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ABSTRACT

The history and development of National Park Systems in Canada and the United States are traced over the last 120 years, and the policies determining their management are examined and compared to identify basic similarities and differences. Official government reports and policy statements, historical records, and pertinent books, articles, and bulletins were used as references for the study. Emphasis is placed on recent history and existing policies.

It is concluded that the philosophies governing National Parks policy have been, and still are, significantly different, and as a result, the National Park Systems of the two countries differ both physically and conceptually. United States policy has traditionally reflected a greater public and administrative concern for the protection of natural environments within the National Parks. As a result, attempts are being made to reduce the purely recreational character of the National Parks, and to divert the recreationists to other types of areas, such as National Recreation Areas and National Seashores. In recent years, concerted attempts to alienate areas within the parks have been defeated, primarily through the existence of a strong preservationist movement in the country. The establishment of the National Wilderness Preservation System demonstrates a widespread recognition of natural
area preservation as a nationally significant land use.

In Canada, National Parks policy has been much less concerned with nature preservation and protection. The provision of public recreation has gradually become the dominant theme of Canadian National Parks policy, with concern for natural areas only recently emerging. No widespread preservationist philosophy has existed in Canada. Despite Canada's lower population, recreation facilities and accommodations in the parks are generally more elaborate and extensive than in the United States. In general terms, the thrust of policy in Canada has been to preserve a quasi-natural setting for enjoying recreational activities, while in the United States, policy has been directed towards preserving and maintaining natural environments.
CONTENTS

Abstract i
Maps v
Tables vi
Acknowledgements vii

1 Comparing National Parks Policies 2
   A) Introduction 2
   B) Approach to the Study 3
   C) Defining National Parks and Equivalent reserves 4
   D) Review of Literature and Principal Sources of Reference 6

2 Early Development of the National Park Systems in the United States and Canada 13
   A) The Beginning: Yellowstone and Yosemite in the United States 13
   B) The National Monuments: A Broadened Perspective in the United States 21
   C) Rocky Mountains Park -- the Beginning in Canada 24
   D) Chapter Summary 32

3 Evolution of the National Park Systems to 1945 35
   A) Creation of the United States National Park Service 35
   B) Canadian National Parks: the Legislation of 1930 40
   C) Chapter Summary 44
### 4 The National Parks in the Post War Years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A) Balancing Use and Preservation in the American National Parks</th>
<th>47</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B) Natural Resources Development in the American National Parks: 1948 - 1968</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C) The National Wilderness Preservation System and the Expansion of the American National Park System</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D) The Canadian National Parks in the Post War Years</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E) Chapter Summary</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 5 Present Parks Policy in the United States and Canada

| A) The Interpretation of Policy: a Comment | 78 |
| B) National Parks Policy in the United States | 78 |
| C) Canadian National Parks Policy | 86 |
| D) Present Policies Compared | 97 |

### 6 Evolution of National Parks Policies: an Overview

| A) Summary | 100 |
| B) Conclusions | 107 |

References | 116 |
### MAPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>National Parks, Principal National Monuments, and Major National Recreation Areas in the United States</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>National Parks, Principal National Monuments, and Major National Recreation Areas in the United States</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Canadian National Parks</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I</th>
<th>The Range of Social Restraints on Human Manipulation of the Natural Environment</th>
<th>101</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>The Evolution of National Park Function in the United States</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>The Evolution of National Park Function in Canada</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the valuable assistance, advice, and criticism given to me by my supervisor, Professor William Rees, throughout the preparation of this thesis.

Thanks are also due to Professor Al Lucas of the Faculty of Law, University of British Columbia, for his helpful suggestions and comments.

To my wife, Nancy, goes special thanks for her encouragement and advice, and finally for her patience in typing this thesis.
"I could see the endless stream of pulpwood floating down the Ottawa River and on the northern horizon, just under the scudding clouds, the whale-backed ridge of Gatineau Park where I had watched beaver at lunchtime the previous day. Looking north, my mind wandered 150 miles further to La Verendrye Provincial Park and its sprawling wilderness. Only the C.N.R. and two minor highways interrupted the flow of wilderness from there to Hudson's Bay. And then, standing in that modern reading room, I had a vivid sense of what a wild, young, undeveloped nation Canada really was. For an American unaccustomed to a frontier and prepared to find his wilderness in isolated chunks, surrounded by roads, this was a revelation. I understood that Canada and the United States had for the last half century operated on different wavelengths so far as wilderness was concerned. Americans had passed through its frontier era to an increasing awareness of the value of wilderness; Canadians were still a pioneering people who retained the old attitudes toward undeveloped places."

From *Wilderness and Man in North America* (1969) by Roderick Nash
Chapter 1 COMPARING NATIONAL PARKS POLICIES

A) Introduction

Nearly a century has passed since the world's first national park was created in the Yellowstone highlands of the western United States. During this period of time, many more national parks have been established throughout the United States and in many other regions of the world. In finding widespread recognition, the national park concept has been altered and revised to suit the cultural and environmental conditions into which it was adopted. As a result, the roles and functions of national parks have become as diversified as their physical characteristics. Answers to such questions as "What is a national park?" and "What special functions does it perform?" are nearly as elusive today as they were a century ago. Even on a national scale, the problem of definition loses little in complexity.

Canada was the first country to follow the lead of the United States in establishing a national park system. At the present time, there are a number of similarities in the geography, function, and policy of national parks between the two countries. This is not surprising when the parallels in the cultural and historical development of Canada and the United States are considered. It is, however, entirely possible that the similarities in function and policy which are seen today or have been perceived in the
past are superficial. The national park systems of Canada and the United States may have evolved along different paths in response to differing ideals, policies, and social pressures. It is highly important that the historical development of national parks policy be better understood and more clearly defined before any attempt is made to apply the planning and management experiences of one country to the solving of the problems of the other. The purpose of this study is to critically examine and compare the evolution and development of national parks policy in Canada and the United States. It is hoped that this study will provide constructive insights into the problems facing planners and administrators of the national parks, and that these insights can be applied to institute improvements in national parks policy in Canada and the United States.

B) Approach to the Study

The study is limited in scope to a consideration of policy for national parks and equivalent reserves under federal jurisdiction. While reference is made to provincial and state parks, they are considered only as they relate to the national park systems of each country, or where they clarify attitudes towards large park areas. Emphasis will be placed on policies relating to the preservation of natural areas and to the development of facilities and resources within the areas included in the national park
systems. The changing philosophies and justifications underlying policy interpretation are also discussed. The study will cover the last 120 years, but will concentrate primarily on the period following World War II.

C) Defining National Parks and Equivalent Reserves

In Canada and the United States, a variety of social institutions perform the functions often associated with national parks (Dasmann, 1969). For example, in the United States, there are "Wilderness Areas", "National Seashores", "National Parks", "National Monuments", and other institutions that provide for landscape protection, recreation, and wildlife protection in varying degrees. In Canada, these functions are normally provided by the federal "National Parks" and large provincially controlled parks. When studying the institutions of two or more countries, an overall conceptual definition must be derived to make a comparison possible.

The International Commission on National Parks of the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources (IUCN) has been concerned with this problem of definition for some time. In compiling the United Nations List of National Parks and Equivalent Reserves, criteria were established so that some degree of continuity could be maintained in classifying the national parks of member states of the United Nations (Harroy, 1969). These criteria relate to protective status, size, legislative authority,
and park function (Harroy, 1969). According to these criteria, a national park must: 1) be legally protected from all natural resource exploitation by man and from any other threat to the quality of the area; 2) be greater than 2,000 ha. in size and have supervisory personnel on a ratio of one to 10,000 ha.; 3) be under the authority of the federal government; and 4) recognize tourism as a legitimate park use (Harroy, 1969). An equivalent reserve has generally similar characteristics to those of a national park, except that tourism may not be a recognized function, in which case the area would be a strict nature reserve. In addition, legislative authority may rest outside the federal administration -- with a province, for example. The other criteria remain unchanged, however (Harroy, 1969).

By applying the criteria outlined above to the systems of recreation and nature reserves in Canada and the United States, a large number of "park" and "recreation" areas are eliminated from consideration as equivalents to national parks. For example, in Canada, many large provincial park areas can be excluded because mining, timber cutting, and river developments are permitted. In addition, many roadside types of parks fail to meet the minimum size requirements. On the other hand, in the United States, federal Wilderness Areas and National Monuments have all the required characteristics to be classified as either national parks or equivalent reserves. The location of the
park reserves under discussion in the United States and Canada are shown in Maps 1 and 2 respectively.

D) **Review of Literature and Principal Sources of Reference**

While numerous books, articles, and accounts have been written about the national parks and equivalent reserves in both the United States and Canada, most have been of a popular nature, focusing on the scenic, historic, or unique aspects of the park areas. Such works are directed primarily towards the tourist and the general public, and have provided an extremely valuable means of making the parks better known and interpreting the significance of each park unit. Generally, little information is provided concerning policy or the historical evolution of the park systems (Scharff, 1966; Butcher, 1968), but some authors provide insights into the values attached to the parks and the functions they perform (Tilden, 1957). Many of the visitor brochures distributed by the National Park Services of both countries fall into this category.

Of the few detailed accounts of national park history in the United States, perhaps the most outstanding is Ise's study, *Our National Park Policy: A Critical History* (1961). Ise presents a thorough treatment of the historical development of national park legislation and policy and outlines some of the problem areas of park planning and administration. However, he directs little attention towards
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the attitudes behind policy decisions or the relationship of the national parks to the conservation movement as a whole. On the other hand, former Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall (1963a), discusses the development of the conservation movement and its influence on the national parks in the United States in his *The Quiet Crisis*. Also useful is the study by Jones (1965), *John Muir and the Sierra Club*, which details the life of this early proponent of wilderness preservation and the part he played in the dispute over the flooding of the Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park. In addition, Nash's *Wilderness and the American Mind* (1967) presents a thorough treatment of the development of the national park system and national park policy. Of significance in this work are the discussions of the changing attitudes towards wilderness preservation in the United States during the last 150 years.

The evolution of the Canadian situation is not as well documented. Two studies of Banff National Park, however, provide useful insights into the history of a Canadian national park (Scace, 1968; Byrne, 1962).

Of the works directed towards a critical appraisal of national parks policy in North America, only three are particularly noteworthy, and each deals with the United States system. Darling and Eichorn (1969) demonstrate a sensitive understanding of the policy and philosophy of national parks, providing the most recent overview of the
situation in the United States. Another important study on national parks policy, on wildlife management in particular, was prepared for the Secretary of the Interior by a group of distinguished wildlife biologists (Leopold et al., 1963). Widely circulated as the "Leopold Report", this study discusses the general purposes of the national parks and stresses the importance of basic ecological knowledge as a pre-requisite to management and planning of the national parks. The third notable study was also undertaken for the Secretary of the Interior. This report (Penfold et al., 1968) presents an examination of the purposes and design standards for roads within the national parks and suggests that a number of alternatives exist to large scale road construction programs in the national parks.

Two conferences have provided particularly useful information. The proceedings of the First World Conference on National Parks, held in Seattle in 1961, gives a valuable global perspective on national parks and equivalent reserves (Adams, 1962). Even more significant to Canada is the recent conference, The Canadian National Parks: Today and Tomorrow, held in Calgary, Alberta. The proceedings (Nelson and Scace, 1969) contain the first major accumulation of papers on the national parks in this country. Several of these are particularly relevant to this study. Harroy (1969) gives a detailed treatment of the national park movement and the problems associated with defining national parks and
equivalent reserves in different cultures and environments. Chrétien (1969), Nicol (1969), and Nelson (1969) provide some of the first documented accounts of the historical aspects of Canadian national park policy. Brown (1969) discusses the early development of national parks in Canada and relates park policy to the resource utilization policy of the federal government. Roderick Nash's paper (1969), "Wilderness and Man in North America", is the most pertinent to this study. He presents a convincing case for the contention that there is a significant difference in perception and appreciation of natural areas and wilderness between the United States and Canada. This assertion is supported in another study (Cowan, 1969).

Statements of policy issued by the federal governments of both the United States and Canada provide additional valuable information. The publications of the United States National Park Service are more numerous and tend to be more detailed than those of its Canadian counterpart. Particularly useful are the general statements of administrative policies for natural areas and recreation areas of the United States national park system (United States National Park Service, 1968a, b), and the overall policy statement for Canadian national parks (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). The recently released Provisional Master Plans for several of the Canadian national parks are also useful in providing insights into planning and management
goals for the parks in Canada (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969b,c, 1970a,b,c,d).

Several other sources of information have been exploited. These include relevant portions of the Congressional Record of the United States Congress and the Canadian Hansard. In addition, conservation publications such as Park News (Canadian National and Provincial Parks Association), The Living Wilderness (The Wilderness Society), National Parks and Conservation Magazine (National Parks Association), the Sierra Club's Bulletin, and other similar journals provide valuable documentation of the significant events and legislation in the formation of the national park systems of Canada and the United States. Unfortunately, Park News, the one Canadian publication wholly concerned with parks, has been produced only since 1963, when the National and Provincial Parks Association was formed. The documentation of the United States national park system provided by American conservation journals is much more complete. The Sierra Club Bulletin has been published since the 1890's, and National Parks Magazine has been in print since 1918.
Chapter 2 EARLY DEVELOPMENT OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEMS IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

A) The Beginning: Yellowstone and Yosemite in the United States

The idea that large areas of undisturbed natural landscape should be preserved for their aesthetic and inspirational value appears to have first been expressed in 1832 by George Catlin, an American artist (United States National Park Service, 1968a). The notion was supported by Henry Thoreau and other naturalist-philosophers with increasing frequency after the late 1850's (Nash, 1967). Its first real expression in governmental action occurred in 1864, when Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Redwood Grove were turned over to the state of California for preservation as a park. The state was to hold the lands for public use, resort, and recreation, inalienable for all time (Hartesveldt, 1963).

It was not until 1872, however, that the national park movement had its legal beginnings. In that year, over 2,000,000 acres in the high country of western Wyoming, eastern Idaho, and southern Montana were reserved and set aside as the world's first national park; Yellowstone Park was a reality (16. U.S.C. secs. 21-40 [1964]). At that time, the Yellowstone region was one of the most inaccessible parts of North America, yet the spectacular nature of its canyons, geysers, and waterfalls had captured the imagination of a few
early explorers, who effectively lobbied for its preservation as a public reserve (Ise, 1961; Langford, 1905). There was, however, opposition to the passage of the Yellowstone Park Act. The vastness of the American frontier pervaded the thoughts of some opponents, who saw no need for its protection. In fact, as has been pointed out, the reservation of federal lands was quite contrary to the policy of the United States government at that time (Udall, 1963a; Ise, 1961). The comments of California's Senator Cole are representative of the opposing view:

"I do not see the reason or propriety of setting apart a large tract of land of that kind in the Territories of the United States for a public park. There is abundance of public park ground in the Rocky Mountains that will never be occupied. It is all one great park, and never can be anything else; large portions of it at all events..." (in Ise, 1961).

Supporters of the Act argued that preservation was essential to insure public access to the scenic wonders of the area. Initially at least, they were not concerned with preserving the wilderness that surrounded the attractions (Nash, 1967; Langford, 1905). The provisions of the Act are significant in this regard, for they did provide legislative protection for the whole of Yellowstone Park, and hence for the wilderness contained therein:

"Yellowstone ... is hereby reserved and withdrawn from settlement, occupancy, or sale under the laws of the United States, and dedicated and set apart as a public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people." (16. U.S.C. sec. 21 [1964]).
The Secretary of the Interior was directed to make regulations to "provide for the preservation, from injury or spoilation, of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition." The Act also made provisions for the accommodation of visitors within the park. However, from 1872 to 1878 no appropriations were made to enforce the regulations drafted to protect the park, and hence, while legally inviolate, the park suffered continued vandalism and its wildlife was slaughtered (Ise, 1961). It was at least a beginning.

Even when Congress finally authorized some funds for protection of the park, they were very meagre, and in many cases, prosecution of poachers and vandals was impossible under existing laws. In 1883, the Secretary of the Interior was given authority to call in federal troops to protect the park and its wildlife, but it was not until three years later that this action was taken (Ise, 1961).

By the mid-1880's, recognition of the broader function of Yellowstone as a wilderness preserve began to emerge. As Nash (1967) records, the debate over a proposed railroad right-of-way through the park marked the first time that arguments based on a "preserve the wilderness" theme successfully countered the utilitarian promotion of the developers. The proposed railroad was to allow the development of a mine
outside the park's boundaries. The proponents of the mine felt that it was unreasonable to block the production of a multi-million dollar mine for the benefit "...of a few sportsmen bent only on the protection of a few buffalo" (Payson, 1886). Preservationists countered by stressing the spiritual or inspirational values of the preserve and the deleterious effect the proposed development would have on the park's wilderness (Nash, 1967). Congressman McAdoo of New Jersey was prompted to comment: "...the glory of this territory is its sublime solitude. Civilization is so universal that man can only see nature in her majesty and primal glory, as it were, in these as yet virgin regions." (in Nash, 1967). Nash describes this speech as "a vindication of the principle of wilderness preservation". The wilderness values of Yellowstone prevailed and the argument propounded by McAdoo was heard with increasing frequency. Hence, in under 20 years, the justification for Yellowstone had changed from one professing protection of natural wonders for public access to one based on the preservation of a wilderness area containing outstanding natural features.

Wildlife in Yellowstone was finally given effective protection in 1894, when Congress passed an "Act to Protect the Birds and Animals in Yellowstone National Park" (16. U.S.C. secs. 21-40 [1964]). Soon after, however, a program was instituted to reduce the number of predatory animals
within the park. The role of predator species was not clearly understood or appreciated at this time, and wildlife protection meant, to most people at least, the protection of animals -- usually herbivores-- against poachers and natural predators. Wolves were ultimately driven to extinction, and cougars seriously endangered (Ise, 1961).

The early history of Yosemite National Park further illustrates the development of United States national park policy and the debate over use and preservation of the parks. As noted, in 1864 the Yosemite Valley and the Mariposa Grove were turned over to California for park lands. However, as public awareness of the scenic qualities of the area surrounding the Valley and of the uniqueness of the remaining stands of interior redwoods increased, pressure mounted for their preservation as park reserves (Strong, 1970). In 1890, Congress passed legislation to reserve Sequoia (National Park) as a "public park or pleasure ground" (16. U.S.C. secs. 41-45 [1964]). This action was followed by the creation of "reserved forest lands" to include Yosemite and the General Grant Sequoia Grove. Ise (1961) notes that the new legislation was based on the Yellowstone National Park Act and contained similar provisions for protection.

Yosemite National Park soon became a focus for the first nationally publicized dispute over the national parks.
By the early 1900's, central California and San Francisco were facing a water shortage. Unfortunately, the damming of the Hetch Hetchy Canyon of the Toulumne River in Yosemite provided the most expedient solution to this problem. While less well known that the Yosemite Valley, Hetch Hetchy was an outstanding area in its own right.

The Hetch Hetchy controversy has been well documented (Jones, 1965; Nash, 1967; Ise, 1961) and will not be detailed here. However, the general background to the dispute and the eventual outcome are of utmost significance in reflecting and directing national park policy trends. At the turn of the century, two distinct and conflicting approaches to the broad question of natural resource conservation were becoming evident in the United States. One favoured the scientific management of all resources in an attempt to stop the wholesale destruction and waste of natural resources, a frequent occurrence during the last half of the nineteenth century (Udall, 1963a). An outspoken advocate of this approach to conservation was Gifford Pinchot, Chief Forester in the United States Forest Service and a prominent figure during the Roosevelt Administration. The other view of conservation, while supporting this approach in principle, was more extreme and favoured the preservation of large areas of wild lands as wilderness undisturbed by man (Strong, 1970). This view encompassed what Nash (1967) has termed the "Wilderness Cult". The two
approaches to conservation were basically irreconcilable, and the Hetch Hetchy dam proposal brought the disagreement to the fore. As Nash (1967) notes, "The Hetch Hetchy issue left no ground for compromise among the early conservationists".

By far the most prominent figure publicizing the preservationist philosophy of conservation was John Muir, one of the founders of the Sierra Club, an organization devoted to wilderness and national park protection (Jones, 1965). Muir had a special affection for the Sierras, and particularly for Yosemite. He had lectured and written numerous articles to generate support for their protection and preservation as park lands. To him, the thought of a dam in Hetch Hetchy was unbearable. His basic assertion was that other sites could be used to create the reservoir. A second-best site could have stored the required water and, at the same time, would have saved Hetch Hetchy. However, despite the strenuous and articulate objections of Muir and his associates, the Hetch Hetchy project was authorized by Congress in December, 1913 (Udall, 1963a).

The significance of the Hetch Hetchy controversy is discussed by Nash (1967):

"Indeed the most significant thing about the controversy over the valley was that it occurred at all. One hundred or even fifty years earlier a similar proposal to dam a wilderness river would not have occasioned the slightest ripple of public protest. 
Traditional American assumptions about the use of undeveloped country did not include reserving it in national parks for its recreational, aesthetic, and inspirational values... What had formerly been the subject of national celebration was made to appear a national tragedy.

Even the partisans of San Francisco phrased the issue as not between a good (civilization) and an evil (wilderness) but between two goods. While placing material needs first, they still proclaimed their love of unspoiled nature. Previously, most Americans had not felt compelled to rationalize the conquest of wild country in this manner. For three centuries they had chosen civilization without any hesitation. By 1913, they were no longer sure."

The dispute over Hetch Hetchy had focused national attention on the parks, and created a new level of awareness of aesthetic conservation in the United States (Strong, 1970). At the same time, while the preservationists lost the battle over Hetch Hetchy, the experience inspired an ultimately successful attempt to have the national parks made exempt from the provisions of the Federal Water Power Act and helped gain support for the formation of a National Parks Service in 1916 (Udall, 1963a). Most importantly, the preservationists realized that to have an effective voice in policy for the national parks, they must be organized and gain widespread public acceptance of their point of view.

Most major issues involving the national parks and wilderness preservation in the United States after the turn of the century involved proposals based on a "wise use" or
"multiple use" of resources philosophy, in league with the conservation approach propounded by Pinchot. In effect, the disputes over developing park lands or limiting their expansion reflected conflicts within what can broadly be called "The Conservation Movement". While this fact is recognized, for simplicity, conservationists favouring preservation of parks and wilderness will hereafter be referred to simply as conservationists.

B) The National Monuments: A Broadened Perspective in the United States

As concern for natural areas of outstanding scenic quality was becoming more and more widespread in the United States, so too was a concern for the protection of archeological and historical sites. Many such sites were located in the Southwest and Great Basin states on lands controlled by the federal government. By 1900, it had become apparent that many archeological treasures of the Southwest were being plundered and that some form of legislation was required to insure their preservation. "The story of the archeological ruins of the Southwest is a rather depressing story of gross vandalism for many years, somewhat like the vandalism of the giant sequoias; a story of pertinacious but, for several years, futile efforts on the part of a few devoted people and organizations to secure protection, and of final success in saving some of what was left of the ruins and of the priceless archeological objects in them." (Ise, 1961).
Proposals for legislative protection of these sites were made as early as 1882, but found little sympathy until the turn of the century. After over six years of legal argument, a Bill was finally passed by the Congress and signed into law by President Roosevelt on June 8, 1906. Called "The Act for the Preservation of Antiquities" (16. U.S.C. secs. 431-458 [1964]), it empowered the President to reserve by proclamation historic landmarks, historic and prehistoric structures, and other objects of historic or scientific interest situated on lands owned or controlled by the federal government. Initially, administration of the reserves, known as National Monuments, remained with the federal agency which had jurisdiction over the area before it was set aside. As a result, some national monuments were administered by the Department of the Interior, while others were under the control of the Department of Agriculture (Ise, 1961).

While the passage of the Antiquities Act may at first appear incidental to the major thrust towards the development of a national park system in the United States, it is significant for several reasons. First, it made possible the protection of areas, such as Mesa Verde in Colorado, that were eventually afforded National Park status (Ise, 1961; Udall, 1963a). Second, it showed an increasing awareness within the Congress of the value of historical, cultural, and scientific features of lands within the United States.
and the need for their preservation. Finally, by its rather broad provisions, it allowed the reservation of landscapes which might otherwise have gone unprotected, or for one reason or another did not meet the requirements of a national park (United States Department of the Interior, 1967). Many areas were too small to become national parks, or had some established right or claim which had to be honoured. The fact that national monuments became increasingly important adjuncts to the national parks demonstrates their significance. Many outstanding areas and features were reserved under the provisions of the Act, including: Mesa Verde, Grand Canyon, Glacier Bay, Death Valley, the Petrified Forest, stands of redwoods and organ pipe cacti, and numerous other archeological, geological, and biological sites. Almost without exception, the national monuments were created to insure the preservation of a unique area or outstanding feature; little emphasis was placed on use, recreation, or possible returns from tourism.

National parks and national monuments differ in a number of respects. As previously indicated, the function of national monuments is to preserve unique features of scientific, historic, or prehistoric significance. On the other hand, the function of national parks is to preserve environments which possess two or more unique features or qualities. Parks also tend to be more spacious, whereas
monuments may vary greatly in size depending on the feature they are designed to preserve. Furthermore, national parks have the added protection of being established by Act of Congress, while national monuments are created by proclamation of the President or Congress (United States National Park Service, 1968a).

C) Rocky Mountains Park -- the Beginning in Canada

Canada of the 1870's and early 1880's was a country struggling for unity, engrossed in the building of a transcontinental railway over 4,000 miles of unexplored mountains, prairie, and muskeg, staggered by the vastness of its territory. It was not until 1884 that the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway to the shore of Burrard Inlet near Vancouver allowed the government to focus its energies on developing and settling the hinterland between the West Coast and Winnipeg.

The government of John A. Macdonald adopted a national policy stressing economic expansion based on the utilization of natural resources (Brown, 1969). Expansion westward was a central thrust of this policy, based on the notion that settlement and development would enhance Canada's claim to the prairies and provide freight and passengers for the operations of the Canadian Pacific Railway.

When a hot springs to which great curative powers were attached was discovered near Banff Station on the Canadian
Pacific Railway's line through Kicking Horse Pass, concern developed that the area should not be exploited by private developers. The government was already disturbed by the unplanned development and commercialization that had taken place at Niagara Falls in Ontario. It saw in Banff the possibility of avoiding some of the undesirable features of the Niagara Falls development. Additionally, there was the possibility of developing Banff to the financial advantage of both the C.P.R. and the federal government. As a result, on November 25, 1885, an Order-in-Council was issued, reserving 6,400 acres of land surrounding the Banff hotsprings (Nicol, 1969). The Order noted:

"...that whereas near the station of Banff ...there have been discovered several hot mineral springs which promise to be of great sanitary advantage to the public, and in order that proper control of the lands surrounding these springs may remain vested in the Crown, the said lands in the territory including said springs and their immediate neighbourhood be and they are hereby reserved from sale or settlement or squatting." [emphasis added] (P.C. 2197, November 25, 1885).

As details of the reserve became better known, it appears that in the minds of government officials, the "sanitary advantage" of Banff was less inticing than the monetary advantage if the area was appropriately developed. Prime Minister John A. Macdonald was prompted to comment:

"I do not suppose in any portion of the world there can be found a spot taken altogether, which combines so many attractions and which promises in as great a degree not only large pecuniary advantage to the Dominion, but much prestige to the whole country by attracting the population, not only of this continent, but of Europe to this place." (Macdonald, 1887).
Needless to say, the apparent potential of the hotsprings as an attraction for tourists did not go unnoticed by the C.P.R. As Byrne (1962) comments, "There was close cooperation between the company and the federal government during this period, and it seems likely the C.P.R. lobby played an important part in getting parks legislation through parliament."

Studies were made of the Arkansas Hot Springs reserve in the United States, which had been created by the federal government in 1832. There, despite federal government involvement, development by private interests had capitalized on the springs, and a town had been established (Scace, 1968; Ise, 1961). In spite of the commercial exploitation associated with the Arkansas Reserve, regulations for Banff based on those of the American reserve were adopted (Scace, 1968). Nelson (1969) states that Banff began as a planned community:

"The arrangements and dimensions of some lots are said to have resembled contemporary planned spa communities in Europe, although an immediate American model was Arkansas Hot Springs in the United States. In other words, at the time of its establishment, the townsite of Banff was thought of as a recreational facility in its own right." (Nelson, 1969).

---

1 This was the first federal "reserve" in the United States, but it can not be closely associated with the early national park movement. It was scenically unimportant, and was reserved only because of the supposed curative properties of the hotsprings (Ise, 1961).
The contention that Banff was designed to be a luxury resort or spa is supported by remarks of Prime Minister Macdonald during House of Commons debate on plans to establish Banff Hot Springs reserve as a national park. "A portion of the park offers some beautiful sites for villas, and I believe in the plan the architect lays these out, to be leased to people of wealth, who will erect handsome buildings upon them." (in Brown, 1969).

When legislation was drafted to create a national park at Banff in June, 1887, special reference was made to the Yellowstone National Park Act of 1872. This is particularly evident in Section 2 of the Rocky Mountains Park Act, which is nearly a word for word duplication of a similar section in the Yellowstone legislation:

"The said tract of land is hereby reserved and set apart as a public park and pleasure ground for the benefit, advantage, and enjoyment of the people of Canada, subject to the provisions of this Act and of the regulations hereinafter mentioned, and shall be known as the Rocky Mountains Park of Canada." (S.C. 1887, C. 32).

Government policy was directed towards the development of the area as a spa and tourist resort. The Banff hot springs were a resource that could be exploited for tourism, and the government planned to do just that. In this context, Brown (1969) states that "the original parks policy of Canada was not a departure from, but rather a continuation of the general resource policy that grew out
of the national policy of the Macdonald Government. Underlying parks policy was the assumption of the existence of plentiful resources within the reserves capable of exploitation ... Indeed, in terms of a fundamental premise of 'usefulness', grazing, lumbering, and mining would enhance rather than deprecate the usefulness of the reservation." No provision was made to restrict mining, logging, or grazing in the park. Had such provisions been introduced, the Act probably would have been defeated in Parliament (Nash, 1969).

Thus it is evident that the first national park in Canada was regarded as a different type of reserve than Yellowstone National Park in the United States. While the provisions of the first legislation may have been similar for both Rocky Mountains National Park and Yellowstone, the real purpose of the Canadian park was more analogous to that of the rather insignificant, commercially oriented Arkansas Hot Springs Reserve.

The concept of resource usefulness remained a dominant theme of the Canadian government's national park policy for many years. Brown (1969) cites the following comment on the development of coal deposits near Banff townsite, from the annual report of the superintendent of Rocky Mountains Park for 1904:
"The acquisition and development of this property by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company marks a new era, not only in the history of the Rocky Mountains Park, but in the industrial life of the district of Alberta. The new village of Bankhead, instead of being a detriment to the beauty of the Park, will on the contrary add another to the many and varied attractions of the neighbourhood ...nestling under the shadow of Cascade, with its beautiful homes and its teeming industrial life it has already become a popular stopping place for tourists."

After the Banff Hotsprings reserve was created, a number of other similar areas were established (Nicol, 1969). It is interesting to note, however, that of the first four park reserves or forest parks established in Canada, three were directly on the lines of the Canadian Pacific or Canadian Northern Railways. The National and Historic Parks (1970b) states that Jasper, for example," owes its creation [in 1907] and early development to the construction of [the C.N.R.]..." and that Yoho was created in 1886 "to protect [not reserve from use] the forests and scenery along the lines of the ...[C.P.R.]..." (1970d). This policy of creating parks along major transportation routes was followed in later years with the creation of Mt. Revelstoke National Park on the C.P.R. and Kootenay National Park on the Banff-Windermere Highway (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970c). The intent to maintain these areas as attractive tourist resorts seems clear.

The next significant step in the development of the Canadian national park system took place in 1911, when the
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act was passed by Parliament (S.C. 1911, C. 10). This Act provided for the establishment of Forest Reserves, controlled by the federal government, within which areas could be designated as Dominion Parks. Shortly after the passage of the Act, the boundaries of several park reserves were adjusted, and Rocky Mountains Park, together with other park reserves and forest reserves were formally established as Dominion Parks by Order-in-Council under the provisions of the new legislation (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970d). These parks were to be "maintained ...and made use of as public parks and pleasure grounds for the benefit, advantage and enjoyment of the people of Canada" (S.C. 1911, C. 10). However, the policy of allowing exploitation of resources within the parks continued, being essentially the same for both parks and forest reserves (Nash, 1969). It was noted by Interior Minister Frank Oliver, that regulations for the parks "look to the enjoyment by the people of the natural advantages and beauties of these special sections of the [forest] reserves, while the regulations regarding the remainder of the forest reserves look rather to the exclusion of people from them" (in Brown, 1969).

Following the passage of the Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act, a new branch of the Department of the Interior was established to administer Dominion Parks. J. B. Harkin was appointed the first Commissioner of the Dominion (later
National Parks of Canada (Williams, 1962). Harkin saw as his immediate task the restoration of the depleted wildlife and the development of a road system to make effective fire protection possible. Basically, Harkin's initial problems were analogous to those in the United States which prompted the passage of the Act to Protect the Birds and Animals in Yellowstone National Park, in 1894. Harkin realized that before he could carry out any action, he required money. In order to gain sufficient support in the legislature to insure the necessary appropriations, he set about to publicize the value of the parks in terms of tourist revenues (Nash, 1969; Williams, 1962). "Throughout this early period the fact that townsites and a host of highly unprimitive recreational activities were permitted and even encouraged in Banff and other parks suggests that the administrators had something other than preserving wilderness in mind as their guiding policy" (Nash, 1969).

While Harkin was himself concerned with preserving some of the natural aspects of the parks, notably the wildlife, his administration of parks was directed toward their further development as tourist resorts and recreation areas. As Ise (1961) notes, however, while Canada was generally behind the United States in achieving protection for the parks and wildlife, the financial burden of the parks was much greater on a per capita basis than it was in the United States. Tourist development provided a means of achieving a level of protection.
It should be pointed out, as Brown (1969) notes, that by 1910, a realization of the interrelated nature of resources was emerging in Canada, and that a movement toward their conservation through managed utilization was developing. Conservation in the pragmatic, utilization-of-resources framework advocated by Gifford Pinchot was being adopted in Canada (Thorpe, 1961). However, it is particularly significant that in Canada "...there was no Sierra Club, no John Muir, and nothing resembling the American struggle to keep Hetch Hetchy Valley wild. There was not even a controversy between the use and preservation schools of principle. No one seemed aware that wilderness was at stake in the national parks. Development, both economic and recreational, carried the day" (Nash, 1969). Thus, the increasing awareness of conservation in Canada during this period served to reinforce the policy of multiple use of resources within park areas.

D) Chapter Summary

Formalization of the national park concept occurred in the United States in the early 1870's in response to a desire to preserve for the public, scenic attractions which otherwise might be exploited to private advantage. Natural resources within the park areas were reserved from development. By the 1890's, the value of the national parks as wilderness preserves was recognized and defended in the United States. However, the Congress showed continued
reluctance to appropriate adequate sums of money to insure protection of park wildlife or adequate administration of the parks. Wildlife finally received effective protection in 1894, with the passage of the Act to Protect the Birds and Animals in Yellowstone Park. The late 1890's marked the significant break between those conservationists favouring preservation of wilderness in a natural state and those who supported the careful utilization of all resources to produce economic benefit. This dichotomy of conservation philosophy was clearly demonstrated in the dispute over the flooding of Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite National Park. However, by 1914, the proponents of wilderness and undisturbed parks had gained nationwide support.

In Canada, a different situation existed. The first national parks were established as an extension of the nation's resource development policy, and were managed to produce maximum dollar returns to the country from tourist travel. No preservation of resources within the parks was undertaken or considered desirable. The government showed eagerness to invest in the parks, directing its expenditures to improvements for tourists, not for protection of the areas. In Canada, there was no division in the philosophy of conservation; a utilization of resources approach prevailed. A public movement for wilderness preservation in the parks, as evidenced in the United States, was non-existent in Canada. The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act of 1911
served to clarify the administrative position of the federal reserves, but offered no provisions to limit development of natural resources within the parks.

With the passing of the Dominion Forest Reserve and Parks Act, a National Park Service was established in Canada in 1911, to provide protection for park wildlife, to control forest fires, and to promote and develop the parks for tourism. Thus Canada preceded the United States in setting up a centralized administrative agency for the national parks. However, perhaps this can be explained by the basic differences in approach taken to national parks in the two countries. Canada had an active policy of developing the parks, while the United States followed a more passive policy of preserving the park areas.

One further difference can be noted between the early policies of the two countries. In the United States, the first national parks were established in remote, by scenically significant areas. In contrast, in Canada, the parks were located around transportation routes, almost without exception. The scenic qualities of the reserves is indisputable, but it is evident that location and tourist access were more important criteria in many instances.
Chapter 3  EVOLUTION OF THE NATIONAL PARK SYSTEMS TO 1945

A) Creation of the United States National Park Service

As the national park system in the United States grew, administration of the parks and monuments became increasingly uncoordinated and disorganized. Since no unifying agency existed to administer the parks, each park was administered as a separate unit under the general supervision of the Secretary of the Interior. Appropriations for the parks came sporadically from Congress, and monies were often illogically distributed and designated for specific parks or projects. As a result, some existing parks were starved for funds while other areas, such as Wind Cave and Piatt, of substandard quality, were established as new national parks and given substantial appropriations (Ise, 1961).

As early as 1900, bills had been introduced into Congress to create a central agency to administer the national parks, but support for the idea was not sufficient (Ise, 1961). Gradually, interest and pressure mounted, however. The Hetch Hetchy dispute further publicized the national parks and helped strengthen support for establishing a park service (Strong, 1970). By 1911, administration gradually became formalized within the Department of the Interior. In 1913, an Assistant Secretary of the Department was given responsibility for the parks and several government bureaus.
Finally, in 1915, a Superintendent of National Parks was appointed. Steven T. Mather, an enthusiastic wilderness supporter, member of the Sierra Club, and national park devotee, was the first man to hold the post.

Mather worked persistantly to generate support for congressional authorization of a national park agency and for sufficient funds to make such an agency effective (Strong, 1970). Park and wilderness advocates finally succeeded in generating sufficient enthusiasm for the legislative proposals, resulting in the passage of the National Park Service Act of 1916 (16. U.S.C. secs. 1-17 [1964]) (Nash, 1967; Ise, 1961). A National Park Service within the Department of the Interior was established, and Mather was made first Director. Under his guidance, the direction of national park policy and management for the next half century was set (Darling and Eichorn, 1969; Ise, 1961).

The National Park Service Act of 1916 was highly significant because it established the long needed Park Service and it provided unifying legislation for the national parks. While each national park unit was and still is established by special legislation, the National Park Service Act defined the purposes of the national parks, clarifying past statements and setting the pattern for future legislation. It stated that "the service thus established shall promote and regulate the use of the Federal areas known as national parks, monuments, and reservations ...which purpose is to
conserve the scenery and the natural and historic objects and wild life therein and to provide for the enjoyment of the same in such a manner and by such means as will leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations" (16. U.S.C. secs. 1-17 [1964]). Other legislation, for example, the Sequoia National Park Act (16. U.S.C. secs. 41-45 [1964]), had specified that resources within the parks be retained in their natural condition, but after 1916, it was the explicit policy of the federal government that this be a basic criterion of all national parks.

With a centralized government voice for the national parks and monuments administered by the Interior Department, it was possible to establish more uniform criteria for the reserves and more consistent guidelines for their administration. On May 18, 1918, Secretary of the Interior Lane issued a directive on policy for the National Park Service. Ise (1961) notes that this directive appears to have been written in consultation with Mather, or more likely by Mather himself. Its contents are significant in that they outline the basic framework of policy which exists to the present time. Several points are worthy of special emphasis. Lane (1918) declared that: "First, the national parks must be maintained in absolutely unimpaired form for the use of future generations as well as those of our own time; second, that they are set aside for the use, observation, health, and pleasure of the people; and third, that the national interest must
dictate all decisions affecting public or private enterprise in the parks". As Darling and Eichorn (1969) and others have pointed out, experience has shown the first two instructions can be conflicting. However, the intent is clear. The national parks are basically areas where natural environments are to be maintained, and use should be consistent with this primary objective.

Lane also stipulated that "educational as well as recreational use of the parks should be encouraged". This appears to be the first explicit association of the national parks with a role in education. Since 1918, this function of the national parks has become increasingly important in the United States, and park interpretation has been pursued with enthusiasm by the National Park Service (Darling and Eichorn, 1969). The problem of establishing criteria for new national parks was evident at this time. "In studying new park projects, the Service should seek to find scenery of supreme and distinctive quality or some natural features so extraordinary as to be of national interest and importance. The national park system as now constituted should not be lowered in standard, dignity, and prestige by the inclusion of areas which express in less than the highest terms the particular class or kind of exhibit they represent " (Lane, 1918).

The National Park Service in the United States was as much in need of funds as its Canadian counterpart, and the
association of tourist revenues with the parks was appealing. The National Parks Service promoted tourism in the parks with the belief that once the parks were adequately developed with roads and facilities, revenues could equal appropriations or even produce a profit (Ise, 1961). This state was never reached, as appropriations were increased throughout the 1920's and 1930's. While development of tourist facilities was pursued to a fairly high degree, the concept of parks as resorts never found the favour in the United States that it did in Canada. Mather, the Park Service Director, was operating under different circumstances than was Harken in Canada. As Nash (1969) comments:

"Large numbers of Americans had already expressed their desire that the parks not be 'spoiled' by over-development during the Hetch Hetchy controversy. The fact that Hetch Hetchy was developed as a water supply and hydropower facility only made people madder. The Sierra Club and the National Parks Association [founded in 1919 under Mather's leadership] constituted a watchdog for the parks. In the 1920's and after, friends of national parks in the United States repeatedly engaged in battle those hostile or indifferent to wilderness values and generally succeeded in keeping them outside park borders."

One other action worthy of note occurred in the United States during this period. After many years of discussion in the National Park Service and in Congress, legislation was passed authorizing the President to reorganize the executive and administrative agencies of the federal government by executive order (Ise, 1961). Using this authority, Franklin D. Roosevelt transferred "all functions of administration of
public buildings, reservations, national parks, national monuments and national cemeteries" to the National Park Service (in Ise, 1961). Thus, the National Park Service became the agency responsible for all of the federal "park" areas. Of greatest importance was the consolidation of the administration of all of the national monuments into the National Park Service. As a result, management for these areas could be better coordinated.

B) Canadian National Parks: the Legislation of 1930

Prior to 1930, federal and provincial responsibilities over the control of lands and resources was not the same in all parts of Canada (Nicol, 1969). Under the terms of the British North America Act, the provinces were given control of lands and resources within their boundaries; yet in the three prairie provinces and in the Railway Belt in British Columbia, this right was retained by the federal government. As a result, the federal government was free to establish land policies and to reserve national parks only in the western provinces, while in the central and eastern provinces, this function was taken on by the provincial governments. This difference in level of federal involvement in various parts of the country explains many aspects of the present form of the national park system in Canada.

In the central and eastern provinces, and in British Columbia outside the Railway Belt, few national parks were established. However, some of the provinces, notably
Ontario, Quebec, and British Columbia, developed large systems of provincial parks, independent of the national parks (Litteljohn and Pimlott, 1971; Pimlott, 1968; Passmore, 1966). In this way, a dual responsibility for parks developed in Canada. The federal government had a clear traditional responsibility for establishing parks in the west, but the provinces, always suspicious of federal powers, had developed their own systems under their constitutional mandate.

Even today, no successful rationalization of the presumably separate functions of national and provincial parks has been realized in Canada. There are a number of federal parks that perform basically local functions, while some outstanding provincial parks have clear national significance in terms of the types of landscapes they encompass (Nicol, 1969; Pimlott, 1968). The federal government and many of the provinces are deeply involved in providing outdoor recreation areas. In fact, some of the national parks are referred to as "family holiday parks", and recreation has a very high priority in all federal parks (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). Thus, there is a very significant overlap of function between the federal and provincial park systems. In recent years, one distinction is clear, however. Natural resource development has largely been eliminated from the national parks, while in most of the provincial systems, the trend has been to open up the larger
parks to mining and logging (Pimlott, 1968).

In 1930, the federal government relinquished control of nearly all of its non-park lands in the prairies and in the Railway Belt of British Columbia under the Transfer of Resources Agreements (S.C. 1930, C. 3, 29, 37, 41). This action was highly significant to the future of the national park system, for it meant that any new national parks established outside of the Yukon and Northwest Territories (where federal jurisdiction still prevailed) would have to be created on provincial lands with the full approval of the provincial government concerned.

Another significant action taken by the federal government in 1930 was the passage of the National Parks Act (R.S.C. 1952, C. 189 as amended). The Act outlined the purposes of the national parks in terms similar to those used in the United States National Park Service Act of 1916 (16. U.S.C. secs. 1-17 [1964]). For the first time in Canada, it was stipulated that the parks be maintained in an "unimpaired" condition, although this term was undefined. Section 4 of the National Parks Act is quoted as follows:

"The Parks are hereby dedicated to the people of Canada for their benefit, education, and enjoyment subject to the provisions of this Act and the regulations, and such Parks shall be maintained and made use of so as to leave them unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations."

While the Act of 1930 introduced the provision that the parks be maintained "unimpaired", no change in policy
was evident, and the development of the parks for tourism and recreation was still a prime goal. Superintendent Harkin, however, was prompted to privately question the increasing commercialization of the parks:

"...is not outstanding beauty one of the rarest and greatest possessions a land can possess? It should be looked upon as a national asset and given an important place in every programme of conservation. And quite aside from the millions of money these rare places bring into a country, have they not an even greater value -- the power to give pure and ennobling pleasure, and may this value seem far more important to future generations than it does today." (in Williams, 1962).

Facility-oriented recreational development of the parks was encouraged, and private home sites continued to be made available. Until the mid 1940's "summer cottages were being encouraged as a very desirable use of the national parks" (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). In a number of the national parks, notably Jasper, Prince Albert, and Riding Mountain, choice areas were, and still are, blocked off for these private developments (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a).

Another important provision of the National Parks Act was contained in Section 6 (3), which empowered the Governor in Council "to purchase, expropriate, or otherwise acquire any lands or interests therein ...for the purposes of a park" (R.S.C. 1952, C. 189, as amended). Despite this provision, however, the federal government requested that all new national park lands be turned over to it by the provinces in perpetuity and free of all encumbrances (National and
Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). It is understandable that the federal government was unwilling to expropriate provincial lands, but there is no apparent reason why purchasing or cost-sharing agreements could not have been reached with the provinces. This policy proved a major obstacle to further expansion of the national park system. In the 38 years before this requirement was relaxed in 1968, only six relatively small national parks were established in Canada (Nicol, 1969; Brooks, 1969).

The National Parks Act had further significance because it defined all parks in a schedule attached to the Act, and all subsequent parks could be created only by amending this schedule by Act of Parliament. This was an important change over previous legislation (The Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act), which left authority for establishing parks and adjusting boundaries with the Governor in Council. Thus, the parks were given increased protection, since now only Parliament could create a national park or change its boundaries. As a result, one Act (with its amendments) provides a legislative umbrella for all of the national parks in Canada.

C) Chapter Summary

The establishment of a centralized bureau to manage the American National Parks was undertaken in 1916 under the provisions of the National Park Service Act. This Act laid
the basis for all subsequent park administration in the United States and emphasized the necessity to maintain the parks in an unimpaired condition for the enjoyment of future generations. In 1918, a more explicit policy directive was drafted by Interior Secretary Lane. This document remains a basic policy guideline in the United States National Park Service. Lane stressed the importance of maintaining high standards in considering new areas for inclusion in the national park system.

In Canada, the Transfer of Resources Agreements in 1930 marked the end of the period when the federal government was free to establish national parks in most parts of the four western provinces. Also in this year, new legislation was passed stating that the parks were to be maintained unimpaired for future generations. Thus, the parks were no longer to be managed as multiple use areas where natural resources could be exploited. In addition, parks could no longer be created or adjusted by the Governor in Council. Parliament was given this responsibility, and as a result, the parks were better protected. After 1930, it became the policy of the government to establish new national parks only on lands turned over to it by the provinces in perpetuity and free of all encumbrances.

In a number of the provinces, systems of parks were well established by the 1930's and 1940's which were similar
in function to the national parks. Thus, no clear
distinction exists in Canada between the functions of
national and provincial parks.
Chapter 4  THE NATIONAL PARKS IN THE POST WAR YEARS

A) Balancing Use and Preservation in the American National Parks

Prior to World War II, visitor use of the national parks in both the United States and Canada was moderate. However, the post war years witnessed an unprecedented increase in the number of people visiting the national parks (Nicol, 1969; Hartzog, 1969). In 1916, when the United States Park Service was formed, total visits to the national park system were under 400,000. By 1956, the level had reached 55,000,000, and was increasing at a rate of about 10 percent per year (Clawson, 1959).

By 1945, automobiles had become the most popular means of travel in most parts of North America. The continent-wide acceptance of this method of transportation and the increasing ease of ownership of cars made parks accessible to a much greater proportion of the population (Smith, 1960). It also meant that people expected to be able to use their vehicles in the national parks, and vastly increased pressure was placed on the parks and their road systems. Furthermore, visitors were (and are) tending to carry more and more equipment, such as trailers, campers, and boats, with them. As a result, the preservation function of some of the national parks was becoming seriously threatened (Cahn, 1968). It soon became apparent that as
increasingly large areas of the national parks were developed for the accommodation and recreation of visitors, some of the natural qualities of the parks suffered (Darling and Eichorn, 1967; Willard, 1967). Preservation oriented conservationists began to wonder if the vastly increased popularity of the parks, originally regarded as the only real safeguard against their exploitation, was not in fact a threat to them (Litton, 1952; Shepard, 1953). Thus, there was a change in the intensity of use of the national parks as well as a change in the character of the park user.

In the early 1950's, the National Park Service was faced with the problem of catching up with maintenance and improvements deferred during the war years (United States National Park Service, 1956). Moreover, by 1955, the national park system was capable of providing accommodation facilities for only one half of the annual visitors to the parks and monuments. In an effort to create an adequate supply of facilities within the parks to meet the projected visitor demands, the National Park Service initiated a 10 year program termed "Mission 66".

Conrad Wirth, Director of the National Park Service during this period, introduced Mission 66 by defining the primary value of the national park system as "...its capability to provide enjoyment in its best sense, now and in the future". He continued with the following statement:
"Appropriate park use by present and future generations requires preservation and protection of the resources of the parks. But the underlying purpose of national parks, a purpose derived clearly from the Act of 1916 as well as from the several acts establishing the national parks and monuments, is to yield certain benefits to the Nation and its people. These benefits result primarily from the visitor's experiences in the areas of the System. It is the function of the National Park Service and the objective of the Mission 66 program constantly to improve the quality of that experience." (Wirth, 1958).

The Mission 66 program had eight key objectives, namely:

1) To provide additional accommodations and related services of types adapted to modern recreational needs, through greater participation of private enterprise within and near the parks.

2) To provide the government-operated facilities needed to serve the public, to protect the park resources, and to maintain the physical plant.

3) To provide the services which will make the parks more usable, more enjoyable, and more meaningful, and thereby improve the protection of the parks through visitor cooperation.

4) To provide operating funds and field staff required to manage the areas, protect the resources, and provide a high standard of maintenance for all developments.

5) To provide adequate living quarters for the field employees of the Service.

6) To acquire lands within the parks and such other lands as are necessary for protection or use, acquire the water rights needed to insure adequate water supplies, and extinguish grazing rights and other competing uses.

7) To institute a coordinated nation-wide recreation plan to produce a system of recreational developments by each level of government, Federal, State, and local, each bearing its proper share of the expanding recreational load.

8) To provide for the protection and preservation of the wilderness areas within the National Park System and encourage their appreciation and enjoyment in ways that will leave them unimpaired." (United States National Park Service, 1956).
These objectives were developed with the hope of reaching some sort of balance between the responsibility to preserve the parks while at the same time making them accessible to the public. It seems that more emphasis was placed on development of the parks than on their protection, although development was not pursued to as great a degree as it was in Canada. Early in the program, Director Wirth stated:

"Preservation of wilderness is something that really measures the whole program. In passing, I might say that the developments planned for the national parks will be accomplished virtually without taking another acre from the recognized wilderness areas in the scenic national parks. What Mission 66 is doing is simply making better and more efficient use of the areas in these parks that are already available to us by road." (Wirth, 1958).

The conservation organizations initially expressed pleasure at the general proposal for improvements within the parks, although they were troubled by the specifics of implementation of the program (Packard, 1956). For example, while the Park Service underlined the importance of maintaining the parks in an unimpaired condition, conservationists noted with regret a reluctance on the part of the Service to include the last of the eight program objectives (Brower, 1958). Moreover, conservationists were disturbed by the Park Service's failure to involve the public in the planning stages of the program. The Mission 66 plans were collated on the basis of recommendations of field personnel, who were instructed to report their immediate requirements
without consulting a more comprehensive master plan (Wayburn and Wayburn, 1956).

From the original estimated cost of $459,000,000, the project grew to require expenditures of nearly $650,000,000 (Hartzog, 1969). It was anticipated that this expenditure would meet the demands projected for 1966, the fiftieth anniversary of the establishment of the National Park Service. Unfortunately, it did not. Whereas Mission 66 had estimated visitation for 1966 at just under 90,000,000, nearly 140,000,000 visited the parks in that year (Hartzog, 1969). Nevertheless, the Mission 66 program accomplished many of its goals. Some facilities were relocated outside the parks--for example service buildings in Yosemite Valley were moved to El Portal (National Parks Association, 1959)--and an impressive number of new facilities were built, including 17,782 campsites, 12,393 picnic sites, and 100 "visitor centers" emphasizing education and park interpretation (Hartzog, 1969).

On the other hand, the project has been severely criticized for certain developments. For example, considerable damage was done to glacial rock formations during realignment and widening of the Tioga Pass road in Yosemite, and roads in Mt. McKinley National Park were built to an excessively high standard (Adams, 1958; Darling and Eichorn, 1969). In another instance, the National Park Service has
admitted regret over the location of the new Canyon Village in Yellowstone National Park, realizing that it could have been better sited outside the park (Darling and Eichorn, 1969).

Up to the 1960's, the National Park Service has had to bear most of the responsibility in providing for outdoor recreation in the United States. "The Service, as it later reacted to pressures was over-generous with a perishable and shrinking resource and did not act quickly enough in coordinating with other agencies [such as the Forest Service] to spread the load and to divert fun-seeking recreation to other areas that the national parks." (Darling and Eichorn, 1969). This comment expresses discontent voiced by many conservationists over the Mission 66 program. They felt that recreational activities not directly related to the national parks were being encouraged in park areas to the detriment of the parks (Smith, 1968, 1970). Conservationists maintained that the basic justification of the national parks was the preservation of natural or quasi-natural environments for their inspirational and aesthetic values. From this point of view, use of national parks should be limited to those activities directly dependent on and related to the special qualities of a particular park. Therefore, it was reasoned, a great many activities, such as downhill skiing, vacation camping, mechanized sports, golf, and other similar pursuits, should be excluded from the national parks, or at least given
very low priority (Darling and Eichorn, 1969). "Mission 66, instead of being a far-sighted planning operation to conserve these choice areas, seems to have been conceived to allow more complete infiltration and uncritical use. We remain somewhat puzzled by -- as it seems to us -- the unfair political pressures which have been brought to bear on the National Park Service to dilute wilderness quality ...and the relative peace with which the Forest Service has been able to conduct its wilderness-preserving and recreational policy." (Darling and Eichorn, 1969).

While development of the parks was an important issue, perhaps the most serious criticism of Mission 66 was its acceptance of the premise that visitor demands must be satisfied (Darling and Eichorn, 1969; Draper, 1956). Certainly, there is the question of how, in a democratic society, one can limit public access to publicly owned land, but as has been pointed out by numerous writers, we do not hesitate to limit admittance to many types of performances or to concerts and art galleries, which are nevertheless "opened to the public". Why, then, was not serious consideration given to limiting attendance in the national parks on a reservation or "first come first serve" basis?

It was realized during the final years of the Mission 66 project, that the capacity of the parks was limited, and that a very serious attempt should be made to divert people
away from the national parks by providing attractive recreation areas around reservoirs, and on undeveloped sections of the coastline. Land acquisition programs for these types of areas were increased, and during the 1960's six National Seashores, two National Lakeshores, and nine National Recreation Areas were established (Hartzog, 1969). Thus, instead of developing the national parks for recreation, alternate areas were acquired for this purpose. The criteria for such areas are less stringent than for national parks (United States National Park Service, 1968b). For recreation areas, location is a prime concern, and outstanding scenic or biological features are of secondary importance.

In a memorandum, released in 1964, Interior Secretary Udall noted:

"In looking back at the legislative enactments that have shaped the National Park System, it is clear that the Congress has included within the growing System three different categories of areas -- natural, historical, and recreational.

Natural areas are the oldest category, reaching back to the establishment of Yellowstone National Park almost a century ago. A little later historical areas began to be authorized culminating in the broad charter for historical preservation set forth in the Historic Sites Act of 1935. In recent decades, with exploding population and diminishing open space, the urgent need for National Recreation Areas is receiving new emphasis and attention... A single, broad management concept encompassing these three categories of areas within the System is inadequate either for their proper preservation or for realization of their full potential for public use as embodied in the expressions of Congressional policy. Each of these categories requires a separate management concept and a separate set of management principles coordinated to form one organic management plan for the entire system." (in United States National Park Service, 1968b).
Thus, recreation was recognized as a function separate from that of the national parks, and separate policies reflecting this difference were developed (United States National Park Service, 1968a,b). As is shown in later sections of this study, this distinction of function between national parks and recreation areas has not been recognized in Canada.

B) Natural Resources Development in the American National Parks: 1948 - 1968

In addition to the growing problems of visitor use in the national parks following World War II, there was also continuing pressure on the National Park Service and the federal government to develop natural resources within the parks and to limit further expansion of the national park system. In the last 20 years, there has been a succession of attempts to alienate national park lands for mining, lumbering, and power development. Disputes have occurred over the timber in Olympic National Park, mineral deposits in several national monuments, and possible water and power projects in a number of parks and monuments. Two disputes, involving Dinosaur National Monument and the Grand Canyon, were particularly significant in influencing the interpretation of national park legislation, and in clarifying the functions of national parks. Such disputes as these were also important because of the role they played in instrumenting a widespread public awareness of the value of wilderness areas.
In 1948, a dispute began which was in many ways reminiscent of the Hetch Hetchy controversy 40 years earlier (Nash, 1967). At this time, the Federal Bureau of Reclamation revealed a proposal to build two dams on the Green River at Echo Park in Dinosaur National Monument on the Colorado-Utah border. This preserve had been established by Woodrow Wilson in 1915, and was greatly expanded by Franklin Roosevelt in 1938. As part of a billion dollar scheme encompassing 10 dams, termed the Colorado River Storage Project, waters from the Echo Park dams were to form a reservoir in the canyons and gorges of Dinosaur (Ise, 1961).

The proposal was immediately challenged by conservationists, who foresaw not only the loss of the scientific, recreational, and wilderness values of the national monument, but also the establishment of a precedent which could endanger the sanctity of every other unit of the National Park System in the United States (Nash, 1967). Already, other suggestions for dam construction on the main stream of the Colorado River threatened both Grand Canyon National Park and Grand Canyon National Monument, and other projects were being considered for Kings Canyon and Glacier National Parks (National Parks Association, 1948, 1949; Packard, 1949a, b). A policy which would allow the flooding of Dinosaur National Monument would greatly increase the chances of these other projects being authorized.
The dispute over Dinosaur soon became a national concern. "Not since Hetch Hetchy had so many Americans so thoroughly debated the wisdom of preserving wilderness." (Nash, 1967). Following hearings on the issue in June, 1950, and despite Park Service opposition, Interior Secretary O.L. Chapman approved the Echo Park project. Park Service Director Newton Drury, who disagreed strongly with his superior's decision, was soon asked to accept a demotion or resign. He resigned, and a new director more ammenable to the Secretary was appointed (Ise, 1961).

As far as conservationists were concerned, the fight had just begun. Before construction work could begin, the project still required Congressional approval. Conservation organizations such as the National Parks Association, The Wilderness Society, and the Sierra Club expanded their efforts to arouse public concern over the future of the national park system. Films such as *This is Dinosaur* and *Wilderness River Trail* were produced and made available for mass distribution (National Parks Association, 1954). The national magazines of the organizations carried frequent articles, pictoral stories, and news reports as the dispute progressed (National Parks Association, 1955; Butcher, 1950a, b, 1952). Furthermore, widely circulated magazines such as *Life*, the *Saturday Evening Post*, and the *Readers Digest* published articles generally opposing the Echo Park dams (Nash, 1967). Nash (1967) states that efforts to stop
the project were backed by over 70 national conservation organizations and about 230 state groups. However, support for the project was also strong, centered in the states most closely involved with it. The Bureau of Reclamation, which would be responsible for construction of the dams "...with lush funds at its disposal ...put on a very effective campaign which won over many of the people of Utah and western Colorado" (Ise, 1961).

While the conservationists stressed the spiritual and aesthetic values of the monument, they also underlined its scientific importance and challenged the economic rationale and some engineering assumptions of the project (Packard, 1955; Nash, 1967). Despite the intensity of opposition to the Echo Park dams, both House and Senate subcommittees reported favourably on the project in 1954. Nash (1967) comments:

"Their action was understandable, since Western Congressmen, whose constituents generally favored the dam, were in the majority in both bodies. Wilderness appeared to be headed for a decisive defeat, but preservationists worked frantically. Appealing to the public with flyers, articles, editorials, and open letters, they succeeded in arousing a storm of protest. The House mail showed a ratio of those who would keep Dinosaur wild to those in favor of the dam of eighty to one. The result was a postponement of Congressional consideration of the Project."

In 1955, the Colorado River Storage Project went before the Congress for consideration. The Senate Bill (S. 500) passed with an Echo Park dam included, but in the
House version (H.R. 3383), Echo Park was deleted. Dams for Flaming Gorge, Glen Canyon, and Navajo Reservoir were approved, however (National Parks Association, 1955). Proponents of the Echo Park dam tried to have the project reinstated, but finally agreed on a compromise (Ise, 1961). When the revised Bill became law the following year, it included the provision that "no dam or reservoir constructed under the authorization of the Act shall be within any National Park or Monument" (in Nash, 1967).

The reaffirmation of Dinosaur National Monument as a natural wilderness area within the National Park System demonstrated the skill of the conservationists in making their views known to the public and the Congress. It also showed the increasing importance accorded national parks by the American people. In addition, it illustrated the importance of jurisdiction in questions affecting areas of unique quality. Had approval for the Echo Park dam been left to local interests, it would have undoubtedly been constructed, since local support for the project was widespread. However, because the area was under federal administration, the significance of the project and the monument to the nation as a whole was the key question. It was opposition from non-local organizations and individuals that defeated the project.

The resolution of the conflict and the deletion of
the Echo Park dams from the Colorado River Storage Project did not fully satisfy some conservationists. Two problems remained. Firstly, the Colorado River Storage Project, as authorized by Congress, included provisions for the construction of a dam in Glen Canyon, north of the Grand Canyon. Glen Canyon, termed "the Place No One Knew", was a spectacular wild area of enchanting quality (Porter, 1963). It was not a unit of the National Park System, and as a result, had no protection. Conservation organizations, notably the Sierra Club, tried without success to have work on the Glen Canyon dam stopped (Leydet, 1964). Their position on the issue was weakened because they did not present a united front (Brower, 1964).

The second concern was over the flooding of parts of Rainbow Bridge National Monument by the waters of Lake Powell, created by the Glen Canyon Dam. The legislation authorizing the project had been interpreted by the conservationists to mean no damage was to be allowed to result from the construction of any works associated with the Colorado River Storage Project. To insure protection of Rainbow Bridge, some construction would have had to be undertaken to stop the reservoir from flooding one of the side canyons leading to the Rainbow Bridge (Brower, 1962). Despite initial concern expressed by the National Park Service, however, Congress explicitly denied appropriations for such work on two occasions, and on the basis of this action, the Department of the Interior stated that the
provision for protection of the monument was no longer operative (Sierra Club, 1963a). Long term structural damage to the Rainbow Bridge is a real and continuing possibility (Judd, 1963).

The proposals to build dams on the mainstream of the Colorado River in the Grand Canyon remained in abeyance for some time after the dispute over the Echo Park dams was resolved. However, in the early 1960's, plans to build dams in the Grand Canyon were advanced by the state of Arizona, the city of Los Angeles, and the Federal Bureau of Reclamation as part of the federal Southwest Water Plan (Thomas, 1963). The Plan, outlined by Secretary Udall on August 27, 1963, called for an investment of four billion dollars over a 30 year period, and included ultimate plans for both the Bridge Canyon and Marble Canyon dams (Sierra Club, 1963b). Concern finally centered on the federal development proposals for the river. Conservationists favoured inclusion of all of the Grand Canyon as a National Monument to insure adequate consideration of the projects before Congress (Sierra Club, 1963b). This action was not undertaken, but the federal government's involvement in the Southwest Water Plan insured hearings before the Congress. In many ways, the dispute was similar to the conflict over the development of dams in Dinosaur National Monument. The conservationists were not in disagreement with the basic objectives of the river development project, but were
opposed to the Grand Canyon dams specifically (Smith, 1966).

The conservationists organized a campaign which aroused massive nation-wide support for retention of the Grand Canyon in its natural condition. Additionally, the economics of the proposal were questioned, since the dams' primary purpose was to aid in the financing of the river development scheme in its entirety. It became apparent that a number of alternatives existed that would produce at least comparable benefits to those projected from the two Grand Canyon dams (Smith, 1966; Moss, 1967). The advisability of the dams was further questioned because of the large amounts of water that would be lost through evaporation from the reservoirs. Proponents of the dams countered these arguments, contending that the dams would enhance the recreational opportunities of the area, and that they were essential to the project.

In any event, massive public opposition, coupled with the existence of feasible alternatives prompted the administration to drop both of the dams from its revised Lower Colorado River Project (Sierra Club, 1967a). While pressure from supporters of the dams for authorization to build at least one of them continued, opposition to the dams was maintained, and attempts to secure passage of legislation to authorize them were unsuccessful (Sierra Club, 1967b). Finally, on September 30, 1968, the Senate passed the Central Arizona Project Act, but stipulated that no dams were to be
built in the Grand Canyon. Support mounted for the inclusion of all parts of the canyon outside the National Park in an expanded park area, but action on this proposal was not forthcoming. The question of allowing development within the national parks, rejected in the Echo Park dispute, was again rejected in Grand Canyon. Again, public awareness of the value of natural parks was stimulated, and preservation of wilderness areas was reaffirmed as a fundamental part of policy for national parks. In addition, public acceptance of the need for natural areas reached an all-time high and gave conservationists a stronger voice in later attempts to expand and protect the national parks (Nash, 1967).

C) The National Wilderness Preservation System and the Expansion of the American National Park System

Early preservation-oriented conservationists, such as John Muir, has always conceived of the national parks primarily as wilderness preserves (Strong, 1970; Nash, 1967). Indeed, in the years prior to World War II, when use of the parks was low, a de facto wilderness state existed in the parks and pressure for development was minimal. However, with the post-war visitor boom, the illusion was lost, and a movement developed to create a federally administered system of true wilderness areas.

Beginning in 1924, the United States Forest Service
of the Department of Agriculture designated areas of wilderness within the National Forests (Nash, 1967; Outdoor Recreation Resources Review Commission, 1962). By 1933, 63 primitive areas were identified in the national forests, ranging in size from 5,000 to over 1,000,000 acres (ORRRC, 1962). Unfortunately, these areas were not protected by legislation and were subject to continuing pressure for development. In later years, these areas were reclassified and redefined under a variety of regulations (see ORRRC, 1962). However, the policy of maintaining large areas within national forests as wilderness regions, with varying degrees of protection, continues.

After the successful defense of Dinosaur National Monument by the conservationists, pressure mounted for the establishment of a national wilderness preservation system. In June, 1956, Hubert Humphrey introduced a Bill (S. 4013) into the Senate providing for the establishment of such a system (Humphrey, 1956). Similar legislation was also introduced into the House by John P. Saylor (H.R. 11703). Based on earlier proposals of Howard Zahniser of The Wilderness Society, the Bills called for federal designation of wilderness areas within National Parks, National Forests, Wildlife Refuges, and Indian Reserves, with jurisdiction to remain with the agencies then responsible for the lands in question (Sierra Club, 1956; Nash, 1967).
"Congress lavished more time and effort on the wilderness bill than on any other measure in American conservation history. From June 1957 until May 1964, there were nine separate hearings on the proposal collecting over six thousand pages of testimony. The bill itself was modified and rewritten numerous times. One reason for the extraordinary delay in reaching a decision was the vigorous opposition to the permanent preservation of wilderness from wood using industries, oil, grazing and mining interests, most professional foresters, some government bureaus, and proponents of mass recreation with plans for mechanized access to outdoor areas. At the root of their dissent was the feeling that a wilderness preservation system would be too rigid and inflexible." (Nash, 1967).

Despite the strong and vocal opposition to the wilderness bills, public support for the measure was widespread. Numerous newspapers produced editorials urging the passage of the bills, and the conservation organizations exerted continued efforts to persuade legislators and the public of the advisability of the proposals (The Wilderness Society, 1956). "The experience of conservationists in the 1950's, when they battled well-financed and politically powerful sponsors of proposals to give away public land and invade and exploit our National Forests, National Parks, and other public ownerships, set the stage for the 'push' for the Wilderness Law." (Brandbourg, 1969).

Indicative of the widespread bi-partisan support for the Wilderness Law are the House and Senate votes on the Bills. The Wilderness Law passed in the Senate by 72 to 12 in 1963, and the following year was passed by the House by 371 to 1 (Nash, 1967). On September, 1964, the Wilderness
Act was signed by President Lyndon Johnson and became Law (16. U.S.C. secs. 1131-1136 [1964]) (Johnson, 1965).

Wilderness was defined in the legislation in a general statement, allowing some flexibility in its interpretation.

"A wilderness, in contrast with those areas where man and his own works dominate the landscape, is hereby recognized as an area where the earth and its community of life are untrammeled by man, where man himself is a visitor who does not remain. An area of wilderness is further defined to mean in this Act an area of undeveloped Federal land retaining its primeval character and influence, without permanent improvements or human habitation, which is protected and managed so as to preserve its natural conditions and which 1) generally appears to have been affected primarily by the forces of nature, with the imprint of man's work substantially unnoticeable; 2) has outstanding opportunities for solitude or a primitive and unconfined type of recreation; 3) has at least five thousand acres of land or is of sufficient size to make practicable its preservation and use in an unimpaired condition; and 4) may also contain ecological, geological, or other features of scientific, educational, scenic, or historical values." (16. U.S.C. sec. 1132c [1964]).

Of significance is the lack of emphasis on the spectacular nature of the landscape—a feature which is emphasized in criteria for National Parks (United States National Park Service, 1968a). It is the natural quality of areas which warrants their protection, not some outstanding or spectacular feature.

The Wilderness Law gave legal recognition to wilderness as a legitimate land use and established a framework for the creation of a nation-wide system of wilderness areas. Initially, the Law called for the inclusion of all "wild"
and "wilderness" areas established by the Department of Agriculture on National Forest lands and gave protection to the Boundary Waters Canoe Area. In addition, it required, within 10 years, the review of Forest Service Primitive Areas and roadless areas of 5,000 acres or more within all National Parks, Monuments, Wildlife Refuges, and Game Reserves for possible reclassification into the Wilderness Preservation System. Ultimately, up to 50,000,000 acres may be included within this system.

Basically, the Law served to unify the classification of areas within a variety of federally controlled systems and to increase the protection afforded these areas. Control and review of the areas remains within the pre-existing government agencies, however, and this provision has resulted in differing interpretations and approaches to implementing the legislation (Brandbourg, 1969).

The statement of intent of the Wilderness Act is particularly worthy of note. It was to:

"...assure that an increasing population, accompanied by expanding settlement and growing mechanization, does not occupy and modify all areas within the United States and its possessions, leaving no lands designated for preservation and protection in their natural condition ...it is hereby the policy of the Congress to secure for the American people of present and future generations the benefits of an enduring resource of wilderness ... and these [Wilderness Areas] shall be administered for the use and enjoyment of the American people in such a manner as will leave them unimpaired for the future use and enjoyment as
wilderness; and so as to provide for the protection of these areas, the preservation of their wilderness character, and for the gathering and dissemination of information regarding their use and enjoyment as wilderness ..." (16. U.S.C. sec. 1132c [1964]).

The Congress recognized the need for wilderness as a special land use, administered at the federal level, implying that these areas are important to all the people of the country. Certainly the Act recognized non-material benefits as a justification for maintaining this type of land use.

It was not the intention of the Congress to change the basis purposes of areas within the national parks and monuments designated as wilderness, but rather to supplement the purposes for which "units of the national park system are established" (16. U.S.C. sec. 1133c [1964]). Thus, the Wilderness Act served to reinforce the preservation function of the national parks and monuments, making it extremely difficult for park areas to be developed for intensive recreation, once wilderness areas are established.

The passage of the Wilderness Act encouraged conservationists in their attempts to expand the national park system in the United States. Both Kennedy and Johnson Administrations were anxious to see new national park and recreation areas added and supported proposals by conservationists for the establishment of a redwoods national park and a park in the North Cascades Range (Udall, 1961; United States Department of the Interior, 1966). These
areas had been proposed as new national parks on numerous occasions, but due to general apathy and opposition from lumber interests, who did not want the preservation of timber in the areas, little action had been taken. In California, private organizations, principally the Save the Redwoods League, had made substantial purchases of stands of mature redwoods and donated them to the state as park lands, but by the mid-1960's some of the crucial stands were in immediate danger of being logged (United States Department of the Interior, 1966; Nash, 1967). The conservation organizations mounted a determined effort to hasten Congressional action, running full page newspaper ads and producing books, brochures, and films on the coastal redwoods (Hyde and Leydet, 1964; Sierra Club, 1967, 1968a). The Redwoods National Park proposals debated in Congress had nation-wide support. This was one of the most closely watched conservation disputes of the century (Wayburn, 1968). Ultimately, Congress passed legislation (Public Law 90-545) authorizing appropriations of $92,000,000 for acquisition of private timber holdings, and established a 58,000 acre national park (McCloskey, 1968a).

In the same congressional session, a large National Park-Recreation Area-Wilderness Area complex was established on National Forest lands in the North Cascades of Washington State by Public Law 90-544 (McCloskey, 1968b). The dispute
over North Cascades had been nearly as intense as the debate over Redwoods National Park, with lumber interests expressing concern over withdrawal of large timber stands from logging and conservation groups stressing the recreational and aesthetic values of the area. A compromise solution was agreed upon whereby some of the timbered river valleys were excluded from the park (Callison, 1968).

The resolution of conflicts over the North Cascades and the Coast Redwoods further indicates the increasing commitment to the preservation of natural areas witnessed in the passage of the Wilderness Act and in the successful defense of Dinosaur National Monument and the Grand Canyon from power development interests.

D) The Canadian National Parks in the Post-War Years

The post-war period saw little expansion of the National Park System in Canada, despite rapidly increasing use of the parks (Nicol, 1969). A number of mining and logging operations in the western parks were phased out and the lands acquired by the federal government. However, in spite of the provisions of the National Parks Act of 1930, leases were granted to 262 square miles of timber in Wood Buffalo National Park between 1955 and 1962 (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970d; Theberge, 1970). Logging of this timber lease continues at the present time, as does logging on some earlier leases within some of the other national parks. However, logging is gradually being phased
out of all national parks. On the other hand, in the provincial systems, industrial development within the parks has been condoned, and this situation can be said to be reflective of attitudes towards parks in most of Canada. All four provinces having the largest park systems -- British Columbia, Alberta, Ontario, and Quebec -- permit logging and mining developments and water impoundments in some of their park areas (Pimlott, 1968; Litteljohn and Pimlott, 1971). In several cases, such as in British Columbia's Tweedsmuir and Strathcona Parks, vast areas of park land have been flooded, but there has been little public opposition to these encroachments beyond comments in the local newspapers. As Nash (1969) points out, there have been no equivalents in Canada to the disputes over Dinosaur National Monument, the passage of the Wilderness Act, or the proposed dams on the Grand Canyon. This is clearly not because parks or wilderness areas have not been equally threatened in Canada. "The proposal that Banff host the 1968 or 1972 Winter Olympics occasioned slightly more controversy but still much less than even a minor row in the United States... The inescapable conclusion is that in Canada a wilderness movement on a broad, citizen level does not exist. In its absence, the political effectiveness of the few Canadian preservationists is and has been slight." (Nash, 1969).
It is significant to note that the National and Provincial Parks Association of Canada was not formed until 1963 (Nash, 1969). The general objectives of this organization are similar to those of the National Parks Association formed in the United States in 1918, and of the Sierra Club formed in 1892 by John Muir (Jones, 1965). This fact is indicative of the traditional general lack of concern over parks and wilderness areas in Canada, and provides evidence to support the contention that Canadian attitudes towards parks and wilderness area management are about 50 years behind those of Americans (Nash, 1967; Cowan, 1968).

While the Canadian public demonstrated little concern for the wilderness aspects of the national parks, recreation in the parks increased dramatically after World War II (Nicol, 1969). As in the United States, use has been increasing by about 10 percent each year. Probably this increase would have been greater had the geographical distribution of the national parks been more balanced.

Wood Buffalo National Park represents about one half of the total area of the Canadian National Park System, and still remains isolated and undeveloped, except for logging as noted above. The other major concentration of park acreage -- the national parks in the Rocky Mountains, including Yoho, Kootenay, Banff, and Jasper -- has become the major focus of policy for national park development.
These parks received the bulk of visitor use and became major recreation centers. As an indication of the importance of these four parks, out of a total of 10,000,000 visits to the national parks in 1965-66, approximately 4,000,000 were concentrated in these parks (Nelson, 1969; Stenton, 1969).

Development within the western parks consisted primarily of road construction and expansion of facilities in the park townsites. While compact visitor service center complexes were maintained in the United States, large townsites developed in a number of the Canadian National Parks. These included the towns of Banff, Field, Jasper, and Radium Hot Springs. The largest of these centers is Banff, which by the early 1960's had grown to a population of 3,400, from under 300 at the turn of the century (Nelson, 1969). The early tradition if the Canadian national parks as well developed resorts continued into the 1950's and 1960's. Numerous new hotel, motel, and ski developments were established at this time, notably in Banff (National Park Service, 1970a,b,c,d).

Other types of developments have also been permitted in the national parks in Canada. For example, between 1947 and 1968, the Banff School of Fine Arts was established and a building housing the Archives of the Canadian Rockies was opened at Banff (National and Historic Parks Branch,
1970a). It is interesting to note that where similar types of developments have been proposed in the national parks of the United States, strong public opposition has been voiced, and projects of this nature have generally not been permitted.

Access to the Rocky Mountain parks was significantly improved by construction of the Trans-Canada Highway through Banff, Yoho, and Glacier National Parks in the late 1950's and early 1960's. As a result, a marked increase in visitation to all of these parks occurred (Nicol, 1969). Additionally, the Banff-Jasper Highway and the Banff-Windermere Highway were upgraded to "modern standards" during this period (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970a,c). The construction of these roads did considerable damage to the park landscapes, and for this reason has been criticized (Bodsworth, 1969). The present two-lane Trans-Canada Highway is now being upgraded to a four-laned roadway (Nelson, 1969; National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970a). It is unfortunate that such action is being taken within the parks, but since the Rocky Mountain national parks include some of the best mountain passes, it is almost unavoidable that such developments should occur. However, as pointed out by Nelson (1969), many roads now in existence or proposed in the national parks do not serve as primary transportation links and "seem to be intended to provide access by auto, rather than by foot or horse, to areas of outstanding beauty
Initially facilities such as public campgrounds are envisioned along these scenic roads. But historical precedent suggests that motels, restaurants, gas stations and other services would soon be demanded by and/or provided for the public." (Nelson, 1969).

Significantly, however, even when development of the national parks had reached the advanced stage noted, no written policy comparable to the 1918 directive of United States Interior Secretary Lane had been developed in Canada. Policy was based on a rather loose interpretation of the National Parks Act (R.S.C. 1954, 189 as amended) and on management procedures established by precedent. As a result, policy was subject to widely differing interpretations. Thus, while the national park legislation in the United States and Canada is similar, very different interpretations of park function and purpose are apparent.

E) Chapter Summary

The post-war period was marked by a tremendous increase in public use of the national parks in both the United States and Canada. However, the responses of the governments and park services to this pressure were quite different. In the United States, despite strong opposition from industrial and commercial interests, extensive additions were made to the national park system. These additions included many National Recreation Areas, Wilderness Areas, and National Seashores. In Canada, only a few small additions
were made to the National Park System. Both countries provided new facilities for visitor use within existing parks, but a difference in type and standard of facility can be noted. In the United States facilities were oriented to park specific activities. Emphasis was also placed on improving park interpretation facilities by the provision of many new visitor centers under the Mission 66 program. Facilities in the Canadian Parks were more highly developed and were oriented to artificial recreations, such as golf and skiing, and to motel-hotel types of accommodation. In addition, the Canadian National Park Service also provided space in the parks for institutional developments, including the Banff School of Fine Arts.

In the United States, numerous attempts were made to alienate park lands for industrial development. However, primarily through the efforts of conservationists, who initiated nation-wide opposition to such developments, nearly all were rejected. In part, this can be attributed to the fact that the final decisions on these development proposals rested with the national government, and thus local interests could not decide the fate of areas of national significance. In Canada, alienation of park land, particularly in the provincial park systems, proceeded with little public opposition. Even though some of the areas affected may have been nationally significant and
worthy of national park status, local or at least provincial interests were given precedence. The absence of a nation-wide preservationist movement in Canada until very recently is an indication of the general lack of concern of Canadians over park policy in this country.
Chapter 5  PRESENT PARKS POLICY IN THE UNITED STATES AND CANADA

A) The Interpretation of Policy: a Comment

While it is easy to pinpoint policy changes which are enacted by legislation, it is more difficult to discern the evolution of park policy interpretation. As a result, to discuss policy as it is presently interpreted in the United States and Canada requires some degree of subjectivity in differentiating past interpretations from those of the present. For a number of reasons, policy for National Park Systems in both Canada and the United States can be said to be in a process of change or dynamism at the present time. For example, hearings on Provisional Master Plans for four of the Rocky Mountain national parks in Canada are underway at the time of writing. Thus, this discussion will attempt to indicate trends in policy rather than specific details of policy.

B) National Parks Policy in the United States

In the past few years, a redirection of policy is occurring within the United States National Park System. Less emphasis is being placed on recreation and entertainment within national parks, and more attention is being focused on the natural aspects of park environments. The traditional Yosemite Fire Fall, in which flaming ashes were pushed off a canyon wall, has been curtailed, and the campsite capacity
of the park was cut in half (Cahn, 1968; Smith, 1968). Moreover, it has been recognized that there is a limit to the number of visitors some sites can absorb. For example, visitor use of parts of Mesa Verde National Park in southwestern Colorado has been restricted, with only limited numbers permitted to visit the spectacular cliff dwellings each day (Cahn, 1968).

Fraser Darling notes in the foreword to the second edition of *Man and Nature in the National Parks: Reflections on Policy* (Darling and Eichorn, 1969) that biological research in the parks has greatly intensified, and that master plans for the parks are showing an increasingly marked ecological orientation. He goes on to comment:

"I would go so far as to say that increased ecological participation, inside and outside the Service, has provided some of the ineluctable proof a hesitant administration needed to firm-up its policy. My impression is that direction today is much more decisive and well fortified than heretofore, especially in those fields most closely concerned with the preservation of park values. The original directives of over half a century ago were made in a different world from ours; half a million visitors to the entire system have become a hundred and fifty million, i.e., three hundred times as many. The magnitude of the task of management is frightening, not only on the side of conserving the parks, but in the growing awareness of what the national park system means in the maintenance of human environmental well-being."

The increase in the application of ecological research to the planning and management of the national parks in the United States has been aided by a number of occurrences. For example, in early 1963, a report on wildlife management in
the national parks (Leopold et al., 1963) was released, and while directed specifically to the increasing problems of managing wildlife within the National Park System, it encompassed in its broad perspective other ecological factors relevant to planning and management in the parks. It noted that simple protection of areas was not adequate to insure maintenance of particular species or habitats. The control of fire in the parks, while aesthetically desirable, results in dramatic changes to the vegetation of areas, often to the detriment of park values. Examples of habitat changes in the Everglades and Sequoia Groves support this point of view (Leopold et al., 1963; Hartesveldt, 1963). The report called for the reintroduction of native species of animals and plants into park areas where they have been exterminated or driven to near extinction by man, and for a concerted effort to remove exotic plants and animals from the parks.

Some excerpts from the Leopold Report are worthy of note:

"The major policy change which we would recommend to the National Park Service is that it recognize the enormous complexity of ecologic communities and the diversity of management procedures required to preserve them... A second statement of policy that we would reiterate -- and this one conforms with present Park Service standards -- that management be limited to native plants and animals ... Carrying this point further, observable artificiality in any form must be minimized and obscured in every possible way. Wildlife should not be displayed in fenced enclosures; this is the function of a zoo, not a national park. In the same category is artificial feeding of wildlife... Although the American public demands automotive access to the parks, road systems
must be rigidly prescribed as to extent and design. Roadless wilderness areas should be permanently zoned. The goal, we repeat, is to maintain or create the mood of wild America. We are speaking here of restoring wildlife to enhance this mood, but the whole effect can be lost if the parks are overdeveloped for motorized travel. If too many tourists crowd the roadways, then we should ration the tourists rather than expand the roadways. Additionally in this connection, it seems incongruous that there should exist in the national parks mass recreation facilities such as golf courses, ski lifts, motorboat marinas, and other extraneous developments which completely contradict the management goal. We urge the National Park Service to reverse its policy of permitting these nonconforming uses, and to liquidate them as expeditiously as possible... Above all other policies, the maintenance of naturalness should prevail.

Active management aimed at restoration of natural communities of plants and animals demands skills and knowledge not now in existence. A greatly expanded research program oriented to management need, must be developed within the National Park Service itself." (Leopold et al., 1963).

In summary, the report stated: "The goal of managing the national parks and monuments should be to preserve, or where necessary to recreate, the ecological scene as viewed by the first European visitors." The report was endorsed by Interior Secretary Stewart Udall, who ordered that appropriate steps be taken "to incorporate the philosophy and the basic findings into the administration of the National Park System" (Udall, 1963b).

In 1964, a Natural Sciences Advisory Committee was formed to make recommendations to the Director of the United States National Park Service (National and Provincial Parks Association, 1971a). Since then, it has been partly
responsible for the formation of a research program now operating within the national parks, has aided in some difficult management problems such as those involving grizzly bears in Yellowstone National Park, and has served to point out areas of needed research (National and Provincial Parks Association, 1971a).

Other problems of the national parks have been recognized and confronted in the United States. In 1967, the National Park Service appointed a committee of distinguished conservationists and civil service staff to investigate the problem of park road standards (United States National Park Service, 1968a). While too lengthy to relate in detail here, the recommendations of this committee are particularly significant to the whole question of accommodation of the automobile in the national parks. Some of the key passages are noted below:

"This flood of park users represents either a profound threat to park values ...or an extraordinary opportunity to make those values a more meaningful part of this nation's cultural inheritance. The single abiding purpose of National Parks is to bring man and his environment into closer harmony. It is thus the quality of the park experience -- and not the statistics of travel -- which must be the primary concern." (Penfold et al., 1968).

The report goes on to state that

"...In this era of enormously increasing vacation traffic, it must be assumed that those who visit the National Parks do so for the purpose of enjoying a unique experience, and are therefore willing to
accept necessary restrictions, including those regulating numbers of people and their means of travel. Such regulations, as necessary, may deepen the awareness of visitors that they are truly in places of special importance. Today the facts are these: unless an open-end road construction program were to be carried out, the National Parks cannot indefinitely accommodate every person who wants to drive an automobile without restriction through a National Park." (Penfold et al., 1963).

It additionally set a number of design standards appropriate to park roads. Secretary Udall ordered adoption of procedures to insure public involvement in road-building decisions for the national parks based on the recommendations of the Park Road Standards Committee (Udall, 1969). However, this order was revoked by Udall's successor, Walter J. Hickel, "since location and design of park roads is only one of several important factors in the planning process" (Hickel, 1969). Hickel ordered that the National Park Service generally revise its planning procedures to provide for greater public involvement.

The most significant aspect of the road standards report (which was widely circulated by the National Park Service) is its challenge of such time-honoured assumptions as unlimited visitor use and unrestricted vehicular use in the parks. On the other hand, the National Park Service in the United States has been criticized for its slow pace in reviewing roadless areas within the parks for possible inclusion in the National Wilderness Preservation System as stipulated in the terms of the Wilderness Act (Dickerman,
1970). Most recent evidence indicates, however, that this situation is being rectified (The Wilderness Society, 1970). Another point of contention is the Park Service's position that transition zones should be created around wilderness areas to separate them from developed areas within the national parks (United States National Park Service, 1968a). Conservation organizations have generally been opposed to this concept, contending that such zones would only serve to allow development in larger parts of the parks, and that designated wilderness areas should be enlarged to include any transition areas (Smith, 1967; Darling and Eichorn, 1969).

Darling and Eichorn (1969) comment that tentative wilderness zoning plans were already in circulation (as of 1967) and that it could be questioned whether some of these were drawn on the basis of wilderness as it is at present, or were formulated in terms of possible future developments of visitor facilities. They conclude that "it is a primary duty of management of any national park that as much of its area as possible should be wilderness or near wilderness if management is to fulfill the intent of the 1916 act setting up the Service".

Prior to 1964, funding for the National Park System in the United States was based on yearly appropriations from the Congress. In order to stabilize the somewhat uncertain nature of this situation, and at the same time
to supplement the congressional appropriations, the Kennedy administration proposed the establishment of a Land and Water Conservation Fund to provide the necessary money for land acquisition and development for recreation and conservation. Enacted in 1965, the Fund provided financing for a number of federal, state, and local programs (United States Department of the Interior, 1966). By 1968, however, the Fund had become the sole source of financing new acquisitions for the National Park System, and was inadequate to meet requirements (McCloskey, 1968b). Costs of land increased beyond projections, and more new park areas were authorized than had been anticipated. Also, revenues were less than had been foreseen (McCloskey, 1968b).

The Fund's initial sources of revenue were the proceeds from the sale of surplus federal lands, funds from the sale of the $7.00 "Golden Eagle" annual entrance permits for federal recreation areas, and non-reimbursed taxes on motor-boat fuel (United States Department of the Interior, 1966). In 1968, a $200,000,000 annual base for the fund was established. Revenues from outer continental shelf petroleum leases can be used for the Fund if Congress fails to appropriate the full $200,000,000 from the treasury (Sierra Club, 1968b). Revenues from the Fund are shared with state and local governments for recreation area and park projects additional to federal undertakings. Although the money is available, the administration still has the power to
set limitations on allocations, and Congress must approve all expenditures. Nevertheless, the establishment of the Land and Water Conservation Fund was a further recognition of the need to purchase desirable recreation lands and natural areas while they are available. It was apparent that parks and recreation areas could no longer be established only on lands given to the federal government by the states, or on nationally owned territory, as had been the policy prior to the mid-1950's, when the first National Seashores were being established. Thus, the approval of the Fund marked a decided change in the policy of land acquisition for the National Park System, and demonstrated a significant financial commitment to expanding the System in the United States.

C) Canadian National Parks Policy

As with the American National Park System, recent changes in policy can be discerned in Canada. Prior to 1964, no written statements of national parks policy existed in Canada. Policy was based on interpretation of the rather nebulous section of the National Parks Act which dedicated the parks for public benefit, education, and enjoyment, subject to the provision that they be maintained unimpaired for the enjoyment of future generations (Laing, 1964). In addition, precedent and usage were important influences on development decisions. Based on recommendations of the royal commission of government organization, a statement of
policy for the national parks was developed and approved by the federal government in 1964 (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a; Laing, 1964). The Hon. Arthur Laing, then Minister of Northern Affairs and National Resources, stated that a unified, coherent, and comprehensible national park policy had become imperative because of the greatly increased use of the parks. "This volume of public use has attracted the attention of private enterprise and resulted in pressure for the development of recreation and entertainment facilities that, while unobjectionable in other places ...are unsuitable in national parks, and if allowed to expand unchecked, would destroy the parks' ability to contribute to the public benefit in the way they were intended." (Laing, 1964).

As overall policy for the national parks, the new directive recognized that:

"1) The basic purpose of the National Park System is to preserve for all time areas which contain significant geographical, geological, biological or historic features as a national heritage for the benefit, education, and enjoyment of the people of Canada.

2) The provision of urban-type recreation facilities is not part of the basic purpose of National Parks. Such recreation facilities in harmony with the purpose and preservation of a park may be introduced as required to meet recreational needs; but always so as to minimize impairment and not at all if substantial impairment is inevitable." (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a).

While emphasizing preservation of the environment as a primary function of the national parks, the policy statement
did note the following considerations:

"The popular interpretation of the general purposes section of the National Parks Act has been to permit, in fact to encourage, artificial recreations and to develop parks to quite an extent along summer resort lines. This interpretation has not completely ignored the value of nature. That value has, however, taken a decisive second place.

It is not surprising that the value of nature has not been emphasized in the administration and policy of our National Parks. After all Canada is a young nation, and it was not many years ago that a significant percentage of the population lived in or very close to wilderness, or at least in rural surroundings... There is not at present, among Canadians in general, a strong desire to seek wilderness enjoyment. This seems apparent by the small proportion of Park visitors who participate in hiking, riding, and camping in the isolated areas of the Parks. The demand of the majority is still for modern accommodation with all of the recreational facilities common to life in the cities.

The variation in nature and extent of National Parks also suggests that certain Parks can be subjected to secondary uses, such as artificial outdoor recreations, i.e., golf, tennis, lawn bowling, skiing and similar participant sports, without detracting from their real purpose, while others cannot. In establishing the overall plan for each park it will be necessary to include the reasons for establishing that particular park, the limits of use that should be encouraged, and the uses that should not be permitted. Unless this is done, inappropriate use patterns may continue or develop and the Parks will not attain the objective for which they were dedicated." (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a).

The policy statement on National Parks leaves considerable flexibility for the development of recreational features and facilities within the parks. In contrast to the overall policy statement on recreation (see No. 2 on previous page), the later discussions reveal that artificial
forms of recreation (types not directly related to the natural environment of a park) are perfectly acceptable within most, if not all, of the national parks. To quote:

"In view of the significant variation in types of National Parks in the system, it is not possible to specify what recreations are or are not appropriate for the system as a whole. The best that can be done in this regard is to provide general guidelines from which a decision can be made for each individual park according to its nature.

Parks in the system can be divided into three general categories on the basis of purpose and use:

a) Parks which are basically scenic and nature parks. This includes Banff, Jasper, Yoho, Kootenay, Glacier, Mt. Revelstoke and Cape Breton Highlands.

b) Parks which are basically family holiday parks with a variety of activities in addition to their natural features. This category includes Waterton Lakes, Prince Albert, Riding Mountain, Fundy, Terra Nova and Prince Edward Island.

c) Parks established to preserve a specific type of fauna or flora; or an area of special geological, historic or geographical interest. This category would include Elk Island, Point Pelee and St. Lawrence Islands.

The breakdown (following) is general and intended only to assist in establishing a general appreciation of which types of artificial recreations should be accepted for each of the general categories...

1) The types of recreations that are acceptable in all parks are those which are primarily natural. Such recreations as boating, swimming, hiking, trail riding and fishing are examples of natural recreations closely related to National Park purposes. The extent of facilities for these recreations should be determined by their effect on the individual park.

2) The wholesome outdoor recreations such as golf, tennis, lawn bowling and horseshoe pitching are particularly acceptable in the recreational and family holiday parks. They should not be developed as a means of attracting visitors to the park but to satisfy the variation in tastes and capabilities in a family group.[It should be noted
that elsewhere in the policy document, it is stated that charges for such activities should be levied "taking into account the desire to encourage general use". Such facilities should be provided only to meet the reasonable needs of the visitors, and only if the park does not suffer appreciable impairment or reduced potential to supply natural enjoyments to visitors who have come for that purpose.

This type of outdoor recreation should be considered acceptable in certain of the parks listed in category a) also. Such activities as golf and tennis do not form as essential a part of the purpose of a scenic and nature park as they do in a family holiday park." (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a).

In general, nearly all forms of recreation are permitted in all of the national parks, except those sports which are "noisy, gaudy, or tawdry or are commonly associated with a midway or amusement park atmosphere" (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a).

One of the major areas of concern expressed in the present policy statements of the National and Historic Parks Branch is with townsite development and private residences in the parks. The government has expressed its intent to eliminate private residences such as summer cottages and homes from the parks except where such accommodation is necessary for people working in the parks (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a; Laing, 1964). This represents a decided shift in policy. As has been pointed out, an opposite policy was pursued until quite recently (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). A detailed description of present leasing arrangements is included in MacDonald's
discussion of national parks policy (1967). Briefly, the policy of the government is to secure title to leases as they expire and, where possible, to phase out private residences not directly associated with visitor accommodation or entertainment.

It is the intent of the government to provide service centers for visitors where necessary within the parks and to maintain established townsites such as Banff and Jasper (Chretien, 1971; National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). However, where possible in the smaller new national parks, commercial developments will be outside the park boundaries (Chretien, 1971). This policy appears to be similar in approach to that adopted in the United States during the Mission 66 program.

It is worthy of note that the Provisional Master Plans for the Rocky Mountain parks indicate a high level of development for visitor service facilities, with a center located every 30 miles along the major roads (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970a,b,c,d). Additionally, a major accommodations center at Lake Louise is presently being planned. It is intended to house 4,200 guests, plus staff, and will include 84,000 square feet of retail/commercial/administration space (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1971). This development indicates a continued commitment on the part of the National Parks Service to this type of facility within park boundaries, and contradicts the approach
advocated by the Hon. Jean Chretien (1971), minister responsible for national parks in Canada. It also contradicts the assertion in the policy directive that the Rocky Mountain parks are basically "scenic" reserves.

If the Provisional Master Plans for the National Parks are an adequate indication, a large scale scenic road development program is envisioned for a number of the national parks (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970a, b,c,d). The National Parks Branch recognizes arterial highways, such as the Trans-Canada Highway, as intrusions into the environment of parks and suggests that efforts made to locate new national parks away from major transportation routes. Nevertheless, roads are considered to be the basic form of access to the national parks, and are therefore acceptable and even desirable within park boundaries (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). Park policy requires, however, that high design standards be employed to reduce the disruption caused by roads (National and Historic Parks Branch, 1969a). The extent to which roads are being projected for some of the parks, notably the four contiguous Rocky Mountain parks -- Banff, Jasper, Yoho, and Kootenay -- has been seriously questioned in a number of studies. It is feared that road development will be allowed to penetrate some of the last remaining undeveloped valleys within the parks (Nelson, 1969). Additionally, since roads most often occupy valley bottoms, disruption of
critical winter ranges of herbivores may result (Cowan, 1969). It is stated in the Provisional Master Plans that roads are restricted to Class IV and V lands (general outdoor recreation areas and intensive use areas respectively) in the national parks, but in fact, it may be questioned if Class IV and V lands were not designated on the basis of road construction feasibility, among other considerations. Furthermore, once roads are built, there is often a tendency to "improve" the facility as use increases. Thus, what was originally an inconspicuous scenic road may ultimately become a major highway.

Increased input of ecological knowledge into planning the national parks does not seem as apparent in Canada as it does in the United States. Cowan (1969) maintains that to date no central ecological goals have been established for park management in Canada, and cites a number of problems evident within Banff and Jasper related to a lack of ecologically oriented planning. Cunningham (1968) notes:

"Generally speaking, the Parks have been and still are being, managed by people with purely administrative or development oriented type backgrounds. The result has been that the Parks have developed or have evolved a dual image or split personality. The first Park image is the Parks of the mountains, forests, wildlife -- in effect, the ecosystems. The second image is the Park consisting of the highways, townsites, campgrounds, ski areas, etc. -- in effect, the developments. For the greater part of their existence the last park image has dominated government thinking and actions. In other words the Parks have not been managed for the ecosystems, rather they have been managed for the developments. The ecosystems have merely formed a colorful background for the developments."
It has been recognized for some time that the National Park System is incomplete in that it is geographically unbalanced, and large parts of Canada are unrepresented (MacDonald, 1967; Chrétien, 1971). As indicated previously, one of the main obstacles to the expansion of the System was the administrative tradition which required the provinces to turn over potential park lands to the federal government free of all encumbrances and in perpetuity (Pimlott, 1968). In 1968, the federal government began a program of sharing acquisition costs for lands on which to establish coastal national parks (Chrétien, 1971). Under this program, the federal government has reached agreement with several of the provinces, and several new national parks have been established. These new acquisitions include Pacific Rim (at Long Beach) in British Columbia, Kouchibouguac in New Brunswick, and Gros Morne in Newfoundland. In addition, a federal-provincial rural development agreement between the province of Quebec and the federal government has lead to discussions resulting in the creation of two national parks in Quebec (Chrétien, 1971). However, until April, 1971, the federal government had taken no action to establish parks in the Yukon or Northwest Territories, where it still has sole jurisdiction.

Press reports state that the federal government has now withdrawn an 870 square mile area along the South Nahanni River in the Northwest Territories, pending national park
studies. An Order-in-Council, passed on April 8, 1971, prevents further staking of mineral claims or filing for oil and natural gas drilling permits (Vancouver Sun, 1971). The major opposition to the establishment of parks in the northern territories has come from mining and development interests (National and Provincial Parks Association, 1971b). Also, the territorial governments do not wish to have lands permanently vested in the federal government as national parks, since their eventual aim is to gain provincial status and attain control over their lands and resources.

Financing seems to be the key to national park expansion in Canada. The provinces are reluctant to bear the financial burden and responsibility for a development which is nationally significant, particularly since the short term economic effects may be detrimental to local industries. It is interesting to note that the federal budget for outdoor recreation in Canada averages about $40,000,000 annually -- approximately 0.04 percent of the total budget (Nicol, 1969). This represents a per capita investment of about $2.00 per year. This figure is about one half of the federal per capita investment in outdoor recreation and wilderness preservation in the United States (Stenton, 1969). If the government of Canada is as intent on expanding the National Park System as it has indicated, then it seems imperative that greater federal investments be required.
In Canada, there has been no tradition of public involvement in hearings or in the general planning process which has been evident in the United States, particularly in recent years. However, recently adopted procedures in Canada have instituted public hearings on the Provisional Master Plans for the national parks. At these hearings, development and zoning plans for each of the parks are presented to the public for scrutiny and comment. Conservation organizations, business groups with interests in the parks, and private citizens have responded favourably to this new planning approach (see National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970a,b,c).

The procedure of calling public hearings indicates a significant shift in government policy in Canada. It will undoubtedly encourage the development of a more active conservation movement within the country. While the nature and traditions of the governmental system in Canada have made it less open to public participation than the government of the United States, it appears that this situation is changing. Increased public participation in questions involving the national parks is certainly an encouraging step in the modification of planning and decision-making processes in Canada, and should result in the ultimate improvement of the National Park System.
D) Present Policies Compared

The historical analysis presented in the previous chapters has shown that policies for national parks in Canada and the United States have differed over time. It is also evident that significant differences exist in present policies. Most differences are clearly a matter of emphasis or degree, or in interpretation of legislation, rather than inclusion of absolute dismissal of some concept of policy. In recent years, the United States National Park Service has been moving towards a policy which emphasizes the natural aspects of the national parks. Non park-specific types of recreation and entertainment are not encouraged, and efforts have been made to curtail them in the parks. In Canada, on the other hand, present policy recognizes and promotes a wide variety of recreational activities as appropriate for inclusion in the national parks.

The Canadian National Park Service has planned an extensive program of expanding road systems into many undeveloped portions of the national parks, a process which will open some large areas of park wilderness to motorists. In contrast, the United States Park Service has taken recent actions indicating that road development is to be limited in the national parks. Furthermore, under the terms of the Wilderness Act, roadless areas are to be reviewed for inclusion in permanently designated Wilderness Areas. This difference in approach to road development
reflects a basic difference in emphasis between policies for the two park systems; the American parks are oriented towards nature preservation, while in Canada, the parks are oriented towards recreation.

Current policy in Canada recognizes the national parks as being of three types: scenic and nature parks, family holiday parks, and special features parks. In the United States, these functions are performed by a number of other types of areas beside national parks.

Within the national parks of the United States, it has been recognized that park areas have limited visitor capacity, which has in some cases already been exceeded. This has prompted the National Park Service to reduce accommodation in these areas and to curtail visitation. While visitor pressure is less intense in Canada, some parks are nevertheless very crowded. The National and Historic Parks Branch does not express an intent to limit visitation in any of the Canadian national parks at the present time, although the possibility for future curtailment is recognized (see National and Historic Parks Branch, 1970a). In any case, the intensity of use considered acceptable in the Canadian parks is likely to be higher than in the United States because of the tradition of greater park development in Canada.
Ecological research and knowledge appears to be having a greater influence on park planning and management decisions in the United States than in Canada. Studies such as the Leopold Report have set new guidelines for parks policy in the United States. The ecological considerations voiced in this and other reports are not evident in present Canadian national parks policy.

Funding for park acquisition in Canada is presently at a much lower per capita level than in the United States, but land prices are also less. In any event, both countries have recognized the need for a greater financial commitment to the purchase of desirable park lands while they are still available.
Chapter 6  EVOLUTION OF NATIONAL PARKS POLICIES: AN OVERVIEW

A) Summary

This section presents a summary in graphic form of the evolutionary trends in policy and policy interpretation discussed in the previous chapters, as reflected in the functions performed by the national parks and equivalent reserves in the United States and Canada. In order to illustrate policy change over time, a framework devised by Hart (1966) was modified for use in this study. Hart suggests that a classification of land areas can be derived based on the number and type of restraints placed on human manipulation of the natural environment. He describes a continuum between a state where no restraints exist to one where control of use is vested in a public or quasi-public body. By relating this framework to a time scale, it is possible to describe evolutionary trends in national park policy and function. Hart's basic framework is illustrated in Table I, and the modified version, incorporating the findings of this study, is shown in Table II for the United States and in Table III for Canada.

Some of the land use types suggested by Hart were eliminated in this application because they are beyond the range of land uses associated with the National Park Systems. Additionally, the order of some of the headings was changed to reflect the limitation of natural resource exploitation
Table I  The Range of Social Restraints on Human Manipulation of the Natural Environment (after Hart, 1966).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fewer Restraints</th>
<th>More Restraints</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easement</td>
<td>Controlled Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User-oriented Recreation Area</td>
<td>Strict Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate Recreation Area</td>
<td>Natural Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple Use Management Area</td>
<td>Natural Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Resource Management Area</td>
<td>Nature Reserve</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Definition of terms in Tables I, II, and III (after Hart):

- Easement - ownership of certain limited rights to land by the public, but with most of the ownership rights remaining in private hands.
- User-oriented Recreation Area - an area on which a high degree of human alteration is permitted by society as a whole, as in small urban parks. Property is acquired solely for utilization and the entire area is planned for use.
- Intermediate Recreation Area - an area where limited alteration of the landscape is permitted. Land of high quality landscapes is usually selected for development.
- Multiple Use Management Area - an area where a variety of resource uses are permitted. In some cases one use may predominate.
- Single Resource Management Area - an area primarily used to protect an endangered species, biotic community or historic site. Habitat improvement may be undertaken.
- Natural Park - an area designated to provide for the maintenance and exhibition of all resources in the area. Human interference is carefully limited.
- Controlled Nature Reserve - an area where modification of the environment is limited to those things that are necessary for visitor contact with nature (as U.S. Wilderness Areas).
- Strict Nature Reserve - an area designated for scientific study where access is restricted.
Table II: The Evolution of National Park Function in the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Park System Function</th>
<th>Multiple Use Area</th>
<th>Intermediate Recreation Area</th>
<th>Single Resource Management Area</th>
<th>Natural Park</th>
<th>Controlled Nature Reserve</th>
<th>Strict Nature Reserve</th>
<th>Significant Events and Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1872 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1872 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1872 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1872 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1872 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1870</td>
<td>1872 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1882</td>
<td>1882 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1882 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1880</td>
<td>1882 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1892 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1892 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1890</td>
<td>1892 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td>1902 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1902 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1900</td>
<td>1902 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1922</td>
<td>1922 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1922 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>1922 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1942</td>
<td>1942 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1942 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>1942 Yellowstone Nat. Park Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For definitions of these terms, see Table I
### Table III The Evolution of National Park Function in Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Park system function*</th>
<th>Multiple Use Area</th>
<th>Intermediate Recreation Area</th>
<th>Single Resource Management Area</th>
<th>Natural Park</th>
<th>Controlled Nature Reserve</th>
<th>Strict Nature Reserve</th>
<th>Significant Events and Legislation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>Scenic Natural Parks</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1887 Rocky Mtns. Nat. Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1890</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1885 Banff Hotsprings reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1930 National Parks Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* For definitions of these terms, see Table I
as an additional restraint on land use. Specifically, a "multiple use area" is considered to be under fewer restraints than an "intermediate recreation area". This arrangement is more consistent with the range of functions performed by various units of the National Park Systems of the two countries at different points in time.

This graphic summary serves to indicate the pronounced differences in the emphasis of National Parks policy between the United States and Canada, how this difference in policy has changed over time, and how the function of each system has evolved over the same period.

As shown in Table II, National Parks policy in the United States has been consistently directed towards the preservation of natural areas and has been associated with wilderness preservation since an early date. Specifically, the function of the National Parks until the 1890's was preservation of unique features (in other words, the parks were single resource management areas). By the 1890's, it had shifted to providing a natural park or controlled nature reserve (wilderness area). This natural park, or wilderness function persists to the present time, although emphasis on wilderness is enhanced somewhat by the reclassification of National Park and other lands to Wilderness Areas. Furthermore, the trend of policy has been to recognize different functions within the National Parks
System and create separate types of areas to fulfill these functions. For example, the National Monuments carry out the function of preserving and protecting special features or species, and National Recreation Areas and National Seashores perform the recreation-in-attractive-landscape function. Similarly, the Wilderness Area classification was devised to provide a designation for areas set aside as controlled nature reserves.

National Park policy has become focused on a more limited range of land uses that has policy in Canada. Thus, in recent years, the function of the American National Parks has been increasingly restricted to that of natural parks, including areas of wilderness. As a result, developments of facilities and the provision of artificial recreation has been much more limited than in their Canadian counterparts. This is particularly apparent when the vast difference in population between the two countries is considered. In the United States, a strong preservationist movement developed to support maintenance of the National Parks in their quasi-wilderness state. During the last 100 years, this movement has become formalized and has exerted considerable influence in directing the future form and function of the American National Park System.

In Canada, on the other hand, policy has evolved differently (see Table III). From the 1880's, Canadian
National Parks policy has shifted from emphasizing a multiple use function, accommodating recreation, forestry, and mining, to a state where the three primary functions recognized are: recreation in attractive landscapes, protection of special areas or species, and preservation of natural environments. Fortunately, the exploitation of timber and mineral resources within the Canadian National Parks has largely been discontinued. Policy has been to extend the recreational function of the parks to include new types of land uses without formalizing new types of areas. The uses now associated with the parks range from those of "intermediate recreation areas" to those of "controlled nature reserves".

National Parks policy in Canada has been much less concerned with nature preservation and protection than has policy in the United States. Early development of the Canadian National Parks was oriented to tourist accommodation; the parks were developed as any other resource to produce the maximum returns. The provision of public recreation has gradually become the dominant theme of Canadian National Parks policy, with a concern for natural areas only recently emerging. The attitudes reflected in policy decisions were those of a people still conquering a wilderness, unconcerned with its preservation. As a result, developments in the Canadian National Parks have been pursued to a much higher degree than in the United
Facilities and accommodations are generally more elaborate in most Canadian parks. In some areas, such as Banff and Jasper, a resort atmosphere prevails, bearing little relationship to the naturalness of the National Parks. No strong preservationist philosophy has existed in Canada until very recently.

B) Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to compare the evolution of policy for national parks and equivalent reserves in Canada and the United States and to isolate and define differences and similarities in policy and policy interpretation. Emphasis has been placed on policies governing the types of activities permitted within the national parks and on the degree of protection afforded natural areas. It is reasoned that restraints on land use will be introduced to restrict activities and developments of parks to the type considered desirable by the government, and through the political process, by private and public interests in general. Thus, it has also been interesting to reflect on the values and attitudes of society as they have been expressed by the determination of functions and purposes of the national park systems in both countries. From the results of this study, it is possible to draw conclusions relating specifically to national park policy and planning, as well as more general conclusions reflecting the relationships between parks, natural areas, and society in general.
One of the most pressing problems in planning for the national parks in Canada is determining just what the parks are for. The uncertainty existing in Canada regarding the function and purposes of the national parks may well be related to the diverse and sometimes contradicting functions actually performed by the parks. Even after written policy statements were produced, so much room for interpretation was left that a number of potential contradictions exist. How can people appreciate the purpose of a park when it may vary from the provision of highly artificial sports to the maintenance of controlled natural areas? Perhaps the experience in the United States is valuable in this regard. When an area is called a Wilderness Area, its function and purpose is clear. Similarly, when the United States federal government provides National Recreation Areas, it is evident that recreation and not wilderness protection is to be the primary function in that area. National Parks in the United States have a more restricted function, that is, of natural parks. The recognition that different areas provide for different types of activities and land uses also simplifies management and planning. The need to make subjective judgements concerning the appropriate function of an area is reduced, and contradictions and conflicts are thus avoided.

Moreover, if the function of Canadian national parks per se is unclear, then the function relationship of national
and provincial parks is totally fogbound. While it is not the purpose of this study to present an analysis of the relationship between the Canadian National Park System and the various systems of provincial parks in the country, it is clear that a real duplication of function exists. Obviously, opportunities for integrating the national and provincial systems have not been fully exploited. The rationalization of the ideally separate functions of national and provincial parks in Canada would go a long way towards creating and maintaining needed reserves for natural area preservation and outdoor recreation.

The experience of the disputes over the proposed developments within the American National Park System in recent years underlines the fact that such natural wonders as are preserved within the national parks are really of national significance. For example, people in all parts of the United States were concerned over the fate of the Grand Canyon and the coastal redwood stands. It was the nation-wide interest in preserving these areas that prevented their development. However, it must be recognized that local areas may be adversely affected economically by the reservation of parks or by the curtailment of construction projects. Federal governments should be willing to reimburse local people of governments for losses they may sustain in national projects. If it is in the national interest to create a new national park, then it is
a national responsibility to pay for it. The creation of
the Land and Water Conservation Fund in the United States
and the recent policy of the Canadian Government to
share park acquisition costs is a reflection of the
realization of this responsibility.

One of the primary concerns facing park planners
in both countries is the automobile and the accommodation
of growing numbers of visitors in the national parks. It
is increasingly apparent that more than anything else,
the automobile presents a real threat to national park
areas once vehicle traffic reaches even moderate levels.
Planners must come to grips with the question: Is it
really necessary for every park user to have his own
automobile while in the national parks? Similarly, with
present transportation technology, is it necessary to
accommodate visitors within parks when most parts of even
the largest national parks can be reached within one or
two hours travel time from centers outside the parks. Is
it really a necessary part of experiencing a nationally
significant and unique area such as a national park to
sleep in a deluxe motel unit? When this level of separa-
tion is reached between the visitor and the natural envir-
onment, can accommodation really be linked with national
park purposes? The United States is currently demonstrating
considerably more restraint than Canada in opening up
national park areas to highway development and accommodation.
It is the intricate complexity of geology, climate, and biological communities existing in a park which make it a unique and nationally significant area. Most types of recreation can be provided in an infinite variety of attractive settings, which can be created by architects and engineers. Whether typical or representative natural landscapes are reserved or spectacular features, the integrity of the natural setting is critical in national parks. As the Leopold Report pointed out, the naturalness of an area is the quality that should be maintained in a national park (Leopold et al., 1963). It is time we recognize, as Darling and Eichorn (1969) have suggested, that the only absolute administrative principle in national park planning can be to consider first the ecological health of a park so that it shall endure for posterity. Thus, the realization that natural areas represent a fragile and limited resource must be translated into policy.

It seems fair to say that, in general terms, the thrust of policy in Canada has been to preserve a quasi-natural setting for enjoying recreational activities, while in the United States, policy has been directed towards preserving and maintaining natural environments. This is a significant difference in approach, for it reflects a differing perspective of the natural environment in the two countries. As Nash (1969), Cowan (1968), and others have pointed out, Canadians have generally lacked sympathy
or concern for natural areas and wilderness. It is reasoned that this difference in attitude results from the stage Canada is at in national development.

It is often said that Canada is still a pioneering nation, and in some respects this is true. Vast unpopulated parts of Canada still exist. However, unlike the United States half a century ago when a similar situation might have been described, Canada also has the industrial and urban characteristics of what has been termed a "post industrial society" (Trist, 1968). Thus, Canada is in fact far removed from both the pioneer economy and the pioneer technology of the United States at the turn of the century. Few Canadians have direct contact with wilderness and natural areas in their daily lives, yet the feeling persists that the wilderness in Canada is nearly infinite. Basically, this is true, but there are many nationally significant features and ecosystems that are being rapidly and irreversibly altered. This is particularly true in southern Canada, where forestry, agriculture, and mining have been established for some time (see Litteljohn and Pimlott, 1971; Yeomans, 1970).

As Trist (1968) comments, while the basic structure of the post industrial (service-oriented and leisure-oriented) society is present in Canada, what is not, "and is not building up at the pace required is any corresponding change in our cultural values, organizational philosophies
or ecological strategies".

What is needed, then, is a change in attitude away from the industrial era concept of wilderness conquest as discussed by Nash (1967), to an accordance with the natural environment, or as Aldo Leopold (1949) termed it, the development of "a land ethic". The recognition of the value of wilderness, apart from any spectacular qualities, in the United States encourages the hope that this land ethic may be developing in that country. But if Nash (1969) and Cowan (1968) are right -- if Canada is indeed 25 or 50 years behind the United States in the development of a concern great enough to prompt government action -- then we may be destined to repeat many of the mistakes made in the United States during the last century. Fortunately, attitudes and cultural values need not take 25 years to change. The emerging conservation movement in Canada is an encouraging sign.

This comparison of the evolution of Canadian and American national park policy has shown that if the national parks in Canada are to perform a nationally significant role in the future, and if maximum benefits are to be derived from their inspirational, educational, and scientific values, a number of changes must be made in policy and interpretation of the purpose and function of the national parks. Specifically, the following recommendations are proposed:
1) The roles and functions presently performed by the national parks in Canada should be rationalized so that a clear and explicit distinction is made between recreation areas and natural environment reserves.

2) Explicit and distinct policy guidelines should be developed for each of the functions presently performed by the national parks, i.e. recreation and scenic preservation.

3) In order that the duplication of function between the national parks and provincial parks, such as those in Quebec, British Columbia, and Ontario, be minimized, the federal role in park development must be clearly distinguished from the provincial responsibility, and a hierarchy of parks should be established.

4) Federal action should concentrate on reserving nationally significant areas, including both spectacularly scenic areas and representative ecosystems and landforms in National Parks and Wilderness Areas respectively. Areas not having nationally significant features, or where intensive recreation is desired (i.e. areas located close to urban centers) should be developed explicitly as Recreation Areas in cooperation with the provinces.

5) The federal government should be prepared to accept all of the costs for protecting nationally significant areas.
6) Development of parks for automobile travel should be undertaken only to the degree necessary to provide access to an area where other less disruptive means are not feasible. Parks should not serve as scenic back-drops for highways.

7) The basic goals of park planning should be redefined to emphasize the maintenance of natural ecological systems within each unit of the national park system.

8) Development of the national parks should be oriented to stimulating an appreciation of natural areas and wilderness in the public -- not to providing for activities that have no direct relationship with these qualities.

High quality national parks and equivalent areas are dependent upon the maintenance of natural ecosystems. Once altered, it is very difficult, if not impossible, to restore a natural system to its original form. Therefore, since planning and management decisions, once implemented, may be irreversible, it is logical to make as few commitments to developing natural areas as possible. In principle, we should be opposed to irreversible change unless we are very sure of where we are going and certain that we will never wish to return.
REFERENCES


MacDonald J.A. 1967. *Statement on the National Parks of Canada to the Standing Committee on Northern Affairs and National Resources From the Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development*. Ottawa, Ont.


National and Historic Parks Branch. 1969b. *Cape Breton Highland National Park Provisional Master Plan*. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, Ont.

National and Historic Parks Branch. 1969c. *Fundy National Park Provisional Master Plan*. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, Ont.


National Parks Branch. 1964. *Canada's Quiet Places*. Department of Indian Affairs and Northern Development, Ottawa, Ont.


Sierra Club. 1967c. "Mr. President: There is one great Redwood Forest Left on Earth; but the one you are trying to save isn't it". Newspaper Ad -- reprinted in: Sierra Club Bulletin, 52 (7): 12 - 13.


Williams, Mabel B. 1962. *The Origin and Meaning of the National Parks of Canada*. (Extracts from the papers of the late J.B. Harkin, first Commissioner of the National Parks of Canada). National Parks Branch, Department of Northern Affairs and National Resources, Ottawa, Ont.
