer roads and bridges be constructed to accommodate the increased traffic. All bridges in the park were in poor condition, and the engineers selected a new site for the lower main bridge across Pass Creek. Nevertheless, the "main construction work" for the nineteen eighteen season was "the improvement and surfacing of the Banff-Kananaskis road which would indirectly be an advantage to Waterton by providing a connecting road to the

bigger northern parks through the Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve".[123] Waterton Lakes was not included in Engineer Wardle's estimates for nineteen nineteen, ( the last year for which the reports were available) and the only construction scheduled was a new road from Waterton Bridge to the north park boundary, a distance of three-quarters of a mile.[124] No trails were built but a survey was conducted from the townsite along Cameron Creek to Oil City.[125] Construction started on the Akamina Highway in nineteen twenty-one and it absorbed much of the park's budget over the succeeding years. Most of the work was done under the winter works program because it entailed a great deal of blasting through solid rock. The full implications and plans for this highway will be discussed later. Other than this roadway, the progress reports for the early nineteen twenties show little new work, with the emphasis being on minor repairs to the existing roadways and town streets.

For many years the only connection between Waterton Lakes and Glacier Parks was a "rough trail" which the Calgary Good Road Association had helped to build through the financial assistance of American sources.[126] James Davidson, President of the Calgary Association, asked the Parks Branch to communicate with American officials regarding a permanent link with the proposed road from Babbs, Montana to the Alberta

boundary.[127] In fact, in nineteen nineteen the American government had approached Commissioner Harkin to suggest an auto route for the American and Canadian Park systems.[128] A major artery linking Banff with Glacier via Waterton Lakes would "stimulate the already intense interest of our two countries in our national park systems". Commissioner Harkin expressed his keen interest in the American scheme and he responded with details on Canada's plans. Departmental engineers had already surveyed a route along the west shore of the upper lake to the International Boundary, in obeyance to the government's policy that "where possible motor roads should be thrown through the mountains rather than around them".[129] The Chief Engineer stated that such a motor route would be "one of the most important in the park, particularly from a tourist standpoint and I would recommend its construction as soon as possible".[130] Nevertheless, the scheme was not implemented because of the prohibitive cost, and the road would be of little value unless it was joined to Glacier. The Americans refused to consider such a costly route and the matter remained dormant for several more years.

5) *Game Protection and Management*

When Waterton Lakes was named a national park it automatically became a sanctuary for most species of wildlife. The comments of concerned citizens, government officials and

visitors to the Rocky Mountains lamenting the fast disappearance of wildlife has been noted above. During the interim nineteen eleven to nineteen fourteen when a large section of the Waterton Lakes was excluded from the park, the regulations protecting wildlife were still enforced by the park staff. The park was covered by the Forestry Regulations which prohibited trespass on Crown Land without permission from the Forestry Branch. Hunters could, therefore, be kept out by forestry officers. However, there were no provincial officers or forestry officials assigned to the Waterton Lakes area, and park Wardens were ordered to protect the game.[131] The number of game wardens on patrol proved too few to be effective. Henry Arnous "Frenchie" Riviere,[132] a long time guide in the district and a provincial game Warden in the Crowsnest area from nineteen eleven to nineteen twenty-eight, sent a map to the Commissioner demonstrating the inadequacy of the park's measures against poachers. Owing to the innumerable horse trails passing through the park, poachers could slip by the park service very easily.[133] Henry Riviere suggested that the park's northern boundary be extended to the Crowsnest Pass Forest Reserve, making the entire south eastern slope one giant game preserve.[134] However, if the government had followed this course of action, it probably would have met with the immediate disapproval of hunting guides and sportsmen in

Southern Alberta.

Another hindrance to effective game management was a jurisdictional dispute between national parks officers and forestry officials. The boundary established in nineteen eleven made the park "such an absurdly small area that it cannot be considered of very great service in protecting wildlife".[135] Henry Riviere noted sadly: "The year nineteen twelve... marked the beginning of a new era in game conditions in Southern Alberta". Now local hunting parties could run the big game ragged. Another cause for concern were the new coal towns where "8 or 10" men would be living in a shack. Consequently, "there are always 2 or 3 idle hands that are supposed to provide meat for the pot".[136] Henry Riviere suggested that a game sanctuary be established in the foothills, and that hunters be issued special permits to carry firearms in a forest reserve. A further difficulty in prosecuting poachers was that park regulations did not empower a Warden to search a private residence for unsealed fire arms. The only person with this authority was a provincial forest ranger because national parks were subject to the laws of the province in which they were located.[137]

The rivalry between the Forestry Branch and the Parks Branch undoubtedly led to confusion as to what policy to follow in game management. The forestry people accused

the park's officials of extending boundaries for game preservation, thereby tying up vital natural resources. The parks department countered that the boundaries were enlarged to enclose unique scenic areas, and that game protection was an incidental factor, albeit an important one. This led to a great deal of spite and bitterness between the two factions. One opinion was that the enlargement of Waterton Lakes Park in nineteen fourteen proved "very disastrous to the game".[138] Until then, residents had accepted the principle of game management,[139] but now poaching abounded because there was little area left to hunt in. Wardens patrolled the grounds but the Forestry Branch refused to relinquish its control.[140] Some forestry officials knowingly issued camping permits to parties who planned to defy the hunting regulations. Finally in nineteen sixteen the northern boundary of the park was surveyed along the south fork of the Yarrow Creek, commencing where it crosses the eastern boundary of the Rocky Mountain Forest Reserve, to Bridgeland Park on the British Columbia - Alberta border. The area was easy to patrol; it left sufficient timber and grazing area for commercial use; it included precious scenic attractions; and the park contained sufficient land to sustain the wildlife population.[141]

One of the first plans to increase big game populations in the national parks was put forth by C.H. Chapman,

Superintendent of Glacier Park. In nineteen twelve, immediately after Waterton Lakes was named a national park, he offered to ship in a dozen or more elk if the park would promise to protect them.[142] The scheme was rejected as impractical, for at the time, Waterton Lakes was neither large enough nor had sufficient personnel to guard the animals. The wapiti were not native to the lakes, and a noted local rancher and guide, F.H. "Bert" Riggall, did not sight the first elk in the park until nineteen twenty.[143] Several animals entered the park over the next decade, and in nineteen twenty-two rancher Max Bradshaw complained of severe damage to his grazing lands and haystacks. Their numbers were not over-abundant, according to the Superintendent's reports of the late nineteen thirties and early nineteen forties, but the animals preferred the open range of neighbouring ranches. Dr. Ian McTaggert Cowan studied the problem in nineteen forty-five and he recommended reducing their numbers and erecting a fence line across their migration route to keep them off ranchers' grass lands. The herds were eventually reduced in the late nineteen forties and the nineteen fifties.[144]

Although all big game animals, all small fur-bearing animals and all upland birds and migratory birds were protected, there was a determined policy to eradicate all predators from the national parks. Wolves, coyotes, cougars, and to a lesser extent, lynx and bob-cat were killed by ranchers on account of their depredations against cattle.

Forest rangers and game wardens also joined in the slaughter because of their predatory action against deer and sheep. Bounties were paid on predators and they were practically eradicated from the mountain foothills.

Waterton Lakes was beset with many problems in its game management program during the early years. At first, Kootenai Brown set out poison bait to exterminate wolves from the park. He believed: "The destruction of wolves and coyotes is a matter of great importance to the farmer, or stockman, as also to the game preserver".[145] The parks Branch objected to the use of strychnine because it was dangerous to other wildlife. Chief Superintendent Howard Douglas ordered Chief Ranger Brown to use only dogs and guns to hunt predators.[146] The frontiersman replied that poison was the only effective method of eradication but he promised to obey the department's directive. Soon complaints were raised by ranchers that the park was a refuge for predators killing their young colts and calves. Subsequently Wardens were issued carbines and field glasses to track down the marauders.[147]

In nineteen fifteen the Superintendent reported that wolves and coyotes were more plentiful than ever, and he described seeing does and fawns being attacked by these

"noxious animals".[148] Over the next two seasons Wardens reported that their numbers were rapidly increasing and that many deer were being killed. Nearby settlers complained of losing more stock than in previous years, but only "a very few coyotes", two dens of young, and one lynx were killed by the park staff during the nineteen sixteen season.[149] The Parks Branch directed its staff "to use all means at your disposal, so far as trapping, and shooting are concerned, in order to rid your park of coyotes during this [1917] winter".[150] The Superintendent was to organize patrols immediately and to order traps, if needed, "without delay". The department wanted precise information on the number killed, the animals' sex, the location, and the name of the successful Warden.

Commissioner Harkin candidly admitted that the reason for "a prompt and efficient campaign" to reduce the predators was to forestall "agitation among the cattle owners".[151] The commissioner believed that predatory management was necessary to protect other wildlife. National parks were intended to preserve breeding and nesting grounds and to safeguard big game animals from hunters. In keeping with this policy, the number of predators must be carefully controlled.[152] These ideas regarding game reserves and predator control were shaped by the American experience. The

department regularly received bulletins published by the United States Department of Agriculture, giving instructions for new methods in preparing bait to attract predators to traps. Whenever there was a shift in American policy or a change in their game regulations, there was usually a similar revision in Canada.

With the arrival of F.E. Maunder in nineteen eighteen as Acting Superintendent, there was a renewed effort to prosecute poachers and to implement conservation practices. "Three of the worst poachers" were caught, and one party was stopped from trapping illegally.[153] Hitherto Wardens had refused to track poachers because it meant days or weeks of tracking in deep, snowbound mountain passes. One party was caught by Warden Bowers and Henry Riviere,[154] along with a group at Oil City and one in the Castle River district. Acting Superintendent Maunder hoped that:

> "The prosecution of the above cited cases will act as a deterent to poachers for some time, when they see there are severe penalties inflicted in each case. In the past it has been a laughing stock for the surrounding country when a light penalty has been imposed, in some cases there was not enough inflicted to cover the cost of an equal quantity of meat.

The former Superintendent had fined one person ten dollars for shooting two deer, whereas Superintendent Maunder imposed fines totalling nine hundred dollars and eight hundred dollars upon lawbreakers brought before him.[155]

The role of Henry Riviere as a provincial game Warden and his criticism of park policy regarding grazing leases in the park has been noted above. Henry Riviere was one of the provinces's most ardent game conservationists, and over the years he established a close relationship with Commissioner J.B. Harkin. Henry Riviere affectionately called Waterton Lakes "my pet hobby" and he closely scrutinized operations in the park. He called the change in park personnel in nineteen nineteen " a huge improvement on past policy", but he was unhappy with the new trails planned by the new Superintendent, which would disturb the breeding grounds of the mountain sheep and pose a fire hazard by permitting camping.[156] On the basis of Henry Riviere's letter, Commissioner Harkin reminded the Superintendent that in planning new schemes he was to remember that "the parks are game sanctuaries and that protection of the animals not only involves protection from poaching, but also involves the protection of their winter feeding grounds".[157]

Henry Riviere also held a permit "to take for scientific purposes one pair of each animal or bird protected by the Game Act", and these were delivered to the Department of Agriculture, Edmonton. In May, nineteen eighteen he was sworn in as an Honorary Ranger under the Dominion Parks Service. This gave him the authority to arrest poachers in

the park, a power which no other provincial game Warden possessed. He was an intimate friend of Kootenai Brown,[158] and he enjoyed a close relationship with Commissioner Harkin, who gave this glowing endorsement:

> "I have been wondering from time to time how it was that you had not been favoring me with information and advice with regard to the Southern country of Alberta. I think you know that I always look forward to letters from you because I know that you are sincerely concerned in the preservation of wildlife".[159]

He was described as "a trusted, experienced officer of the Alberta Warden Service",[160] who was instrumental in tracking down several notorious poachers in the Waterton Lakes district. He wrote numerous letters to government officials concerning game regulations, overgrazing and other conservation matters.[161] Henry "Frenchie" Riviere is another prominent frontiersman of the Rocky Mountain whose pioneering work has been ignored by writers of the early west.

Following Commissioner Harkin's directive in nineteen seventeen, more coyotes were shot and traps were purchased. In addition the Superintendent asked permission to use poison for predatory controls.[162] As Kootenai Brown and other experienced hunters had noted, strychnine was the most effective means for killing predators. The department was reluctant

to sanction its use for fear that other carnivors, especially bears, might be poisoned accidently. It was understood that "no bears should be killed in your park except in the case where one becomes a real nuisance. In such cases, you may authorize one of your wardens to kill the bear but I would impress upon you that the case against the animal must be complete and that you must exercise the utmost judgment and discrimination".[163] When there was no appreciable increase in the number of coyotes killed, Ottawa complained that its instructions were not being complied with. Chief Ranger Brown had been too old to accomplish much, and the Superintendent was accused of not fulfilling his duties in carrying out the eradication program. The department was anxious to appoint "an efficient chief warden" and "send him very full instructions as to the latest methods for combating the predatory animal nuisance, which is particularly acute in Waterton Lakes Park vicinity".[164] During the nineteen twenties, an even more vigorous eradication program was inaugurated.

One of the most important pressure groups to influence the government's predator policy was the ranching community, which leased large blocks of grazing land in Waterton Lakes Park. Departmental records for grazing leases were opened in nineteen seven when applications were accepted for the Rocky Mountains Park.[165] Dominion lands regulations

did not apply to the national park but they formed the basis of parks' policy. The Superintendent issued a yearly permit for a nominal fee, depending on the amount of land, and subject to ninety days notice. The arrangement was very informal and covered only a small area of the park. It would have cost more to have had the park sub-divided than the income from rent for ten years.[166]

When Howard Douglas was appointed Commissioner of Dominion Parks in nineteen eight, he opposed the granting of leases because grass lands reserved for wildlife would be destroyed. The presence of ranch hands would require "an army of game wardens" to prevent poaching, and there was the increased danger of fire as more stockmen entered park lands.[167] Nevertheless, grazing leases were issued in Banff National Park and problems arose over stray cattle and the inordinatly large herds using the land. Consequently the government introduced legislation in nineteen fourteen governing grazing in national parks to establish a uniform fee and to regulate the location and size of herds.[168] The Superintendent determined what areas might be leased and the Wardens were to ensure that the cattle did not exceed the permissable number or wander outside the designated areas. No exclusive rights could be granted but ranchers nearest the park were given preference.[169] Permits in Waterton

Lakes Park were subsequently issued the fall of nineteen fourteen.[170]

Unfortunately the regulations were not rigidly enforced and cries of favoritism were raised by rejected applicants. The ranchers paid the Superintendent directly for the leases and the Wardens were not informed how many stock were allowed under permit. During his inspection of the park in nineteen eighteen, H.E. Sibbald found no evidence of overgrazing, but he recommended that a Warden be appointed to deal with the ranchers.[171] Warden R.C. McDonald was appointed to the position and it was his responsibility to review all applications and issue leases to those ranches within a five mile radius of the park. No cattle were allowed without a permit, and three thousand head was set as the maximum allowable in the park.[172] Any rancher refusing to comply with the regulations immediately had all rights suspended. Grass land was at a premium because each year more land was being fenced in by settlers, and several complaints were received regarding the cut-back in the number of head permitted on park land. Furthermore, all diseased cattle were excluded, no sheep could enter the park, the limit was to be strictly enforced to prevent overgrazing, and stock could not be grazed in areas where they might come in contact with tourists or damage trails and natural scenic features.[173] Grazing was restricted to the months June to

October and wintering rights required special approval by Ottawa. No permits were granted in areas populated by elk or other big game. The problem was to reconcile the park's objective of protecting wildlife and promoting tourism with the commercial interests of the surrounding ranch community.

The attempt to maintain an accurate record of all cattle in the park failed. In nineteen nineteen, a newly appointed Fire and Game Warden wrote that "instead of improving, matters have got worse and the entire district has been over-grazed and the ground is practically bare of vegetation". Cattle and horses frequently entered the park because there was insufficient grass land outside the reserve. "The result is that all the winter range for the elk and deer has been badly eaten off," and once domestic stock entered an area, wild game would not return.[174] Winter pasturage was badly tramped by the excessive number of cattle, and camping parties in the Pass Creek valley complained of cattle crowding around the tents and "messing up everything".[175] The regulations were firmly enforced in later years, and the question of overgrazing was frequently debated, but the problem remained with the park for the next two decades. Cattle ranging over the grassy plains of Waterton Lakes Park were a familiar sight to visitors until December 31, nineteen forty-seven when the regulations were amended to prohibit all grazing in the park.

## *PART II - THE CONSERVATION AND RECREATIONAL PERIOD, 1920 - 1937*

As early as nineteen fourteen, Commissioner J.B. Harkin clearly elucidated his policy for Canada's national parks system in a thirty-four page memorandum.[1] The parks served two purposes - the humanitarian and the commercial, but the latter was subordinate to the former. The parks were, first and foremost, "for all the people... Their mission is to serve that innate desire of every individual to seek relief and repose and refreshment of mind and body in the open air and sunshine". The parks were health and recreational centres that would provide "a remedy for the more serious ends of city life". However, when the prosaic descriptions and the homages to the general public are stripped from the annual reports, it is evident that the main justification for the parks was the tourist trade. "It is well known that tourist traffic is one of the largest and most satisfactory means of revenue a nation can have". The "commercial potentialities" of tourism was "startling", and Commissioner Harkin noted that hundreds of millions of dollars were spent by travellers in the United States, France, Italy, Germany, and Switzerland. Canada must therefore utilize its impressive scenery and natural attractions to win its share of this vast potential wealth.

The memoranda employed extensive quotations from American Parks Service reports, and mountaineers' books (notably J. Norman Collie, H.E.M. Stutfield and W.D. Wilcox) to substantiate the Commissioner's philosophy on the national parks . He cited prominent Canadian politicians who extolled the beauty and tremendous commercial potential of the Canadian Rockies. The preservation of wildlife and natural resources was essential, both for aesthetic reasons and their commercial contribution. The Commissioner's justification for expanding Canada's park system was straightforward:

> "To sum up then, Dominion Parks constitute a movement that means millions of dollars of revenue annually for the people of Canada; that means the preservation for their benefit, advantage and enjoyment forever, of that natural heritage of beauty... which is one of our most precious national possessions; that means the guarantee to the people of Canada today and to all succeeding generations of Canadians of those means of recreation which serve best to make better men and women, physically, morally and mentally...."

What Commissioner Harkin did not emphasis was that encouragement of the tourist trade would necessitate many "improvements" in the parks. Townsites would have to be expanded to provide better accommodations and facilities; bigger and better roads would need to be constructed; and recreational playgrounds providing swimming, boating, tennis, golfing and other activities would have to be planned. Such

developments inevitably marred the landscape and altered the environment. The implementation of the new park policy had a profound impact upon the development of Waterton Lakes National Park as a recreational resort.

*1) The Expanding Townsite 1919 - 1924*

Under the direction of Superintendent George Ace Bevan a new administration compound was built above Lake Linnet and several recreational features were constructed. Eighty lots were surveyed in the townsite in nineteen eighteen, and within one season the park received forty-two applications for leases in the new subdivision.[2] Plans were formulated to reserve merchantable timber on Stoney (Sofa) Creek to provide a cheap source of timber for the anticipated boom in cottages and businesses. In the past there had been little investment in the park due to the scarcity of both lumber and labourers. A new hotel was needed but investors could not be attracted to the townsite. Superintendent Bevan offered a simple solution: "A sawmill in the vicinity would result in largely increased building activities, better and more elaborate cottages, and further investments in permanent residences and business houses".[3] The Parks Branch was evidently more concerned with providing adequate accommodation for tourists rather than preserving the park from settlement.

In nineteen nineteen an estimated nine thousand visitors entered Waterton Lakes, the majority journeying from Lethbridge and neighbouring towns.[4] Most visitors came in July and August, and left soon after September first because the fishing season ended on that date. The Superintendent suggested that a school be built to attract permanent residents. This would make possible an "eight or nine months season", and prospective investors would erect "more permanent buildings". The Superintendent frankly admitted that if a school were built, his family could live in the park's official residence.[5]

Although the Superintendent's request for a school was refused, a new dormitory capable of accommodating forty school girls from the Blood and Peigan Indian schools was built by Canon S.H. Middleton in the summer of nineteen twenty.[6] The same year, the Pincher Creek Boy Scouts group, working under the supervision of park personnel, erected a three room camp shelter. The park supplied the tents, blankets and meals in return for labour. In nineteen twenty-two, the Boy Scouts applied for a government grant to erect cabins, a lecture hall and entertainment centre, but the department turned down the petition. In nineteen thirty-four, Senator W.A. Buchanan lobbied on behalf of the Y.M.C.A. for a boys summer camp.[7] Commissioner Harkin approved the application because he wished "to encourage Y.M.C.A. and

other such camps in the National Parks... These camps provide a means for a holidy in the Parks for many boys".[8] That summer a delegation from Lethbridge chose a site on the east side of Lower Waterton Lake and started to build a kitchen and bunkhouse.

The National Parks Branch enthusiastically supported any public organization wishing to provide an outdoors environment for young people. The ultimate Youth Training Program was inaugurated in nineteen thirty-nine. The Parks Branch instituted a three year National Forestry Program for young men between ages eighteen and twenty-five to provide them with an opportunity to participate in conservation work. They participated in normal staff functions such as highway improvement, cleaning picnic and camp ground areas, erecting camp kitchens, widening and grading trails, installing telephone lines, building dams on creeks to reduce spring run-off, planting trees, clearing bush, and they attended lectures in fire, fish and game management.[9] The program was the epitome of J.B. Harkin's life long goal to make the parks health and recreational centres for young Canadians.

A major aspect of park policy was the promotion of recreational facilities for tourists. In the spring of nineteen twenty-one, William Thompson, a golf professional from Banff, visited Waterton Lakes to lay out a nine hole

golf course.[10] The suggestion for a golf course was first proposed by Chief Warden Herbert Knight in nineteen nineteen. The ideal location was the level, open ground south of Pass Creek, which would have cost twelve hundred and fifty dollars to build. It would quickly pay for itself and with the nearby completed tennis courts as another attraction, "a better class of tourist would certainly be thereby induced to patronize this resort".[11] (See Figure 32) Commissioner Harkin ordered departmental planners to draft a comprehensive recreational program, including tennis, golf and playgrounds on "an intelligent and broad basis in the whole Park area".[12] The Superintendent asked that Lake Linnet be reserved as a bathing bay with diving boards, rafts and a concrete wall to act both as a path-walk and as a buffer against high water. (See Figure 33) The possibility of establishing a museum was discussed but it was turned down as being premature.[13] A children's playground was completed for the nineteen nineteen season, which "met with universal approval of our visitors and promises to become the main feature of the Park".[14] Waterton Lakes gradually added many recreational past times which won praises from a growing number of visitors.

Following the Great War numerous government buildings were constructed throughout the park. The administration offices were moved nearer the townsite, (see

Figures 27 to 29) and in nineteen twenty a bunkhouse was built on the hillside above Lake Linnet (See Figure 30). The department wanted to centralize their staff and it built a headquarters cabin as "a sort of organized camp or reunion place" for Wardens coming to town.[15] The overall plan was "to standardize the buildings in the park so that when at any future time a cabin, stable, or hay barn, is to be erected, the department may be in possession of the approximate cost of same and thus save delay in dealing with the question".[16] The materials' cost, architectural plans, location, and progress of work were all meticulously recorded. Special pains were taken to place the structures where they would be screened behind trees, and if possible, situated some distance from the residential and business areas. Under Superintendent Bevan's leadership (1919-1924), the park added a stable, bunkhouse, garage, warehouse, granary, powder magazine, incinerator, blacksmith shop, hay barns and other storage buildings, most of them in the government compound above Lake Linnet. Others were built near Steamboat Bay (Emerald Bay) because the shoreline, at that time, was quite thickly wooded.[17] (See Figures 34 and 35)

The general progress of the townsite and the variety of recreational features was impressive by nineteen twenty-one.

> "...there are Government Buildings, Post Office, Local and long distance telephone, Hotel, furnished cottages for rent, Rooming house, Garage, Restaurant, Dancehall, 2 General Stores, R.C.M. Police Station, modern Playgrounds for children, swings, slides, etc. first class Golf course 3/4 mile from Townsite, Rowboats, several private and public gasoline motor launches, Saddle and packhorse outfit, in addition to a number of privately owned summer cottages".[18]

Despite the problems in acquiring building material, the poor accommodations, and the rough roads, Waterton Lakes was a popular recreational resort which attracted a growing number of local visitors and tourists from the United States. The emphasis by the Parks Branch in promoting tourism made an indelible impression upon a delegation led by Stephen Mather, Director the United States National Parks Service, when it toured Waterton Lakes Park in August nineteen twenty-four. The American delegates concluded:

> "Our general impression was one of a definite contrast in policy between the Canadian and American National Park Services. The Canadian Parks seem to be administered with the idea of exploitation or utilization for revenue in somewhat the same way as are the American National Forests, as against our own park policy of perpetuating great natural wonder spots solely for the enjoyment and edification of our own and future generations".[19]

The essential difference between the two countries in their respective philosophies regarding park management could not have been stated more distinctly, nor more bluntly.

2) *The Irrigation Dam*

When Waterton Lakes was officially proclaimed a national park in nineteen eleven, it was assumed by the majority of people that the park was forever protected from further economic exploitation. In actual fact, the Irrigation Branch of the Department of the Interior still maintained a covetous eye on Waterton Lakes. The Irrigation Department authorized further survey work in nineteen eleven to examine the feasibility of extending the Alberta Railway and Irrigation Company's irrigation system throughout Southern Alberta.[20] Surveyors were instructed to locate possible diversion points and reservoir sites, explore canal routes, measure stream flows, and make detailed topographical maps to determine the irrigable area of every potential reservoir. These surveys included the streams and lakes of Waterton Lakes Park. In nineteen fifteen a reconnaissance trip was made of "the possibilities of power development for a small town or summer resort, and the location of favourable basins for water storage on Bertha Creek, Oil Creek, and Blakiston Brook". The hydrographer's report selected an area two and one half miles below Oil City as the best site for power purposes, and suggested that data be collected on stream flow for future reference.[21]

To meet the fuel crisis during the Great War, the federal government appointed the Royal Commission on Economics

and Development to report on means to control and exploit natural resources in Canada.[22] William Pearce, now an executive with the Canadian Pacific Railway was appointed to the Commission to investigate land settlement in western Canada. One of the schemes drafted for the Commission by William Pearce reiterated his life time dream of opening the prairies to agricultural development through irrigation. By constructing storage dams in the mountains, the spring run-off would be made available for irrigation during the dry summer months. In November, nineteen nineteen an engineering crew from the Reclamation Service[23] surveyed the Narrows located at the northern terminus of Upper Waterton Lake. This construction where the Upper Lake opens into the Lower Lake made the Narrows uniquely suitable for a reservoir dam. The Waterton River was an ideal site for a dam owing to its high storage capacity. For three consecutive years (1916-1918), Southern Alberta suffered from severe drought, and there was a great deal of public interest in any scheme which offered relief from their predicament.

Before making any definite proposal for locating a reservoir, the Director of the Reclamation Service Department, E.F. Drake, asked Commissioner Harkin if raising the water level would "materially impair the scenic beauty of the park".[24] Superintendent Bevan raised no

objections; rather, he wanted an assurance that the dam would be wide enough to provide a road to Vimy Mountain. "Only imagine, Sir, a road all round the Lake. Ambitious, I grant, but possible in the future, giving us over 30 miles of lake shore and mountain driveway and skirting the bases of ten mountains .. making a most beautiful scenic roadway or motor highway, unsurpassed in the West".[25] Superintendent Bevan later explained that he had endorsed the engineers' plans because he understood the townsite would not be affected if a concrete front wall was constructed. "[W]e should really be the gainers by (a) a right of way connecting the two lakeshores and (b) a projecting concrete lake wall on our foreshore, both at the expense of the Irrigation Department and erected by their Construction Engineers".[26] Commissioner Harkin was more cautious and wanted definite information on the extent of land to be flooded. If the townsite were to be adversely affected, then the advantage of preserving Waterton Lakes as a recreational area would need to be weighed against the benefits to agriculture.[27] Until the question was resolved, orders were given to postpone leasing lots in the recently surveyed town sub-division to guard against damage claims that would inevitably arise if a dam were built.[28]

Commissioner Harkin's approach to the problem was very pragmatic initially.

> "I recognize that all matters of this kind must be dealt with purely on merit. If an irrigation scheme can be developed which it can be demonstrated will prove more beneficial to the country than the recreational facilities provide for the public at Waterton Lakes Park [,] I can see that there would be grounds for justifying the sacrifice of the Park".

The proposed scheme would wipe out the town and there was no suitable alternative for a "general recreational area". The park would be essentially a game preserve with a few hiking trails. The progress of the park was momentarily hampered until a final decision was made. Building permits could not be issued for fear that it might be flooded. Nor was Commissioner Harkin confident that a solution would be easily found: "I assume it will take several years to thoroughly work out the irrigation plans and to secure the consent of the United States because the Waterton Lakes are International waters. I am therefore at present in a quandary as to what action should be taken in regard to the townsite extension".[29] As it turned out, the International status of the lake proved to be the decisive factor in defeating the proposed dam.

In the summer of nineteen twenty, the Commissioner of Irrigation, P.H. Peters, presented his department's study on the Lethbridge Southeast Project. A dam forty to sixty feet in height was necessary at the Narrows, thereby destroying

the townsite, but the stored water would irrigate seventy-five thousand acres of semi-arid farmland. As far as Commissioner Peters was concerned, the economic benefits were "obvious", and "it is assumed that the necessity for providing this reservoir is admitted". He argued that Waterton Lakes was the best natural site and the most economical to build. The dam would not interfere with fishing or boating on the lake, although some mountain scenery would be engulfed. The water margins at their lowest level would not be unsightly since the shoreline was mainly rock. The lower lake would not be touched as a concession to the Parks Branch and the dam would attract more visitors. A new town could be located west of Lake Linnet where several government buildings already stood. Commissioner Peters predicted that the public would rather have the irrigation scheme than simply a recreational park.[30]

Before preparing the final designs and cost estimates, the Irrigation Branch wanted the approval of the Minister of the Interior. In summary, the case for the dam was: 1. Southern Alberta required irrigation owing to extreme dry years. 2. The residents had petitioned for the project. 3. Waterton Lakes would irrigate the largest bloc of land, and without it, seventy-five thousand acres would be elimited from the Lethbridge Southeastern Irrigation Project. 4. "The cost of constructing this reservoir will

be low, and the project entirely feasible, and it is not thought that the Lake will be greatly injured for park purposes".[31]

The first criticism to the Irrigation Department's proposal came from Superintendent Bevan. He noted that other areas down river were equally suitable for a reservoir, but that the irrigationists wanted to avoid the expense of buying private land. There was no other "attractive" location for a town, and the site above Lake Linnet was too "precipitous and impossible for building sites". Tourists would no longer be attracted; the park would become "a game preserve pure and simple;" and the area would revert to a picnic site for local residents. Fishing and boating would be destroyed by the accummulation of logs and debris as the water level dropped, and the beautiful natural scenery would be marred by the unsightly lakeshore. The cost of removing the townsite and the expense of altering the existing roads would be more prohibitive than acquiring private lands downstream. Superintendent Bevan concluded: "Parks are set aside as public recreation grounds for all future generations" and they should not be sacrificed to private enterprise. It would be a "sacrilege" to destroy the park for the "sake of a few thousands of dollars necessary to buy additional private interests [downstream]". Hereafter no park would

be safe from interest groups seeking to utilize water and timber resources. Preserving it as a tourist resort would more than compensate any immediate gain the Reclamation Service would achieve from flooding the park.[32]

During the winter of nineteen twenty-one, Superintendent Bevan travelled to Calgary, Lethbridge and neighbouring towns to prompt local civic leaders in voicing their opposition to the dam. He reported that Fort Macleod favoured irrigation and its town council severely criticized the Pincher Creek resolution which advocated complete presentation of the park. Lethbridge and Cardston were divided and largely uninterested, while Calgary did not want to "interfere with other peoples quarrels".[33] Commissioner Harkin directed the Superintendent to survey alternate reservoir sites outside the park, and "by a process of elimination show that everything that could be done by a Waterton Lakes Reservoir can be done by reservoirs elsewhere".[34] Ottawa wanted every piece of evidence that would support their contention that irreparable damage would result from the dam and lessen the area's potential as a tourist centre. Superintendent Bevan forwarded any relevant items, such as newspaper articles and town petitions, to Ottawa so that the Parks Branch would be fully cognizant with both the irrigationists' arguments and local sentiment against the proposal.

Perhaps one indication of the serious concern of the officials in Ottawa was their close scrutiny of publications discussing the benefits derived from irrigation projects. The Park's files contain numerous copies of the magazine Irrigation Review, which contended that park policy should not preclude the utilization of storage sites in the national parks. "Even if a few local beauty spots might be marred in some way, their aesthetic claims should not take precedence over the welfare of the people making their living on the land and over the prosperous development of the country".[35] Ironically, it was the United States National Parks Association Publication, the "Bulletin" (No. 26, March 6, nineteen twenty-two), which best articulated the argument that the dam would do "irreparable damage to broad shores and magnificent valleys covering the floor of the Kootenay Valley at our end of the lake at a point which is the key of the entire future development northward of Glacier National Park. Hotel sites of great importance, and the starting of the Brown Pass trail to the Bowman and Kintla countries, will be destroyed; the only location for a long-planned International highway will be blocked".

After months of inter-departmental debate, the issue became a contentious public controversy. The park hoped to build a strong defence by winning public opinion to its side.

One of its most ardent spokesmen was L.E. Dimsdale.[36] He was afraid that "this is the first move of private interests to get a hold on our National parks, and if it is granted, the government can scarcely refuse similar requests". Furthermore, the low water level would disfigure the landscape, innundate the townsite, and spoil all natural beach areas.[37] Superintendent Bevan asked Dimsdale to forward petitions or any evidence which would prove that public opinion was not entirely with the irrigationists.[38] He explained the vital contribution of national reserves such as Waterton Lakes:

> "The Parks are for all, and a heritage to posterity. The money spent on them is for the benefit of the people of Canada, and not for any small community [like irrigationists]. They are made convenient and accessible as national playgrounds for all, with nature as a healing balm to those who need rest and quietness".[39]

It was imperative that all petitions, resolutions and private letters supporting the department's stance be forwarded to Ottawa "before it is too late". When the Reclamation Branch received word that the Pincher Creek townspeople were organizing a protest against the dam, its Director urged the Acting Commissioner of Irrigation stationed in Calgary to have those people wanting the dam to present their case before federal authorities.[40] When the Town Council of Pincher Creek sent a resolution to the Minister of the Interior protesting the scheme, the Irrigation Commissioner replied that

opponents to the dam were a minority group who greatly exaggerated its detrimental effects upon the park.[41]

The irrigationists appeared to have the upper hand. The Civic Council of Fort Macleod, the Lethbridge City Council, the Southern Irrigation District, and the New Dayton Irrigation District all submitted resolutions in favour of the scheme. Other communities "endorsing the proposed plan of the Reclamation Service of damming the lakes at the Narrows are those from Milk River, Warner, Macleod, Cardston, Magrath, Raymond, Bow Island, Taber, Lucky Strike, Grassy Lake and New Dayton". Many people signed the petitions because "Southern Alberta generally appears to feel that the water is needed more on the lands of the prairie in producing crops than in the mountains serving only a few".[42] The majority of civic leaders and local politicians spoke favourably of irrigation because of its apparent popularity with the public. The irrigationists enjoyed widespread support while the park's defenders were poorly organized with only Pincher Creek and a few individuals opposing the scheme.[43] The irrigation organizations were public groups and, therefore, free to present their case. No similar organization existed for the parks, and because they were government employees, park personnel could not publicly enter the controversy. Commissioner Harkin lamented privately, "there is the greatest need

in Canada for an organization something on the lines of the American National Parks Association which, being independent of the Government is free to actively carry on work in defence of National Parks".[44]

Once the battle lines between the Parks Branch and the Reclamation Service had been drawn, the issue became a political football. The final decision by the Minister of the Interior was due the spring of nineteen twenty-two. If the Minister approved the scheme, plans for the irrigation project would be drawn and the question would then be referred to the International Joint Commission as provided by the terms of the Waterways Treaty. The first intimation that the American government was opposed to the dam arose when the survey party studying Waterton Lakes was refused admission to the American side of the lake.[45] The Reclamation Service was caught completely by surprise and its Director bitterly complained "that it would be a practical impossibility now, or at any time in the near future, to secure the consent of the United States authorities to making any use whatever of that portion of Waterton Lake within Clacier National Park for reservoir purposes in connection with irrigation in Canada". Nevertheless, his department insisted upon presenting its case before the International Waterways Commission to open the channels for later discussions with the American

government.[46] In response, the Parks Branch drafted "a very comprehensive memorandum" which it hoped would provide "a formidable problem for the irrigationists to overcome".[47] Meanwhile, Superintendent Bevan was "to continue to transmit every scrap of useful information that you run across".[48]

From nineteen twenty to nineteen twenty-three, the dam proposal aroused bitter feelings and acrimonious debate. It was generally accepted that the reservoir would destroy the park as a major tourist centre. It was the belief of some individuals that Canadian Pacific Railway officials were attempting to muzzle criticism of the proposed scheme because agricultural prosperity would increase tonnage on the railroad and Waterton Lakes would be eliminated from competition against Banff.[49] Commissioner Harkin now confirmed that if the lake was used as a reservoir, he would recommend abolition of the park.[50] National Parks constitute "¼ of one percent of Canada" and should remain absolutely immune to exploitation. "The creation of a precedent in the commercialization of our parks seems to me to be a most serious matter. If the Waterton Irrigation Scheme goes through, how can the power interests be turned down; if the power interests are recognized, how can the lumbermen be refused permission to destroy the forest which is such an essential part of the beauty of the parks.....

the next step would be a demand on the part of sportsmen for an open season with respect to wildlife".[51]

The Parks Branch was determined to combat any plans for commercial utilization of a park. If successful, the Waterton Lakes dam would be a dangerous precedent. The only power development producing electricity for consumption outside of a park was at Lake Minnewanka, Banff. Such developments in a national park could only be authorized by an Act of Parliament. The question of setting a precedent was a vital issue because, at this same time, there was a similar controversy concerning the development of Spray Lakes in Banff National Park as a hydroelectric dam.

Commissioner Harkin's strongest allies during the entire controversy proved to be the American Park Service. The United States National Parks Association was on record as decrying the detrimental effects that flooding the main Waterton Lakes would have upon Glacier.[52] George Bird Grinnell said "the project is to the last degree short-sighted;"[53] and the Ecological Society of America offered moral support in the fight.[54] The United States government expressed its opposition to any action which might affect Glacier Park. Until now, the arguments had centred on whether the irrigation project or the park offered the greater

value to the public, but any move towards implementation required the approval of the United States government. If the Americans opposed the scheme all other arguments were purely academic. The return of the wet years in nineteen twenty-three quelled the farmers' immediate anxieties and this quieted their demands for large, expensive irrigation projects. But most important, the expressed hostility of the Americans towards raising the water level of the lake finished the project. Waterton Lakes National Park had challenged successfully the most serious threat to its existence as a national park, and the attitude of the United States Park Service firmly reinforced their position. Various irrigation surveys were conducted thoughout Southern Alberta during the nineteen twenties and the nineteen thirties, but it was not until nineteen thirty-nine that construction was started on a comprehensive irrigation scheme encompassing all the prairies. In nineteen fifty-one, the large St. Mary's Dam was built and later the Waterton River Dam was constructed a few miles east of the park's boundary.

*3). The Blood Indian Timber Limit "A"*

Another controversial issue which embroiled Waterton Lakes Park was the presence of Blook Indian Timber Limit "A" in the southeast sector of the park.[55] The question did not become a public issue but the relationship between Park's officials and the native people was very strained. The Blood

Indians claimed that the terms of Treaty Number Seven gave them the right to dispose of timber and mineral rights in any manner they saw fit. The park maintained that, because the timber limit was situated within its boundaries, the ceded area was subject to park regulations. The Parks Branch was determined to oppose all utilization of natural resources in the parks. The department was afraid that if a precedent was set, it might lead to similar demands concerning mineral rights, water for irrigation purposes, and so on. The case was presented to the Justice Department, but in this particular instance the Parks Branch lost its case.

The area involved was a six and one half square mile timber limit set aside for the use of the Blood Indian tribe by order in council dated May 17, eighteen eighty-nine. The Indian people had applied for a tract of hay land in eighteen eighty-two on the south side of Kootenay Lake, but the area was already leased to the Cochrane Ranch Company.[56] Timber Limit "A" was located on the west bank of the Belly River, one and a half miles north of the International border. It was confirmed by order in council dated June 12, eighteen ninety-three (P.C. 1694) as being part of the Indian Reserves withdrawn from the Dominion Lands Act. The greater portion of the trees had been swept by fire and for several years the tribe cut timber in adjacent areas for their sawmill, designated

Timber Limit No. 776 in eighteen ninety-seven.[57] Each year the Indian Agent submitted a statement listing the quantity of timber cut, its disposal, and the payment due for timber sold. At this time the Indian Department treated the timber limit as part of the Indian Reserve.[58]

The status of Indian timber berths was reviewed in nineteen four. The law clerk for the Department of the Interior expressed the opinion that the area should be viewed as a timber limit, with the Department of the Interior receiving all dues arising from cut timber.[59] This decision was nullified when it was discovered that the law clerk had not known about P.C. 1694 of June 12, eighteen ninety-three which had withdrawn the timber belt from the Dominion Lands Act. The area was in fact outside the jurisdiction of the Department of the Interior. The significance of this discovery was not immediately apparant because the Indian people did not use the berth and later their sawmill was closed in nineteen ten. Only a few trees were cut by band members to be employed as teepee poles and fence posts.[60]

When Waterton Lakes Park was enlarged in nineteen fourteen to four hundred and twenty-three square miles, its boundaries encompassed the Blood Timber Limit "A" and the adjacent Berth No. 776. In nineteen fifteen lumber for

constructing Waterton River bridge was obtained from the timber berth on orders from the Superintendent of the park.[61] The area was now heavily wooded with spruce and pine and, although the park officials acknowledged the Band's right to the timber, they believed the area was subject to park regulations. For future reference, J.B. Harkin asked the Lands Branch to outline the procedure for cancelling the berth if the Parks Branch so decided. The Commissioner pointed out that it was not economical to haul green timber from the area. The department was afraid that "the fact of the Indians holding this berth might be construed to mean that they are given permission to hunt thereon". The Superintendent had recently charged one band member with trespassing department wanted to clarify its jurisdictional right.[62]

The reply from the Indian Department toally ignored the tribe's right to the berth:

> "... in view of the fact that the local Indian Agent has reported that the Indians do not make any use of this limit, either by occupation or getting timber therefrom, and that there would be no ojbection to its being given up by them, the Department hereby relinquishes any claim that it may have had for the Indians to limit known as No. 776".[63]

Two years later the Indian Department asked that the timber berth be returned to the Blood Indians because they required lumber for fence posts and construction work.[64] The Parks Branch opposed re-opening the berth for fear that the Indians

would hunt there, but it would agree to grant yearly permits to cut dry timber.[65] The Indian Department replied that relinquishment of the Indians' rights had been an unfortunate error, the action having been taken by the Indian Agent without consulting the native people.[66] Superintendent Bevan was concerned that his staff could not check on the timber removed, nor make the Indians conform to park regulations, especially as regards hunting. Random cutting would disfigure the forest, and the Bloods had plenty of dead timber suitable for fencing and building.[67] Nevertheless, the Band's claim was indisputable, and it was given permission to cut dry wood at one dollar per twenty-five cords, but no green timber was to be taken. In several instances, however, the Wardens confiscated rifles found in an Indians' possession because technically they were still within the park.

In nineteen twenty-five the Blood Indian Agent asked the Superintendent to clarify the Band's right to cut green timber.[68] Over the years some green timber had been taken by the natives, but now Ottawa directed the Superintendent to enforce strictly the terms of the permit which according to their interpretation, authorized only the use of dry or dead timber. The matter was raised again by the Indian Affairs Department in nineteen twenty-eight, but this time the Superintendent was advised by Ottawa that he could not justifiably refuse to let the Indians cut either dry or green timber.[69] Local farm organizations were also

permitted to cut green timber east of the Belly River as a temporary relief measure.[70]

There were no further developments until nineteen thirty-two, when the Indian Agent informed the park Superintendent that the tribe proposed building a sawmill on their timber limit.[71] The Parks Branch responded that, since the timber berth was within the park, the Indians could remove only dead or dry timber. Commissioner Harkin called the nineteen twenty-eight agreement sanctioning the use of green timber, "a special concession" and the department would not consent to the erection of a sawmill.[72] To open the area to commercial business would mean building new roads; a fire hazard would result from bush pile burning; the scenery would be spoiled by unsightly stumps; and the watershed would be irreparably damaged. The presence of one group cutting green timber would draw similar requests and when denied, lead to criticism from those parties. The Indians countered that the terms of their treaty gave them the right to dispose of both green and dead timber.

The issue came to a head in January, nineteen thirty-four when a Blood Indian was arrested for having an unsealed firearm in a national park. The question arose whether the timber limit was merely a special berth or whether it was legally an extension of the Reserve. The Parks Branch claimed

that legislation establishing the parks superseded all other legislation protecting Indian rights.[73] The Secretary Branch so advised Agent J.E. Pugh, and it suggested that he drop the charges against the band member since "he was apparently acting under a misapprehension as to his rights".[74]

The Band reiterated that the terms of treaty intended the timber limit be a part of their reserve with the same rights and privileges. The Parks Department then approached the tribe with a plan to exchange the timber berth for land located east of the Belly River. The discussions were delayed because any exchange would require the formal approval of the province, which had just claim to lands withdrawn from a national park. Ottawa instructed Superintendent Knight to continue discussions with the view of confining the mill operations to dead timber, but if the Indians persisted, arrangements could be made to allow the use of green timber to meet their personal needs only.[75] The Parks Branch went even further and expressed a willingness to exchange land that would include full reserve rights. It was then discovered that the proposed land was of poor quality and practically devoid of trees. The Band Council decided to retain their existing limit.[76] The Parks Branch reluctantly allowed band members to cut green timber for their own use, providing they notify the district Warden upon entering the park and obeyed park regulations.[77]

The matter came to a conclusion on February 25, nineteen thirty-six when the Justice Department rules that "the tracts of land described in the attachments to the Order in Council of the 17th May, eighteen eighty-nine, including the so-called Timber Limits "A" and "B", should be held to be Indian Reserves within the meaning of the Indian Act".[78] The Parks Branch was obligated to compensate the Band for land requisitioned for the newly constructed Belly River highway. Commissioner Harkin immediately directed the Superintendent to make no further improvements, such as camp grounds, within the disputed ground.[79] The Parks Branch renewed its previous proposal of a land exchange since "all advantages of the National Park" in the Belly River district had been "wiped out" by the decision. The highway was the most vital link with the United States and the park wanted complete control over the land.[80] The National Parks Bureau eventually did obtain jurisdiction over the highway corridor in exchange for a compensatory parcel of land.

*4) Wildlife Management*

By the nineteen twenties the wildlife population in Waterton Lakes Park (notably deer and elk) was making appreciable gains. The Wardens conducted an annual game census and all game sightings were recorded in their diaries. There were few poachers and a close watch was maintained for signs of overgrazing. Wardens were, however, under standing orders to kill any birds or animals designated as predators,

especially if they were damaging the park. This included the wolf, coyote, mountain lion (puma), lynx, bear, gopher, porcupine, eagle, hawk, wood-pecker, and blue heron (for eating geese eggs). The decision to eliminate a species was left to the Superintendent's discretion, but subject to approval by Ottawa. This lax and indiscriminate policy was revised in nineteen twenty-four, marking the start of modern day policy of preserving the national parks in their "natural state".

Around nineteen nineteen to nineteen twenty, two packs of wolves were observed entering Waterton Lakes Park from Glacier. In hopes of eradicating them once and for all, the Superintendent granted special permission to two Stoney Indians to track the animals. Their attempts were unsuccessful, and subsequently two other bounty hunters were appointed temporary game officers with authorization to hunt predators from February to April, nineteen twenty-one.[81] They received no wages but were entitled to collect the provincial bounty of twenty-five dollars. Henry Riviere was also named an Honorary Warden and given permission to kill five male deer and sheep to use as poison bait; all the other hunters could only trap or shoot predators.[81] Orders were issued to kill pumas "at any time of the year".[82] Despite persistent effort, none of the hunters experienced much success. This was mainly due to the cold weather which froze the traps

and the poisoned bait.[83] During the nineteen twenty-one to nineteen twenty-two season, nine ranchers and one wolf hunter were appointed Honorary Wardens, but they met with little success since action was taken only when predators came near cattle.[84] The program was repeated the following year and this time a total of one hundred and eighteen coyotes were killed by the ranchers and twenty-two animals by the Wardens.[85]

In the summer of nineteen twenty-four the Parks Branch issued a directive to all parks respecting game management and conservation. There was no change in their basic policy of "controlling" predators, but there was a re-assessment of what birds and animals were detrimental to the park. Special care was to be taken in protecting "beneficial" species of hawks and owls, and only Wardens competent in distinguishing species would be allowed to hunt them. The reason for the change in emphasis was clear: "It is felt that so many people are interested in seeing various forms of wild bird and mammal life, even though these be partially injurious, that only the kinds of mammals and birds, against which there is the strongest possible case, should be killed".[86]

Following discussions with the Wildlife Division, that fall a memorandum was issued by the Parks Branch calling

for "a strict tightening up" in exterminating predators. No fur bearing animals except wolves, wolverines and coyotes were to be trapped, but Wardens would still receive credit for any skins turned in to the Superintendent. The only unprotected birds were the Goshawk, Cooper's Hawk, Great Horned Owl, Crow and Magpie. With respect to magpies, "a limited number should be spared because of the interest to tourists" due to their attractive appearance. Great care was to be taken in distinguishing between "beneficial" and "injurious" species of hawks. Any wildlife shot, or found dead, was to be preserved for scientific purposes.[87] Some problems were encountered with bears and beavers but the standard procedure was to trap the animals alive or scare them into a different locality. If more drastic action was required, the Superintendent would file a report describing the circumstances of the case.

The Parks Branch defended its new policy with the explanation that the "attractiveness [of predators] to tourists more than compensates for the small amount of damage they do". The goal was to preserve large park areas in their "original state" as showcases. This gave the parks "their chief charm and attraction, that differentiates them from parks of the formal urban type... What is most universally desired is the good and beautiful mingling of indigenous species which nature itself provides".[88]

One critic of the government's policy was the well known Alberta rancher, A.E. Cross. Cattlemen along the foothills were worried that the mountain lion and wolf populations would increase disproportionately if not hunted by Wardens.[89] The department agreed to take action immediately if predators were proven to be a serious menace to cattle.[90] A.E. Cross countered that their "theory" sounded plausible but it did not work in actual experience because the advent of man had upset the natural balance. Predators needed to be controlled to safeguard "useful animals" such as beef cattle.[91] W.W. Cory, Deputy Minister of the Department of the Interior, succinctly expressed the government's policy when he responded:

> "Predatory animals are of great scientific, educational, recreational and economic value to society. It is now generally recognized that they should be preserved. The practical problem is where and how to do so. In consequence, it is considered most desirable to maintain public sanctuaries or parks for their preservation in favourable isolated areas".[92]

Henceforth, predators would be killed only when they attacked the cattlemens' stock.

Even after the inauguration of the new predatory policy there was a concerted effort to reduce the coyote population (See Table II) and a controversy arose when the department banned the use of traps in nineteen twenty-eight.[93] After October 15, no Warden was permitted to keep the furs of

TABLE II

Number of Coyotes Killed in Waterton Park 1923 - 1936*

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| 1923 - 19 coyotes | 1924 - 23 coyotes | 1925 - 6 coyotes |
| 1926 - 37 coyotes | 1927 - 9 coyotes | 1928 - 18 coyotes |
| 1929 - 0 coyotes | 1930 - 1 coyote | |
| 1934 - 12 coyotes | 1935 - 24 coyotes | 1936 - 29 coyotes |

*Owing to departmental concern with the presence of predators in the National parks, there is a fairly complete record of the number of coyotes killed by the park staff.

captured animals; instead, the money from the pelts was credited to the department. Several Wardens had spent an inordinate amount of time catching coyotes for the bounty, while others were trapping non-predatory fur animals. Commissioner Harkin angrily exclaimed, "We were in the winter time virtually paying them a salary to carry on a general trapping business".[94] Almost all the predators had been trapped, and inevitably, other fur-bearers were accidently caught. The Wardens were still under orders to shoot coyotes on sight, but the winds affected their accuracy and tracking was impossible in deep snow; trapping was easier and more

reliable. In nineteen twenty-nine no coyotes were killed, and the local residents[95] and newspapers[96] vociferously protested the new rule. Senator W.A. Buchanan criticised the ban,[97] and Acting Superintendent Knight repeatedly asked the department to supply Wardens with traps.[98]

Despite the mounting criticism, Commissioner Harkin was adament in retaining the ban on traps. He eloquently outlined the department's new policy towards killing predators.

> "It is the desire to make the parks true preserves for all wild things, not only for a few selected species. It is thought that if the Parks are to be made true preserves for all wild life as is the present effort, they will become far more interesting than if they were used to protect a few species such as deer, etc. There is also the question to keep in mind that if the predators that are natural enemies, let us say, of deer, are killed, something must be done with the increasing deer population".[99]

Nevertheless Wardens were to make every effort to reduce the predator population by means other than trapping. After nineteen thirty-two, the Superintendent no longer pressed for the use of traps, and his reports supported departmental policy that a fair balance between predators and big game must be maintained.

A new directive was issued in nineteen thirty-three reiterating those birds and animals to be shot and reinforcing the ban on traps. Wardens no longer received revenue for

hides turned in, and each man was to keep a careful record of animals observed in his district.[100] A large number of complaints had been received from local residents the previous winter (1932-33). During his visit to Waterton that fall, Commissioner Harkin warned Superintendent Knight that he wanted "no legitimate grounds for complaint" the coming year. Every Warden was informed that "His efficiency in the Service will be judged by what he accomplishes this winter".[101] Superintendent Knight set down a monthly quota of two coyotes per officer, and target practice sessions were instituted. When only one coyote was shot in November and two the next month, the rifles were checked and found inaccurate. Superintendent Knight requisitioned two sporting rifles with scopes, but still there were no appreciable results.[102] In nineteen thirty-four, Waterton Lakes reported twelve coyotes killed. Ottawa was disappointed with the results in all the mountain parks and the department commissioned a review of its predatory policy.[103] Some complaints were received occasionally regarding the presence of coyotes in the park but Superintendent Knight countered that the Wardens were doing their best. Indeed, there was no intention to kill all coyotes.

> "The coyote has his place and serves his purpose in maintaining a reasonable balance in wildlife, in that he takes the undernourished, aged and weak deer and leaves a virile and hardy stock to propagate, thus so long as his numbers are not allowed to become too great, the coyote is an asset to the wildlife of the Park".[104]

Superintendent Knight was now a confirmed conservationist and he received firm backing in his stance from Ottawa. The situation in Waterton Lakes was "well in hand" and a "reasonable" number[105] of predators were retained since an over-abundance of deer would result in "disease or epidemic".[106] The Parks Branch was no longer prepared to react unquestioningly every time someone cried "wolf".

The philosophy of game management was slow to evolve.[107] Before nineteen twenty-eight the parks department conducted a vigorous eradication program to placate the ranching community. Officials pointed out that a substantial increase in big game would benefit sportsmen in areas open to hunting adjacent to the parks. The Parks Branch was slow to accept the theory of "the natural balance in nature", but once it had, it stood its ground against all criticism. Departmental files abound with petitions from ranchers, and fish and game associations protesting their predatory policy. Because of the governments sensitivity to public criticism, every letter received a reply carefully outlining the government's stance - that is, in accordance with sound scientific principles a certain quota of predators were needed in national parks. In consequence of mounting cries by game associations and provincial authorities, the federal government commissioned a study by a noted biologist to report on game conditions in

the national parks. Following a tour of the mountain parks in nineteen thirty-eight, Dr. R.M. Anderson concluded that there was no predatory problem. In fact, there was an over-abundance of game both inside and outside the parks.[108] The Parks Branch welcomed the report as a vindication of its game management program because wildlife populations were on the increase and the overflow benefited sportsman. All birds and animals were treated on an equal basis, and any species found doing damage would be controlled to meet that particular situation. The government's wildlife policy was a flexible one which applied the new "scientific approach" to game management.[109]

*5) Fish Management*

Waterton Lakes National Park traditionally was reputed to be the most popular fishing spot in Southern Alberta. One of the most important reasons for setting the lakes aside as a national park was to safeguard the excellent angling waters. During the period when the area was incorporated as the Kootenay Lakes Forestry Reserve, the fish population was dangerously reduced by indiscriminate fishing practices. It was not uncommon for campers to catch five hundred trout in one day. To replenish the depleted waters, the park service started stocking the lakes and streams in nineteen twenty,[110] and seven years later the park constructed its own hatchery. In consequence of an extensive fish management program, the

park regained its reputation as the foremost fishing ground with its many scenic mountain lakes, numerous streams and beaver ponds. Commissioner Harkin boasted "Waterton Lakes Park probably ranks first as a fishing resort",[111] and the park was determined to maintain its popular image.

The angling season in the park was shortened as much as possible to conserve the fish population for the summer tourist season.[112] If local residents were allowed to deplete the waters early in the year, it was feared that the resort would attract fewer fishermen-tourists. Thus tourism guided policy - to conserve the fish for the benefit of visitors and to prevent local residents from dominating the early spring season. It was no surprise that the Dolly Varden trout was chosen as the emblem for transient automobile stickers first issued in nineteen twenty.

The national parks were mainly concerned with protecting "sporting fish". In nineteen nineteen the department permitted white fish netting in the upper and lower lakes because of their "excessive" numbers, and in response to a petition by local ranchers for a cheap food supplement.[113] The government enacted legislation (P.C. 498, March 7, 1919) allowing the use of nets and the sale of non-game fish. White fish were unprotected because they were believed to be "an actual detriment to the continued propagation of game fish

through their habit of devouring the spawn of these latter [game fish]". The Superintendent was authorized to act on the behalf of the Fishery Department and it was his responsibility to supervise the netting operations. The Superintendent designated what waters were open to commercial fishers and he recorded the quantity and species of game fish captured. Any game fish inadvertantly caught in the nets were sent to the Returned Soldiers Home at Blairmore.[114]

Permission to conduct commercial operations was granted to only one company, the Park View Cattle and Horse Association based in Twin Butte. There were outcries against this "monopoly" and, subsequently, two more permits were issued - one to the Pincher Creek Council and the other to a representative body from the area east of the park. The authority was received too late for the latter two groups to organize their equipment, and only the Park View Association was operational in February and March, nineteen twenty. However, the experiment was a financial failure and only two hundred and seventy-five pounds were netted.[115]

None of the three permits were renewed the following season. The department received an application to net whitefish during the winter of nineteen twenty-nine, but it was turned down because game fish would also be affected.[116]

In nineteen thirty-two pike and whitefish were netted by the department to supplement food supplied to relief camps operating in the park during the depression years. This was the final recorded attempt to net whitefish. Apparently the cost was prohibitive feeding relief workers in this manner. It is also likely that too many "game fish" were being accidently caught which would have conflicted with the park's policy of conserving the fish population to attract sportsmen.

The first attempt to stock fish in Waterton Lakes Park was recorded in nineteen twenty. The United States Park Service shipped fifty thousand cutthroat trout to Waterton to plant in Cameron Lake. When the fry arrived, they were so lifeless that the young fish were simply deposited in the main lake for fear that they would not survive the difficult trip to Cameron Lake.[117] The United States Park Service again slatted ninety thousand fish for Waterton in the nineteen twenty-one season. Twenty thousand fry were stocked in Crandell Lake because the road to Cameron Lake was impassable, and ten thousand fry were released in Cameron Creek. The remainder were released in the headwaters of the Upper Waterton Lake. The program proved highly successful; only twenty-five percent of the fish died in transit as

compared to the anticipated loss of forty percent.[118] The following year the United States government adopted an experimental program of planting trays of fish eggs in the streams. It was hoped that the mortality rate would not be excessive, enabling more fish to be transported at less cost. In July nineteen twenty-three, the Glacier Park Service planted sixty thousand Mackinaw trout fry in Waterton and for the first time, the fish culture branch at Banff scheduled ten cans of salmon fry for distribution in Waterton Lakes.[119] The United States government had proven the success of fish plantings and the Canadian parks were quick to follow their example.

In nineteen twenty-four, the park staff erected nets at the mouth of Maskinonge Lake and across the Dardanelles to catch pike and suckers. Fishery officials believed that the two species were proliferating too rapidly and endangering their efforts to re-stock the lakes and streams with game fish.[120] For the first time, in nineteen twenty-five, fishing was opened in Cameron and Bertha Lakes. The results were better than anticipated because the trout had matured extraordinarily fast. When the road to Cameron Lake was opened to motor traffic in nineteen twenty-six, the number of fishermen increase considerably, making it necessary to reduce the limit from ten to seven trout per day.[121] Superintendent Knight suggested that live minnows be prohibited to keep suckers out

of the isolated mountain lakes. Commissioner Harkin did not agree: "I know of no reason why an exception should be made for Cameron Lake".[122] It was not until the nineteen fifties that fishing with live bait was prohibited when it was found necessary to poison several mountain lakes to eradicate the large sucker population.

In nineteen twenty-four the residents of Waterton Lakes petitioned the Parks Branch to build a hatchery in the park because fishing was "the chief attraction and greatest lure to the Park for the angler, camper and tourist". The petitioners complained that the park was being "gradually depleted of fish", and a hatchery was required to "systematically commence restocking these streams with trout and other spawn".[123] A similar resolution was drafted by the Pincher Creek Board of Trade in nineteen twenty-five. Acting Superintendent Knight endorsed their request for a hatchery, commenting that he would like to see native fish raised in the park rather than importing different species from outside the park.[124] Commissioner Harkin forwarded the petition and Superintendent Knight's letter to the Fisheries Service to have his department on record in support of a fishery at Waterton.[125] W.A. Found replied that "numerous Boards of Trade and Angling Associations in Southwestern Alberta" had

called for establishment of a hatchery and his department was awaiting a report from the Biological Board of Canada evaluating "the relative value and importance of artifical propagation as compared with natural reproduction". He promised to inform the Parks Branch if his department decided to construct additional hatcheries.[126] Meanwhile, Commissioner Harkin instructed his staff to prepare a memorandum listing all the pertinent arguments in support of a hatchery at Waterton. The memo was forwarded to Senator W.A. Buchanan, who was also lobbying for a hatchery in Waterton. Fishing was the park's main attraction and a local hatchery was needed to meet the demands of the growing number of tourists. The fry brought in from Banff suffered a high mortality rate and it was an expensive procedure.[127]

In nineteen twenty-six the Department of Marine and Fisheries commissioned a study on those streams in Waterton Lakes Park suitable for a hatchery. The main difficulty was locating a stream with an adequate water supply. The fisheries department needed data on the rate of flow and quality of the water at various seasons before deciding upon a suitable location. Cameron Creek was seriously considered, but the site finally chosen was Spring Creek, located north of the Waterton River Bridge. It

contained suitable space for rearing and brood ponds, and even though the volume of water was lower than Cameron Creek the temperature and flow rates were adequate.[128] A contract to build a two storey fish hatchery and a five room residence was given to Oland and Scott, a local construction firm. (See Figure 41). The structure was operational by June nineteen twenty-eight, and in the spring of nineteen twenty-nine tenders were let for a water storage dam, six hatching troughs, and a combination icehouse-garage. G.E. Bailey was appointed Superintendent of the Hatchery and W.C. Cable was assigned as his assistant.

The hatchery was no sooner opened when it ran into difficulties; a family of beavers built their own dams across the spring which fed the rearing ponds. The animals had been below the hatchery, but when the flow of water had decreased, they migrated above the hatchery. The destruction of trees shading the stream interfered with the normal water temperature, which could affect the hatching of the fish eggs. J.A. Rodd regretted that it was "a situation that was entirely unforeseen", but the beavers had to be removed before the entire project was jeopardized.[129] Their activities not only reduced the water flow but they also stirred up sediment which was fatal to young fry.[130]

It was first suggested that a wire mesh fence be erected around the hatchery, but the plan was not implemented because Ottawa was awaiting an official report from the Superintendent. The hatchery was operated and managed by the Department of Fisheries and any request for renovations required the approval of the Parks Branch.[131] It was finally decided to trap the beavers alive. This proved impractical because trapping was "an expensive and long drawn-out" procedure, and if transplanted, the animals might not be able to build new homes before freeze-up.[132] Instead, the department decided to ship the animals to a fur farm near Edmonton.[133]

In the spring of nineteen twenty-nine the beaver moved back in above the hatchery even though their dams and houses had been destroyed by Wardens. Acting Superintendent Knight postponed action until the fall because, if silt entered the troughs, it would kill the fry. He added pessimistically: "Even if the beaver are all taken others will undoubtedly come in". The area either had to be fenced in or all the animals killed and their dams destroyed early in the spring before the fish eggs arrived.[134] Despite the park's efforts, the hatchery operations were continually hampered by beavers and sediment from the stream constantly blocked the intake screens. Cattle occasionally strayed across the stream and stirred up silt, and oftentimes birds

of prey would feed on the young fry, but both of these problems were easily managed. The presence of the beaver continued to plague the hatchery until it was closed down permanently.

When the natural resources were transferred to the province of Alberta in nineteen thirty, the original intention was to include all the fisheries in the transaction. However, the Parks Branch strongly fought for their retention because: 1. The Banff and Waterton hatcheries (the one at Lac La Biche was transferred to the province) were situated in national parks where the federal government retained exclusive legislative authority under the terms of the Natural Resources Agreement; 2. Hatcheries were a major tourist attraction; and 3. Provincial waters would receive preferencial treatment.[135] During the nineteen twenty-seven through nineteen twenty-nine seasons, the fish plantings had been split sixty-four percent in provincial waters and thirty-six percent in the parks. The Parks Branch therefore suggested that the province pay sixty percent of the operating cost in return for the same percentage of fry.[136] In the ninety-thirty season, the province received three-quarters of the hatchery output and its share of the operating costs amounted to fifteen thousand dollars.[137] Alberta benefited the most because it had not been required to contribute to the original expenditure, nor

the improvement costs to the hatcheries. The Fisheries Branch administered the entire operation until nineteen-thirty-one, at which time they were turned over to the Parks Branch. The funds came from the park's department estimates but fisheries personnel were retained since there were no qualified men in the parks service.[138] The capacity of the Waterton hatchery was increased, and in nineteen thirty it distributed over one million cutthroat and rainbow trout.[139] A new program was started whereby only one species of fish was released into a particular lake or stream system. This depended on the available egg supply and the species best adapted to local conditions. The cutthroat trout had been the predominate native fish in the park, but they were uneconomical to raise in the hatcheries and the species planted in most waters were rainbow and eastern brook trout.

Thus, from its early beginnings when Waterton Lakes was entirely dependent upon the United States Park Service for young fry, the fish planting program evolved into one of the park's major operations. After nineteen thirty-one, the hatcheries were administered by the Parks Branch and, henceforth, "their output was distributed primarily to meet the requirements of the waters within the parks. They would be operated at their full capacity, and the parks would distribute the surplus fry not required for the parks in

provincial waters. In recompense, the province would repay a certain percentage of the annual operating costs, depending on the number of fry it was alloted".[140] During the nineteen thirties all high altitude lakes were stocked with trout and fishing continued to be the Park's major attraction. Appropriately, in nineteen fifty-six Waterton Lakes National Park was rated as one of the top twelve fishing locations in Canada by True Magazine.[141]

### 6) *The Roads System 1920 - 1937**

The advent of the automobile age had many ramifications for Canada's National Parks. It was necessary to upgrade park roads and construct new scenic highways if the tourist industry was to expand. The older parks situated on the transmountain routes were given primary attention whereas the more isolated parks lagged in road construction. Waterton Lakes Park suffered, not only because the railroad by-passed the resort, but also because of the inadequate roads system. There was no direct north-south connection between the mountain parks, and as J.B. Harkin explained: "At present ... our hands are so full trying to get our east and west roads put into first-class condition that I fear it will be some years

---

*It is not the intention of this section to discuss the yearly improvements to bridges and roads. This is covered adequately in the Superintendents' annual reports published in the Sessional Papers. Rather, this section will discuss the overall implications of road development upon the parks general progress, and discuss two of the most important highways sytems - the Akamina highway and the Belly River highway.

before the north and south work can be given serious consideration".[142] The situation did not change appreciably until nineteen twenty-seven when the Great Northern Railway Company agreed to finance road improvements in the Waterton Lakes vicinity. The company's initiative finally prompted the provincial government to upgrade access roads leading to the park.

There were a few improvements in Waterton Lakes during its earliest years, such as gravelling the old wagon roads and erecting the Waterton River, Cameron Creek and Pass Creek bridges. Owing to stringent fiscal policies necessitated by the Great War, most of these wooden structures needed major repairs by nineteen twenty. During the nineteen twenties, the park concentrated on straightening and gravelling the Pincher Creek and Cardston roads and the trail leading to the townsite. The most scenic route within the park was the Akamina Highway, but the most important road link from the economic standpoint was the Belly River Highway leading to Glacier Park.

Construction started on the Akamina highway in the winter of nineteen twenty-one, following a survey conducted in nineteen nineteen by staff engineers from Banff. The federal government wanted the road to Cameron Lake to

join with Glacier Park where Kishenena Creek traversed the United States - British Columbia border. Approximately ten miles of the proposed inter-park route would include the Cameron Lake road, and then the right-of-way would branch into the south-east interior of British Columbia. The success of the transmountain route depended upon the willingness of the British Columbia government to relinquish the necessary territory. This would give Waterton Park a second major highway outlet when joined with the Flathead highway in Glacier. The round trip would draw American tourists to Canada, new lakes would be opened to fishermen, the glacier overlooking Kintla Lakes would be readily accessible, and the road would aid fire fighters. The Parks Branch was in favour of the circular route because it would direct American tourists across the border who ordinarily might not enter Canada. Commissioner Harkin explained: "I believe that tourist traffic (foreign) is the only real sheet anchor we have under conditions as they exist today; for saving and justifying the good roads movement... We must think of our good roads as something we have to sell and having got to that point to then go out and sell them".[143]

According to Henry Riviere, the Akamina route was first suggested by a man named Grouin. Apparently Grouin held coal, oil and timber claims in southeast British Columbia and used his influence in government circles to

get the highway approved. His holdings were worthless without accessible road allowances and the tourist traffic would be of inestimatable value.[144] Superintendent Bevan enthusiastically endorsed the road scheme because the park needed a roadway in the mountain interior, and the cost of constructing the relatively short portion in Waterton Lakes would be "trifling" compared to the anticipated benefits.[145] The Parks Branch pressed both the United States government and the British Columbia Department of Public Works to construct their respective sections. Both refused to commit themselves but expressed their earnest hopes to start work shortly.[146] The Akamina highway was built to Cameron Lake in the nineteen twenties with the expectation that it would eventually link with Glacier Park via southeast British Columbia.

The question of access routes to Glacier Park was also a matter of concern to other public offices and to commercial corporations. The Mayor of Calgary enquired if the highway from Glacier might not be improved because United States hotel officials were advising motorists not to travel the dusty, bumpy route into Canada. The mayor complained, "there is not much use of spending so much money for advertising propaganda purposes if it is largely to be rendered futile" by inadequate roads.[147] Commissioner Harkin replied that his department frequently communicated

with the United States Park Service, but it was useless to improve Canadian roads without a firm commitment from the Americans to upgrade the highway on their side.[148] The United States Park Service had full authority to maintain park roads through the Blackfoot Indian Reserve but it lacked funds for constructing new routes. The line to Canada was located below irrigation ditches, and seepages constantly undermined sections of the road. The United Stages government was negotiating with the Blackfoot tribe to secure an alternate right-of-way, but they were unsuccessful.[149] Another barrier was the overlapping jurisdiction of three competing agencies - the Montana State Highway Commission, the Federal Department for Irrigation matters, and the Indian Bureau. It was difficult to get a consensus among the three rivals, but finally, in nineteen twenth-three, a three year program was drafted. The plan was to relocate the road on higher ground if the necessary land could be obtained through the Blackfoot Reserve.[150] The scheme was delayed until nineteen twenty-four owing to budgetary restrictions.

The roads situation was discussed in August nineteen twenty-four when Stephen Mather and a delegation from the American Park Service visited Waterton Lakes Park. The American party concluded that the best alternative would be to build a road in Canada to join with the Babb-Boundary

road, with a second route down the Akamina and Kishinena Creeks to the Blackfeet National Forest near the Flathead River. The two roadways would connect with the Banff-Windermere highway at Fernie, and the inclusion of southeast British Columbia would provide a game refuge for wildlife crossing the International border.[151]

The commonly discussed Akamina Highway circular route received the enthusiastic support of local newspapers, roads associations, Boards of Trade, and local politicians. The Parks Branch raised no objections and it commissioned the necessary surveys and preliminary work in the park. The major obstacle was the reticence of the British Columbia government which would lose all land, forest and mineral rights to an area of vast potential. American approval to build their connecting roads was contingent upon the establishment of a game preserve in southeast British Columbia. The United States took no further action and instead, concentrated upon finishing other road projects and upgrading existing routes.[152]

The possibility of a roadway between Waterton Lakes and Glacier via the Kishanena Creek was raised periodically over the years. In nineteen twenty-five the Canadian government sent a representative to Glacier to attend a roads

conference. The Kalispell Chamber of Commerce from Montana renewed its interest in an inter-park highway system, and the organization claimed credit for "a great many big road undertakings".[153] One suggestion was to pave the road from Glacier to Cardston and then to Banff but, since this would have by-passed Waterton, the Parks Branch ignored the plan. In nineteen twenty-six American engineers reconnoitered the mountain valleys extending from Many Glaciers Hotel to the south end of Upper Waterton Lake; but aside from the prohibitive cost, this would have left Cardston and Lethbridge outside the tourist mainstream.[154] Following a tour of the British Columbia and Alberta parks in nineteen twenty-seven, the Minister of the Interior, Charles Stewart, hinted that a highway might be constructed from Waterton to Fernie, British Columbia. It would be a popular scenic tour from Banff passing entirely through mountain country.[155] The opening of the Great Northern Railway Hotel (Prince of Wales Hotel) in nineteen twenty-seven added new impetus to the movement for a circular mountain route between the national parks. The federal government reopened negotiations with the British Columbia government to incorporate the southeastern part of the province with Waterton Lakes Park.[156] Again no agreement was reached.

Although all hope for the circular route was temporarily quashed, the Akamina road to Cameron Lake was upgraded as part of the federal government's relief program during the depression years. The Lethbridge Herald carried a report (January 29, 1932) that "Appropriations have been made by the American government to build a highway up the west side of Glacier National Park to connect with the Akamina highway in Waterton Lakes National Park and this work on the American side will be undertaken immediately [if] satisfactory arrangement can be made with our federal government and the British Columbia government for the completion of their work". Superintendent Knight added his earnest wish that "the South East portion of B.C. will be taken into this Park at any early date".[157] Still the province refused to relinquish any territory. The pleas even reached the upper echelons of government:

> "The completion of the Akamina Road...is most necessary for the benefit of this park. This would be a very scenic highway connecting up with the American Highway system which connection is most desirable from a Parks viewpoint as it would bring in a very large amount of American tourists to the National Parks. Without the completion of the Akamina Road to connect with the U.S. Highway, this park cannot and will not receive the consideration of tourists from the States which it rightly deserves, but if this road is completed this Park will undoubtedly become one of the most important in the continent. We have everything to offer to attract the tourists with the drawback of having no through road.." [158]

The British Columbia government was adamant; the scheme would benefit only the national parks. The province would lose valuable mineral and timber resources without adequate compensation.

In nineteen thirty-seven Ottawa instructed Superintendent Knight and the resident engineer, C.K. Le Capelain, to inspect the Kishinena Creek to the International border. They encountered "no serious obstacle" and the beautiful scenery would be a decided advantage in attracting tourists.[159] The parks department decided, however, to finish the existing roads system and to concentrate on maintaining the large number of roads and trails built by relief workers during the depression.[160] Although justifiable from the anticipated number of tourists, there were not sufficient funds to start another major road project. This, combined with the continued resistance of the British Columbia government, effectively killed the scheme. Today the hope for an inter-mountain highway is raised by various interested groups. Ironically, it is now the National Parks Branch which opposes such a route for fear of the devastating effects it would have upon the natural environment.

A turning point in the development of roads, both leading to and within the park, was the opening of the Great

Northern Hotel in nineteen twenty-seven. The hotel operators warned that, unless the province invested two hundred thousand dollars in building all-weather gravel roads to Waterton Lakes Park, the company would have to reduce its expenditures in the park to invest in road construction.[161] The park roads were in reasonable condition and the Parks Branch promised to build a road to the Belly River-International Boundary once the United Stages government agreed to a connective route. Work started on the hotel in the spring of nineteen twenty-seven, and the Great Northern Company paid out forty dollars per day to keep the highway open in winter. Construction material was stocked at the Hillspring railway station and the company kept the roadway open to transport supplies. When exceptionally heavy snows closed all the roads, the company asked the Park to assist in keeping the route clear to facilitate the transportation of building materials.[162] The Commissioner advised the company that the Parks Branch could provide no assistance, but he wrote Acting Superintendent Knight: "If you are able to undertake a certain amount of this work out of the usual monthly appropriation for road work this will be in order but I feel we should not set a precedent which may in the future involve the expenditure of considerable sums of money for keeping the roads open for motor traffic during the winter".[163] The permanent park population was only two hundred and fifty and it was not practical to expend

large amounts on winter road clearance. The question was resolved when warm weather arrived early that spring and work progressed on the hotel.

The cry for improved provincial roads was taken up by the newspapers. The Lethbridge Herald (March 18, 1927) pointed out the need for gravelled roads in Southern Alberta, especially those leading to Waterton.

> "...there are already hundreds of cars coming into Alberta each year en route to Banff...and this without a gravelled road to Waterton Lakes Park, but why be satisfied with this when we have the opportunity of doubling or even trebling this most profitable traffic by the linking of this park and also with the added advantage of the assurance of such an extensive investment in our locality as the Great Northern Railway Company propose to carry out".

The province had made no provision for improving access roads to Waterton in its annual road budget. In subsequent meetings between the Alberta government and the hotel officials, "the [provincial] government accepted the railways proposition to provide means whereby the [Cardston to Waterton] road could be constructed this year without the province having to assume financial obligation until nineteen twenty-nine..., the year the government had figured provision could only otherwise have been made for construction of this road in accordance with its highway program".[164] The arrival of the Great Northern Company was a boon not only to Waterton Lakes Park, but its presence resulted in better roads for all Southern Alberta.

The construction of the hotel in Waterton also spurred the Parks Branch to improve its roads system. The major highways were graded, widened, and then gravelled or oiled. The pot-holed townsite streets were repaired and muddy sections gravelled. The bridges were reinforced and culverts installed or cleared of debris. Up to nineteen thirty, the Superintendents' annual reports noted substantial improvements to the Pass Creek Road (Red Rock Canyon). In nineteen thirty-one, Superintendent Knight recorded that new bridges were erected across Spring Creek and Waterton River, Cameron Falls bridge was widened, others were painted, all culverts and ditches were cleaned and repaired, and a "considerable amount of regravelling was done". The park acquired a new power grader, caterpillar, and two dump trucks to accommodate the increased motor traffic entering the park.[165] Roads were cleared of winter debris, and the ditches and culverts were cleaned in preparation for spring run-off. Then the Superintendent and resident engineer would tour the park to plan the season's maintenance program. The actual work was under the direction of a road gang foreman who, in turn, was responsible to the resident engineer. The usual procedure was to widen and re-surface the highways, improve grades and curves, install guard rails, oil and gravel the roads, and paint or install road signs and mileage boards. There was no federal highway department and the National Park Branch was in the unique position of having

its own engineering staff to construct and maintain roads on a large scale.

Owing to the tremendous increase of automobile traffic in North America, the highways became the most important link between major tourist areas. It was often suggested that a route be constructed from Pass Creek to the Akamina Road via Crandell Lake. The preliminary survey indicated that it would be too expensive; moreover, the grades were extremely steep and it would not open any particularly spectacular scenery.[166] When the report was studied three years later, Superintendent Knight agreed that only roads "absolutely necessary" should be constructed. If every scenic attraction was accessible by car, it would negate the park's philosophy, recently outlined in the nineteen thirty Act, that park areas should be preserved in their natural state for future generations. "I am aware that many people are of the opinion that motor roads should be built to the scenic attractions in National Parks, but one must take into consideration the enormous expense involved and the danger of over-development".[167] This dilemma faced the Park in all its decisions regarding new roads, and the argument was employed later in opposing the expansion of the Akamina highway into British Columbia.

To fulfill its promise to the Great Northern Hotel Company, the Parks Branch proceeded to construct a road link with Glacier Park. The Akamina route was stalled by the British Columbia government, and the prohibitive cost of a road along the Waterton lakeshore ended that scheme. The only alternative was a route extending from the townsite to Belly River.[168] In nineteen thirty-one a steel bridge was erected across Waterton River at the park entrance gate and road engineers completed their preliminary survey. At the same time, the United States Park Service was formulating an "advance planning program of road construction" for its parks. They enquired if the Canadian government was favourably inclined towards meeting the proposed cut-off route, linking Glacier and Waterton.[169] Commissioner Harkin replied that no development program for Waterton Lakes was contemplated because funds were not available owing to the economic depression and their budget was limited to maintenance jobs only. No work was scheduled for the nineteen thirty-two season but the park would cooperate when economic conditions were more favourable.[170]

The United States started surveying in nineteen thirty-two, partially in response to the naming of Waterton and Glacier as an International Peace Park. That fall the Canadian government set up a winter relief camp to clear a right-of-way for the Belly River highway. The existing

road extended from Waterton Bridge to the North Fork of the Belly River, and that winter, surveys were taken to the border to form a coordinated program with United States engineers. Relief crews comprised of unemployed single men also performed extensive work on the Pincher Creek and Cardston roads. Several miles were resurfaced, a new bridge was erected over Crooked Creek, new culverts were installed, and rock retaining walls were built.[171] Similar work was performed on the Akamina highway; the road was straightened, culverts were installed, the bridge below Oil City was replaced, and rail guards were positioned along precipice banks. By nineteen thirty-four a brush line had been cleared all the way to Cameron Lake.[172]

In the summer of nineteen thirty-three, the United States Park Service officially opened Going-to-the-Sun highway across Logan Pass, connecting east and west Glacier Park. The Montana Highway Commission surveyed the Babb-International Boundary route and construction began in nineteen thirty-four. Canada treated its section of the Belly River project as an unemployment relief measure to employ idle men and the work was not bound by any time table. In July nineteen thirty-six, the Montana and Alberta Rotary Clubs scheduled a memorial celebration to dedicate the Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park. The Committee Chairman, Canon S.H. Middleton,

invited the two parks to participate in the ceremonies renaming the Belly River highway "Chief Mountain International Highway". The American government accepted the invitation but the Canadian National Parks Branch decided not to hold an opening ceremony for its half of the highway. No official explanation was given but the refusal was perhaps symptomatic of the end of the commissionership of J.B. Harkin when tourism and publicity had been a major concern of the Parks Branch. The changing attitude towards the proliferation of new roads in Canada's National Parks was succinctly stated in an editorial by the Christian Science Monitor:

> "There is foresight in the policy of restraint in highway building. Indiscriminate road building would tend to change the character of Canada's national parks from peaceful places of majestic solitude into crowded popular resorts of automobile adventure".

The automobile age had brought many changes to Canada's National Parks, but in reaction, there was a renewed emphasis on preserving the quiet, restful character of the wilderness country.

### 7) *General Developments in Waterton Lakes Park 1925 - 1937*

Over the years the landscape in Waterton Lakes National Park changed dramatically. The Chief Botanist for the National Herbarium, M.O. Malte, compared his impressions

of the park in nineteen eleven to the changes that had occurred by nineteen twenty-five.

> "I was much impressed by the richness of the native flora [in 1911] , particularly on the hillsides above the present P.O. [park office]. Those hills were then a mass of blazing colours with many varieties of showy flowers; ...the whole place was a paradise to the botanist and to the lover of flowers. How different it was when last year, 14 years later, I came back to the same spot! Such a great change had taken place that I could hardly recognize it. I do not refer to the new buildings and the numerous improvements resulting from the last years' activities in attracting tourists but solely to the striking change in the vegetation ... The [high altitude] wooded slopes of the mountains as well as the alpine meadows which I had occasion to visit show no signs of having changed in botanical complexion... it is quite different on the lower levels where there is open prairie or mixed prairie and woodland. There a marked depletion in the native element of the vegetation is manifest and the indications are that unless some steps are taken in not too distant future, the indigenous flora, which only a few years ago through its abundance and beauty made the park so attractive to the lover of nature, may easily be ruined beyond repair".[173]

The botanist attributed devastation of the flora to overgrazing by wildlife, cattle and horses, and to the encroaching townsite. Acting Superintendent W.D. Cromarty responded to the scientists' unflattering comments by explaining that some damage to the landscape was inevitable.

> "While I appreciate Dr.Malte's point of view, yet it seems to me that one has to realize and accept the fact that various phases of the activities to which we are committed must necessarily be destructive of the wild flower growth. The Townsite

> and Campsite areas, for example, are laid out on open prairie land, as is our farm, and the Golf Course is a continuation of the hillside to which Dr. Malte refers. Road building, too, destroys a certain amount, both of forest and flower life, but roads are the life-blood of a national park system as we have conceived it".[174]

The area which experienced the greatest change was the lakeshore and the flat grassland in the centre of the townsite where the swimming pool is now situated. (See Figures 34, 36 and 37). A tremendous transformation resulted as roads were built and more facilities added to accommodate visitors.

In nineteen twenty-six the local commercial establishments consisted of a new hotel which charged three dollars per day, seventeen chalets at thirty dollars per week, three rooming houses at three dollars per day (operated by Mrs. J. Morris, Mrs. Lee and Mrs. Ellison), and one private boarding house at four dollars per day. Other services available to visitors were three restaurants two bakeries, one tearoom, four ice cream parlours, one garage, one service station, and a swimming pool. The town campsite covered a thirty-five acre area which contained three shelters equipped with stoves and tables, and a large community house.[175] Boat launches made two trips daily to the head of Waterton Lake, but there was no bus service until the Great Northern Hotel was built in nineteen twenty-

seven. The succeeding years were particularly active because the Prince of Wales Hotel attracted American tourists and more people were erecting permanent residences in the park. A new dance hall was opened; the fish hatchery was built; the administration building was enlarged; the golf club house was expanded; the Royal Canadian Mounted Police barracks were erected; All Saints' Anglican Church was officially dedicated in nineteen twenty-eight; and the Roman Catholic Church was constructed two years later. (See Figures 39 to 44). Modern brick structures were replacing old log buildings but the townsite still retained its rustic appeal. The Superintendent's report for August, nineteen twenty-seven juxtaposed the traditional modes with the modern conveniences. "The construction of the new wagon shed and blacksmith shop was completed... The Administration Office Building was wired and electric lights installed".[176]

One result of this growth in the park's facilities was a corresponding rise in the permanent population. The community increased from "four or five" in nineteen nineteen to approximately "three hundred" in nineteen thirty-one.[177] Owing to the inadequate accommodations, many residents erected tents for guests and family members wishing to sleep outdoors. It was customary for restaurant owners and

other businesses to erect tents to house summer help.[178] Park officials did not object to "a reasonable number of tents" for personal use on private property or for employees working in town businesses. But in the event of "an extensive commercial proposition", the matter was to be forwarded to Ottawa with full particulars along with the Superintendent's recommendation.[179]

The most common temporary structure was the "shack tent". (See Figure 45). This was a building with a wooden frame three feet high covered with canvas. The only stipulation was that they be hidden among the trees from public view and then removed at the end of the season.[180] Waterton Lakes in particular was plagued by shack tents left standing over winter. In nineteen thirty-six all the shacks were cleared from the townsite and camp grounds and completely banned thereafter.[181] They were permitted only at Prince Albert, Riding Mountain and Point Pelee Parks because of the shortage of accommodations in those parks.

One question that was raised every year was whether or not to provide additional facilities to accommodate the growing number of visitors. (See Table 3). There was a great demand for single unit bungalows and auto courts. Initially, the Parks Branch refused to authorize their erection in Waterton Lakes until the benefits of auto camps

TABLE III

Visitors to Waterton Lakes National Park 1922 - 1937*

| | Canadian Entries ** | Number of Passengers *** | American Entries | American Passengers | Foreign Entries | Foreign Passengers |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1922 | 1,750 | 6,042 | 100 | 351 | -- | -- |
| 1923 | 3,650 | 11,813 | 215 | 683 | -- | 25 |
| 1924 | 2,500 | 8,548 | 150 | 479 | -- | 18 |
| 1925 | 2,750 | 8,737 | 100 | 304 | -- | -- |
| 1926 | 4,936 | 15,431 | 312 | 792 | -- | 14 |
| 1927 | 3,653 | 11,374 | 1,170 | 2,734 | -- | 26 |
| 1928 | 6,035 | 18,409 | 2,465 | 7,542 | -- | 51 |
| 1929 | 8,957 | 36,838 | 5,768 | 11,673 | -- | 81 |
| 1930 | 8,369 | 33,555 | 3,109 | 11,235 | -- | 37 |
| 1931 | 8,425 | 32,637 | 3,250 | 10,702 | 17 | 52 |
| 1932 | Number of Registrations | | 35,334 | | | |
| 1933 | Number of Registrations | | 32,844 | | | |
| 1934 | Number of Registrations | | 36,765 | | | |
| 1935 | 10,943 | 40,019 | 2,194 | 7,757 | 1 | 1 |
| 1936 | 9,104 | 39,088 | 4,916 | 20,399 | 12 | 59 |
| 1937 | 7,776 | 32,044 | 6,804 | 27,355 | 11 | 121 |

*Adapted from information in the W.R.O. files. The figures before 1925 are approximate because the registration office which was first situated across from the post office above Lake Linnet, was not constructed until that year.

**Cars and trucks owned by park residents were not registered.

***Children under the age of eight years were not counted.

in Banff had been studied. But owing to "exceptional financial stringency", Ottawa encouraged new building operations in the national parks.[182] The master plan called for one central building surrounded by several smaller cabins.[183] Tenders were called in May, nineteen thirty-one for a licence to operate an auto bungalow camp, with exclusive rights for five years in compensation for the large capital expenditure, as well as the usual twenty-one year renewable lease. The first applicant was William J. Baker, but he felt that the building requirements were too rigid and no action was taken that year. The tender was repeated the following year because of the immediate need for a camp. The only application was submitted by Erik Hagglund and James Fisher, whose tender of seventy-five hundred dollars was accepted by Ottawa. The auto camp was limited to ten cabins but these could be single, double or multiple unit bungalows. The annual licence fee was set at fifty dollars.[184] There was no response to a similar tender advertised for Cameron Lake. A.C. Hunter had had a tent camp by the lakeshore since nineteen twenty-nine, but he was issued a licence only on a yearly basis for his temporary structures.[185] The Cameron Lake concession was awarded to George Baker in nineteen thirty-seven.

By nineteen thirty-one the number of cottages and buildings in the park had grown immensely as compared to

nineteen twenty-six.[186] The two main hotels were the Prince of Wales (eight dollars for a single room, sixteen for a double), and the Waterton Lake Hotel and Chalets (two dollars for a single room, three dollars for a double). There were four rooming houses - Kilmorey Lodge (Mrs. Kemmis), Stanley House (N.W. Dilatush), Bellevue Lodge (Mrs. Hagglund) and The Tavern (Mrs. Costello) - which charged two dollars for a single room and four dollars for a double. Seventy cottages (from a total of approximately one hundred and twenty-five) were available at five to six dollars per day or thirty to thirty-five dollars a week. Town businesses now included three service stations, two garages, four general stores, a drugstore, two butcher shops, and five restaurants.[187] The park also boasted two churches, an employees quarters for the Prince of Wales Hotel, a dance hall, a police barracks, a swimming pool, a school house and fourteen government buildings. The only major change by nineteen thirty-five, however, was the addition of Carthew Lodge run by Mrs. Udell, and there were now eighty private cottages for rent. A motion picture theatre was also under construction. The short but rapid burst of expansion was curtailed by the depression. New business ventures in the park were stymied and only three restaurants were operating by nineteen thirty-five.[188]

One of the priorities in the Park's development was the construction of a permanent water, sewage and light system, which was essential to cope with the increased volume of visitors and year round residents. The hydro-electric companies refused to extend their facilities into Waterton Lakes until "the district .... grows to a point where the revenue would take care of all the charges involved".[189] The only sources of power were a government operated generator plant, a power plant in the Prince of Wales Hotel, and thirteen private auxilliary plants. This was usually sufficient to meet park needs. It was not economical to install a major electrical system because only fifteen families remained in the park during winter.[190] The same excuse was used for not installing a new water and sewage system, although these facilities were more urgent for public health and for fire prevention.[191] They were eventually added during the nine-teen thirties under the winter relief programs. The respon-sibility for constructing and maintaining town services was delegated to the Engineering and Construction Section in nineteen thirty-seven. This branch was under the direc-tion of the resident engineer, C.K. Le Capelain, who was appointed Superintendent in nineteen thirty-nine.

The town facilities were "cheap" and "temporary". "The present [water system] layout just 'grew up' without much attention being paid to any preconceived plan, extensions and services being added as the necessity arose without en-

larging the distribution mains. Furthermore it is quite inadequate for fire protection purposes".[192] Water was available only in summer because the pipes were laid on the surface and could not be used after the first frost. During winter the permanent population of approximately fifty people (1936) depended on the main lake, Cameron Creek, or wells. An epidemic was a real threat each spring, but Ottawa refused to expend funds on such a small population. The only justification would be if the water was contaminated and not just the possibility of it being so.[193] Eventually, town services were improved but mainly because the department required more water for its tree planting program and its fish rearing ponds.

One area of rapid progress was the additions and improvements to camp and recreational grounds. When one tourist complained of the dirty conditions in the camp site, Superintendent Knight thought it unjustified because all tables, benches, and toilets were scrubbed every other day.[194] The maintenance crew consisted of one caretaker and two men on the garbage truck. They supplied wood to the kitchen shelters and performed any necessary labour work. A major improvement in the town campground was the installation of rest rooms and kitchens, and the clearing of brush and rocks. Pedestrian walk-ways and horse trails were upgraded and

extended because of their popularity with visitors. In nineteen thirty-one the tennis court was enlarged and construction was started on an eighteen hole golf course. Despite the depression, golf course receipts increased by eighty-five percent. Superintendent Knight observed: "The course has become so popular that at times there are as many as 14 players waiting for their turn to play.[195] Officials were pleased because the larger course provided work for the unemployed, it increased revenue and reduced congestion. In recognition of its importance, the course was watered from its own exclusive supply system.

Management of the golf course required a full time office staff and a maintenance worker to care for the greens. In nineteen thirty-one E.H. Wagstaff assumed responsibility for the Golf Club House where he collected fees, and sold clubs, balls and other articles associated with the game. Wagstaff had joined the park as a clerk in nineteen twenty. When work started on the course in nineteen twenty-one he was appointed sub-foreman, a position he held until nineteen thirty-one. George Stewart joined him in managing the course greens and Mrs. Galbraith ran the concessions.[196] The eighteen hole course was completed in nineteen thirty-five and plans were drawn to improve the trees, to put in bunkers, and to level and widen the fairways.[197] A water reservoir for exclusive use by the course was finished in nineteen

thirty-six and work began on laying more pipes and adding new storage tanks. The investment paid handsome dividends as the seasonal revenue continued to rise. Waterton Lakes was a popular spot for golf enthusiasts and the course gained a province-wide reputation as a challenging tournament ground.

The greater portion of construction work in Waterton Lakes Park during the nineteen thirties was formulated under the unemployment relief programs. The majority of workers were delegated to the Akamina road and Belly River highway projects. In addition, the town streets, sidewalks and alleys were improved; and several new access roads were cleared of trees, graded and surfaced to a width of twenty-four feet. Labourers were paid five dollars and fifty cents per month and were provided with free food, clothing, accommodations, medical aid, recreational facilities, and all basic necessities.[198] Participants in the program had to be either residents of the park or from the surrounding district. Most were hired as common labourers but some were employed as camp caretakers, information and registration clerks, lifeguards and fee collectors.

The government established four relief camps in hopes of discouraging the movement of entire families into

the park. This led to complaints of discrimination but Superintendent Knight retorted: "The great, and apparently insurmountable, difficulty in administering relief in this Park, ... is that it is practically impossible to make the local residents realize that relief is only intended for those in actual need. They regard relief as winter work and are all convinced that they should be permitted to work full time with no restrictions".[199] The parks department discouraged permanent settlement and no relief was offered residents who had enjoyed a financially successful summer season. When people residing outside the park saw the apparently good employment situation in Waterton, and because the park was an attractive place to settle, many families moved to the town. In an attempt to stem the flow, the work season was shortened to keep the pay schedule for relief work lower than the prevailing rates outside the park.[200] Despite the government's efforts to limit the influx of people, the townsite slowly expanded along the lakeshore and moved into the former empty central plains. (See Figure 38).

*8) General Administrative Matters 1925 - 1937*

The outstanding leader to preside over the growth and expansion of Waterton Lakes National Park during the nineteen twenties and nineteen thirties was Herbert "Bert"

Knight. Bert Knight first joined the park staff as Chief Fire and Game Warden in nineteen nineteen. He was promoted to Acting Superintendent in nineteen twenty-five, but this was only during the winter months. W.D. Cromarty was Acting Superintendent for the summer season from June through September, after which he returned to Ottawa to work as an architect during the winter. From nineteen thirty to nineteen thirty-two Bert Knight was full time Acting Superintendent and then he was promoted to the Superintendency, a position he held until nineteen thirty-nine. His association with the park was the longest of any previous or succeeding Superintendent. Under his dynamic and innovative leadership Waterton Lakes Park gained its reputation as a national park of major importance.

The Parks Branch sympathetically considered any new business or recreational program which would benefit the tourist trade. Some of the suggestions were outlandish. One applicant wanted to build a minature scenic railway in Waterton Park.[201] Commissioner Harkin responded: "I do not think the Department could reasonably object to any legitimate enterprise which would supply forms of amusement which are recognized and adopted in other parts of the country".[202] The enterpriser was asked to submit a formal proposal specifying the area in which he wanted to operate the train. There were

a variety of other business propositions. Applications were received to establish a lumberyard, taxidermist shop, and laundromat. All were refused because they were commercial enterprises which might tend to attract permanent residents to the park. One exception was pedlars licences to sell bread and milk to residents and campers during the tourist season. Local farmers were also permitted to sell dairy products and vegetable produce in town. Neither did park officials object to merchants selling goods from a private residence during the winter months, although this contravened park regulations. Goods could not be stored in shops over winter, and the precedent was set when the Great Northern Hotel was allowed to sell groceries year round at a small commissariat serving its employees.[203]

The Parks Branch collected a ten dollar licence fee from most business establishments. Some shop owners did not pay a fee because their business was not specifically mentioned in the park regulations. Others simply ignored the business regulations, the most common infraction being the rental of rooms or private cottages without obtaining a licence to conduct that class of business. The business regulations were completely revamped in nineteen thirty-eight to cover the many new types of establishments. Fees were revised to correspond with the volume of trade and profits from a particular business. These adjustments were a

reflection of the many changes taking place in the modern business world.

One of the most contentious issues to embroil the business community in Waterton Lakes was the question of liquor licenses. During its earliest years as a park, Waterton Lakes was a popular entry point for smugglers bringing in contraband whiskey from the United States. The traffic was effectively curtailed after the Great War. When the British Columbia Liquor Act was passed in nineteen twenty, "certain persons in Pincher Creek" planned to build a licensed hotel near Wall Lake just outside the park boundary. The Superintendent was afraid that a "boozing club" so near the park would attract visitors of "an undesirable type". He excused his unsolicited comments regarding the proposed club-house on the grounds that "the past reputation of this Park which we have endeavoured to overcome is I am sure sufficient excuse for it".[204] Commissioner Harkin immediately reminded the British Columbia government that his department would be "very glad if you would give the Parks interests full consideration", that is, refuse any applications for a license near Waterton.[205] The Commissioner's fears proved groundless because the province's legislation did not authorize beer outlets other than government controlled vendors.

In nineteen twenty-four the Alberta Liquor Control Act was passed. The province agreed not to issue licenses in a national park without consulting the federal government. If it had a choice, Ottawa preferred not to have any liquor outlets in the parks, but the issue was not that simple.

> "It is recognized that with the rest of Alberta wet and with B.C. wet the only result of our placing a prohibition would be that the parks would be overrun with bootleggers. My understanding is that the Alberta Liquor Law is to be very carefully administered and under the circumstances I have no hesitation in recommending that it will be far better to have Vendors Stores and licensed hotels rather than to take a chance on having bootleggers".[206]

Liquor stores were opened in Banff and Jasper and licenses were issued to four hotels in Banff, but no outlet was provided in Waterton owing to the small permanent population.

The Parks Branch received applications for a liquor license from the three major hotel operators in Waterton Park. Commissioner Harkin agreed to discuss the matter with the provincial authorities and asked the Superintendent to present his views on the subject. Acting Superintendent Knight replied: "It will be a good policy to grant Beer Licenses to a reliable applicant in the Park, as I fear, unless this is done, and the traffic properly controlled, the Parks will be the only profitable fields for bootlegging activities".[207] The towns-people submitted a petition

favouring an outlet and claimed to represent "over 90% of the residents and property owners here".[208] The Cardston News (May 13, 1924) responded that their village stood for prohibition, and even though Waterton Park was outside their constituency, it was "the natural playground of Cardston's young people. ... They would be free from the restraining forces of the home and left to the temptations of the dissolute and irresponsible who gravitate to such resorts. . . where the means of intoxication are at hand". Whether public pressure was the explanation or not, the province decided not to issue licenses in Waterton. The parks department raised no objection since the question was within provincial jurisdiction; their only concern was that they be notified before a license was granted. The Department of the Interior did not want to be involved since "there is a strong sentiment in the [Waterton] district against the granting of such a license".[209]

The nineteen twenty-four season was a poor one for the tourist industry and the townspeople blamed it on the fact that liquor was not freely available to visitors. The President of The Tourist Association of South Eastern British Columbia and Southern Alberta claimed that several tourists had told him that they had by-passed Waterton, or

had shortened their stay, because they could not buy liquor in the park.[210] Acting Superintendent Knight attributed the dwindling numbers to the Calgary, Lethbridge and Fort Macleod Exhibitions, and to the unusually heavy rainstorms that had turned the roads into quagmires. Nevertheless, he supported the requests for a liquor license "as I am sure that it is for this Park's benefit, and for the public welfare, to maintain law and order, and have a legal sale of beer instead of this wretched bootlegging business".[211] The Royal Canadian Mounted Police had only one officer stationed in the park until nineteen thirty-one and he was powerless to control the illegal traffic. Commissioner Harkin was sympathetic towards issuance of a license but he insisted that any move must come from the province.[212]

The townspeople again petitioned Ottawa to press their application for a liquor outlet. Commissioner Harkin discussed the matter with the Minister of the Interior, pointing out that the majority of settlements in Alberta were licensed. He reiterated his stance that nothing was to be gained by refusing one for Waterton.[213] The Minister refused to interfere because he had received a telegram reminding him that Mormon residents nearby admantly opposed the granting of license.[214] The Lethbridge Herald in May, nineteen twenty-five pointed out that Waterton Park came within a Municipal District which the legislature had

promised would not be granted a license. The issue remained dormant for another year.

In nineteen twenty-six the department received an application from the recently built Waterton Lakes Hotel and Chalet for a parlour license. Commissioner Harkin decided to "remain neutral" in the issue and accept the province's decision.[215] Finally, a liquor license was issued in nineteen twenty-seven to the Great Northern Hotel. Its beer parlour was a small room designed strictly for guests. According to the Liquor Act, a second liquor license could not be issued until the permanent town population reached five hundred. Waterton Lakes had less than two hundred residents, but after lengthy correspondence between the province and the Minister of the Interior, the Waterton Lakes Hotel and Chalet was permitted to serve the general public. The license was valid only for the tourist season from May 1 to September 30. In nineteen thirty-one a seasonal provincial liquor vendor was established at Waterton but it carried no stock. The store would accept orders and then phone to the Fort Macleod outlet in time to catch the afternoon bus to Waterton Park. A permanent agency was not thought necessary owing to the small permanent population.[216] Subsequent applications to establish a third beer parlour were turned down because

the tourist volume did no warrant it as yet. It was not until nineteen fourty-seven that a seasonal liquor store was opened in the townsite equipped with its own stock.

Another area in which the Province of Alberta held jurisdiction was the appointment of Police Magistrates. The park regulations gave Superintendents' power only to preside over violations arising from the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act. It was difficult to secure the services of a Justice of the Peace (J.P.) to hear court cases in Waterton Lakes because of its relative isolation. Superintendent Knight raised the issue in nineteen twenty-four when he requested the appointment of a court official. He recommended that Inspector A.H.L. Mellor of the local Royal Canadian Mounted Police detachment be appointed to the position.[217] The Parks Branch contacted the provincial Attorney General's Department and it agreed to Inspector Mellor's appointment. He was transferred from the park in nineteen twenty-six and Inspector Frederick J. Mead[218] was named as his successor. Due to the growing responsibilities of the Superintendent's office, Ottawa asked W.D. Cromarty to recommend two or three residents of the park who might quality as J.P.'s.[219] The names of O.G. Oland, a contractor in Cardston, and A.H. Harwood, the post-

master in Waterton, were put forth as candidates.[220] No action was taken, however, by provincial authorities.

In nineteen twenty-nine Premier Brownlee advised Charles Stewart that F.T. Reilly was to be appointed Police Magistrate at Waterton.[221] The appointment was sanctioned by the province upon request from the Department of the Interior, but since he was to work specifically in the park, the J.P.'s salary was paid by Ottawa. Later, under the nineteen thirty Parks Act, Magistrates were appointed by order in council upon the recommendation of the Minister of Justice. The nineteen thirty Statute stipulated that "every Park Warden and any Park officer designated by the Minister shall have all the powers of a police constable". Even temporary labourers were empowered to assist the Wardens in enforcing park regulations.[222] F.T. Reilly was replaced in nineteen thirty-one by J.W. Low, the Magistrate at Cardston, who travelled to Waterton Lakes whenever necessary to preside over court cases. The same year, the Royal Canadian Mounted Police force stationed in the park was increased to one N.C.O. and two constables. In nineteen forty-one the Justice Department ruled that the Magistrates of Pincher Creek and Cardston might both hear cases in Waterton, unless their appointment specifically exempted the park from their jurisdiction.[223]

Under the terms of the nineteen thirty Resources Act which transferred the natural resources to provincial control, the Dominion government retained control over the administration of the national parks. Park lands no longer required for that purpose would revert to the province. Parliament had "exclusive legislative jurisdiction" over the national reserves and the park regulations could be amended only by an Act of Parliament. Provincial laws and general taxes were applicable unless they were "repugnant" to park regulations or expressly excluded from applying to the parks by Parliament.[224]

To ensure the continued existence of the parks, the basic principles of the National Park Policy were clearly enunciated by the nineteen thirty Parks Act. National Park lands were a public trust wherein people might enjoy activities and experiences related to Nature. The Parks were preserved in their "natural state" and special emphasis was given to retaining unique or representative natural geographical areas. Year round residency was restricted to park employees and townspeople providing essential services. Facilities and services other than roads, nature interpretation, campgrounds, picnic areas, police protection, certain recreational facilities, and general park information was provided by private enterprise. The emphasis was still on tourism, but there was an awareness that national parks must be guarded from a rapidly mobile society.

The most significant event of the nineteen thirties was the naming of Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park. Over the years there had been a friendly liaison between the National Parks Branch and the United States Park Service. Both parties were aware of each others actions in wildlife management, conservation practices, road and trail construction and promotion of tourism. Since their inception in nineteen ten, Glacier and Waterton Parks had publicized their unique International relationship through the umbilical Upper Waterton Lake. Canada's publicity department emphasized the International character of the adjoining parks to attract American tourists. A joint title would merely proclaim formally what was already a reality.

The first serious proposal that the two parks be united as an International Peace Park came from an Alberta-Montana Rotary Club meeting held in July, nineteen thirty-one at Waterton Lakes. Canon S.H. Middleton, a frequent visitor and prominent clergyman in Waterton, presented a motion to the assembly that the Rotarians petition their respective governments to create a peace park. The gesture would serve as an example to a war-ridden world which was plagued by militarism and was in the throes of a world depression.

The proposal won the enthusiastic support of local politicians. Scott Leavitt, a Congressman for Montana, was "convinced" that union of the parks "would greatly increase International travel between the Western States and Western Canada".[225] It was an astute means of getting funds to build roads in Montana and Glacier Park. The bill presented to Congress establishing the peace park provided for the special development of Glacier "to permit more free intercourse across the border".[226] The bill explained that the main objective was to permanently commemorate "the long-existing relationship of peace and good will existing between the people and governments of Canada and the United States". Each park would be administered by their respective departments but it was hoped that the decision would lead to closer cooperation between the two countries.

The Parks Branch raised no objection to the proposal since "the proposition involves merely superimposing a new name upon existing names and doing it all as a gesture of International peace and good will". The move would also be a boon to the tourist business. "The very fact that these Parks were made into an International one and that the particular reason was peace and good will would provide very much first class raw material for publicity from the tourist standpoint .... particularly .... in our American publicity".[227]

The one condition incorporated into the agreement was that each country would "deal exclusively" with the administration of each respective park. Another matter of concern was the "appropriations for National parks in United States have been increasingly generous in recent years and that if Canada agreed to the establishment of the International park we might find difficulty in keeping pace with the developments going on in the American end of the park". Commissioner Harkin was quick to add that this was not "a serious objection though I feel I should mention it".[228] The Canadian government readily agreed to cooperate in changing the title of Waterton Lakes Park.

A few weeks before the scheduled opening of the Peace Park, federal authorities were deluged with protests from Boards of Trade and politicians representing the province of Manitoba and the State of North Dakota. In August, nineteen twenty-nine, the Annual Conference of the International Association of Gardners inaugurated plans to set aside 1,500 acres along the International boundary as an International Peace Garden.[229] Eric Willis, Conservative Member of Parliament from Souris, accused the government of undermining the Peace Garden project in the Turtle Mountains. The Waterton-Glacier plan was a unfair attempt to "steal the thunder" for commercial gain; theirs was a true Peace Garden, not a tourist attraction.[230]

Owing to the vociferous criticism, passage of the American bill was delayed temporarily by Representative Thomas Hall of North Dakota. The plans finally went ahead following a discreet delay. The two parks were an International park sharing a common boundary and it would serve no purpose not to publicly acknowledge the fact. In the summer of 1932 the Congress of the United States and the House of Commons of Canada passed the necessary legislation proclaiming the first International Peace Park in the world. The dedication ceremonies were held June 18, nineteen thirty-two at Many Glaciers, Montana. The Rotarians continued to meet each year, alternating between the two parks, as a symbol of peace and friendship. Following the completion of the Belly River (Chief Mountain International) Highway, the parks were formally dedicated and the park entrances bore new signs signifying the "Waterton-Glacier International Peace Park".

The park service gradually evolved new priorities and directions to play a more amenable role within the changing social structure of the nineteen thirties. In the early years a Warden's duties consisted of patrolling cattle on grazing lands, cutting hay, erecting telephone and fence lines, and clearing park trails. A Warden's responsibilities eventually came to include compiling game censuses, operating a fish rearing and stocking program, patrolling miles of trails and roadways, and acting as a public relations officer. There

was no increase in the Park Warden staff between nineteen nineteen and nineteen twenty-nine. Acting Superintendent Knight asked for additional personnel to fulfill the many new tasks. There was no Warden service in the townsite during the winter months despite the large number of year-round residents. Additional staff members were required to prepare fire fighting equipment for the summer season, and to relieve Wardens on sick or holiday leave.[231] In nineteen thirty the position of Supervising Park Warden was created to relieve the Superintendent from part of the administrative duties. The qualifications set down by the Civil Service Commission were an "Education equivalent to primary school graduation; experience in forestry; knowledge of the care of animals; knowledge of park regulations; good physical condition".[232] The salary ranged from nineteen hundred and twenty dollars to twenty-one hundred and sixty dollars per annum, while regular Wardens received around fifteen hundred dollars per annum.

In January, nineteen thirty-three, J.C. "Bo" Holroyd was named Supervising Park Warden and L.S. McAllister, a permanent seasonal Warden for four years, was placed in charge of all fire equipment. Warden Holroyd had been with the Park since nineteen twenty, and it was hoped that his

promotion would be an incentive to others and promote efficiency within the administrative structure.[233] Superintendent Knight described the ideal Warden:"a good woodsman, a pleasant personality to meet the public, responsible and conscientious, mechanically inclined, a capable horse rider and familiar with flora, animals and geology of the park." For its part, the department offered high salaries and promotions to counteract loneliness, lack of social intercourse, physical hardships and poor living accommodations.[234] A Warden's personal appearance was especially important because "the travelling public will have no respect for a slouch, untidy-looking individual, especially when he wears no badge".[235] All Wardens were ordered to "appear in the public in as clean, well shaved and smart a manner as possible, and that the cabins and the surroundings to those cabins are kept tidy".[236] The Supervising Warden was required to "submit reports at the end of each month covering work undertaken under your supervision. In the case of Trails and Telephones it will be necessary to give details of the amount of work accomplished, the materials used, making sure that exact measurements and quantities are given. Any other work that may be undertaken must be covered by similar reports".[237] At least one aspect of a Warden's responsibilities had not changed over the years.

Superintendent Knight was advised that "while an annual report is an official document primarily devoted to recording the work accomplished during the year, it also may be used as a medium for conveying a message touching the ideals for which the National Parks stand". The report should be concise without leaving out anything "of importance or of human interst". Some of the themes to be incorporated were "interviews, meetings attended, inspections, patrols (miles travelled, etc.), visitors, motor car registration, camp grounds, bathhouses,gateways, golf courses, tennis courts, game, fishing, hatcheries, forestry, forest fires, warden service, telephone lines, forest trails, roads, grazing, health and sanitation, regulations (enforcement and infractions), permits and licenses issued, general".[238] Ottawa wanted to be sure that its staff members were fulfilling their responsibilities. Waterton Lakes and Banff were the only parks whose reports were classified as acceptable by the department. To maintain its high standard of efficiency, Superintendent Knight asked for a new administration office. The old headquarters were

> "inadequate to our needs in size, we have no room to store old files and no convenient place to keep those files to which we must refer continually; the heating arrangements are very poor, only the main room can be kept at a temperature at which it is possible to work and during the cold weather the ink, typewriter, etc. all freeze up".[239]

He emphasized that Waterton Lakes was just behind Banff and Jasper in popularity, revenue derived, visitors registrations and amount of administrative work involved. His efforts to gain greater recognition for the park were to no avail. Despite its stature as an International Peace Park, Waterton Lakes remained in the shadow of the larger national parks centred around Banff.

## *CONCLUSION*

The preceding study has attempted to outline the salient developments in the early history of Waterton Lakes National Park. Many current concepts and attitudes regarding the function of the national parks can be traced to nineteen eleven with the creation of the National Parks Branch. There was a gradual change in parks policy in the search to define the future role of the parks, and the course of action to be followed in developing the Rocky Mountain recreational resorts. After nineteen eleven a concerted effort was made to end industrial activities in the parks. The Parks Branch sought to promote and develop the national forests as tourist resorts. Thus residential sites were surveyed, industries catering to visitors multiplied, numerous trails and roadways were cleared, recreational and camping facilities were added and in particular, the advent of the motor car irrevocably revolutionized the role of the parks in modern society.

Alongside the emphasis on tourism, the preservation of major scenic attractions and the protection of most species of wildlife remained a fundamental part of parks policy. The mountains reserves were promoted as "living Museums" to be preserved for all future generations. The Parks Branch

successfuly defeated proposals to exploit natural resources in the parks. A seemingly contradictory position arose because, while the parks department sought to preserve the mountain parks, it also advertised them as recreational playgrounds. The planners saw no contradiction in setting land aside for public use while at the same time hoping to preserve the area in its "natural state". The two goals were antagonistic because the emphasis on tourism meant that scenic attractions must be made accessible to the average visitor to attract sufficient numbers to maintain the parks economically. This relentless assault on the landscape effected many changes in the flora and fauna. The history of the national parks is largely the story of compromise and accommodation between the conservationists and the commercial entrepreneurs.

This study has viewed the particular development of Waterton Lakes Park within the general progress and events of Southern Alberta. Its first decade as a national park was perhaps the most flamboyant and exciting period. This era was, however, a time of confusion and poor administration which would partially account for its laggard development during its initial years as a Dominion Park. The main contributing factor which retarded the park's early growth was its extreme southern position and, to compound the feeling of isolation, it usually lacked

dynamic, assertive leadership. The park service had no special program to train Wardens, and this detracted from the efficient administration of Waterton as a tourist resort. Most Wardens were well qualified and conscientious in their work, and the inadequate pay deterred many good officers. Under Herbert Knight's Superintendency work conditions were improved, and the park bloomed as a popular playground for Southern Albertans. Its role and stature within the Rocky Mountain Parks rose appreciably when it was proclaimed an International Peace Park in nineteen thirty-two. The majority of American visitors entering Canada received their first impression of the Canadian parks system at Waterton. By nineteen thirty-seven, Waterton Lakes Park had earned its rightful recognition as an essential and prominent partner in the mountain parks system.

The new ideals and philosophy which shaped future developments in the national parks were clearly articulated by a Conference of National Parks Superintendents held in Ottawa, January 4 to 14, nineteen thirty-seven. The Parks Branch was reorganized under a central administration which would purchase equipment in bulk, decrease management personnel, and simplify the accounting. Revised rental and license rates covering park services, business and residential leases, electrical and water rates, and all licence fees were

designed only "to make a reasonable profit". The Conference recommended that stock grazing and timber cutting fees be raised to discourage the practices, and that more stringent rules be drafted. A system for transferring Wardens within the parks sytem was proposed, and the replacement of unreliable telephone lines by radiophones was urged by the Superintendents. A Nature Guide Service was considered to provide visitors with "nature history lessons". Each park should maintain a library for staff use and a vigorous publicity program promoting national parks should include literature, photographs, motion pictures and lectures. The Conference emphasized that "the relation between predators and their prey is very complex", and that the plant and animal life native to the park be protected for park visitors to observe and study. "Certain outlying primitive areas should be preserved and no access, except for fire fighting purposes, should be given to such areas, for the perpetuation of the flora and fauna". The "over-building of roads should be carefully avoided and construction of Highways should be limiting to necessary truck roads; also outlying park areas should be jeasously guarded for the protection of the flora and fauna and should only be reached by horse trails".[1] The Conference's recommendations were both an eloquent summation of the changes that had occurred in Canada's National Parks since nineteen eleven and a forceful presentation of administrative, financial, road and conservation programs necessary for the future survival

and meaningful role of the national parks system.

The succeeding years were spent in realizing many of the policies and goals put forth by the nineteen thirty-seven Superintendents Conference. It was the first guideline for the scientific and efficiency orientated policy of the new National Parks Bureau. The department anticipated a tremendous upsurge in usage of park facilities during the post-war years. Detailed, long-range plans were drafted to guide the expansion of recreational and service facilities. Numerous studies were conducted by limnologists, mammalogists, naturalists and other branches of the science community to help plan programs for the parks. A new attitude evolved towards park policy which incorporated the latest advances in technology and science to anticipate future needs in Canada's national playgrounds.

## *FOOTNOTES*

### *CHAPTER I - The First Explorations, 1800 - 1885*

[1]A good secondary reference is H.A. Innis, The Fur Trade in Canada. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1962; or E.E. Rich, The Fur Trade and the Northwest to 1857. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1967.

[2]David Thompson's Narrative has been published twice by the Champlain Society. It was first edited by J.B. Tyrrell (1916), and this was followed by a more critical account by Richard Glover (1962). The initial contact between Thompson and the Kootenai Indians is described in the introduction of the books, and then recounted in David Thompson's own words.

[3]The name Kootenai is written in a variety of ways, - Kootanie, Kootenay, and Cootoonay. For the sake of clarity, the term "Kootenai" is employed whenever referring to the Indian tribe, and the alternate spelling "Kootenay" refers to the geographical area which is now Waterton Lakes. It should be noted that in common usage the term "Kootenay" is applied to the Kootenay District in southern British Columbia, but in this study it refers to the Waterton Lakes area.

[4]Claude E. Schaeffer, Le Blanc and La Gasse, Predecessor of David Thompson in the Columbian Plateau. U.S. Department of the Interior. Studies in Plains Anthropology and History No. 3, 1966, p.3. This booklet is the best study available on the work and explorations of Le Blanc and La Gasse.

[5]B. Reeves, "Man and His Environment, The Past 10,000 Years: An Approach to Park Interpretation," in J.G. Nelson and R.C. Scace (eds.), The Canadian National Parks: Today and Tomorrow, Vol. II. (Calgary, 1969), pp. 243-261.

[6]J.N. Wallace, The Passes of the Rocky Mountains Along the Alberta Boundary. Paper presented before the Historical Society of Calgary, April, 1927.

[7]Hugh Monroe's exciting and adventurous life among the Blackfoot people is described by J.W. Shultz, Rising Wolf, the White Blackfoot, Hugh Monroe's Story of the First Year on the Plains (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1919); and Red Crow's Brother; Hugh Monroe's Story of His Second Year on the Plains (Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1927).

[8]The authoritatitive source which contains invaluable background material and explanatory notes on the Palliser Expedition Reports (originally published by the British government) is The Champlain Society's republication of the Palliser Reports, edited and introduced by Irene Spry. The Papers of the Palliser Expedition 1857-1860 (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1968). The Champlain Volume contains a comprehensive bibliography whereas the popular edition of Irene Spry's book has none of the explanatory notes. The Palliser Expedition (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, Ltd., 1963).

[9]By the mid-nineteenth century the North and South Kootenay Passes had fallen into disuse because fire, disease and indiscriminate slaughter had decimated wildlife in the mountain valleys, and in particular the buffalo had become increasingly scarce. (J.N. Collie, "Further Exploration in the Canadian Rocky Mountains", Reprint from The Geographical Journal, May, 1903, p. 12).

[10]Pallier Report, 1860, Appendix II, "Report on the Exploration of the Kootenie and Boundary Passes of the Rocky Mountains in 1858," by Captain Blakiston. Reprinted in Irene M. Spry, The Papers of the Palliser Expedition 1857-1860, (Toronto: The Champlain Society, 1968, p. 578).

[11]For background on Charles Waterton see the biography by R. Aldridge, The Strange Life of Charles Waterton 1782-1865, (New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1949).

[12]Palliser Report, 1860, p. 579.

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid. pp. 569-570.

[15]Ibid. p. 75.

[16]A. Waddington, "On the Geography and Mountain Passes of British Columbia in Connection with an Overland Route", Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, Vol. 28, 1868, p. 128.

[17]The United States survey party was headed by Commissioner Archibald Campbell, with Lieutenant John G. Parke as his chief astronomer and surveyor, and G. Clinton Gardner as his assistant. For the official United States government report on the Commission's work see Marcus Baker, Survey of the Northwestern Boundary of the United States 1857-1861, (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1900). Hereafter referred to as Baker, Boundary Survey 1860.

[18]Ibid., p. 9.

[19]Ibid., map between pp. 22-23.

[20]Ibid., "Chart of Elevations along the forty-nineth parallel ....," p. 43.

[21]John E. Parsons, West on the 49th Parallel, New York: William Morrow and Company, 1963, p. 15.

[22]Ibid., pp. 14-15. The previous summer an American surveyor had erected a boundary marker which encompassed land previously regarded as British Canadian territory.

[23]Captain Samuel Anderson, "The North-American Boundary...", Journal of the Royal Geographical Society, XLVI, 1876, p. 230.

[24]Ibid., p. 255.

[25]Sessional Papers, 1875, No. 8, "Annual Report of the Minister of the Interior", p. 4.

[26]Lethbridge Herald, March 25, 1957.

[27]Anderson, "The North-American Boundary....", pp. 301-302.

[28]A brief summary of G.M. Dawson's work is found in F.J. Alcock, A Century in the Geological Survey of Canada, (Ottawa, 1947), pp. 41-47.

[29]A microfilm copy of G.M. Dawson's, "General Diary and Observation Book", recounting his 1874 and 1881 explorations is on deposit in the Glenbow-Alberta Institute. A meticulous observor, the geologist recorded his personal impressions of the area and described the general terrain, fauna and rock formations of the district.

[30]Geological and Natural History Survey of Canada. Report on the Region in the Vicinity of the Bow and Belly Rivers, North-West Territory, By George M. Dawson (Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1884), p. 12 C.

[31]The names of several members of the Palliser Expedition and the two Boundary Commissions are now commemorated as mountain peaks, lakes or streams in Waterton Lakes Park. A list of the places named after the early explorers and surveyors is found in Dawson's Preliminary Report on the Physical and Geographical Features of the Rocky Mountains, 1886, pp. 11B-12B. See also "Chief Mountain" [S.H. Middleton], Kootenai Brown (Lethbridge, 1954), pp. 41-45.

[32]Geological and Natural Survey of Canada. Report on the Region in the Vicinity of the Bow and Belly Rivers, North-West Territory, By George Dawson, p. 22 C. Dawson's description of the geological, topographical features and his analysis of the mineral and agricultural potential of the Waterton district is on pages 21 C to 22 C, 64 C to 65 C, 108 C, 145 C. A more detailed description of the Waterton Lakes area is found in the "Preliminary Report on the Physical and Geological Features ... of the Rocky Mountains", (Montreal: 1886), pp. 37 B to 55 B, section subtitled "Mountains in the Vicinity of the Forty-Nineth Parallel and near the South Kootenie Pass".

*CHAPTER II - Early Settlement and Development, 1870 - 1907*

[1]For an authoritative biography of Kootenai Brown see William Rodney, Kootenai Brown, His Life and Times 1839 - 1916, Sidney, B.C., Gray's Publishing Ltd., 1969. William Rodney's account of the Waterton Lakes area itself is brief and goes only to 1916. This study will cover some of the same ground as Rodney, but the footnotes will indicate more precisely the location of various documents held by the National Parks Branch.

[2]For example: J.D. Higinbotham, When the West Was Young, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1933); S.H. Middleton, Kootenai Brown (The Lethbridge Herald Job Dept., 1954); and W. McD. Tait, "I Remember", Farm and Ranch Review, Vols. 15 and 16 (1919, 1920).

[3]W. McD. Tait, "Kootenai Brown Tells Tales of Buffalo Hunting in Early Sixties". Vancouver Daily Province, March 8, 1924. Quoted in Rodney, Kootenai Brown, p. 62.

[4]Rodney, Kootenai Brown, p. 125.

[5]L.V. Kelly, The Range Men (Toronto: William Briggs, 1913), pp. 93-94, 101-105.

[6]A.S. Hill, From Home to Home (London: Sampson, Low, Marston, Searle and Rivington, 1885), pp. 329-338. The book contains several pictures of the Waterton area.

[7]W. McD. Tait, I Remember, p. 87.

[8]G.M. Dawson, General Diary and Observation Book, July 30, 1881.

[9]Sessional Papers, 1881, No. 3, "Annual Report of the Department of the Interior," Part I, Dominion Lands, pp. 52-53.

[10]G.M. Dawson, General Diary and Observation Book, August 3, 1881.

[11]A comprehensive examination of the ranching community in Southern Alberta is found in David H. Breen, "The Cattle Compact: The Ranch Community in Southern Alberta 1881-1896", (Unpublished Master's Thesis), University of Calgary, 1969.

[12]Privy Council Order 722, April 11, 1882.

[13]A.J. Hudson, Charles Ora Card, Pioneer and Colonizer (Cardston: The Author, 1963).

[14]The Lethbridge Herald, "Golden Jubilee Edition, 1885-1935," July 11, 1935: Fred M. Huddlestun, A History of The Settlement. .. in S.W. Alberta Bordering Waterton Park ... Published by the author, ca. 1969.

[15]C.A. Magrath, The Galts, father and son, pioneers in the development of Southern Alberta. Lethbridge, 1936.

[16]The story of the mining industry and its significance for Alberta is told in the series, Canadian Frontiers of Settlement, Vol. IX, Part II, "Settlement and Mining Frontier", by H.A. Innis, pp. 282-320.

[17]Ibid., pp. 309-310

[18]Pincher Creek Echo, August 30, 1904; and September 7, 1906.

[19]William Pearce Papers, University of Alberta, Special Collections and Archives Section, Box 15, File 11-2, F.W. Godsal, Fire Guardian, to E.F. Stephenson, Crown Timber Agent, Winnipeg, July 9, 1898, (Hereafter cited as Pearce Papers). It should be noted that Godsal spoke out against the railway not as a concerned conservationist, but as a rancher who was protesting against pasturage being consumed by grass fires.

[20]Sessional Papers, 1900, No. 13, Part IX, "Report of Chief Inspector E. Stewart on Timber and Forestry", pp. 7-8.

[21]Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 181-182.

[22]The authoritative source which best describes the events surrounding the discovery of oil is William Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 168-170, 181-185. In addition, there are many newspaper articles on Oil City and various records maintained by the National Parks Branch. The best overall summary of the succession of drilling operations in the Pincher Creek area up to 1920 is a brief report compiled by William Pearce. See Pearce Papers, Box 16, File 12-A-5, "Gas and Oil in Alberta", Report on the Pincher Creek District.

[23]The popular story is that Oliver Aldridge, the twelve year old son of William, first discovered the oil seepages, which he showed to his father. See the Lethbridge Herald, July 16, 1963 and Cardston Diamond Jubilee 1887-1962, Souvenir Pamphlet, p. 37.

[24]Lethbridge Herald, November 21, 1932.

[25]Geological Survey, Economic Geology Series No. 5, "Oil and Gas in Western Canada", by G.S. Hume (Ottawa:1928), p. 62.

[26]Sessional Papers, 1892, No. 3, "Report of the Superintendent of Mines", p. 10.

[27]Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 181-182.

[28]John Lineham was a prominent rancher and sawmill operator from Okotoks, and G.K. Leeson was a wealthy Calgary businessman. Other prominent directors of the company were Arthur Sifton (later premier of Alberta); H.E. Hyde, J.K. Rickets and W. Gillies (Patrick Oils Limited, Prospectus, [1929] ).

[29]An article in the Lethbridge Herald, (n.d., on deposit in the Waterton Library) and William Rodney (p. 182, citing J.W. Horan, West Nor West as his source) state that oil was not struck until September 21, 1903, but the more likely year was 1902.

[30]The Alberta Oil Fields, The Rocky Mountain Development Co., Limited, Prospectus [1904] . Pictures of the drilling operations printed in the Prospectus are included here as Figures 10 to 18.

[31]Waterton Mills was another pioneer town situated on the shores of Maskinonge Lake across from the present day Registration Building at the main park entrance. It too was abandoned and no evidence remains of the town.

[32]This was a Pincher Creek based operation which included Jack Drader (a driller formerly with the R.M.D.C.), R.W. Dobie, John Herron, Fred Forrester, and other towns-people. The rivalry and feuding between the two oil companies is vividly described in the Frontier Guide to Waterton, Land of Leisure, Frontier Book No. 15, pp. 21, 26.

[33]One hole was reportedly located on the Gairns and Frache lots near Cameron Falls, and the other was drilled on the lot where the Waterton Lakes Hotel and Lakeshore village was built. (Lethbridge Herald, July 16, 1963).

[34]PARC Box 162038, File W.2, Vol. I, W.I. Margach, Chief Forest Ranger to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, May 4, 1906.

[35]Canada, Department of Transport. A Statutory History of the Steam and Electric Railways of Canada 1836-1937. Compiled by R. Dorman (Ottawa: 1938), p. 18. The railroad changed its name to "Pincher Creek , Cardston and Montana Railway Co." in 1909, and finally to the "Alberta Pacific Railway Co."., in 1910, with plans to build from Calgary to Montana.

[36]Ibid., p. 248. The name was changed to Great West Railway Co., in 1905. A map in the Rocky Mountain Development Co. Prospectus for 1904 shows the proposed North-West Coal and Coke Railway Co.

[37]F.K. Beach and J.L. Irwin, The History of Alberta Oil (Edmonton: n.d.), p. 13.

*CHAPTER III - The Formulation of National Parks and Forest Reserves Policy, 1872 - 1911*

[1]Sessional Papers, 1887, No. 7, "Annual Report of the Department of the Interior", pp. xxii - xxiv.

[2]The most important primary source for William Pearce is the Pearce Papers on deposit in the University of Alberta, Edmonton, Special Collections and Archives Department.

[3]William Pearce, "Establishment of the National Parks in the Rocky Mountains", Alberta Historical Review, X, No. 3 (Summer, 1962), p. 12. (Hereafter cited as Pearce, National Parks Speech).

[4]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 88; William Pearce to A.O. Wheeler, President of the Alpine Club, May 7, 1923.

[5]Pearce, National Parks Speech.

[6]Sir Sanford Fleming, England and Canada (Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1884), p. 415.

[7]Pearce, National Parks Speech.

[8]Sessional Papers, loc. cit.,p. xx. The growth of Banff as an international tourist resort is graphically outlined by the Superintendent's annual reports for "The Rocky Mountains Park", which perfunctorily included daily meteorological observations for the park, statistical information and describing the general progress of all facets of the park's development.

[9]R.C. Brown, "The Doctrine of Usefulness; Natural Resource and National Park Policy in Canada, 1887-1914", pp. 94-110, in The Canadian National Parks, Today and Tomorrow (edited by J.G. Nelson and R.C. Scace), Vol I, published by The University of Calgary, 1968. Hereafter cited as Brown, National Park Policy.

[10]Ibid., p. 101.

[11]A.R. Byrne, "Man and Landscape Change in the Banff National Park Area Before 1911", Master's Thesis. University of Calgary, 1964. Published as National Park Series No. 1, 1968. Studies in Land Use History and Landscape Change, J.G. Nelson, Director.

[12]The Calgary Herald (October 6, 1888) called for legislation against "pot-hunters" who were making game scarce around Calgary.

[13]Ibid., January 22, 1890.

[14]Ibid., October 9, 1886.

[15]Calgary Tribune, February 27, 1885.

[16]Calgary Herald , January 22, 1890.

[17]PAC, R.G., 84, Vol. 167, File U3-1-1. Mr. Whitcher's Report, December 31,1886 to Thomas White, Minister of the Interior.

[18]Sessional Papers, 1887, No. 7, Part I, "Annual Report of Superintendent of Mines", p. 24.

[19]E.A. Mitchner, "William Pearce: Father of Alberta Irrigation", (Unpublished Master's Thesis), University of Alberta, 1966. (Hereafter cited as Mitchner, William Pearce).

[20]Sessional Papers, 1886, No. 8, "Annual Report of the Superintendent of Mines", pp. 19-20.

[21]PARC Box 162038, File W. 2 #1; F.W. Godsal to William Pearce, September 12, 1893.

[22]Mitchner, William Pearce, p. 32.

[23]Sessional Papers, 1900, Part IX, "Report of the Chief Inspector of Timber and Forestry for Canada", p. 6.

[24]PARC Box 162038, File W. 2 #1; A.M. Burgess to Hon. T. Mayne Daly, November 18, 1893.

[25]Ibid., William Pearce, Superintendent of Mines, to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, September 23, 1893.

[26]The perimeters of the reserve enclosed one and a half townships, - the west half of township 1 and the south-west quarter of township 2, range 29, west of the fourth meridian; and the east half of township 1, and the south-east quarter of township 2, range 30, west of the fourth meridian.

[27]PARC Box 162038, loc. cit., Memorandum by T.M.D. [aly] to A.M.B. [urgess] .

[28]Ibid., W.I. Margach to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, May 4, 1906. For further elaboration on Margach's letter, see Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 184-187.

[29]The gate and notices complained of by F.W. Godsal were a fence and "no trespassing" signs posted by the Western Coal and Oil Company. Picnickers were apparently using the company's pasture to graze their horses.

[30]PARC Box 162038, W. 2 Vol. I; R.H. Campbell to W.I. Margach, May 27, 1907.

[31]Rodney, Kootenai Brown, p. 185.

[32]The transfer of these lands is discussed in Chapter IV, Part I, Sub-section i.

[33]One of the best studies of the United States national park system, and the influence of the American conservation movement, is John Ise, Our National Park Policy, A Critical History. Baltimore: John Hopkins Press, 1961.

[34]The first two decades of the twentieth century witnessed the publication of many books which glorified the beauty, grandeur and mysticism of the Rocky Mountains. Some examples are: H.E.M. Stutfield and J. Norman Collie, Climbs and Explorations in the Canadian Rockies (London: Longmans, Green & Co., 1903); James Outram, In the Heart of the Canadian Rockies (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1905); Charles W. Stokes, Round About the Rockies (Toronto: The Musson Book Company, 1923); W.D. Wilcox, The Rockies of Canada (New York: G.P. Putnam's Sons, 1909).

[35]Sylvia M. Van Kirk, "The Development of National Park Policy in Canada's Mountain National Parks 1885 to 1930" (Unpublished Master's Thesis), University of Alberta, 1969. Hereafter cited as Van Kirk, National Park Policy.

[36]These included the Rocky Mountains Park, Yoho, Glacier, Jasper, Elk Island, and Buffalo (Wainwright).

[37]R.H. Campbell had been an officer of the Department of the Interior since 1887, administering grazing lands. In 1905 he was appointed Chief of the Timber Branch, and then as Superintendent of Forestry on March 1, 1907. As Director of the Forestry Branch, Campbell had a great influence on park policy, which he approached from a very practical viewpoint in terms of its usefulness to resource use and management.

[38]Pearce Papers, Box 11, File 9-3, Commission of Conservation, 1909.

[39]Van Kirk, National Park Policy, p. 26; Rodney, Kootenai Brown, p. 191.

[40]Sessional Papers, 1910, No. 25, Part VII, "Report of the Superintendent of Forestry and Irrigation", pp. 40-41.

[41]PARC Box 162126, W. 46 Vol. I; R.H. Campbell to H. Douglas, December 30, 1909. Douglas' first question upon receipt of the letter was "Please let me have Mr. Brown's address". Ibid., H. Douglas to R.H. Campbell, January 6, 1910.

[42]PARC Ibid., Memorandum: R.H. Campbell to W.W. Cory, November 25, 1909. Marked "Approved, F.O.". The suggestion for Kootenai Brown's appointment came from John Herron, M.P., in a letter to the Forestry Branch, August 19, 1909. (Cited by Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 191-192).

[43]Ibid., To His Excellency The Governor-General in Council, December 31, 1909. The stated area included the west half of township 1, and the south-west quarter of township 2, range 29, west of the fourth meridian; the east half of township 1, and the south-east quarter of township 2, range 30, west of the fourth meridian,- that is, the original 54 square miles.

[44]PARC Ibid., "Regulations for the Administration of the Kootenay Lakes Forest Reserve".

[45]PARC Box 162038, W. 2 Vol I; Memorandum: Forestry Branch to Mr. E.F. Drake, May 21, 1910. Initialled "F.H.B. [yshe] ".

*CHAPTER IV - Waterton Lakes National Park: Administration and Development, 1911 - 1937*

Part I

[1]PARC, Box 162126, W. 46 #1; Howard Douglas to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, November 23, 1910.

[2]The correspodence between the park officials and J.B. Ferguson is found in the PARC, Box 162038, W. 2 #1, See also Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 200-201.

[3]PARC, Box 162038, W. 46 #1; Memorandum: J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, March 20, 1912. Marked "Approved", signed "J.A. Cote" (Minister of the Interior).

[4]PAC, R.G. 15, File B-8C, Vol. I; "Agreement Between His Majesty the King, Represented by the Honorable The Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs and The Governor and Company of Adventures of England Trading into Hudson's Bay, December 23, 1924".

[5]The negotiations were carried on intermittently over a long period of time. The correspondence regarding the Company's land in the park is found at PARC, Box 162038, W. 2 #1. The first letter on record is from C.C. Chipman, Commissioner of Hudson's Bay Company, to the Superintendent of the Forestry Branch, April 8, 1909. For maps and particulars on the location of the Hudson's Bay lands see the Waterton Library Records, File N 14.

[6]PARC, Box 162696, W. 16-3 Vol. I; The President of the Waterton Oil, Land, and Power Company to Howard Douglas, December 27, 1910. The land on which the sawmill was located had originally been rented from the Hudson's Bay Co., but with the establishment of the park it was included with the blocks of land being taken over by the Crown. Although the land was treated as Crown property, and exact legal standing of the property was unclear until the final agreement of transfer was signed in 1924. The government was therefore reluctant to forcibly evict the sawmill operators.

[7]PARC, Ibid., H. Douglas to The Secretary, January 9. 1911.

[8]Ibid.,; L. Pereira, Assistant Secretary, to H. Douglas, January 31, 1913.

[9]Ibid.,___to R.M. Brown, Forest Supervisor, Pincher Creek, March 17, 1913. The company planned to cut its logs on the American side and float them down the Waterton Lakes to the mill.

[10]Ibid., R.M. Brown, Forest Supervisor, to R.H. Campbell, Director of Forestry, April 12, 1913.

[11]Ibid., L. Pereira, The Secretary, to _____ , May 8, 1913.

[12]Ibid., Memorandum: R.H. Campbell to W.W. Cory, April 1, 1914.

[13]Ibid., Memorandum: Mr. Miller, Re. Waterton Oil, Land and Power Co., October 25, 1913.

[14]Ibid., R.C. McDonald, Fire and Game Warden, to Superintendent Cooper, February 23, 1915.

[15]Ibid., P.C. Barnard-Hervey to the Commissioner, April 23, 1915.

[16]Ibid., Memorandum: Mr. Cory, July 3, 1915.

[17]Ibid., Chief Superintendent to R. Cooper, September 10, 1915.

[18]Ibid., Commissioner of Police Carpenter's Report, April 10, 1916.

[19]Copy of Schedule of Wells Drilled for Oil and Gas Prior to 1949. This company was originally the "Pincher Creek Oil Co., Ltd.", which had been active in the 1905-06 period.

[20]PARC, Box 162709, File W. 29-1; Memorandum to W.W. Cory from H.H.R., December 29, 1919.

[21]The Original Discovery Oil Company Limited Prospectus, 1914.

[22]Copy of the Schedule of Wells Drilled for Oil and Gas Prior to 1949.

[23]PARC, Box 162709, File W. 29-1, H.H. Rowatt to J.S.T. Alexander, April 21, 1914.

[24]Ibid., W.W. Ross to W.W. Cory, Deputy Minister of the Interior, July 3, 1919. Marked "Personal". The petroleum regulations were not extended to include the parks in accordance with advice received from the British Admiralty in 1919 that the Canadian government withhold for its own use a portion of the petroleum reserves in western Canada.

[25]Ibid., T.W. Dwight, Forestry Branch, to W.W. Cory, July 18, 1919.

[26]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Application of J.S. T. Alexander, J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, July 25, 1919.

[27]Waterton Library, File N 12: The Superintendent to the Commissioner, October 13, 1919, "Report on Oil City Fire".

[28]PARC, Box 162709, File W. 29-1, Memorandum: J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, December 20, 1919.

[29]Ibid., R.A. Gibson, Acting Deputy Minister of the Interior, to Arthur Meighen, January 8, 1920.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to J.H. King, Minister of the Department of Public Works, October 14, 1922. Commissioner Harkin was writing in response to a suggestion by King that the parks be opened to commercial development, and he asked that J.S.T. Alexander's application be given every consideration.

[32]Ibid., W.D. Cromarty to The Commissioner, August 10, 1925.

[33]Ibid., Superintendent Knight to W.M. Connacher, July 4, 1926.

[34]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 160, U. 3 #4; Memorandum: F.H.H. Williamson, September 19, 1916; and J.B. Harkin to Benjamin Lawton, Chief Game Guardian for Alberta, September 22, 1916. The rule came into effect in 1916 in compliance with a request from the federal parks department.

[35]The land title was apparently held in trust for a Mrs. Elma Martin Desbrisay and a Mrs. Elizabeth Barber McKay of Okotoks. See Waterton Library, File 3 C, Lineham Estate.

[36]Ibid., J.W. McNicol, Inspector of the Trust and Guarantee Co., Ltd., Lethbridge, to H. Knight, April 29, 1931.

[37]Lethbridge Herald, July 28, 1932.

[38]PARC, Box 162709, W. 29-1, Patrick to H.H. Rowatt, Deputy Minister of the Interior, March 17, 1932.

[39]Ibid., Memorandum: J.B. Harkin to Mr. Rowatt. Re Drilling for Oil on Lineham Property, Waterton Lakes Park, by L. Patrick, April 6, 1932.

[40]PARC, Box 162709, W. 29-1; H.H. Rowatt, Deputy Minister, to L. Patrick, April 30, 1932.

[41]Ibid., Enclosed clippings - Lethbridge Herald, July 28, 1932; August 26, 1932, September 10, 1932.

[42]Ibid., Enclosed clipping - Lethbridge Herald, July 24, 1933.

[43]Ibid., Superintendent Knight to The Commissioner, July 4, 1933.

[44]Ibid., J.M. Wardle to the Commissioner, October 20, 1933.

[45]Ibid., H. Knight to The Commissioner, December 11, 1935.

[46]PARC, Box 162126, W. 46, Vol. I: Memorandum: E. Deville, Surveyor General, to E.F. Drake, June 7, 1910.

[47]Sessional Papers, 1912, No. 25, Part V, "Report of the Superintendent of Waterton Lakes Park", March 23, 1911, p. 14, See Map II.

[48]PARC, Box 162697, W. 20; Superintendent Robert Cooper to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, April 17, 1918.

[49]PARC, Box 162697, W. 20 Vol. I; Commissioner Douglas to The Secretary, November 23, 1910.

[50]PARC, Box 162126, W. 46 Vol. I; J.G. Brown to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, July 27, 1910.

[51A]Ibid., Howard Douglas to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, March 1, 1911.

[51B]PARC, Box 162697, W. 20 Vol. I; J.G. Brown to the Commissioner, August 14, 1912.

[52]The first dance hall was located at Waterton Mills, near the Hanson sawmill on Maskinonge Lake. It was a crude open air frame building used only on special occasions. (Interview with Henry L. Newly, June 1970, Waterton Lakes National Park. Mr. Newly's family owned a ranch south of the park).

[53]Sessional Papers, 1913, No. 25, Part V, "Report of the Superintendent of Water", p. 53.

[54]The minimum cost level was raised to eight hundred dollars in 1920, and periodically thereafter.

[55]PAC, R.G., 84, Vol. 172, U. 3-4, "Building Regulations 1912".

[56]PARC, Box 162697, W. 20 #1; The Commissioner to Superintendent Brown, May 20, 1914.

[57]Ibid., The Secretary, National Parks Branch, to Superintendent Cooper, August 24, 1915. PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 172, U 3-4; The Commissioner to the Superintendent, Waterton Lakes Park, March 13, 1918.

[58]"Regulations for the General Management and Control of the National Parks", as set down in the 1911 National Parks Act.

[59]In one of his letters Kootenai Brown wrote, "Some people have plotted to make a "land grab" and take in Cameron Falls. I am glad to hear that their scheme failed". (PARC Box 162696, W. 16-5, J.G. Brown to The Commissioner, October 27, 1912).

[60]R. Scace, Banff, p. 63.

[61]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 174, U. 3-2, R. Cooper to The Commissioner of Public Works, December 19, 1917. Cooper was responding to a draft copy of proposed changes in the regulations which was circulated among the Superintendents for their comments.

[62]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 172, U. 3-4 (1912-1920); The Commissioner to the Superintendent of Waterton Lakes Park, March 13, 1918.

[63]Ibid.

[64]R.C. Brown, National Parks Policy, pp. 102-103.

[65]PAC, R.G. 10, Vol. 241, Memorandum: R.H. Campbell to W.W. Cory, March 17, 1913.

[66]Sessional Papers, 1913, No. 25, Part V, Dominion Parks, "Report of the Superintendent of Waterton Lake Park", p. 52.

[67]Pearce Papers, Box 47, File 20-2, William Pearce to The Secretary, Department of the Interior, April 11, 1913.

[68]Sessional Papers, 1913, No. 25, Part V, "Report of the Chief Superintendent of Dominion Parks", April 1, 1912, p. 16.

[69]Throughout this report, all references to Glacier National Park mean the American Park and not Glacier Park in the Canadian Rockies.

[70]Ibid., "Report of the Superintendent of Waterton Lake Park", April 1, 1912, p. 52.

[71]PAC, R.G. 22B-2, Vol. 94; R.B. Bennett, M.P., to J.B. Harkin, March 16, 1914.

[72]P.C. 1165, June 24, 1914. The order in council also enlarged the boundary of Jasper National Park. The precise description for Waterton Lakes was: "Commencing at the North Kootenay Pass, through the summit of the Rocky Mountains Forest Reserve, as defined by the Forest Reserves and Parks Act of the 19th day of May, 1911; Thence following the boundaries of the said Rocky Mountains Forest Reserve in an easterly and southerly direction to the International Boundary; thence northerly along the said summit to the point of commencement, containing approximately an area of four hundred and twenty-three (423) square miles". In 1921 the park was reduced to 220 square miles and the boundary was revised in 1955 to its present area of almost 203 square miles. See Table I.

[73]Pearce Papers, Box 47, File 20-2, Memorandum Re. Dominion Parks, to Hon. W.J. Roche, Minister of the Interior, January 24, 1914.

[74]Quoted in William Rodney, Kootenai Brown, p. 208. Although Kootenai Brown is generally referred to as the park's first Superintendent, and even he and his superiors freely employed the term, his official title was Chief Fire Guardian and Ranger.

[75]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 94; R.B. Bennett, M.P. to J.B. Harkin, November 28, 1913.

[76]Sessional Papers, 1916, No. 25, Part V, "Report of Superintendent of Dominion Parks", p. 13.

[77]Rodney, Kootenai Brown, p. 209.

[78]The writer was unable to find any of these diaries, which would have offered an invaluable record of developments in the park. It would appear that the only diaries extant are a few written by Kootenai Brown, now on deposit in the Departmental Library, National and Historic Parks Branch, Ottawa.

[79]PAC, R.G. 22 B-1, Vol. 71, U. 194-2; "Instructions to Game and Fire Wardens Employed in the Rocky Mountain Park", dated October, 1912.

[80]Although no complete diaries are available, extracts were frequently copied from the diaries, and from these documents it is possible to have some cognizance of the work performed by park wardens. The monthly reports and diaries sent to Ottawa were all destroyed with the exception of Kootenai Brown's.

[81]Waterton Library, File N 5; J.B. Harkin to the Superintendent, February 23, 1918; The Superintendent to All Wardens, January 21, 1918.

[82]Waterton Library, File N 2; J.B. Harkin to F.E. Maunder, July 12, 1918.

[83]PMAA, Accn. # 70.190, Box 19, W. 189-1; Extract from Warden William Henderson's diary for May, 1917.

[84]Waterton Library, "The History of Waterton", Vol. I, Extract from the Report of the Chief Superintendent, 1917.

[85]PMAA, Accn. # 69.218, A.W. 189-2; Memorandum: A.C. Sparks to J.B. Harkin, October 10, 1921. Harkin's reply was written in the margin.

[86]Waterton Library, File N 2, J.B. Harkin to F.E. Maunder, July 15, 1918.

[87]Waterton Library, File N 2; F.E. Maunder to George Allison, Chief Fire and Game Warden, July 22, 1918. Enclosure: "Duties of the Chief Game Warden".

[88]Waterton Library, File N 2, F.E. Maunder to J.B. Harkin, August 22, 1918.

[89]PAC, R.G. 22 B-2, Vol. 94; J.B. Harkin to R.B. Bennett, M.P., June 13, 1912.

[90]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to R.B. Bennett, September 26, 1912. Marked "Personal".

[91]In 1918 a directive was sent to all park Superintendents saying that "Patronage lists have been abolished, and in making purchases, prices should be obtained from as many firms as possible". All purchases over twenty-five dollars were submitted to the War Purchasing Commission for approval. (Waterton Library, File N 7; J.B. Harkin to F.E. Maunder, June 11, 1918).

[92]Waterton Library, File 3 B; Donald Matheson to J.B. Harkin, October 27, 1915.

[93]Waterton Library, File 3 D, passim. For example, the Commissioner asked the Superintendent several times to send quotations on wire required for fencing (June 27, 1917), or to enclose a map showing the location and length of fire guards ploughed by the staff (June 18, 1917).

[94]Ibid., Donald Matheson to J.B. Harkin, October 27, 1915.

[95]PARC, Box 162127, W. 179; P.C. Barnard-Hervey, Chief Superintendent of Parks, to The Commissioner, December 23, 1915.

[96]Ibid, J.B. Harkin to Silas M. Carpenter, December 17, 1915.

[97]Ibid., Report by the Commissioner of Police to J.B. Harkin, February 4, 1916.

[98]Ibid., The Commissioner to P.C. Barnard-Hervey, February 17, 1916.

[99]Ibid., Report of Testimony taken before B.W. Collison, Commissioner of Police, Lethbridge, February 22 and 23, 1917.

[100]Ibid., H.E. Sibbald, Chief Game Warden, R.M.P., to P.C. Barnard-Hervey, March 9, 1918.

[101]Ibid., P.C. Barnard-Hervey to J.B. Harkin, March 18, 1918.

[102]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, April 20, 1918.

[103]Waterton Library, File N 2; J.B. Harkin to F.E. Maunder, June 12, 1918.

[104]PARC, Box 162127, W. 179; F.E. Maunder to J.B. Harkin, September 24, 1918. "Charge Against Chief Warden".

[105]Ibid., Memorandum: J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, August 13, 1918. Initialled: "I concur. WWC".

[106]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 239, U. 170-5. Memorandum; J.A. Cote, Acting Deputy Minister, to J.B. Harkin, August 12, 1914.

[107]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 85, U. 336-1; Memorandum; RE Employment of Labour, W.W. Cory, March 16, 1920.

[108]Waterton Library, File 3 B; H.E. Sibbald to J.B. Harkin, April 19, 1916.

[109]The construction of telephone lines was commenced in 1917 but the quality of the contract work led to frequent washouts and blowdowns.

[110]PMAA, Accn. # 70.190, W. 66; J.B. Harkin to P.C. Barnard-Hervey, December 16, 1912.

[111]PARC, Box 162038, W. 2 # 1; Enclosure: Lethbridge Herald, January 21, 1914.

[112]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 59, U. 62, Vol. I; The Commissioner to The Superintendents of National Parks. Memorandum: Trail Specifications, January 15, 1920.

[113]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 202, U. 60 #1: Memorandum: William Pearce, April 8, 1913. The research for the report and the maps employed in drafting the paper are found in the Pearce Papers, Box 83, File 27-B-25.

[114]PARC, Box 162038, W. 2 # 1; P.C. Barnard-Hervey to J.B. Harkin, March 9, 1915.

[115]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to the Chief Superintendent, Dominion Parks, April 15, 1915.

[116]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 202, U. 60 # 1, Memorandum: J.M. Wardle to J.B. Harkin, May 4, 1917.

[117]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 429, W. 60 # 2; P.C. Barnard-Hervey to The Commissioner November 29, 1917.

[118]Waterton Library, File N 2; F.E. Maunder to J.B. Harkin, August 16, 1918.

[119]The trail today follows roughly the same road which extents from Red Rock Canyon road to Crandell Lake, and over the summit down to the Historic Sites cairn marking Oil City along the Akamina Highway.

[120]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 429, W. 60 # 1, The Chief Superintendent to The Commissioner, July 12, 1917.

[121]Waterton Library, File N 11; E.H. Crandell, President of the Southern Alberta Conservative Association, to Robert Cooper, April 27, 1918.

[122]Waterton Libary, File N 2; F.E. Maunder to J.B. Harkin, August 16, 1918.

[123]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 202, U. 60 # 1; Memorandum: J.M. Wardle to J.B. Harkin, May 1, 1918.

[124]Ibid., George A. Bevan to The Commissioner, December 13, 1919.

[125]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 429, W. 60 #2; F.M. Steel, Engineer, to the Acting Chief Engineer, October 30, 1919.

[126]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 203, U. 60 # 2; James W. Davidson, President of the Calgary Good Roads Association, to J.B. Harkin, July 24, 1920.

[127]Ibid.

[128]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 432, W. 60-4; H.M. Albright, Acting Director, National Park Service, Washington, D.C., to J.B. Harkin, May, 10, 1919.

[129]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 432, W. 60-4; J.B. Harkin to H.M. Albright, May 13, 1919.

[130]Western Regional Office, Calgary, Engineers' Correspondence; J.M. Wardle to J.B. Harkin, November 15, 1917.

[131]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; J.G. Brown to Chief Superintendent, July 3, 1912: Telegram: F.H.H. Williamson, Parks Branch, to J.G. Brown, 1912; Memorandum: Re. game protection, (initialled) "F.H.H. W." September 11, 1912.

[132]Henry Riviere was born in Brittany of French and American parents in 1867. He was educated at a French naval school and went to sea. His family settled in the southern United States, and he later moved to Montana as a cowboy. He came to Calgary in 1883 to work as a cowhand, and then went into partnership with John Herron to raise Clydesdale horses on a ranch near Pincher Creek. He died at Pincher Creek on June 30, 1956 at the age of 89. (Lethbridge Herald, July 7, 1956).

[133]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; H. Riviere to J.B. Harkin, October 29, 1916. Marked "Personal".

[134]Waterton Library, File 3 B; Henry Riviere to H.E. Sibbald, August 5, 1916.

[135]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 74, U. 300 # 1; Memorandum: for W.J. Roche, Minister of the Interior, November 18, 1913.

[136]Ibid., Report of H. Riviere, Game Guardian, to B. Lawton, Chief Game Warden, July 4, 1913.

[137]Ibid., E.L. Newcombe, Law Clerk, to W.W. Cory, Deputy Minister of the Interior, June 17, 1913. All previous powers granted to Wardens under the Rocky Mountains Park Act had been repealed by a new law, Section 22 of Chapter 10, Statues of 1911.

[138]Ibid., Report of H. Riviere, Provincial Game Guardian, to the Chief Game Guardian, n.d. [1914] , Re. Conditions in S.W. Alberta in the Vicinitie(sic) of New Waterton Lakes Park.

[139]Henry Riviere's statement is verified by a memorandum to W.J. Roche, November 18, 1913 (loc. cit.) which states that the public had accepted "the inviolability" of the parks, and that few infractions had been reported.

[140]For a fuller enunciation of the differences between the Forestry and Parks Branches, see PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 160, U. 3 # 3; Two memoranda to J.B. Harkin, dated January 17, 1914 and January 19, 1914.

[141]Waterton Library, File 3B; "Memorandum on Decision of Northern Boundary of the Waterton Lakes Park, .." by H.E. Sibbald, Parks Branch, and E.H. Finlayson, Dominion Forestry Branch, July 28, 1916.

[142]PARC, Box 162696, W. 16-5; Chief Ranger, J.G. Brown to the Commissioner, November 12, 1912.

[143]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 258; Report on Elk in Waterton Lakes Park, by Dr. Ian McTaggert Cowan, August 8, 1945. Riggall was referring to the Belly River area. In 1918 approximately one hundred head of elk were reported in the northern portion of the park by Warden Andrew Bowers. (PARC Box 162127, W. 179. Report on Waterton Park by H.E. Sibbald, March 9, 1918, loc. cit.).

[144]The story of the elk in Waterton Park is found in PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 258.

[145]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; J.G. Brown to Chief Superintendent, July 9, 1912.

[146]Ibid., H. Douglas to J.G. Brown, July 3, 1912.

[147]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 74, U. 300 # 1; J.B. Harkin to H. Douglas, Chief Superintendent, January 30, 1912.

[148]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; Robert Cooper to the Chief Superintendent, November 8, 1915.

[149]Waterton Library, File N 5; The Superintendent to J.B. Harkin, May 26, 1917.

[150]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, December 4, 1917.

[151]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; The Commissioner to The Superintendent, March 29, 1917.

[152]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 74, U. 300 # 1; J.B. Harkin to Charles Barber, Chief Game Warden, Manitoba, March 30, 1917.

[153]Ibid., Enclosures: for example, "A Successful Bait for Wolves;" "A Successful Wolf Scent"; et passim.

[154]Commissioner Harkin wrote a personal letter to each man congratulating him for his perserverence and work in bringing about the arrests.

[155]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; F.E. Maunder to J.B. Harkin, April 19, 1919.

[156]Ibid., H. Riviere to J.B. Harkin, August 20, 1919.

[157]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to H. Riviere, September 9, 1919.

[158]Rodney, Kootenai Brown, pp. 158, 180, 189.

[159]Ibid., H.B. Harkin to H. Riviere, September 9, 1919.

[160]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90. W. 300 # 1; Memorandum by Chief of the Animal Division, March 28, 1919.

[161]The correspondence is on file in PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; with some additional material located in the Waterton Library.

[162]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; Robert Cooper to The Commissioner, July 28, 1917.

[163]Ibid., The Commissioner to The Superintendent, October 30, 1916.

[164]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 1; Memorandum: Chief of the Animal Division to J.B. Harkin, April 25, 1919.

[165]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 183, U. 3-13; Memorandum: Mr. York from T.G. Rothwell, June 11, 1907.

[166]Ibid., Howard Douglas, Superintendent of Rocky Mountains Park, to The Secretary, July 19, 1907.

[167]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 183, U. 3-13: Howard Douglas to J.A. Cote, Acting Deputy Minister of the Interior, April 1, 1908.

[168]P.C. 1331, May 21, 1914.

[169]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 183, U. 3-13: The Commissioner to all Superintendents, August 11, 1914.

[170]A list of all the people holding permits in Waterton Lakes during 1917, with the areas designated for their use, is found in PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 258.

[171]PARC, Box 162127, W. 179; Report on Waterton Lakes Park, by H.E. Sibbald, Chief Game Warden, to P.C. Barnard-Hervey, March 9, 1918.

[172]Waterton Library, N 2; --to R.C. McDonald, July 5, 1918. "Instructions to Grazing Inspector McDonald".

[173]Waterton Library, File N 2; Memorandum Re. Game and Grazing Matters in Waterton Lakes Park and Adjoining Game Preserve, June 11, 1918. (Signed) Maxwell Graham, Chief of the Animal Division. These were essentially the same rules applied by the United States in its parks. (See Ibid., Stephen T. Mather, Director U.S. National Park Service, to J.B. Harkin, February 21, 1918).

[174]Waterton Library, File N 7; Andrew Bower to the Superintendent, November 30, 1919.

[175]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 #1; The Commissioner to F.E. Maunder, November 30, 1919.

Part II - *The Conservation and Recreational Period, 1920 - 1937*

[1]Pearce Papers, Box 47, File 20-2; Memorandum on park policy dated January 24, 1914.

[2]Waterton Library, File 3D: The Superintendent to The Commissioner, September 11, 1919. The requests for lots were delayed pending approval of the town plan by the Surveyor General, and until a decision had been made on a proposed irrigation dam.

[3]Waterton Library, File N 21; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, November 18, 1919.

[4]Waterton Library, File N 6; George A. Bevan to J.B. Harkin, November 12, 1919.

[5]Waterton Library, File N 21; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, November 18, 1919.

[6]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 40, W. 300 # 1; Enclosure: Calgary Herald, March 30, 1921.

[7]PARC, Box 162696, W. 16-22; W.A. Buchanan to J.B. Harkin, February 26, 1934. W.A. Buchanan's interest in, and love for, the park gave rise to his unofficial title "Senator from Waterton". A brief description of his work for Waterton Lakes Park is found in: C.F. Steele, Prairie Editor, The Life and Times of Buchanan of Lethbridge, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1961), pp. 120-125.

[8]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to W.A. Buchanan, March 5, 1934.

[9]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 89, W. 182-3; Youth Training Program Progress Reports, 1939.

[10]Waterton Library, File N 6; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, May 11, 1921. April Report.

[11]Waterton Library, File N 21; H. Knight to The Commissioner, September 25, 1919. An appropriation was made for tennis courts in 1916, but they were not finished owing to the war.

[12]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, October 1919.

[13]Ibid., The Superintendent to The Commissioner, November 18, 1919.

[14]Waterton Library, File N6; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, July 15, 1920.

[15]Waterton Library, File N 11; J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, October 30, 1919.

[16]Waterton Library, File N 19; J.B. Harkin to F.E. Maunder, June 9, 1919.

[17]Detailed information regarding the cost, size and location of the above mentioned buildings is found in Waterton Library, File N 11; and PMAA, Accn # 70.190, Box 17, W. 56-2.

[18]Waterton Library, File 0 18; Memorandum: Fishing Waters in Waterton Lakes Park, 1921.

[19]Waterton Library, File N 14; Memorandum for Director Mather Regarding Visit of August 9, 1924 to Waterton Lakes Park Canada. Written by Chas. J. Kaebel, Superintendent Glacier National Park.

[20]Lethbridge Herald, July 16, 1951, "St. Mary Dam Edition".

[21]PARC, Box 162709, W. 39; V.A. Newhall, hydrographer, to F.H. Peters, Commissioner of Irrigation, December 3, 1915. "Reconnaissance Survey - Oil Creek, etc".

[22]A large variety of memoranda, briefs, policy statements, booklets and pamphlets concerning the Commission's work is found in the Pearce Papers, Box 11, File 9-5.

[23]The Irrigation Branch was superceded by the Reclamation Service in 1918, which was again reorganized as the Water Power and Hydrometric Bureau in 1924.

[24]Waterton Library, File N 12; E.F. Drake to J.B. Harkin, November 5, 1919.

[25]Waterton Library, File N 21; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, November 18, 1919.

[26]Ibid., The Superintendent to The Commissioner, December 8, 1919.

[27]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to E.F. Drake, November 8, 1919.

[28]Waterton Library, File 3 D; J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, December 10, 1919.

[29]Waterton Library, File N 21; J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, November 17, 1919.

[30]Ibid., Report on Waterton Lakes Reservoir, August 5, 1920. by P.H. Peters.

[31]PAC, R.G. 87, Vol. 87, W. 41 # 2; Reclamation Service, Memorandum: Re. Use of Waterton Lakes as a storage reservoir, n.d.

[32]Waterton Library, File N 21; Criticism of Commissioner Peters' Report on the Waterton Lakes Reservoir, August 5, 1920.

[33]Ibid., G. Bevan to J.B. Harkin February 2, 1922.

[34]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to G. Bevan, December 28, 1921.

[35]Irrigation Review, V. No. 3 (October, 1923), p. 44. The National Parks Branch files contain numerous extracts from American publications such as the Engineering News-Record and the "Bulletin" (Issued by the U.S. National Parks Association).

[36]In recognition of Dimsdale's active support in the irrigation fight, Superintendent Cromarty suggested naming a lake in the park after him. (Waterton Library, File 3 A; W.D. Cromarty to J.B. Harkin, September 27, 1929). The request was turned down.

[37]Waterton Library, File N 21; Letter to the editor, Lethbridge Herald, November 3, 1921, signed by L.E. Dimsdale.

[38]Ibid., G.A. Bevan to L.E. Dimsdale, July 5, 1922.

[39]Ibid., Superintendent Bevan to L.E. Dimsdale, December 12, 1921.

[40]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 87, W. 41 # 2; E.F. Drake, Director, Reclamation Service to V. Meek, Acting Commissioner of Irrigation, Calgary, January 11, 1922.

[41]Ibid., V. Meek to E.F. Drake, January 21, 1922.

[42]Ibid., Enclosure: Lethbridge Herald, February 27, 1922. Italics mine. It is significant that the petitions mentioned the Narrows project specifically, and were not supporting irrigation dams merely on principle.

[43]Henry Riviere suggested moving the drought stricken ranchers and farmers from Southern Alberta to the northern part of the province, thereby eliminating the need for irrigation dams, (Ibid., H. Riviere to J.B. Harkin, May, 3, 1922). Later, assistance was given settlers in drought stricken areas in Saskatchewan and Alberta who wanted to move to other agricultural regions in their province. (P.C. 2181, October 21, 1922).

[44]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 87, W. 41 # 2; J.B. Harkin to A.O. Weese, Ecological Society of America, June 1, 1922. The American association was dedicated to combatting all attempts by commercial interests to exploit the American National Parks.

[45]Waterton Library, File N 21; Supervising Warden H. Knight to The Commissioner, March 9, 1922.

[46]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 87, W. 41 # 2; E.F. Drake to the Deputy Minister of the Interior, February 3, 1921.

[47]Commissioner Harkin was likely referring to an eighty-six page memorandum presented to W.W. Cory, dated March 25, 1922. It was a comprehensive recapitulation of the arguments presented by the Reclamation Service in favour of the Waterton Dam, and the Parks Branch refutation of those arguments. This chapter has been based entirely on documents still present in the National Parks files, and not on this lengthy memorandum which presents extensive statistical data, maps, and employs lengthy quotations from inter-departmental memoranda. The report recapitulates many (but not all) of the views already presented here, especially with reference to overall park policy. A copy of the report is available in the Waterton Library for reference in conjunction with this chapter.

[48]Waterton Library, File N 21; J.B. Harkin to G. Bevan, march 6, 1922.

[49]Ibid., Supervising Warden Knight to The Commissioner, March 9, 1922.

[50]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 87, W. 41 # 3; J.B. Harkin to F.W. Alexander, Divisional Engineer, C.P.R. Co., May 26, 1922.

[51]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to F.J. Lewis, University of Alberta, Edmonton, May 26, 1922. The only power development producing electricity for consumption outside of a park was at Lake Minnewanka, Banff. Such developments in a national park could only be authorized by an Act of Parliament. The question of setting a precedent was a vital issue because, at this time, there was a similar controversy concerning the development of Spray Lakes in Banff National Park as a hydroelectric dam.

[52]Ibid., "Bulletin", loc. cit.

[53]Ibid., G.B. Grinnell to J.B. Harkin, February 20, 1922.

[54]The society advocated the preservation of representative areas in their natural condition for scientific studies in order to study the relationship of animals and plants to their environment.

[55]A voluminous file dealing with Blood Timber Berth No. 776 is found in PARC Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vols. I, II and III.

[56]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. I; A.E. Forget, Assistant Indian Commissioner, to the Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, September 15, 1890.

[57]Ibid., Hayter Reed, Deputy Superintendent General of Indian Affairs, to A.M. Burgess, Deputy Minister of the Interior, January 19, 1895.

[58]Ibid., J.D. McLean, Secretary, Department of Indian Affairs, to P.G. Keyes, Secretary, Department of the Interior, April 24, 1901.

[59]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. III; Department of the Interior to Indian Affairs Branch, March 5, 1904.

[60]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. I; A.G. Smith, Crown Timber Inspector, to the Crown Timber Agent, Calgary, June 18, 1915.

[61]Ibid., A.G. Smith to the Crown Timber Agent, Calgary, November 5, 1915.

[62]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to Mr. York, Controller, Timber and Grazing, Lands Branch, March 17, 1917.

[63]Ibid., J.D. McLean, Assistant Deputy and Secretary of Indian Affairs, to B.L. York, Controller, Timber and Grazing Lands Branch, May 3, 1917.

[64]Ibid., J.D. McLean to B.L. York, July 8, 1919.

[65]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. II; Memorandum for J.B. Harkin, August 19, 1919.

[66]Ibid., J.D. McLean to J.B. Harkin, October 16, 1919.

[67]Ibid., J.D. McLean to J.B. Harkin, October 16, 1919.

[68]Ibid., J.P. Faunt, Indian Agent to The Superintendent, April 15, 1925.

[69]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. II; Memorandum Re. Rights to Timber (Dry or Green) Indian Timber Limit, Waterton Park, November 8, 1934.

[70]Waterton Library, File 0 9; H. Knight to General J.S. Stewart, December 23, 1932.

[71]Ibid., J.E. Pugh, Indian Agent, to Superintendent Knight, October 31, 1932.

[72]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to H.A. Riviere, November 15, 1932.

[73]Ibid, J.B. Harkin to A.S. Williams, Assistant Deputy and Departmental Solicitor, Department of Indian Affairs, January 29, 1934.

[74]Waterton Library, File 0 9; Quoted in J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, March 9, 1934.

[75]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. II; Memorandum Re. Rights to Timber .... November 8, 1934.

[76]Waterton Library, File 0 9; H. Knight to J.B. Harkin, June 17, 1935.

[77]Ibid., H. Knight to J.E. Pugh, June 17, 1935.

[78]PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. II; Quoted in Memorandum Re. Blook Indian Timer Limit "A", October 26 1936. A chronological summary of the correspondence and events, from 1882 to 1936, leading to the Justice Department's decision, is found in PARC, Box 162041, W. 206-776, Vol. III.

[79]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Timber Limit "A".... through which the Belly River Road passes, May 6, 1936.

[80]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Blood Indian Timber Limit "A", October 26, 1936.

[81]Waterton Libraty, File N 9; J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, February 16, 1921.

[82]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, March 1, 1921. Mountain lions reportedly killed one deer per week, as well as posing a threat to the cattle.

[83]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 74, W. 300 #2; Memorandum Re. Destruction of Predatory Animals. 1920-21 report by Maxwell Graham, Director Park Animals.

[84]Ibid., Memorandum for W.W. Cory, August 25, 1922.

[85]Waterton Library, File N 16; Supervising Warden to The Superintendent, April 13, 1923.

[86]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, June 2, 1924.

[87]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 #2; The Commissioner to The Superintendent, September 30, 1924.

[88]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 75, U. 399 # 3; The Commissioner to All Superintendents, January 31, 1925.

[89]Ibid., A.E. Cross to W.W. Cory, January 26, 1925.

[90]Ibid., Department of the Interior to A.E. Cross, January 21, 1925.

[91]Ibid., A.E. Cross to W.W. Cory, May 5, 1925.

[92]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 75, U. 300 # 3; Memorandum: W.W. Cory, Re. Predatory Animals, Rocky Mountains Park, May 20, 1925.

[93]Waterton Library, File 0 2; J.B. Harkin to The Acting Superintendent, October 3, 1928.

[94]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 76, U. 300 #5.

[95]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 2; Report by A. Ford, Lethbridge sub-district, Waterton Park detachment, January 20, 1929; F.H. Riggall to J.B. Harkin, June 17, 1929. Riggall commented that the great increase in wildlife was due almost entirely to the park, and that the mule deer had grown from "a few hundreds to many thousands". He suggested that a full-time trapper be hired to hunt down coyotes. Riggall was a noted rancher and hunting guide who lived just north of the park.

[96]Ibid., Enclosure: Lethbridge Herald, July 16, 1929.

[97]Ibid., W.D. Cromarty to Senator Buchanan, July 19, 1929.

[98]Ibid., H. Knight to The Commissioner, May 9, 1930; H. Knight to The Commissioner, November 25, 1932.

[99]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 2; J.B. Harkin to The Superintendent, December 5, 1932.

[100]Ibid., "Policy Governing Predatory Animals Control in the National Parks of Canada". The species listed as predators remained the same as those in the 1924 directive.

[101]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to H. Knight, October 17, 1933.

[102]Waterton Library, File 0 4; H. Knight to The Commissioner, October 30, 1933.

[103]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 90, W. 300 # 2; J.B. Harkin to J.M. Wardle, Chief Engineer, Banff, February 27, 1934.

[104]Ibid., H. Knight to The Commissioner, April 17, 1934. Superintendent Knight was responding to a complaint by N.W. Dilatush, President of Waterton Road and Gun Club, that coyotes were overrunning the park.

[105]The number of coyotes in the park was estimated at ninety-five (95). PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 77, U. 300 #8; Memorandum Re. Game and Predatory Animals, December 13, 1934.

[106]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 77, U. 300 # 8; J.B. Harkin to George M. Spargo, Alberta Fish and Game League, June 7, 1934.

[107]For a summary of general park activities concerning all wildlife (for example, the protection of Rocky Mountain Sheep, the establishment of buffalo and antelope compounds, the collection of specimens for museums, biological studies, et cetera), see PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 76, U. 300 # 6-7; Memorandum Re. Summary Asked for Respecting Wild Life Conservation Activities of the Dominion Parks Branch, September 13, 1930.

[108]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 78, U. 300 #11; Memorandum Re. Investigation into Wild Life Conditions in National Parks (Jasper, Banff and Waterton) in the Province of Alberta. By R.M. Anderson, Chief Division of Biology, National Museum of Canada, November 4, 1938.

[109]For a statement of National Parks Branch Policy, see PAC, R.G. Vol. 79, U. 300 #12; Memorandum Re. Wildlife Administration in National Parks, April 24, 1940.

[110]A summary of fish plantings in Waterton Lakes Park is attached as Appendix II.

[111]Sessional Papers, 1923, No.12, Part III, "Report of The Commissioner", p. 101.

[112]The fishing season in the park extended from July 1 to October 31, except for Lake Trout which was from May 1 to August 31. (PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 167, U. 3-1-1 # 1; Chief Superintendent of Dominion Parks to J.G. Brown, June 19, 1913). In 1925 the season was changed to May 15 to October 1.

[113]Waterton Library, File 0 18; J.B. Harkin to W.A. Found, Superintendent of Fisheries, January 15, 1919.

[114]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to F.E. Maunder, January 15, 1919.

[115]Ibid., The Superintendent to The Commissioner, May 6, 1920.

[116]Waterton Library, File 0 19; The Acting Superintendent to The Commissioner, June 7, 1929.

[117]Waterton Library, File 0 18; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, September 2, 1920.

[118]Ibid., The Superintendent to The Commissioner, July 18, 1921.

[119]Ibid., J.P. Brooks, Assistant Superintendent, Glacier Park, to H.T. Williams, U.S. Park Ranger, July 11, 1923. Copy to Superintendent G.A. Bevan.

[120]Ibid.

[121]Ibid., H. Knight to The Controller, National Parks Bureau, January 10, 1937.

[122]Ibid., The Commissioner to The Acting Superintendent, April 30, 1925.

[123]Waterton Library, File 0 18; Petition for a Fish Hatchery, 1924.

[124]PAC, R.G. Vol. 238, W. 296 # 1; H. Knight to The Commissioner, December 21, 1925.

[125]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to W.A. Found, Director, Fisheries Service, Department of Marine and Fisheries, December 30, 1925.

[126]Ibid., W.A. Found to J.B. Harkin, January 15, 1926.

[127]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Fish Hatchery in Waterton Lakes Park. (circa January, 1926).

[128]Waterton Library, File 0 18; J.A. Rodd, Superintendent of Fish Culture, to J.B. Harkin, August 19, 1927.

[129]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 238, W. 296 # 1; J.A. Rodd, Superintendent of Fish Culture, to J.B. Harkin, September 7, 1928.

[130]Ibid., G.E. Bailey to J.A. Rodd, August 24, 1928.

[131]Ibid., W.D. Cromarty to The Commissioner, September 19, 1928.

[132]Ibid., Memorandum: Mr. Harkin Re. Damage by Beaver to Fish Hatchery in Waterton Lakes Park, September 26, 1928.

[133]Ibid., Telegraph: J.B. Harkin to W.D. Cromarty, October 11, 1928.

[134]Ibid., H. Knight to The Commissioner, May 27, 1929.

[135]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 238, W. 299 # 1; Memorandum: W.W. Cory, July 17, 1930.

[136]Ibid., Memorandum: Mr. Cory, September 22, 1930.

[137]Ibid., Memorandum: Mr. Rowatt, Re. Distribution Surplus Output Banff and Waterton Hatcheries, May 5, 1931.

[138]Ibid., Memorandum; Mr. Marchand, Financial Controller, December 24, 1931.

[139]See Appendix II for a breakdown of the streams stocked in Waterton.

[140]Ibid., Memorandum: Mr. Spero, Re. Agreement Required Between the Department and the Province with Respect to the Distribution of Surplus Output of Banff and Waterton Lakes Hatcheries, January 14, 1931.

[141]Gladstone, A History of Waterton Lakes National Park, p. 39.

[142]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 203, U. 60 # 2; J.B. Harkin to Geo. H. Webster, Mayor of Calgary, March 1, 1923.

[143]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 203, U. 60 # 3; Copy of "Speech by Mr. Harkin at Good Roads Convention at St. Andrews", August, 1924.

[144]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 87, W. 41 # 2; H. Riviere to The Commissioner, May 3, 1922.

[145]Waterton Library, File N 19; The Superintendent to The Commissioner, January 3, 1921.

[146]Ibid., The Superintendent to Mr. Brady, Road Engineer, B.C., March 15, 1921.

[147]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 203, U. 60 # 2; George H. Webster, Mayor of Calgary, to J.B. Harkin, January 10, 1923.

[148]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to G.H. Webster, January 19, 1923.

[149]Ibid., Arno B. Cammerer, Acting Director, U.S. National Park Service, February 6, 1923.

[150]Ibid., A.B. Cammerer to J.B. Harkin, March 5, 1923.

[151]Waterton Library, File N 14; Memorandum to Director Stephen Mather Regarding Visit of August 9, 1924 to Waterton Lakes Park Canada, from Chas. J. Kraebel, Superintendent Glacier Park.

[152]Waterton Library, File N 15; Chas. J. Kraebel, Superintendent Glacier, to H. Knight, February 19, 1927.

[153]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 430, W. 60-4, P.N. Bernard, Secretary, Kalispell Chamber of Commerce, to R.B. Bennet,, Acting Minister of the Interior, June 17, 1927.

[154]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 432; H. Knight to The Commissioner, October 20, 1926.

[155]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 430; Enclosure: Calgary Albertan, July 29, 1927.

[156]Waterton Library, File 3 A; J.B. Harkin to H. Knight, April 11, 1928.

[157]PARC, Box 162696, W. 2 N.C., Vol. I; H. Knight to The Commissioner, February 1, 1932.

[158]Waterton Library, File 0 14: Memorandum to General J.S. Stewart Re. Akamina Road, May 11, 1935.

[159]PMAA, Accn. # 69.218, Box 16, W. 60-3, H. Knight to The Controller, National Park Bureau, September 22, 1937.

[160]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Proposed Extension, Waterton Lakes National Park, to R.A. Gibson, Director, Lands, Parks and Forests Branch, [1937] .

[161]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 432, W. 60-4; Enclosure: Cardston newspaper article dated November 25, 1926.

[162]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 430, W. 60-3; Telegraph: Oland and Scott, Contractors, Canadian Rocky Hotel Co., to J.B. Harkin, March 8, 1927; Superintendent Knight to The Commissioner, March 10, 1927.

[163]Ibid., The Commissioner to The Acting Supintendent, March 16, 1927.

[164]Ibid., Enclosure: Edmonton Journal, June 15, 1927.

[165]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 432, W. 60-4; 17th Annual Report, Waterton Lakes Park, January 5, 1931.

[166]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 430, W. 60-3. J.M. Wardle, Chief Engineer, to J.B. Harkin, January 31, 1930.

[167]Ibid., The Superintendent to The Commissioner, October 13, 1933.

[168]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to R.A. Gibson, Assistant Deputy Minister of the Interior, November 4, 1930.

[169]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 432; H.M. Albright to J.B. Harkin, December 30, 1931.

[170]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to H.M. Albright, January 29, 1932.

[171]W.R.O.: J.M. Wardle, Chief Engineer, to J.B. Harkin, March 24, 1932.

[172]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Relief Program, Single Homeless Men, March, 1934.

[173]Waterton Library, N 14; M.O. Malte to J.B. Harkin, June 4, 1926.

[174]Ibid., Acting Superintendent Cromarty to The Commissioner, June 28, 1926.

[175]Waterton Library, File 0 10; The Acting Superintendent to The Commissioner, December 31, 1926.

[176]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 430, W. 60 # 3; Copy of Superintendent's Report for August, 1927.

[177]Waterton Library, File 0 18; Memorandum to J.S. Stewart from H. Knight, September 24, 1932.

[178]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 200, U. 36 # 1; W.D. Cromarty to The Commissioner, July 12, 1926.

[179]Ibid., The Commissioner to The Acting Superintendent July 22, 1926.

[180]Ibid., The Commissioner to Acting Superintendent Knight, April 14, 1927.

[181]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 200, U. 36 # 1, Memorandum: J.M. Wardle, Deputy Minister of the Interior, February 1, 1936.

[182]PARC, Box 162697, W. 16-112, Vol. I; Memorandum Re. Auto Bungalow Camp, Waterton, April 28, 1931.

[183]Waterton Library, File 0 6; F.H.H. Williamson to The Acting Superintendent, January 15, 1931.

[184]Waterton Library, File 0 7; H. Knight to Messrs E. Hagglund and J. Fisher, September 21, 1933.

[185]PARC, loc. cit.; C. Hunter to H. Knight, June 15, 1932.

[186]Supra, p. 168.

[187]Waterton Library, File 0 6; H. Knight to J.B. Harkin, February 6, 1932.

[188]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 88, W. 41 # 4; H. Knight to J.B. Harkin, June 17, 1935.

[189]Waterton Library, File 0 7; Calgary Power Company to the Waterton Lakes Board of Trade, October 1, 1930.

[190]Waterton Library, File 0 6; J.B. Harkin to J.S. Stewart, M.P., September 16, 1930.

[191]Waterton Library, File 0 11; H. Knight to J.B. Harkin, October 24, 1930.

[192]Waterton Library, File 0 8; C.K. Le Capelain, Park Engineer to Acting Chief Engineer, August 17, 1936.

[193]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to the Chief Engineer, October 23, 1936.

[194]Waterton Library, File 0 7; H. Knight to J.B. Harkin, July 31, 1931.

[195]Ibid., H. Knight to The Commissioner, August 4, 1931.

[196]Ibid., The Superintendent to The Commissioner, March 13, 1933.

[197]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Improvements to Golf Course, May 17, 1935.

[198]W.R.O.; J.M. Wardle, Chief Engineer, to J.B. Harkin, February 29, 1932. "Report of Unemployment Relief Camp Conditions".

[199]Ibid., H. Knight to the Chief Engineer, February 3, 1936.

[200]Waterton Library, File 0 14; H. Knight to the Controller, December 11, 1936.

[201]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 408, W. 3-24; Clarence Olsen to The Superintendent of Waterton, October 8, 1925.

[202]Ibid., The Commissioner to The Acting Superintendent October 23, 1925.

[203]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to The Acting Superintendent, April 14, 1927.

[204]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 174, U. 3-5; G.A. Bevan to J.B. Harkin, February 26, 1921.

[205]Ibid., J.B. Harkin to A.M. Johnson, Deputy Attorney General, March 22, 1921.

[206]Ibid., Memorandum: J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, May 12, 1924.

[207]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 407, W. 3-5, H. Knight to The Commissioner, May 29, 1924.

[208]Ibid., E. Haug to the Minister of the Interior, May 24, 1924.

[209]Ibid., Memorandum: R.A. Gibson, Deputy Minister of the Interior, to J.B. Harkin, June 17, 1924.

[210]Ibid., J. Fred Spalding to Minister of the Interior, July 16, 1924.

[211]Ibid., H. Knight to The Commissioner, July 3, 1924.

[212]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Beer License, W.L.P. J.B. Harkin to W.W. Cory, July 18, 1924.

[213]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Hotel Site, Waterton Lake, April 22, 1925.

[214]Ibid., Telegram, Martin Woolf to Hon. Charles Stewart April 27, 1925.

[215]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Hotel Beer License, W.L.P., May 11, 1926.

[216]Ibid., Memorandum Re. Appointment of Liquor Vendor, W.L.P., J.B. Harkin to H.H. Rowatt, March 31, 1931.

[217]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 258, W. 174-193; H. Knight to The Superintendent, May 15, 1924.

[218]Ibid., Deputy Attorney General, Alberta, to J.B. Harkin, July 6, 1926.

[219]Ibid., The Commissioner to W.D. Cromarty, June 23, 1926.

[220]Ibid., The Commissioner to W.D. Cromarty, June 23, 1926.

[221]Ibid., Premier Brownlee to Honorable Charles Stewart January 31, 1929.

[222]Waterton Library, File 0 4; W. Stuart Edwards, Deputy Minister of Justice to J.B. Harkin, May 12, 1932.

[223]PAC, R.G. 84, Vol. 258, W. 174-193; J. Smart, Acting Controller to The Superintendent, October 21, 1941.

[224]G.V. La Forest, Natural Resources and Public Property Under the Canadian Constitution, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969. Appendix B "The British North America Act, 1930, 21 Geo. V, c. 26 (Imp), " pp. 207-208.

[225]PARC, Box 162696, W. 2 N.C.; Ottawa Citizen, February 17, 1932.

[226]Ibid., Winnipeg Tribune, February 24, 1932.

[227]PARC, Box 162038, W. 2 # 1; Memorandum; J.B. Harkin to H.H. Rowatt, February 4, 1932.

[228]Ibid.

[229]Ibid., Memorandum: J.B. Harkin to H.H. Rowatt, April 26, 1932.

[230]Ibid., Enclosure: Lethbridge Herald, May 5, 1932.

[231]Waterton Library, File N 20; Memorandum Re. Suggestions for more efficient fire control, Waterton Lakes Park, October 4, 1929.

[232]Ibid., Civil Service Commission "Position Vacant" form, October 12, 1932.

[233]Waterton Library, File 0 4; H. Knight to J.B. Harkin, August 25, 1933.

[234]Ibid., Superintendent Knight to The Commissioner, April 13, 1931.

[235]Waterton Library, File 0 12; F.H.H. Williamson to the Superintendent, September 8, 1937.

[236]Ibid., Memorandum to Supervising Warden J.C. Holroyd, September 23, 1937.

[237]Ibid., Memorandum for Supervising Warden Holroyd, April 21, 1937.

[238]Waterton Library, File 0 5; F.H.H. Williamson, Controller, to Superintendent Knight, December 23, 1936.

[239]Waterton Library, File 0 14; Memorandum Re. Building for Administration Office, Information Bureau and Museum, May 17, 1935.

*CONCLUSION*

[1]Waterton Library, File 0 5; Recommendations made by the National Parks Superintendents at a Conference held in Ottawa, January 4-14, 1937.