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ABSTRACT

In 1911 the Canadian Province of British Columbia established Strathcona Provincial Park in central Vancouver Island. The legislators intended the Park to serve in perpetuity as a public park for citizens' benefit and enjoyment. Despite repeated pleas that it be used for these purposes, parts of the Park have been logged, flooded and mined. At first this change in policy seemed the result of a succession of anti-park governments. At a deeper level, though, Strathcona's history also illustrates the limits of the wilderness preservation movement. In Canada and the United States these limits are indicated by the large area of agricultural, urban, logged, paved, and mined land, juxtaposed to the small area protected in national parks. Moreover, many of these parks, like Strathcona, have been used for non-park purposes.

This thesis begins with an economic geography model to analyze conflicts over wilderness and to explain wilderness depletion. Wilderness is conceived as consumption space, important for immediate recreation and for long-term social/economic reproduction. Contending with wilderness for consumption space are: non-wilderness consumption space (e.g. residences); circulation space (e.g. roads and railways); and production space (e.g. resource extraction and secondary industry). A general historical analysis of the origin and the nature of the struggle over wilderness for the contending uses of production, circulation and consumption space is followed by a case study of central Vancouver Island and Strathcona Park.

The history of Strathcona Park illustrates the broader conflict over wilderness but also shows particularities of physical geography, settlement history, law, corporate behaviour, politics and citizen activism which influence conflict over wilderness. Particular attention is directed at the Friends of Strathcona Park and their initiative to stop further mineral exploration in the Park.

The thesis contributes to research on the ideas, activism, and influence of environmental groups, as well as the limits and opportunities they face. Although there will continue to be successes in protecting wilderness, I conclude that an examination of the wilderness movement's limits, at the large scale and in central Vancouver Island, indicate that the demands for
production, circulation and non-wilderness consumption space will continue to take precedence over wilderness preservation.
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Chapter One - Introduction
Wilderness Parks and Strathcona Park, British Columbia

In 1911 the Canadian Province of British Columbia established Strathcona Provincial Park to serve in perpetuity as a public park for citizens' benefit and enjoyment. Despite repeated pleas that it be used for these purposes, parts of the Park have been logged, flooded and mined. In the 1980's the "Friends of Strathcona Park" had to resort to civil disobedience to prevent further mineral exploration and mining in the Park. But the Westmin mine still extracts 2,000 tons per day of ore from the Park and numerous mineral claims remain within its bounds. At first the Park's use for resource extraction seemed the result of a succession of anti-park Governments. At a deeper level, however, Strathcona's history illustrates the broader limits of the wilderness preservation movement in general.

In Canada and the United States the movement's limits are indicated by the large area of agricultural, urban, logged, paved and mined land, relative to the small area protected in national parks. As much as for their park value, national parks tend to be located in mountain and canyon areas because of the relatively low market value of this rugged terrain. Moreover, many of these mountainous parks, like Strathcona, have been used for non-park purposes.

Often researchers begin their analysis of ecological problems and the conflicts that they engender with models which emphasize the "control of nature" or the "domination of nature." ¹ Some of these theorists specify that not everybody wishes to dominate nature but that many scientists or technologists do, and their influence on the modern uses of nature is greater than their number. I think this overestimates the role scientists play in causing ecological problems. Often they are at the service of governments or corporations rather than being independent agents. In addition, they are as willing to work on solving ecological problems as they are in developing some of the destructive plans concocted by their employers. How and why people

use nature may sometimes stem from a will to dominate or control it, but often a basic economic analysis better explains their motives and practices. Capitalist corporations clearly try to control nature, but the uses to which it is put are directed by the need to extract surplus value to further capital accumulation. Some corporations have enormous power to determine what will be done to the earth; still, if they embarked on abstract quests to dominate nature, they would soon be out of business. The will to dominate nature is sometimes also a factor in the uses consumers make of nature; however, a basic economic analysis can also better explain consumers' practices and influences. For example, they purchase and drive cars, with various incremental influences on wilderness and non-wilderness environments, mainly to commute to work rather than to dominate nature. The antiphonal theme that would protect wilderness may be conceived as the will not to dominate nature. But it also stems from short-term needs for recreation, tourism, and nature as well as hopes for long-term social/economic reproduction through nature preservation. Nevertheless, a will to dominate nature is sometimes an important aspect of its use. Moreover, non-domination also represents a source of resistance to certain forms of use. Although this theme is not highlighted, it is therefore included in the analysis.

Both domination of nature theorists and standard economic analysts develop non-spatial analysis of "nature," which do not address the explicitly spatial concepts of wilderness depletion and parks. In this work, wilderness is conceived at the economic level as "consumption space." There is a tension over wilderness between its use "as is" for consumption space in a wilderness park and its use for other forms of consumption space, such as residential development. There are also tensions within wilderness values over recreation, tourism and nature preservation. But the main disputes over wilderness involve a confrontation between the use of wilderness for consumption or social reproduction and that for four main primary resource extraction industries: mining, logging, agriculture and hydro development. Consumer demands for goods are a crucial aspect of the demands that resource industries have for the use of wilderness. However, I begin my analysis with the demands primary and secondary industry workers and corporations make for "production space." So, following Michael Heiman, conflicts over wilderness are seen to
involve a confrontation between "production space" and "consumption space." The state is called upon to balance productive and consumptive interests in wilderness. However, because of unrelenting demands for resource extraction and the concerns of citizens for recreation, nature preservation and, broadly, social/environmental reproduction, as seen in the numerous conflicts over wilderness, "tension remains absolute."!

A production/consumption classification is limited because it does not include population growth, which tends to cause wilderness depletion. However the dynamics of growth in production and consumption help explain population growth, and I refer to population growth below. Another limitation is that production/consumption does not include circulation: the movement of energy, information, material, and people between and within production and consumption.4 Park advocates sometimes oppose routing energy or information networks through wilderness areas. More often, transportation is at issue in conflicts over wilderness. Preservationists sometimes oppose siting roads in parks because they directly damage the environment. Moreover, roads are often the first big step in resource extraction, as well as recreational, residential and other forms of wilderness depletion. One of the large preservationist groups, Earth First!, refers to wilderness areas as "roadless areas."5 Because of the significance of transportation space to wilderness, I expand Heiman's classification to include "circulation space."

Therefore, to analyze conflicts over wilderness and to explain wilderness depletion, this thesis begins with a social/economic geography model. Wilderness is conceived as consumption space, important for immediate recreation and for long-term social/economic reproduction. Contending with wilderness for consumption space are: non-wilderness consumption space (e.g.
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residences); circulation space (roads and railways); and production space (resource extraction and secondary industry). The main research question asks: What is the origin and nature of the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space? Two chapters address the general history of this conflict and three chapters address the case study of the central Vancouver Island region where Strathcona Park is located.

General history of conflict over wilderness

Chapter Two begins with how the production/consumption/circulation wilderness conflict emerges in the agricultural revolution and then turns to early urban society. In the latter section, close attention is directed at the role that hunting parks played as a form of aristocratic consumption space in pre-modern Europe. Analysis shows that although the purposes of royal forests and the disputes over them were very different from the purposes of recent "national parks" and recent conflicts, the movement to preserve wilderness has been important through history, and its evolution partly explains recent conflicts.

Chapter three concerns how the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space emerges with the advent of industrial capitalism in North America. I first examine the emergence of the movement to found national parks in North America and then consider the values which inspired those parks (recreation, tourism and nature preservation) in greater detail. Then attention turns to how these values conflict with wilderness as production and circulation space. Concerning production, I consider the problems several of the main resource industries (agriculture, logging, mining and hydro electricity generation) pose to the founding and protection of wilderness parks. Concerning circulation, the emphasis is on roads.

Conflict over wilderness in central Vancouver Island

Chapters four, five and six concern the 1911 founding of Strathcona Park and disputes over its protection to the present. Strathcona Park is significant from a variety of points of view: for its natural environment; as the first provincial park in British Columbia; as likely the most fought over B.C. park; and as a primary example of how a park can be used for logging, mining and electricity generation; and, as an example of how a park can be protected, as illustrated by the
Friends of Strathcona's recent success in stopping further mineral exploration in the Park. Because of its significance, Strathcona has been discussed in general histories of B.C. parks.6 However, the history of the Park has not yet addressed in detail, imparting particular significance to this case study.

The history of Strathcona Park illustrates the broader conflict over wilderness, in which park advocates interested in wilderness for consumption space battle with resource corporations interested in wilderness for production space. Use of the Park for resource extraction also illustrates the precedence that use of wilderness for production space often takes over its use for consumption space. This much can be seen in a cursory view of the Park's history. However, the analysis considers details of physical geography, regional settlement history, law, corporate behaviour, politics and citizen activism which influence conflict over wilderness. The greatest attention is devoted to citizen activism and especially the Friends of Strathcona's struggle to stop mineral exploration in the Park.

Several theoretical approaches are applied to analyze citizen activism. In one approach, "collective behaviour" theorists generally do not treat seriously the problems that citizen activists address. At best they conceive protestors as developing "generalized beliefs" which are seen as less rational than those of the population at large; in some cases they even conceive protestors as influenced by "contagion."7 Therefore, citizen protests, especially when they involve civil disobedience, are seen as more of a problem than are the problems they address. Although I would not follow this approach with all perceived social problems, and though I do not address the rationales for wilderness preservation in detail, this research treats wilderness depletion as a serious problem. Moreover, although my analysis is critical of aristocratic sport hunters in the
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Middle Ages and the form of reserves they founded, it treats the work that the Friends of Strathcona Park and other contemporary groups carry out to curtail wilderness depletion as a rational and generally valuable contribution to society.

From a broad structural social/economic perspective, such as this research begins with, citizen activism is seen as simply the reflection of basic social/economic trends in society. Within the consumption, production and circulation classification, natural wilderness is seen in broad social economic terms as a form of consumption space. Park advocates are impelled to defend this space from wilderness for production and circulation space. Thus there is a contradiction in capitalism between the need to extend wilderness for consumption space and the growth imperatives of production and circulation. This form of structural theory can explain "why" groups orient themselves to stopping wilderness depletion. It can also explain why there is still wilderness depletion, even in protected areas such as Strathcona Park, given the primacy wilderness for production and circulation over wilderness as natural consumption space within capitalism. However, such a structural analysis is limited in showing "how" movements and groups carry out their work or the successes and influence they do have.

Action theorists consider in detail how movements and groups mobilize resources (money, media, legal advice, active group members) to achieve active and supporting members as well as their tactical decisions and their influence. A group can be assessed concerning its successes in addressing the immediate problem it faces or according to its broader influence working with other groups and movements for broader, even revolutionary, change. The case study is crucial to this approach because of the several variables on which movements, their countermovements and their outcome, depends. For example, my analysis will show how a crucial development in the Friends' successful struggle to stop mineral exploration in the Park was the group's tactical decision to use civil disobedience. I also consider the Friends' involvement with the Tin Wis Coalition which attempted to unite three sectors that often have been in conflict over rural
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resources in British Columbia: natives, environmentalists and labour. Coalition participants hoped that by facilitating round table discussions among these sectors they could deal with large corporations and the provincial government from a common ground to work for progressive social and economic change in the province.

Chapter four concerns the 1911 creation of Strathcona Park and its history to 1960. Since Strathcona was the first provincial park, the steps leading up to passage of the Strathcona Park Act represents the emergence of the struggle over wilderness for production and consumption space in British Columbia. I consider the Park's founding and then continue with the conflicts over the Park, for forestry and hydro development, up to 1960. I also consider the difficulty of developing recreation and tourism in the Park. Strathcona recreation began slowly as a result of relatively slow population growth, the Park's remote location on Vancouver Island, and the undeveloped transportation infrastructure to and on the Island. Moreover, a succession of B.C. governments refused to develop Strathcona as a park. The creation of the park and its broader development by 1960 for resource extraction rather than recreation set a precedent for the Friends problem, mining and mineral exploration in the Park.

Chapters Five and Six concern the most contentious Strathcona Park issue since the 1960's: mining and mineral exploration. More broadly, the disputes over minerals in Strathcona Park are the main instance of the parks/mining conflict over an existing B.C. park. Chapter Five concerns the failed 1960's initiative to stop mining so that there is still a large mine in the Park. I consider several aspects of the conflict, including: corporate behaviour, mine pollution, miners' legal rights and the political feud between the New Democratic Party and the Social Credit Party. The greatest detail, however, is devoted to how the Friends of Strathcona Park articulate the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space. The group is noteworthy for its 1988 blockade which directly stopped Cream Silver's exploration for minerals in the Park. Their actions may generally influence Provincial Law pertaining to mining in parks. The Friends also helped start the Tin Wis Coalition which attempts to unite workers, Indians and environmentalists to resolve regional political/ecological problems.
Chapter Five begins with the 1960's dispute over Western Mines' operation in Strathcona Park. Then, I follow the dispute over mining up to late 1987, when the Friends vowed they would use civil disobedience if more mineral exploration was carried out in the Park, and the Social Credit Government permitted Cream Silver to drill three exploratory holes. Chapter Six concerns the blockade that the Friends muster in the Park, for six weeks in January and February of 1988, and its aftermath. One of the immediate results of the blockade was that the Friends had to defend 64 arrestees in Court. Another important consequence of the blockade was that the province created the Strathcona Park Advisory Committee to make recommendations for the Park's use. The Committee eventually recommended that the Park be better protected and up to 1993 the government has agreed to this. I will try to explain the reasons behind this major success in the struggle against mining in provincial parks. Finally, I consider how, although the Friends and other Central Island groups sometimes succeed in protecting local bits of wilderness, they are nonetheless losing the overall battle to protect Island wilderness, as indicated by the imminent construction of a freeway in the central Island region.

Chapter Two and Three draw on various analyses of ecological problems, sport hunting and parks at a general level. The subsequent chapters on Strathcona Park draw mainly on primary sources such as newspapers and other documents, as well as personal interviews with members of the Friends of Strathcona Park.

This thesis contributes to research on environmental groups' ideas, activism and influence, as well as the limits and opportunities they face. Although the methodological basis of the research is distinct from that of domination of nature theorists and several criticisms are made of Roderick Nash's historical analysis (which emphasizes how fear of wilderness motivates its domination), no substantive critique is made of them. Some of their works, especially Robyn Eckersley's recent volume, make important insights, particularly regarding the moral dimension to the causes and solutions of ecological problems, including wilderness depletion. Although I do not highlight the domination of nature, I believe that this work's broad social economic
analysis and its case study of the central Island region and the Friends of Strathcona Park provide important insights into the struggle over wilderness depletion.
Chapter Two

Historical Origins of Conflicts over Wilderness

This chapter addresses the first research question: What is the historical origin of the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space? In his often-cited text on the relation with wilderness, Roderick Nash holds that people's fear of wilderness predominated over positive feelings until the 18th Century.¹ Concerning pre-agricultural hunter gatherers he says, "At a time when there was no alternative [i.e. no farm or pasture], existence in the wilderness was forbidding indeed."² Referring to Neolithic farmers, "In early folk belief, the wilderness of central and northern Europe [] swarmed with supernatural beings. Some were worshipped, but generally with the fear characteristic of the attitude of the unsophisticated toward the incomprehensible."³ In sum, "Fear of wilderness was one of the strongest elements in European attitudes to wilderness up to the nineteenth century, with the 18th century marking a period of transition. It is clearly expressed with regard to those places not yet brought under the plough."⁴ In this Chapter I present a different view. People through history have sometimes loved wilderness and so attempted to preserve areas of it in parks as well as preserve the resources within in a near natural condition. The first main section below concerns the relation with wilderness in the Neolithic era. The second section concerns the pre-modern urban relation first with reference to the Epic of Gilgamesh and then with reference to European history up to 1800. In the latter regard, the analysis shows that Feudal elites loved the wild environment, albeit with perverse intent on slaughtering game species, and so attempted to preserve areas of it. The conclusion concerns the decline of aristocratic sport hunting, which I argue was a cause as well as a consequence of capitalism.

2.1 The Neolithic Relation with Wilderness

Research indicates that before the agricultural revolution:

²Nash, ibid: 9.
³Nash, 1974: 11.
We must then envisage the primitive landscape of Central and Western Europe as covered by a mantle of forest, broken only where the Alps, the Carpathians, and a few other mountains rose above the tree line, and where occasional stretches of country, for one reason or another, were too sterile or too marshy. It was a broad-leaved forest, where oak generally predominated, but mixed with other trees such as elm, beech, and lime, and with an undergrowth of hazel. In its shade lived some Mesolithic hunters and food gatherers, opening up small areas for their dwellings, using tree trunks for boats, and finding in the forest both fruit and game. 

The population, though low, was evenly distributed, so, in addition to its natural characteristics hunter gatherers knew the surrounding environment for its people, with whom there was usually social and economic interaction. Hunter gatherers were actively interested in the subtle distinctions between the uses made of nature in regional economies. Since groups knew the surrounding economies, an unknown wilderness environment that was neither used or influenced by humans was an abstraction, as it is today. Finally, hunter gatherers tended to experience nature not as an inhospitable wilderness, but as a "giving environment." 

Because of population growth and increased per/capita use of nature, Neolithic farmers transformed nature far more than their predecessors. Like hunter-gatherers, they made minor transformations in wilderness areas by hunting and gathering. They also used wilderness for grazing domestic species and gathering composting material, and they transformed wilderness significantly through intensive forestry practices. Without saws, large timber had little value. Therefore some old growth forests were felled with flint axes, the huge oaks left to rot, and intensive forest practices commenced. Desired tree species were encouraged to grow by leaving seed trees and weeding out undesirable species. Trees were cut at a small size and farmers developed specialized forestry techniques, such as coppicing and pollarding, to maximize the
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yield of small timber. Moreover, the land was completely altered for pasture and farm. Clearing the land was often extremely difficult. Since they would not burn while standing, the giant oaks in some cases were felled with stone axes, bucked into shorter pieces with the same, hauled into piles, and then burned. The remaining thick roots had to be dug out of the ground with wood and stone implements. I tend to situate the origins of the impetus to dominate nature and the ideology which rationalizes its domination with these large projects, rather than, as is often done, the Middle Ages.

The new wilderness-depleting industries are, as Nash suggests, partly explained by human ingenuity: in developing productive forces, to extract more from nature, and thereby (hopefully) to better satisfy human needs. In contrast, Paul Bairoch's review of recent research indicates that with agriculture:

humanity, for better or for worse, apparently without seeking to (and this is a point about which anthropologists are in agreement) crossed a critical threshold. "For worse" may seem a mere rhetorical flourish, but nothing could be further from the case. For even without taking into account the problems of the industrial age, a growing number of studies show that [hunter gatherers] had to put in less work, and what work [they did] was probably less taxing than was the case in agricultural societies. All appearances tend to indicate, moreover, that his diet was more complete and, surprisingly, less subject to climatic fluctuations. And the better or worse included the city as well; for the new mode of producing food very rapidly carried in its wake the beginnings of urbanization.

In terms of nutrition intake and leisure time, the standard of living of pre-modern hunter gatherers was superior to that of most people today in impoverished areas of the world; in fact it even compares favourably with more affluent areas. Therefore, more than ingenuity and satisfaction of needs are required to explain relations with nature in the Neolithic (as well as later
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10 Nash explains: "At a time when there was no alternative, existence in wilderness was forbidding indeed. Safety, happiness and progress all seemed dependant on rising out of a wilderness situation. It became essential to gain control over nature. Fire was one step; the domestication of some wild animals was another. Gradually man learned how to control the land and raise crops. Clearings appeared in the forests. This reduction in the amount of wilderness defined man's achievement as he advanced toward civilization" (Nash, 1976, 9).


history). Other factors include: population growth, shifts in climate, certain fluctuations in yields of wild resources and the difficulty that farmers, once aware of the problems of farming, had in reverting to hunting and gathering. In the latter regard, Layton et al explain, "...population growth and ecological degradation consequent on intensive husbandry have a tendency to render the movement toward specialized husbandry less readily reversed than the converse movement into generalized hunting and gathering." So wilderness depletion was not just a result but also a cause of agriculture.

Positive memories of a hunting and gathering life, knowledge of hunter gatherers in surrounding areas, and knowledge of their predicament troubled farmers' psyches. As Schusky explains:

Myth after myth of farming peoples reveals how a supernatural order gave domesticated plants or animals to humans. The ability to farm is seen as a blessing. Yet, the same myth often offers a contradictory view: the way of life for farmers is something of a curse. The story of Adam and Eve suggests [this] contradiction. In the Garden of Eden the life of innocence is an easy one of food collecting. After "gaining knowledge of evil," or something like culture, humans are doomed to earn a living "by the sweat" of their brow, obviously as farmers.

So farm land was sometimes cursed, and hunter gatherer land - wilderness - was sometimes admired as sacred space. Prior to Christianity, farmers revered "sacred groves" which sometimes were places for pagan religious ceremonies. As well, early farmers valued wilderness for its uses in the wilderness economic sector. They used the ancient oak forest as had their predecessors: for harvesting wild game, nuts, mushrooms, berries and honey, which were delicacies in the routine of the Neolithic diet. They also used the wilds for new agricultural purposes: for grazing domestic species and gathering leaves for composting. They often enjoyed wilderness work more than clearing land and hoeing.

---

Because of its economic and spiritual significance, early agriculturists sometimes protected wilderness from farming and intensive forestry in parks and attempted to conserve the resources within. In some cases opposition arose to building cart roads into such parks. They improved access to wilderness resources and opened up the forest, thereby increasing the yield of desired species; however, roads also encouraged wilderness-depleting intensive forestry, agriculture and settlement.

As they are today, initiatives to preserve wilderness were limited in scope; attempts were not made to preserve all land as wilderness, and small-scale measures often failed. In spite of any resistance that occurred, in certain places for limited periods of time, pre-urban farmers in northwestern Europe fell or burned a significant proportion (perhaps 1/3) of the post-glacial forest.

There are differences between the Neolithic and the present. Neolithic farmers sometimes attempted to protect a range of regional wilderness biomes, but did not attempt to protect representative ecosystems over the world. Debates over wilderness involved communities and regional alliances, but not urban social movements. Neolithic farmers did not have to protect wilderness from cities, mining, and hydro development; with the advent of agriculture, however, people have sometimes tried to protect wilderness from farming, grazing, forestry and roads.

2.2 Hunting Parks and the Pre-Modern Urban Relation with Wilderness

This section begins with analysis of the relation with wilderness in the earliest urban societies, particularly as indicated by the Epic of Gilgamesh. Then I address the difficulty of conserving forests in pre-modern Europe. Finally, attention is directed at the conflicts over European aristocratic sport hunting and hunting parks.

Gilgamesh and the early urban relation with wilderness

Unbeknown to early farmers their wilderness depletion and population growth established important preconditions for cities, "for the new mode of producing food very rapidly carried in its wake the beginnings of urbanization."17 Given the transportation technologies of the day and
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a threshold population level, enough surplus value could be extracted from a surrounding region to supply a city.\textsuperscript{18} Early cities tended to be located on rivers downstream from resource extraction areas.\textsuperscript{19} Heavily-laden barges floated toward cities and returned against the current with a light load of manufactured goods: the city consumed the balance or ejected it as waste. New forms of wilderness depletion in addition to forestry and agriculture arose, including military (especially with the scorched earth tactic), hydro development (for irrigation and power), mining and urban sprawl. The advantages of urbanism over hunter gatherer, Neolithic farming and pastoral pursuits were not always readily apparent. War, famine and slavery often represented worsening conditions. Accompanying knowledge new forms of suffering, memories of hunting-gathering and pre-urban farming, and awareness of hunter gatherers in surrounding regions, an ambivalent view of wilderness carried over from the Neolithic: that is, to use it or to preserve it.

The \textit{Epic of Gilgamesh}, one of the first of the favoured tales from the oral tradition to be etched in stone, illustrates the tensions that wilderness depletion aroused in early urban society.\textsuperscript{20} Gilgamesh, the great Mesopotamian builder of ramparts and buildings, the original urban developer, is the hero. The story begins with him announcing his intention to log an area of the mountainous slopes east of the Tigris River. To do this he must slay the forest's protector Humbaba, a pantheistic forest protector from earlier times. Some of the people of Uruk, in an early urban social movement, pleaded Gilgamesh to not carry out plans. People in Mesopotamia saw this disapproval arising out of concern for Gilgamesh's safety, but they also conceived it as arising from the sources of opposition to logging the mountain slopes over the 1.5 millenia during which the Epic was read. Disapproval of logging the slopes, and sometimes organized opposition, arose for a number of reasons: the difficulty of transporting distant wood to the city; logging of steep slopes leading to siltation of canals; low public interest in more temples and

\textsuperscript{18}Bairoch, 1988.
\textsuperscript{19}ibid.
ramparts; a belief that cities are a parasite on the wilderness; a desire to save wilderness for rural people to use for hunting, gathering, and grazing; a military threat posed by forest hunter gatherers; a desire to protect forest people, to serve social justice or to preserve a beneficent culture; and a desire to protect a natural cedar forest as a park for sightseeing or hunting.

Gilgamesh, pushed by a combination of his own hubris, the imperatives of the forest industry, and urban demands for forestry products ignores his opponents and proceeds to the forest. On arrival he considers the beauty of the virgin cedar trees; yet he still proceeds, slays the forest protector Humbaba and begins felling the trees. His decision leads to his personal downfall and widespread famine. This moral and the popularity of the Epic for 1.5 millennia suggests opposition to wilderness depletion among some early city-dwellers, which sometimes produced preservation initiatives.

Pre-Modern European forest conservation

In a recent example of Nash's argument that distaste for wilderness prevailed until recently, Short states that "European folklore is populated with demons and dangers who dwell in the forest: that was where little Red Riding Hood met the wolf."21 Short overlooks the positive views of wilderness: e.g. Red Riding Hood gathered flowers in the forest, Red Riding Hood's grandmother lived within the forest, the wood cutter derived his living from the forest and supplied the community with wood. The geographer Clarence Glacken complains "...some writers of the Middle Ages and modern students who have copied them give the impression that forests and mountains were the enemies of civilization, dreaded places where no one went unless he was forced to, that mountains, unappreciated for their beauty, were looked upon as angry barriers to be crossed."22 Glacken provides long lists of the uses of managed forests and wilderness areas, including uses held over from the Paleolithic and Neolithic as well as new urban uses, to support his views.

---

Having considered the variety of forest uses Glacken, unlike Nash who depicts an unmitigated assault on forests, is led into a discussion of the "antiphonal themes of forest clearance and forest conservation."\textsuperscript{23} Farmers who in their expansion had once bumped into hunter gatherers now "met up with the opposition of the forest intendants."\textsuperscript{24} So, "a substantial part of economic life revolved around the elaborate rights of forest use, with demands on the one hand for clearance to provide the arable, and on the other to save the forest in order to protect old rights of usage or to prevent torrents and soil erosion."\textsuperscript{25}

He refers to the conflict between old forms of preservation and more modern western agricultural techniques.

Replacing heathen with Christian customs often indirectly caused changes in the landscape. In a thirteenth century description of the Prussians, which conveys the spirit of an active Christianity, zeal for clearing, and resistance to it, they are described as illiterate, ignorant of God, worshippers of all kinds of creatures. "They also had fields, woods and waters which were holy to them, so that they neither plowed nor fished nor cut wood in them..."\textsuperscript{26}

In addition, Glacken emphasizes a more particular regional character to conflict over forests.

Attitudes of monasteries, for example, might be indistinguishable from those of lay institutions as far as environmental change is concerned. As they became larger and more prosperous, as the network of their interests spread beyond the countrysides in which they were established, their attitudes toward change varied with their economic interests. Some might wish to preserve their forests, while others were desirous of clearing; some found themselves at odds with nobles who resisted forest clearance; some did not wish to drain land, valuing their ponds and swamps for fish; others might want to dry them up and turn them into arable.\textsuperscript{27}

Fishers sometimes opposed hydro projects (for power and irrigation) because they interfered with the spawning cycle of valued fish. In his classic 16th C. work on mining, Agricola considers the many fallacies of mine opponents.\textsuperscript{28} According to Agricola, people sometimes opposed mining because they thought that if God or Mother Earth wanted humans to have minerals, they would not have been hidden within the earth. Agricola maintained that mining

\textsuperscript{23}Ibid, p.333.
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\textsuperscript{26}Ibid, p.330.
\textsuperscript{27}Ibid, p.314.
was unfairly signalled out in this regard since fishing and other pursuits also extract unseen resources. Agricola considers other problems with mining:

...the strongest argument of the detractors is that the fields are devastated by mining operations...the woods and groves are cut down, for there is need of an endless amount of wood for timbers, machines, and the smelting of metals. And when the woods and groves are felled, then are exterminated the beasts and birds, very many of which furnish a pleasant and agreeable food for man. Further, when the ores are washed, the water which has been used poisons the brooks and streams, and either destroys the fish or drives them away. Therefore the inhabitants of these regions, on account of the devastation of their fields, woods, groves, and rivers, find great difficulty in procuring the necessities of life, and by reason of the destruction of timber they are forced to greater expense in erecting buildings. Thus it is said, it is clearer to all that there is greater detriment from mining than the value of the metals which the mining produces.29

Other complaints pertain to the terrible working conditions and the objectionable products of mining. Agricola goes on to explain how such problems are overestimated and, at any rate, can be overcome. He finds fault with some of the uses to which mining products are put, but also notes that other uses may provide more social good. The classic distinction is between the production of metal for either swords or plowshares. However, even in the cases of objectionable uses, whether for military equipment, luxury goods or money, Agricola maintains that it is not the metal that is to blame for problems, but the unfortunate excesses of some people who exploit the resource. Agricola makes clear that mining was sometimes opposed in general as well as in specific cases. Sometimes the situation arose, as it did later in Strathcona Park, where mining was opposed partly because it would destroy park values.

Aristocratic European Sport Hunting and Hunting Parks

Likely all urban societies beginning with those in Mesopotamia had some combination of: pleasure parks for walking, sightseeing and nature observation; zoos; urban hunting parks to which wild animals were transported for sport killing; and wilderness hunting parks. Parks were either publicly owned and administered (by city, palace, state or empire) or privately owned by individuals or groups. They ranged in size from private urban parks to large state reserves primarily for sport hunting which were also the wildest parks. Roads were sometimes routed

through hunting parks to provide room for the chase and to increase deer habitat. Generally only selective logging was permitted in these areas so trees grew to maturity.

The history of Western Europe to 1800 illustrates that in pre-modern periods of economic development the extravagance of sport hunting tended to increase.\(^3\) Roman writers commented on the existence of sport hunting in Gaul and variable class access to game, albeit both less pronounced than near Rome. Later, in the classic Medieval chase, rather than simply shooting prey with bow and arrow by stealth, as hunter gatherers had devised, sport hunters chased a single stag with hounds and horses in a whole day's sport. Elderly stags were preferred for the size of their trophy, their ruses and their slow gait, which horses and hounds could match. The stag or boar was killed by sword in an often dangerous display of machismo. The excesses of the chase stemmed from several dimensions including patriarchy, meat eating, domination of nature, state pride, conspicuous consumption and class. Women seldom hunted. While male hunters eulogized sport hunting they sometimes condemned women's activities within wilderness as a derogatory "witchcraft." In another context, writers made allegories between the stag chase and the love chase.\(^3\) In the love chase the damsel, like a deer, lures on the hunter while exercising ruses to evade his intelligence and weapon. This form of allegory is not only an effect of patriarchy. The primeval naturalness of the stag chase portrayed attempts to naturalize, or at least rationalize to hunters, the patriarchal love chase, and hence patriarchy. Sport hunting also celebrates meat eating and cruelty to animals. Chasing an animal all day seems deliberately cruel. This is one of the main contexts I am aware of in which a motive, indeed delight, seems to


\(^3\) Duerr, 1985.

\(^3\) Thiebaux, 1974.
be the "domination of nature". Doubtless the explanation hunters made, that for a deer to be plagued by hounds, horses and men all day and then executed by sword did not bother them since they were accustomed to life in the wilds and so were used to such conditions, was poorly understood by many. Through urban history campaigns of peasants, hounds and horses, under the direction of elite sport hunter/war lord, were launched against animals in preparation for war. Often the hunting season alternated regularly with the war season\textsuperscript{33}. Concerning state pride, states competed to have the most desirable hunting parks and the most elaborate hunts. The conspicuous consumption dimensions of Medieval sport hunting included horses, hounds, beaters, hunting lodges, hunting castles, hunting parks and trophies.

Still, the Medieval chase was a modest sport compared to later forms of sport hunting. The practices of the Emperor Maximillian (1459-1519) represent a turning point in the development of sport hunting. Baillie-Grohman comments that Maximillian's preserves in the mountainous regions of Tyrol "practically included every glen and mountain range worth having for hunting purposes."\textsuperscript{34} He reproduces the 1504 picture by Jorg Kolderer which shows Maximillian's Achean See reserve in the Alps. Maximillian's reservation of this remote area as well as the lodge and people in attendance for hunting and non-hunting pleasures cuts against the opinion of Nicholson that mountains were especially feared places to which people would not voluntarily go until the 18th Century.\textsuperscript{35} Indeed, the crampons on the climbers suggest established mountaineering techniques!

At the Achean See Maximillian enjoyed "shooting chamois and stags from a boat, from which in the intervals between the drives he used to fish."\textsuperscript{36} Peasant beaters who made the drives would undoubtedly have been happier if they could shoot and eat the deer rather than chasing them over the country for Maximillian's frivolous pleasure. Still, Baillie-Grohman

\textsuperscript{32}Anderson, 1985.
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stresses, both the number of Maximillian's bags and of peasants purloined for his drives were miniscule compared to later excesses.\textsuperscript{37}

No one [i.e., before about 1500] who deemed himself a veneur would dream of delegating the killing to a subordinate, as generally was done later on when men grew soft, and the use of gunpowder removed many of the risks of the chase, until, finally, sport was degraded to mere slaughter, and that by men securely ensconced in danger-proof stands, to which they were driven in chariots or carried in litters.\textsuperscript{38}

In the later forms of hunting the hunting park became necessary mainly to maintain game species, as many elite hunters did not actually go into these preserves. The hunting park became a wilderness factory farm from which the game was chased or carried in a cart or litter to an appropriate site for sport. Baillie-Grohman discusses a particularly extravagant 18th C. example on Starenberg Lake, near Munich, shown in a picture by Fleming showing "one of those fantastic coups de theatre replete with the monstrous extravagances then \textit{en vogue}."\textsuperscript{39} Three large recreational row boats built for speed, in which the thirty rowers exceeds the number of tourists, adorn a scene dominated by an elaborate two-tiered state barge powered by over a hundred rowers, supporting about 200 members of the Bavarian Court. A pack of about one hundred hounds have driven a stag of fourteen to water. Three fancy rowboats with five rowers each divert the stag to a fourth rowboat in which stands the Duke.

In the rowing boat, which is heading off the swimming stag, is the Duke, who either killed the deer there and then, or what was occasionally done, the exhausted animal was dragged on board the Bucentaur and killed at the feet of the Duchess; after which the right fore-leg; cut off at the knee-joint was presented to the august lady. As a cannon is being fired from the bows of the barge, and trumpeters, drawn on its gaily-beflagged roof, are blowing a fanfare, it is likely that the stag came to his end in the former manner.\textsuperscript{40}

The canon is an innovation. The horns used to coordinate dogs and hunters in the Medieval chase became the row of trumpeters blowing a fanfare announcing the kill to a watching audience.

In more common examples of excesses, Middle Age elites organized among the largest "battue" hunts in history. In the off-season preparation for these hunts, "[t]he artisan had to give
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his labour gratuitously to construct and keep in repair the enormous hunting equipage, the hundreds of carts and wagons for transportation [and] to manufacture and make up the miles upon miles of canvas screens from six to ten feet in height..."41 When the hunt was in progress, "For weeks at a time every adult villager had to turn out to beat the woods and drive together deer and boar, endless chains of watch-fires having to be kept up at night time, so as to get as much game as possible for the great court hunts when thousands were slaughtered."42 During the day peasants erected or moved around the battue, sometimes for several miles, so that the beaters could divert deer to aristocrats waiting with guns. In some cases battue and beaters diverted the deer into a ring around which they circled until they were shot by elites in the shooting stands.

Sometimes everyone in the royal party shot the animals while in other cases the Lord reserved the pleasure for himself, having on hand several over-heated rifles loaded by a worker. Aristocratic hunters diligently maintained diaries which can still be seen in European archives, recording their daily achievements as to the quality and quantity of the bag. Daily kills sometimes exceeded a hundred animals, and life time tallies exceeded ten thousand per species (particularly red deer), and over 100,000 total kills.43

Another form of sport saw the animals brought by litter from regional hunting parks, foreign countries and Africa for show hunts. Men would take on bears or boars with a sword while the audience watched. Bear, auroch, wolves and lions were manipulated into fighting amongst themselves. Perhaps most offensive was the practice of animal tossing. In the Bavarian version of "fox-tossing" hundreds of foxes were brought from the forest in sealed boxes and released in an enclosure with "aristocratic" tossers.

The tossing was done by two persons standing about twenty or twenty-five feet apart holding the ends of tossing slings made of webbing or cordwork about twenty-five feet in length. As the terrified animals were running about leaping over the tossing slings, the centres of which lay on the ground, it behaved the tossers to jerk the animals into the air as forcibly as their strength permitted. Skilled male hunters could toss a fox twenty-four feet high. To prolong the sport the ground was covered with a thick layer

---
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of sawdust, so as not to kill the wretched animal at the first toss. A great number of couples - generally a lady and a gentleman were partners - could participate at the same time, and the quantity of game thus slaughtered on great occasions was something almost beyond belief, the rivalry between the separate couples giving additional zest to the cruel amusement.44

The cruelty to animals becomes even stranger in the Baroque relation with wilderness.

Not only did the players put on bizarre costumes, dressing themselves up as Dianas, sprites of the wood, nymphs, hobgoblins, centaurs, sphinxes, and other creatures of mythology, but these master-buffoons did the same thing to the animals they tossed. By means of cardboard, bits of gaudy cloth, and tinsel, the wretched foxes and hares - these latter being the preferred favourites for this purpose - were dressed up in the most fantastic manner imaginable, unpopular personages or political foes being represented in as lifelike a manner as possible.45

In an example of the cruelty to humans, "Another form of oppressive service of the chase enforced by sport-loving rulers was the billeting of thousands of hounds upon the peasantry, who had to keep them in good condition, and thus had often to deprive themselves of food badly needed for their own families."46

Sport hunters were not the only supporters of sport hunting. The meat was often distributed to a wider group than those who shot it. Although peasants were not permitted to hunt deer or boar, poaching was sometimes common and they were permitted to hunt some other species. Although farming was prohibited in hunting parks and other industries were restricted, removal of underwood was sometimes permitted. Hunters also permitted selective removal of mature trees necessary for large building and ships, leading to support for hunting parks. Employees in the sport hunting tourism economy (gun makers, gamekeepers, trainers and caretakers of hounds and horses, hunt organizers, and builders and caretakers of hunting lodges and castles) had vested interests in hunting parks. However, a strong distaste arose for aristocratic sport hunting and the reservation of land for it. Lay and secular elites opposed sport hunting "to excess". It sometimes damaged particular interests in the agricultural and other productive forces, and damaged the common weale.

The pictures in Baillie-Grohman's comprehensive volume show no more than one hundred spectators (who by their dress are generally elite) viewing show hunts in enclosures, small arenas
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and town squares. The popularity that animal sports attained in the Coliseum arose only as an echo in the Middle Ages and, generally did not arise with the development of capitalism. The absence of plebes at wilderness sports may be because elites preferred privacy. But, it is more likely that peasants despised the excesses of sport hunting and were little interested in viewing it. In the off-season, "The farmer grew his crops for the great herds of deer and boar to feast on. Neither fence nor trap cold be constructed to prevent their unwelcome visitations, and to put up a trap or snare was literally a matter of life or death." The fact that peasants were prohibited by the death penalty from killing boars which were ruining crops points to the end of the idea that the lord protected people from dangerous animals. The purloining of thousands of peasants to work for the hunt in the fall, when the aristocratic preference for deer hunting (when rutting commenced) coincided with the harvest, raised the greatest animosity. Sport hunting took priority, so crops rotted while peasants worked to satisfy the decadent pleasure of sport hunters.

In some cases people retaliated to such abuse by felling ancient oaks signifying venerable family status, by breaking the heads of fish ponds, by accosting game keepers, and by burning houses and barns. From 1500 to 1800 with the increase in the number and area of hunting parks, and with the increasing extravagance of sport hunting, opposition mounted and poaching was accorded heavy fines, torture or death.

The Aristocracy's argument that God gave them the right to sport hunting ultimately failed. The classic development occurred in France where sport hunting "engendered hatreds against the forests and their royal and noble owners that reached a climax in the French Revolution." Referring to Louis XVI Baillie-Grohman comments "As the monarch's carefully kept diary shows, he was an over-keen sportsman, who assuredly would have ended in a less dramatic manner had he vouchedsafed as much thought to his peasants and merchants as he directed to his pheasants and partridges."

---

49For example, John Manwood, in A Treatise on the Laws of the Forest (Norwood, New Jersey: Walter Johnson, 1976, first published 1615) depicts the aristocratic right to sport hunting extending through history to God.
Conclusion
I began by considering the troublesome role wilderness depletion played in the agricultural revolution. Wilderness depletion was not an acceptable trade-off for the benefits of agriculture. Rather, wilderness depletion tended to cause agriculture since farming and logging environmental degradation tended to make it difficult to return to hunting and gathering once the inadequate diet and hard labour of the agricultural economy were apparent. The Neolithic wilderness was valued for its meanings as a hunter-gather landscape as well as for its resources. Wilderness goods were often delicacies and wilderness work was often preferable to clearing and hoeing, so farmers sometimes attempted to preserve areas of wilderness.

The Epic of Gilgamesh shows both deep historical and new urban tensions over wilderness. Gilgamesh fells the virgin forest, causing his own downfall and that of his domain, and ends up brooding on correct zoning. His land types include wilderness. Among the uses of wilderness which likely led to its centrality to the Epic was its importance not as a place of pleasurable work, but as a consumption space for sport hunting.

Wild was a staple in the Mesolithic and a less important, yet significant, part of the Neolithic diet. Maximum yields of most game species were probably attained in the Mesolithic (and sometimes exceeded which resulted in the extinction of some species), and certainly were in the Neolithic. In urban society, as the population rose and yields of game animals fell with the spread of agriculture as well as over hunting, the nutritional significance of wild game to the population as a whole dramatically declined. With the increase of elite leisure in urban society, rather than gathering, contemplation, sightseeing or hiking, sport hunting was celebrated as an elite outdoor sport. Although the royal forests and parks aristocratic sport hunters established throughout Europe to the 19th Century prevented wilderness depletion, and still do in some instances, they are little-admired by today's preservationists. A constellation of forces seems to have led to the often cruel obsession with sport hunting: the military, conspicuous consumption, patriarchy, meat-eating habits, class attitudes and state pride. To highlight just one of the themes, aristocratic sport hunting seems to have been not just at the expense of the lower class:
the form of sport was partly driven by a desire to be cruel to the peasantry. As a result, opposition to aristocratic sport hunting played a significant role in the French Revolution.

There are still elite forms of sport hunting. In some cases affluent hunters hire airplanes and guides to take them to remote regions for trophy hunting. But generally the extravagant forms of the chase and battue styles of hunting have declined. Today the royal hunt exists as only a vestige: in England elites chase only the occasional fox with horses and hounds; in the United States no President has exceeded the prowess of Theodore Roosevelt at big game hunting; and in Canada Prime Minister Brian Mulroney was recently condemned for a single boar hunting expedition in Russia.52

Industrial capitalism helps explain the decline of aristocratic sport hunting. With stable or falling game yields and rapid urbanization, a smaller proportion of the population could participate in extravagant sport hunting. Elite hunters, therefore, became increasingly segregated. At the same time, railways and other transport allowed people to escape the industrial city to wilderness for non-hunting pleasures such as sightseeing, hiking, and natural history observation, which do not mix well with hunting and so led in some areas to increased opposition to hunting. In some respects democracy extended to animals. For example opposition increased against cruelty to animals, and especially to the aristocratic chase. Wider participation came to sport hunting. Today it is carried out by millions of hunters, but not so much in the tradition of the Medieval chase as (at the technical level) in the hunter gatherer tradition of stealth, albeit hunters go out by pick-up truck and shoot with rifles.

In these respects broad social/economic developments curbed aristocratic sport hunting. The demise of aristocratic sport hunting was, however, also a cause of capitalism. Modern sport hunting plays a role in capitalism. Rising mass participation in sport hunting made it an important part of the tourism economy, producing more labour (with hundreds of thousands of amateur hunters each shooting several deer a year) than the extravagances of sport hunting in the Middle Ages. Of even more importance, was the development of a powerful class which

heeded, especially after the French Revolution, the perennial criticisms of sport hunting. Lacking an aristocratic obsession for sport hunting, the bourgeois turned more of their attention to production. For example, they successfully lobbied for laws enabling them to erect fences which kept deer from crops and prevented the chase from spilling onto their property. They hired workers to harvest crops rather than forcing them to erect battue or serve as beaters. This increased the availability of factory workers and the amount of agricultural yields, both of which fed the industrial city.

Whether it represents a cause or effect of capitalism, the decline of aristocratic sport hunting accompanying the rise of capitalism illustrates the intractability of ecological problems. Even though sport hunters often support conservation, the practice of sport hunting carried out by millions of people damages natural wilderness and, even with the "quick kill", hunting offends animals' rights. More broadly, as illustrated by the world-wide spread of agriculture, logging and mining as well as by new forms of industry and pollution, in capitalism there are more persuasive causes of wilderness depletion.
Chapter Three
Conflicts over North American Wilderness

This chapter concerns Canadian and American National Parks: the values which inspired their founding and protection, the struggles over them, and their geographic nature. The research question begins with wilderness in the spatial commodity cycle: How does the struggle between wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space arise in North America? There are three main sections to the chapter. The first concerns the establishment, in advance of the westward-moving industrial frontier, of Yellowstone National Park in the United States and Rocky Mountains National Park in Canada. The second section concerns the forms of national parks conceived for their several main purposes: national pride, recreation, tourism and nature preservation. Finally, the third section concerns radical approaches to wilderness preservation as well as the impediments and opportunities the commodity cycles based in agriculture, water, logging, mining and transportation pose to preserving "representative ecosystems."

3.1 The First National Parks in Canada and the United States

By 1492 even the wildest European hunting parks were crisscrossed with roads to increase the yield of deer, to facilitate the chase and to permit removal of resources. The underwood was often removed, and selective logging had been carried out for so long that no old growth forest remained. So, although North America's indigenous people altered the environment, through hunting, gathering, burning and in some cases horticulture or agriculture, to many Europeans North America seemed an uninhabited wilderness. Nash maintains that this relatively wild environment, along with the immigrants' tenuous existence in it led to a general fear of the wilderness, especially since humans have a primeval fear of densely forested areas. He acknowledges there were economic motives for clearing the land but tends to downplay them despite the fact that many immigrants, with only an echo of hunting and gathering in their heritage, faced starvation if they did not farm. He maintains: "The pioneers' obsession was to

---
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clear the land, to remove the vision-obscuring trees and vines, to bring light into darkness." In contrast to this approach, Kawashima and Tone's review of environmental policy in early America shows a strongly developed conservationist tradition. Some Colonial Statutes applied the concept of "public nuisance" to all uses of the environment over which problems might arise. Other legislation specified appropriate uses of the forests; prohibited timber-cutting in certain areas; discouraged wasteful cutting by restricting timber harvest to amounts necessary for private use; and specified seasonal hunting, bag restrictions and, in some cases, prohibited exports of deer hides to keep deer for the colonists. Kawashima and Tone ponder the early emergence of environmental law: "It is striking that the colonists, who settled in a wilderness filled with natural resources, would so choose to limit the use of the forest. Certainly, they brought with them a notion of conservation from England; there various environmental problems had long existed, including short supplies of timber and wood fuel, and had steeped colonists in a long-standing tradition of resource planning." The other factor was regional circumstances.

As forests were cut back it became increasingly difficult to transport wood to settlements and homes. Therefore attempts were made to conserve the forest resource and reserve some forested areas from agriculture. The best-known American advocate of the latter approach was William Penn, after whom Pennsylvania was named. In 1682 he advocated that "in clearing the ground, care be taken to have an acre of trees for every five acres cleared." Americans were amenable to these views and often conceived a nation of independent farmers having each main land use type so that trading could be minimized, thereby avoiding widespread conflicts over resources and starvation as occurred in Europe. This mode of decentralized conservation was doomed. Farming was more profitable on arable land than was waiting a century for trees to grow, so wherever possible forests were cleared for agriculture. Farmers then traded their crops for wood from surrounding regions, opening up interregional trading and socio/economic
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relations. Settlers were at first dependent on manufactured imports, especially metals. This maintained the uneasy trading dynamic in which America’s staples economy was bled by the European powers' integrated economies. As mining, smelting, manufacturing and urbanization developed in America, so to did a fully integrated sociology and economy. Industrial capitalism commenced in North East America in about 1850, a century after it began in England. This tardiness, Allan Pred shows, was more a result of the low population (with a correspondingly small work force and market) and undeveloped infrastructure rather than an anti-modernist sentiment or the curbing of America’s economic development by England.7

Before the 1872 founding of Yellowstone National Park, game reserves were established in North America but only on private land since neither the main Colonial powers (France, England and Spain) nor the United States established large nature reserves. There are several main reasons for this absence: low population, a small indigenous aristocracy, and the opposition of settlers. In the latter regard, Huth argues that opposition to sport hunting among the Puritans indicated an absence of love for nature with unfortunate results: "They disapproved of outdoor sports and hunting for pleasure, which might have strengthened ties between man and nature."8

While sport hunting indicates a form of appreciation of nature, I think Huth is unfair to the Puritans. One can appreciate nature through utilitarian hunting for the family or community even though it is a different type of pleasure than that experienced in sport hunting. Moreover, the European aristocracy’s cruel excesses established a reputation for sport hunting which justified opposition to getting the sport started in North America. Settlers were also aware of the excesses of other types of parks, such as at Versailles, in which large areas were landscaped for the enjoyment of the rich. So opposition arose not just to hunting parks, but to any sort of state nature reserve.

8Huth, 1957: 7. Huth’s volume, however, remains one of the best on the immigrants’ early leisure relation with nature and the early conservation movement.
The conservationist trend continued in the 19th Century, and the park advocacy movement had its first successes. George Catlin is often credited with originating the national park idea after his 1832 expedition of the Western Plains.

And what a splendid contemplation too, when one (who has travelled these realms, and can duly appreciate them) imagines them as they might in future be seen (by some great protecting policy of government) preserved in their pristine beauty and wildness, in a magnificent park, where the world could see for ages to come, the native Indian in his classic attire...A nation's Park, containing man and beast, in all the wild and freshness of their nature's beauty!9

Catlin appreciated the pristine wilderness as well as hunter-gatherers' life styles and their uses of nature which he regarded as less destructive than those of the industrializing immigrants.10 He goes on to note the Western plain's low agricultural potential: "Such scenes might easily have been preserved, and still could be cherished on the great plains of the West, without detriment to the country or its border; for the tracts of country on which the buffaloes have assembled, are uniformly sterile, and of no available use to cultivating man." Even though agriculture did not yet directly impede founding parks in the West, a concerted campaign did not arise to found a large prairie or savannah park.

Henry Thoreau also was an early park advocate. He pointed to the constitutional distinctions of potential American parks in an 1858 issue of the Atlantic Monthly.

The Kings of England formerly had their forests "to hold the King's game," for sport or food, sometimes destroying villages to create or extend them; and I think they were guided by a true instinct. Why should not we, who have renounced the King's authority, have our national preserves, where no villages need be destroyed, in which the bear and panther, and some of the hunter race, may still exist, and not be "civilized off the face of the earth," - our forest, not to hold the King's game merely, but to hold and preserve the King himself also, the lord of creation, - not for idle sport or food, but for inspiration and our own true recreation.12

Several factors worked to turn calls for the creation of wilderness parks into a reality.

In the interregional competition over parks through history mountainous regions were at first more often admired as hunting parks than as romantic or picturesque parks. As the advent

11 Haines, 1974.
12 Quoted in ibid: xxii.
of railway transport in Europe brought an increasing number of non-hunting recreationists (sightseers and mountaineers) to wilderness areas, an international competition arose over the appearance and suitability of mountainous and other monumental landscapes for park purposes. Eastern American dramatic landscapes, such as Natural Bridge, Mammoth Cave, Niagara Falls and the Catskill Mountains were comparable to many European examples, but did not measure up to the grandeur of the Swiss Alps.

Where Americans did have dramatic landscapes in the East, they were often damaged. The immigrants first went by horse to Niagara Falls for sightseeing, and later in greater numbers by canal and train. Since the Falls were admired for their natural beauty, when their power was tapped for adjacent factories (wires did not distribute electricity till the 20th Century) a conservation campaign arose: "Americans, Canadians, and even foreign visitors complained about the undignified and sordid conditions confronting visitors to the falls until the protests finally took the form of a public petition requesting the United States and Canadian governments to remedy the situation."13 Americans were particularly sensitive to European comments that Americans generally did not have grand landscapes and, moreover, they did not care for those they had. These criticisms spurred efforts to protect Niagara Falls; but industry grew faster than the defence movement. By the 1860's most of the surrounding land was privately owned with secondary industrial development, so conserving the Falls in a natural state became impossible.

At the same time as concerns arose to protect special landscapes, there was a movement West into land acquired through conflict with Spain, England and the Indian Nations. Some of the newly-claimed Western landscapes were generally regarded as more spectacular even than Switzerland. Moreover, it was possible found parks on them since they were not owned or used by non-Indians. Therefore, with the development of industrial capitalism in the East and New York City's population approaching a million, westward industrial expansion was accompanied

by a significant movement to protect, what Runde calls, "monumental landscapes" in national parks.\footnote{Alfred Runde *National Parks: The American Experience* (Lincoln and London: University of Nebraska Press, 1987).}

The Western park advocacy movement achieved its first success with the 1864 founding of Yosemite State Park, a small area of spectacular canyon and falls, and a grove of Redwood trees, which Washington ceded to the state of California on the condition that it be protected in a natural state. The 1872 founding of Yellowstone Park provided the first large North American wilderness preserve. Although there had been similarly large wilderness reserves in Europe and elsewhere in the past, it is likely that in the 19th Century Yellowstone - with dimensions of 44 miles by 40 miles - was among the largest formal wilderness parks in the world.

The Yellowstone Park Act specified that the tract of land in Montana and Wyoming was:

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; and all persons who shall locate or settle upon or occupy the same, or any part thereof, except as hereinafter provided, shall be considered trespassers, and removed therefrom.

The "public" didn't include Indians. The Generals who supported founding the Park may have wanted the above clause allowing for removal of trespassers to permit the removal of Indians, especially since Catlin, Thoreau and other park advocates had raised the idea that Indians should be protected in large wilderness reserves where they could carry on their traditional economy. National policy, however, dictated that Indians be confined to small reserves in which a traditional economy was impossible. Whether or not this was the intent of the Act, the main trespassers to be removed from the Park were Indians.\footnote{Alston Chase, *Playing God in Yellowstone: The Destruction of America's First National Park* (San Diego and New York: Harvest HBJ Books, 1987), 108-109.} Indeed, some of the last stands of non-Reservation natives were made in non-agricultural Western areas such as the Yellowstone Valley.\footnote{Ibid.} The Act specified that the "park shall be under the exclusive control of the Secretary of Interior, whose duty it shall be, as soon as practicable, to make and publish such rules and regulations as he may deem necessary or proper for the care and management of the same."
After the Act was passed, the Secretary appointed a Park Superintendent. Given their war with the United States, and their by then impoverished and diseased state, the Indians did not mix well with the incipient tourism the Superintendent was authorized to promote. Accordingly he lobbied Congress to expel Indians from the Park. In 1877, partly on the basis of the Superintendent's lobby, as well as broader National policy, the cavalry chased Indians from the Park, some of whom had already been chased into it from as far away as Oregon. The indigenous Shoshone, Sheepeater and Bannock were removed to Reserves in Idaho.17 The Superintendent then broadcasted the idea that Indians had never frequented the Park because of their "superstitious awe concerning the rumblings and hissing sulphur flames of the spouting geysers and other hot springs, which they imagined to be the wails and groans of departed Indian warriors who were suffering punishment for their earthly sins."18

The Yellowstone Bill specified that the Secretary of Interior was mandated to make regulations to "provide against the wanton destruction of the fish and game found within said park, and against their capture or destruction for the purposes of merchandise or profit," but did not prohibit sport hunting outright"19 In Congressional debate several Senators who supported the Yellowstone Park Bill argued that it be amended so that sport as well as commercial hunting be prohibited.20 Senator Pomeroy, sponsor of the Bill, maintained that unfortunately hunting was necessary for recreationists who were there for weeks on foot or horseback to feed themselves. The Bill was not amended in this regard. In the following years, commercial hunters decimated deer and elk populations for their hides, and many sport hunters frequented the Park mainly for hunting. The problem was the ambivalence of an Act which prohibited wanton destruction of game but did not prohibit sport hunting outright, and by refusal of Congress to make an appropriation for the Secretary to hire game wardens. Rather the Secretary was expected to run the Park as a profitable enterprise:
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17Ibid.
18Quoted in ibid.
19Quoted in Haines, 1974: 127.
20Haines (1974) quotes the entire text of the Congressional debate.
The Secretary may, in his discretion, grant leases for buildings purposes for terms not exceeding ten years, of small parcels of ground, at such places in said park as shall require the erection of buildings for the accommodation of visitors; all the proceeds of said leases, and all other revenues that may be derived from any source connected with said park, to be expended under his direction in the management of the same, and the construction of roads and bridle-paths therein.

Most tourism benefits were not at first realized, however, because an anticipated railway did not extend to the Park until 1883.

The main debate over the Bill concerned the natural resources in the Park. The Act specifies the Secretary should make regulations "for the preservation, from injury or spoliation, of all timber, mineral deposits, natural curiosities, or wonders within said park, and their retention in their natural condition." Mr. Edmunds argued on behalf of the Bill that the region was worthy of preservation and, since the timber was not harvestable and the region was too high for agriculture, it had no other uses. Mr. Cole spoke against the Bill saying that agriculture was conceivable at 7,000 feet above sea level and, moreover, "if it cannot be occupied by man, why should we make a public park of it."21 In spite of confusion in its sponsors' arguments, the Yellowstone Bill passed with 60 not voting, 65 nays, and 115 yeas and on March 1, 1872 was signed by President Ulysses S. Grant.

At first the Park was used mainly by Eastern sport hunters, scientists and sightseers, who were affluent enough to make an expedition to the remote region as well as a few local farmers south of the Park. In 1883, however, the Northern Pacific Railroad Company laid a track by the Park, built hotels within it, and promoted the Park through large-scale advertising, thereby bringing wilderness tourism to the first American National Park.

Nelson maintains: "The wilderness idea developed earlier in the United States than Canada, where it seemingly appeared only rarely and then usually in the contained and conservative way that has been typical of Canadian reaction to romantic or aesthetic ideas."22 I attribute the more rapid development of park ideas, bureaucracy and legislation in the United States to the earlier

21 Quoted in Haines, 1974: 119.
industrialization there, rather than Canadians' "contained and conservative way", and I note that the initiative to preserve Niagara Falls, which straddles the border between the nations, arose in Canada with Confederation. Moreover, the generalization of Canadians as "contained and conservative" certainly doesn't apply to Sir John A. Macdonald, a Father of Confederation, the Nation's first Prime Minister, and an important park advocate. He was unabashed in his enthusiasm for the Western landscape as he saw it in 1886 from one of the first trains, in which he was particularly pleased to ride up front in the locomotive, to cross Canada on the newly-laid Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) transcontinental line. Following his adventure, as reported in an Regina newspaper, he said:

There may be monotony of mountains as there is of prairies, but in our mountain scenery there is no monotony. You go up from Calgary and climb to the summit of the first range of the Rocky mountains, and you see one description of grandeur. You plunge into the valleys, and rise up another range, and you have quite a different character equally sublime. You plunge into another valley and then come the Selkirk's, of unsurpassed beauty and grandeur, of magnificent and almost eccentric changes. You plunge into the valley of the Fraser and the magnificent canyons.

The depiction is not sophisticated and shows as much enthusiasm for technological wonders as a natural sublime, but Macdonald's enthusiasm contradicts the generalization of the Canadian psyche as "contained" or "conservative". At any rate, in 1887 Macdonald provided "the strongest and most convincing case for establishing Rocky Mountains Park", Canada's first National Park.

When he spoke in favour of the 1882 Rocky Mountain Park Bill in the Canadian Parliament, Macdonald had a measured view of landscape:

I do not suppose in any portion of the world there can be found a spot, taken all together, 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. It has all the qualifications necessary to make it a great place of resort...There is beautiful scenery, there are the curative properties of the water, there is genial climate,

25 Quoted in Leslie Bell, Parks For Profit (Montreal: Harvest House, 1987), 14.
there is prairie sport and their is mountain sport; and I have no doubt that will become a great watering-place.27

One of the most important CPR directors and Member of Parliament (MP) for Montreal West, Donald Smith (a.k.a. Lord Strathcona, after whom Strathcona Park was later named), also spoke in favour of the Bill:

Anyone who has gone to Banff and from the plateau on which the [CPR] hotel is to be built, has looked down on the fall immediately below, a fall of eighty feet or more with a large volume of water, who has looked on the reaches of the Bow River and, on turning around beheld the mountains towering heavenward, and not felt himself elevated and proud that all this is part of the Dominion, cannot be a true Canadian....28

Several MPs objected to the tourism-related expenses the Government had already made in the region, improprieties in those expenses, the withdrawal of land from resource extraction and the existence of forest tenures within the proposed park. But the Bill passed since high level interests in the Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) planned and supported the reserve.

Partly on the CPR's recommendation several of Canada's first and most important national parks were located at stops on the Rocky Mountain section of its transcontinental railway.29

Shortly after their park status was established, the CPR built hotels at several of the train-stop Parks and promoted visitation, thereby profiting from accommodation as well as transportation. As a result of these circumstances, although Rocky Mountains National Park was established 15 years after Yellowstone, Canadian national park tourism started in the 1880's at the same time as in the United States.

Briefly stated, in ensuing years both Canada and the United States established national parks which were brought together for protection under omnibus legislation in National Park Acts. There are differences between their systems of national parks and ours. The United States has generally led in developing sophisticated legislation to protect parks with an accompanying bureaucracy, the National Park Service, to promote them. In Canada the Provinces rather than Ottawa administer most public lands. There are, therefore, more large provincial parks in

27Quoted in Lothian, 1987, 22.
28Quoted in ibid, 22.
Canada (sometimes called "provincial national parks" after Yellowstone was called a National Park) than there are state parks in the United States, where Washington administers most public land. The population and GNP of the United States are about ten times that of Canada, so the social/economic contexts of park debate are distinct between the two countries. Similarities in their national park systems include: the founding of parks in advance of westward industrialization; siting of national parks in mountainous western public lands, founding of parks in Alaska and northern Canada beginning in the 1960's; indigenous mass wilderness recreation arising out of developed economies; cross border initiatives to, for example, preserve Niagara Falls and protect migratory birds; and common interests in protecting wilderness.

3.2 Wilderness Interests: Recreation, Tourism and Nature Preservation

Three of the main interests which inspire campaigns to preserve wilderness include tourism, recreation and nature preservation. I will examine the similarities and differences between these interests. On the one hand, diversity enriches the rationale for wilderness preservation, on the other, diverse interests and perspectives clash and sometimes weaken the wilderness movement's ability to stop instances of wilderness depletion and to develop a cohesive strategy to protect more wilderness.

Wilderness tourism

An exchange between John A. Macdonald and another MP (Mitchell) in the debate over Rocky Mountains Park distinguishes recreation and tourism purposes of national parks. Macdonald envisioned the CPR and Ottawa building a town near Banff Springs so: "there will be rental of waters; that is a perennial source of revenue, and if carefully managed will more than many times recuperate or recoup, the government for any present expenditures." "Recuperate too?" interrupted Mitchell. "Yes" replied Macdonald, "recuperate the patients and recoup the Treasury." So wilderness recreation refers to the social purpose of national parks while wilderness tourism refers to their economic purpose. From one perspective the wilderness
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30Quoted in Foster, 1978: 23.
visitor is a recreationist (whether sightseer, mountaineer or patient) and from the other, a tourist consumer or a customer. The state provides national parks for both purposes.

Governments establish parks partly to derive direct income from tourist activities (e.g. rental of hot springs, camping fees, ski operation fees) and, in the case of Jasper and Banff, rental or lease of land for urban development within National Parks. They also found parks to further general economic development, by attracting consumers and investors, and to help the overall tourism industry. Wilderness tourism is important for economic development in several sectors: wilderness equipment (for example, sleeping bags and mountaineering equipment), transportation, accommodation, dining, souvenirs and general retail sales. Because of this range of economic benefits, all levels of government, chambers of commerce and tourism associations try to attract wilderness consumers to their region and to encourage regional consumers to take their vacation at regional national park(s). At the global scale there is an international competition in which countries compete to keep nationals at home and to attract foreigners to wilderness parks. This competition necessitates having scenic national parks, transportation to them, amenities within them and advertising, both home and abroad, to attract consumers. The most well known example of the latter is the See America First campaign carried out by the United States Park Service. Initially this Service promoted train travel to parks which was later complemented by autocamping expeditions. If few nationals travel abroad for wilderness tourism, and many foreigners are attracted to a region, then a favourable balance of trade can occur in a significant sector of the tourism economy.

Individual corporations may influence governments to found parks. In both the United States and Canada, the strongest early corporate advocates of national parks were railway corporations with a side interest in wilderness tourism. They advocated national parks as a source of profits derived from transporting people to and from them, and from on site accommodations. In Canada the CPR began as the east-west rail, by the 1882 passage of the

31 For train corporations' influence on American national parks see Alfred Runte Trains of Discovery: Western Railroads and the National Parks (Flagstaff Arizona: Northland Press, 1984). For the Canadian experience see Bella, 1987.
Rocky Mountains Park Act it had become one of the most powerful Canadian corporations having characteristics of both a state monopoly and a capitalist corporation with sectors in transportation, resource extraction, secondary industry, and residential development. In return for laying the transcontinental railway, the CPR acquired, through its agreement with Ottawa, a swath of land across the country. So while it profited from resource extraction across the country and urban development at some of its lowland stops, it would also profit national park transportation and accommodation at the parks founded at its stops in the Rockies.

Although corporations whose main interest is in wilderness tourism may provide ongoing support for wilderness parks, the general support of multi-sectoral corporations for preservation is often soft. When demands eventually arose to enlarge Canadian national parks, the CPR balked; such enlargements would damage its interests in extraction and transportation of natural resources. When Canadian national parks were enlarged to Yellowstone size, the CPR lobbied for resource extraction in them, and was one of the first Canadian promoters of the idea that, through careful "multiple-use" of resources, wilderness preservation was compatible with mining and logging.

Wilderness recreation
Recreationists use the tourism argument to substantiate their arguments for recreation space. But generally they emphasize nature preservation more than government and corporate tourism interests. Common forms of activities which drive recreationists interest in nature preservation include sport hunting and fishing, mountaineering, hiking and sightseeing.

In his defence of sport hunters, Reiger ignores their Old World atrocities and attempts to justify their killing in America of game species as well as species (such as wolves) which depend on them by pointing to the worse slaughters by commercial hunters. He thus fails to understand opposition to sport hunting. He nevertheless shows how sport hunters and fishers influenced the founding and protection of American national parks. That sport hunters advocated creating Yellowstone and then used it for sport hunting suggests that it was
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established partly for sport hunting and, as this pattern was repeated with other National Parks, the sport hunting tradition was an important early influence on American National Parks.

Likely in Canada sport hunters and fishers also influenced the founding and protection of National Parks. Bella observes that naturalists and mountaineers were not active in establishing Rocky Mountains Park. Therefore, she is surprised at the protection afforded wildlife in the Act protecting it: "Although the Canadian government did not entertain the notion of creating a wildlife preserve in 1887, the very wording of the Act went a long way towards establishing, in theory at least, the principle of wildlife protection. The Yellowstone regulations had prohibited only the 'wanton destruction' of wildlife, but for some unknown reason, Canada's regulations...provided for the 'protection and preservation of game, fish [and] wild birds generally.' Part of the motive for the regulations was likely that the Park was conceived by some of its advocates as a hunting reserve which, as always, required regulations.

Although some advocated hunting in National Parks, a faction within the sport hunting movement advocated prohibition. George Bird Grinnell, Field and Stream's editor, first lobbied Congress to enact and enforce strict game regulations in Yellowstone Park and later to prohibit hunting entirely, but mainly so game could multiply within to be shot when they migrated or strayed outside its bounds. Still, Reiger is right that sport hunters and fishers were early influences on the modern concept of a national park "as an essentially inviolate wildlife and wilderness sanctuary." Today Fishing is often permitted in national parks, but hunting is generally prohibited. This prohibition is not so much a credit to the sport hunting lobby as, for example, the obvious danger of hunting in an area frequented by mountaineers, hikers, and sightseers.

Before the 19th Century, sport hunters were probably the main European mountain climbers. Trips were, however, sometimes made to wilderness mountains and other remote areas
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(desert or forest) for retreat, re-creation, visions and purification. Fasting is often the physical aspect of these traditional wilderness pursuits, whereas for mountaineering there is fitness and a rigorous challenge to external nature. Baillie-Grohman closes his analysis of sport hunting to 1800 with a chapter on the early development of sport mountain climbing. This illustrated the similarity of climbing to sport hunting as a rigorous wilderness sport and, since few mountaineers would kill animals for pleasure, signalled a new sensibility in the relationship with nature. John Muir, a principal Sierra Club founder, was a vegetarian mountaineer.

Hikers sometimes prefer mountainous areas but make their way between peaks, and often make treks in a range of biomes. Sometimes long treks emphasize endurance, but often more casual hiking is enjoyed in which campfire sing-a-longs are as important as covering a great distance. Both hiking and mountaineering tended at first to be elite sports due to the cost of special equipment (mules were often required for Sierra Club expeditions) and travel to remote regions. Today there are also financial barriers to some elite forms of trekking which require guides and transportation. Tourist operators take affluent tourists on submarines rides and are conceiving expensive tourism in outer space. However, hiking equipment is generally inexpensive today so people who have vacations and can afford to get to a national park can participate in wilderness recreation.

Hikers and mountaineers formed organizations to promote their sport and to protect the wilderness environments they loved: the British Alpine Club (1857), in the United States the Appalachian Mountain Club (1876) and the Sierra Club (1892), and the Canadian Alpine Club (1906). The Sierra Club lobbied for wildlife protection in Yellowstone but from a different perspective than sport hunting and fishing associations such as the Boone and Crockett Club. The Sierra Club opposed hunting because of the danger it poses to hikers and because of their views on ecological management. Rather than regulations to maximize yields of game animals,
the Sierra Club has been advocating regulations which let the numbers of species, whether deer or wolf, fall to a natural level. This stance stems from Club members' beliefs that nature has a right to be left completely alone in some instances, moral commitments to vegetarianism, appreciation of completely natural environments in the present and belief that wilderness is important for future generations. As large clubs concerned with wild North America appeared in the 20th Century, a distinction emerged between sport hunting and fishing groups such as Ducks Unlimited and hiking-wilderness protection groups such as the Sierra Club and the Canadian Parks and Wilderness Society.

One of the main forms of "public park or pleasuring-ground for the benefit and enjoyment of the people" at Yellowstone and later national parks pertained to sightseeing. Through urban history picturesque parks for sightseeing were generally smaller than hunting parks and were located nearer to or within cities. But with the train and later the automobile it became possible for casual sightseers to get to remote wilderness areas. To support their cause, national park advocates in the United States drew on early examples of wilderness hotels in the Swiss Alps, in the English Lake District and the 1823 establishment of the Catskill Mountain House and further wilderness hotels in the Eastern United States. Hotels were built for sightseers in several American National Parks and in Canada even towns were established within Banff and Jasper National Parks. Many people today camp out at roadside campgrounds within national parks. In some cases a circuit may be made of the campgrounds in several parks in which more time is spent driving than walking. Because of their popularity among their members, automobile associations promote the founding and protection of national parks as well as the construction of amenities.

Casual sightseeing is often more compatible with tourism than other recreational practices, since many sightseers spend on accommodation and are usually less disturbed by alterations to nature. But sightseeing may conflict with other forms of recreation. Baillie-Grohman, has little sympathy for sightseeing. Concerning the picture of Maximillian's hunting reserve on the Acheean See, considered in the Chapter above, he says: "The quaintly gabled shooting-lodge we
observe in the background is now, alas! the site of a huge ungainly summer hotel for tourists, whose presence in chattering shoals has spoilt the grand solitude that until recently reigned over a locality sacred to sport."38 Hikers and mountaineers too sometimes are unimpressed by sightseers' casual forms of recreation.

The problem of unregulated wilderness tourism emerged at eastern resorts in the 19th Century, including Niagara Falls:

Although then recognized both at home and abroad as the nation's most magnificent natural spectacle, as early as 1830 the falls suffered the insults of so-called sharpers and hucksters of every kind. While some located adjacent to the cataract to tap its endless stream of power, still more came to fleece the growing number of tourists attracted by completion of the Erie Canal, and, close behind, the railroads. The mixed blessings of Niagara's popularity were soon apparent. Private developers quickly acquired the best overlooks, then forced travelers to pay handsomely for the privilege of using them. By 1860 gatehouses and fences rimmed the falls from every angle. No less offensive were hackmen, curio hawkers, and tour guides, who matched their dishonesty with annoying persistence.39

National Parks were established partly to overcome these sorts of problems through careful regulation of tourism development. As in urban areas, economic development would be controlled in national parks but with special regulations to protect the wilderness as sacred space. Indeed, park advocates commonly urge the government to own and operate facilities in parks so that the private profit motive has less influence on the character of park development.

The contradiction between nature preservation and recreation is illustrated by one of the first great disputes over national park protection: the 1910's battle over a proposal to dam the Hetch Hetchy Valley in Yosemite State Park. As Runte explains:

To save the valley, indeed the entire park system, seemed to hinge on the encouragement of much greater visitation not less. By definition today, the policy is inconsistent with wilderness preservation. Yet, given a choice in 1910, preservationists clearly preferred roads, trails, hotels and crowds to dams reservoirs, powerlines and conduits.40

Generally preservationists support programs to attract more people to national parks to improve the socioeconomic rationale for protection and because people who go to a park usually support its protection, and sometimes work actively to protect it. At the same time preservationists
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promote the careful regulation of park recreation and tourism which minimizes ecological damage.

Serious hikers often attempt to minimize their own damage to nature. The Sierra Club initially took mules on their expeditions into the wilderness, but stopped this practice in the 1940's partly because mules chewed down sensitive alpine vegetation.41 Today in some wilderness areas only "no trace" camping is permitted. Still, as Wilke's explains in his paper, "The Myth of the Non-Consumptive User," all activities have significant impacts on nature if carried out by numerous people.42 Hikers in some respects are worse than mass recreationists because of their wider "spatial consumption" of nature when they backpack into remote areas.43

Hikers and mountaineers sometimes oppose road construction in parks for recreation and tourism purposes. Roads directly damage the environment and lead to demands for campgrounds and other facilities which further despoil the natural environment. It is a difficult problem to deal with because opposition to roads leads to charges that preservationists, who are often hikers and mountaineers, are greedy because they want so much land for those fit enthusiastic and affluent enough to hike.44 In some cases preservationists have attempted to reduce the damage caused by recreationists by advocating restrictions on their number, whether hikers or sightseers. In other cases they advocate founding parks that are not for social and economic development, but instead mainly for nature preservation.

Wilderness preservation

In addition to recreation and tourism, many park advocates demand wilderness be preserved for: national identity, scientific research, natural history observation, education, protection of the rights of nature and preservation of representative ecosystems.

In some cases National Parks are founded to protect sacred landscapes which are important for national identity. These serve national pride but also national insecurity when unfavourable
comparisons are made with other nations. The Americans at first did well in this competition relative to the urbanized regions of Europe and with other continents. The size of Yellowstone and other national parks in the United States, their natural state and their dramatic mountain topography as well as their special features, including cliffs, waterfalls, geysers and hot springs, impressed park advocates the world over. However criticisms have subsequently arisen over American National Parks.

The high value of mountain landscapes for park purposes, and their low value for resource extraction, created a bias in favour of preserving high elevation sites. This bias applied also in Canada with establishment of national parks in the Rocky Mountains. Extreme low elevation sites too came to be well-represented in the developing system of American National Parks with the founding of Grand Canyon and other national park in canyon region. It has also been possible to preserve desert biomes in National Parks. Preservationists appreciate such reserves but would also like a representative range of "ecosystems" or "biospheres."

Part of the impetus for biosphere reserves came from scientists inside and outside government. Runte singles out Ferdinand Hayden's influence on the founding of Yellowstone. Hayden was a Doctor of Geology and director of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories that explored the Yellowstone region to determine its worth for preservation. In establishing the Park, Congress placed its trust in Hayden and other Expedition members, who included entomologists, topographers, mineralogists, a meteorologist and a zoologist as to the park-value of the region. Hayden was likely the main personal influence on Congress to protect all the chief scenic attractions (geysers, cliffs and waterfalls) and also the unprecedented preservation of a large forested area. Since then scientists in the developing park bureaucracies in Canada and the United States, as well as in non-governmental science associations, have often urged the founding of parks and their protection. They want to preserve nature in parks to serve as places for study of unique ecosystems and species, as sites for education and as a controlled environment with which to compare changes in non-preserved
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ecosystems. These scientists generally contend that it is important to have "representative" ecosystems, for thorough study and analysis.

Natural history societies formed in the 19th Century and continue through to the present. They organize trips to wilderness areas but generally the study of nature predominates over hiking per se. It is probably fair to say that, in both Canada and the United States, while 19th Century hikers were most interested in protecting mountainous regions, natural historians to a greater degree embraced prairie, forest, swamp and desert biomes. Hiking clubs which tended to be more active lobbyists had an easier task in preserving wilderness due to the low market value of mountain landscapes for non-park purposes. Less active natural history societies had the more difficult task of, for example, preserving land with agricultural potential. Because of these factors, many mountainous areas are preserved in large national parks, while arable prairie lands are preserved only in small nature sanctuaries.

The Sierra Club, from its beginning, focussed on protecting nature as well as providing places for wilderness recreation. Although John Muir, the Sierra Club President from its 1892 inception until his 1914 death, took a particular interest in protecting regions of the High Sierra and the Yosemite Valley, he was also concerned about preserving all facets of nature. Since then the Sierra Club and other hiking/preservation associations have supported preserving representative ecosystems. A variety of environments is important to provide a range of hiking experiences and to preserve nature for scientific interests, future generations, and the rights of nature. Groups and individuals who support wilderness preservation mainly to protect the rights of nature make two main arguments: that animals should not suffer needlessly (hence strong opposition to sport hunting, especially the chase) and that species must not become extinct. In the latter case, concerns are sometimes raised as to individual species, especially non-predatory birds. But this interest often leads to initiatives to preserve the ecosystems on which desirable species depend. This perspective is sometimes criticized for its focus on particular flora and its neglect of fauna, like the sport hunting tradition which attempts to preserve the conditions for game species to the neglect of others. Other groups such as the Wilderness Society and Earth
First! attempt to preserve all of nature in wilderness reserves for its own sake and may not promote recreational or touristic use of parks.

3.3 The Limits and Opportunities for Preserving Representative Ecosystems

From several perspectives initiatives have arisen to preserve samples of all characteristic ecosystems from the global to the regional scale. Only by preserving large areas can sufficiently high breeding populations of flora and fauna species to prevent extinction and only by saving all characteristic ecosystems can the extinction of species and entire ecosystems be prevented. Today international comparisons are made of the amount of each type of national landscape which is protected in national parks. The United States and Canada equal other countries in several measures but overall do not excel.46 Both nations have major gaps in their systems of representative ecosystems and many of their national parks have been damaged by resource extraction or other uses. Elite park advocates in the Middle Ages attempted to preserve a variety of landscapes, in hunting and non-hunting parks. Revolutionaries did not so much conceive destroying these parks as opening them up to the public. Today, interest in protecting "representative ecosystems" generates considerations of a different sort of revolution. In this section I first consider radical approaches to stopping wilderness depletion and then turn to the problems that specific industries (agriculture, mining and logging, hydro development) pose to preservation of representative ecosystems.

Radical approaches to preserving wilderness

The goal of preserving representative ecosystems has taken on legitimacy through support of governments, science associations and a popular social movement. However, such ecosystems remain inordinately difficult to acquire and maintain. Runte shows that areas preserved in American National parks do not correspond to their value for recreation, nature preservation or even tourism. Rather, the areas preserved correspond less to their positive value for preservation than to their absence of value for any other purpose, especially that of resource extraction. He

cites Senator Conness' 1864 proposal in Congress to establish Yosemite State Park as the classic illustration of the "worthless lands" argument: "I will state to the Senate, that this bill proposes to make a grant of certain premises located in the Sierra Nevada mountains, in the State of California, that are for all public purposes worthless, but constitute, perhaps, some of the greatest wonders of the world.\textsuperscript{47} This bias for the preservation of economically worthless lands produced an impetus for the founding of parks in canyons and mountains that has carried on into the twentieth century:

Well into the twentieth century national parks emphasized only the high, rugged, spectacular landforms of the West; invariably park boundaries conformed to economic rather than ecological dictates. Even later awareness about a growing need for wilderness, wildlife and conservation did not change the primary criterion of preservation - national parks must begin worthless and remain worthless to survive.\textsuperscript{48} Moreover, in cases where National Parks were found to have marketable resources (due to new technologies, rising commodity prices, or more intense examination of the Park), and despite preservationists' objections, they have often been opened to resource extraction.

By the 19th Century many North American ecosystems had been completely altered and large preserves of them could not be contemplated. The rate of species extinction in the 20th Century exceeds all other eras, even that during the extinction of dinosaurs.\textsuperscript{49} Global pollution, population growth, and economic development threaten remaining wilderness even if protected in a National Park. In this context, some advocates conceive wilderness as important to prevent ecological collapse that would destroy the conditions for social reproduction as we know it and indeed for human existence of any sort. Some preservationists, therefore, want to (1) protect existing preserves, (2) protect many remaining areas of wilderness, (3) return some areas that are now used for resource extraction or other purposes to a wilderness state and (4) dramatically reduce pollution which threatens all world ecosystems. Some criticize economic growth in parks as well as economic growth in general.

\textsuperscript{47}Quoted in Runte, 1987: 48-49.
\textsuperscript{48}Runte, 1987: 55.
\textsuperscript{49}Christopher Manes, Green Rage: Radical Environmentalism and the Unmaking of Civilization (Little Brown and Company), 1990.
Historically, the main reason that national parks were opposed in Congress and Parliament has been the need for resource extraction which is linked to employment and corporate profits. However, at another level resource extraction in actual and proposed parks was advocated for secondary industrial employment and general economic development as well as the satisfaction of peoples' needs with manufactured goods produced from natural resources. In liberal economic theory the quantity and quality of consumer demand is often seen as the driving force behind economic development; the increasing consumption of material goods represents the increasing satisfaction of needs. From this perspective wilderness preservation, while important for recreation, ultimately means reduced satisfaction of other needs. Some wilderness preservationists adopt this stand, but maintain that reduced consumption of material goods is an acceptable price to pay for wilderness. In other cases wilderness preservationists challenge the liberal view of modern consumers' satisfaction and the strong role consumers play in guiding development of the productive forces.

Several criticisms of the idea of the sovereign consumer and the progressive development of history arose in the chapter above. The fact that hunter gatherers enjoyed an adequate standard of living weakens the "progressive" model of history in which increasing material consumption indicates increasing happiness. In another example, I suggested that the cruel excesses of aristocratic sport hunting stemmed not from the innate pleasure that sovereign consumers derive from slaughtering wild animals, but from insidious aspects of patriarchal, class and militaristic behaviour. As concerns have mounted for areas of North American wilderness to be preserved, criticisms have focused mainly on resource corporations and the governments' management of them. However, the direct assault on wilderness also led to broader criticisms. John Muir questioned the equation of need satisfaction with increasing resource extraction and material consumption. For him pleasure derived not so much from consuming materials or having a large house, but in being within wilderness. At the turn of the Century, he complained about
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"robber barons" who encouraged reckless use of nature that seemed independent of consumer demand, and often represented an alien force in disputes over wilderness, exercising power greater than their numbers. He supported Henry George's doctrines which, Muir hoped, would reorganize land ownership and taxation to reduce destructive land speculation and monopoly control.52

Today concerns for wilderness inspire deep ecologists, eco-Marxists, eco-feminists and others to advocate revolutionary change to protect wilderness.53 Questions are focused on both the quality and quantity of the uses of nature that lead to wilderness depletion. Most would agree that there are excesses in the manner people use nature in North America. Not only is nature being destroyed, important needs are not being satisfied. Analysts draw on examples from the pre-industrial and developing worlds as well as contemporary science (soft technology) to conceive ways of living that may be pleasurable but do not contribute to further wilderness depletion. Criticisms are directed at population and economic growth as well as all points in the commodity cycle (production, circulation and consumption). More detailed criticisms focus on the particular problems of the commodity cycles based on agriculture, wood, water and minerals as well as the impact of roads and other transportation lines.

Agriculture

By the 19th Century it was unlikely that much Eastern North American land with agricultural potential could have been preserved because it was largely privately owned and productive. In the West, Congress required repeated assurances that it was inconceivable that the land proposed for Yellowstone National Park could be used for farming. The main evidence that the sponsors of the Yellowstone bill gave was high elevation, indicating one of the main factors that restricts national parks largely to mountainous regions. Many people complained about the demise of the

52 At the turn of the Century, in the United States, the revolutionary ideas of Karl Marx were not nearly as popular as those of Henry George. While Marx focused on the labour theory of value, George focused on the land theory of value. George maintained that further "robber baron" corporate monopolies could be prevented, that corporations could be better controlled in other respects, resources conserved and, broadly, an equitable society could be achieved all through adoption of a single "land tax."

buffalo in the West and some of them conceived establishing a large prairie park. Neither in Canada nor the United States, however, was there the enormous campaign which would have been required to preserve large areas of prairie or any other land with agricultural potential. Today prime farm land is among the least represented in national parks in Canada and the United States. Shafer notes, "Tall-grass black-soil prairie once covered more than 13 million acres in eastern Illinois and northwestern Indiana...only about 200 acres remain of which some 20 acres are essentially undisturbed."54

In Congressional debates over National Parks the concept of "worthless land" was sometimes used in a relative sense to mean that the land in question had little potential for resource extraction. This was never the case with land with farming potential. However, because land with ranching but not farming potential has lower market value its defence as productive land by ranchers and legislators was weaker. In some cases Congress approved national parks in areas that were appropriate to some extent for grazing especially in the Sierra Nevada. Grasslands National Park in Saskatchewan is a Canadian example. Having failed to prevent the founding of parks, ranchers attempt to use national parks for grazing through having areas of or entire parks deleted, legislative exemptions, or defiance of poorly-enforced regulations. Opposition preservationists have attempted to restrict grazing in parks and in some cases to expand the boundaries of parks into surrounding ranch land.55

Much less land is required to feed people on a vegetarian diet than on a meat-eating one. Therefore, vegetarian/preservationists maintain that a vegetarian diet is preferable not only for personal nutrition, gourmet eating and to prevent cruelty to animals, but also to protect areas of land with agricultural potential. Rifkin conceives stopping agricultural clearance as well as returning some agricultural areas to wilderness.

The elimination of beef will be accompanied by an ecological renaissance, a grand restoration of nature on every continent. America's western range will come to life again. Ancient rivers will flow, their waters bathing and healing thousands of damaged riparian zones across the great plains. Native wildflowers and perennial bunchgrasses

55Bella, 1987: 142, 156.
will sprout and bloom, spreading a verdant carpet across the western landscape. Cottonwood trees will shade the prairie once again, providing refuge for thousands of native birds. Streams and springs will come to life, bringing back freshwater trout and other native fish. The large mammals of the plains--elk, moose, pronghorn sheep--will repopulate the western range once again...\textsuperscript{56}

Since large areas of farm land grow corn and other feed crops for overwintering and slaughterhouse fattening, both grazing and farm land could be protected. Carrying out Rifkin's vision would require increased international vegetarianism to lower present sales by agribusinesses of fattening grain and meat overseas. It would also be necessary to ensure that family farm and agribusiness land owners did not increase cultivation of grains for gasohol or some land use that might be equally environmentally destructive. These are not immediate problems since only about 5% of the population is vegetarian and agricultural land clearance is continuing in, for example, the Peace River region of northern British Columbia and Alberta.

Forestry

Historically preserving forested land has proven easier than preserving farmland and has been about equally difficult as preserving grazing land.\textsuperscript{57} Part of the reason it was possible to preserve the Adirondack forest in the East was the relatively low value of the high elevation timber found there.\textsuperscript{58} Generally, as the value of timber increases so does the difficulty of preservation. Although most of the Adirondack region had not been logged, much of the land was privately owned when it was included in Adirondack State Park. In spite of the many areas within it that have subsequently been logged and the extensive summer-home residential development within its boundaries, Adirondack Park contains the most substantial mixed coniferous-deciduous forest in the East.\textsuperscript{59} Eastern deciduous forests were often felled with great rapidity during settlement because they were valued both for timber sales as well as to create farmland.\textsuperscript{60} The result is that few areas of pristine Eastern deciduous forest remain. The

\textsuperscript{56}Jeremy Rifkin, \textit{Beyond Beef: the Rise and Fall of the Cattle Culture} (New York: Dutton, 1992), 289.
\textsuperscript{57}P. Stegner "Let it Be Woodsw" \textit{Sierra} (Sept/Oct, 1991), 54-61.
\textsuperscript{58}Heiman, 1988: 192.
\textsuperscript{59}Stegner, 1991.
relatively small 43-acre Belt Woods reserve is one of the last old-growth upland hardwood forests on the Atlantic Coastal Plain.\textsuperscript{61}

The earliest initiatives to preserve Western forests focussed on the Sierra redwoods, which were universally admired for their large size. However, only four square miles of the largest redwoods, at the Mariposa Grove, were protected in Yosemite State Park when it was established in 1864. Initiatives by Muir and other preservationists resulted in the enlargement of Yosemite and the founding of Sequoia and General Grant National Parks in 1890. Runte observes that Congress considered the low market value of the redwoods due to their "brittleness and inaccessibility" as preconditions for their preservation.\textsuperscript{62} Similarly, founding Yellowstone National Park was made easier by its sparse and inaccessible high-elevation timber.

Except for a few valley bottoms, the land that western coniferous forests are located on is seldom arable, so these areas are logged only for their timber. Nevertheless, forest depletion has proceeded rapidly in the West due to new technologies and high demand.\textsuperscript{63} New technologies make it possible to log areas regardless of the difficulty of the terrain; in some cases helicopters are now used to transport timber from steep mountain sides. This means that today's preservationists have difficulty arguing that any forested lands are worthless in terms of market value. The classic instances of the forest industry's influence on national park geography focuses on the tree line: for example, "Preservationists working for the establishment of Olympic National Park, Washington, during the 1930's encountered stiff opposition from lumbermen who were determined to draw the park boundaries closer to the timberline."\textsuperscript{64} I believe that such considerations along with those of agriculture led, more than the value of mountain landscapes for park purposes, to the high representation of mountains among Canadian and American national parks.

\textsuperscript{61}Shafer, 1990: 23.
\textsuperscript{64}Runte, 1987: 16.
In the 1990's few areas of old-growth forest remain in the West and there is a strong lobby to log remaining areas. The immediate needs of forest corporations mainly depend on access to first growth timber. Therefore preservation can lead to reductions in yields with consequent unemployment, exacerbating the larger problem of unemployment due to technological developments which increase productivity. Therefore loggers often support logging in wilderness areas. At the same time, preservationists are trying to protect the few remaining areas of old-growth forest. Once all the trees in a tract are under 100 years old, species which depend on old-growth, such as the Spotted Owl, will become extinct in that area. Moreover, these forests are important to preserve out of regional interest and because they are among the last unlogged temperate forests in the world. Therefore regional, national, and international groups support preservation of the remaining wilderness forest from California to Alaska.65

Preserving the remaining areas of old-growth and allowing areas of second growth forest to return to a natural state would be furthered by a massive program of the four R's: recycling, reducing, reusing and rethinking. Concerning newspapers, the demand for timber would go down if newspapers were shared and did not contain advertisements, though this is difficult to conceive since advertisers pay for most of the papers. Cardboard boxes and other disposable or recyclable containers could be standardized, improved in quality and reused. Many preservationists point to the necessity of stopping or better yet to reversing population growth to preserve forested wilderness because, for example, residential construction for a growing population is a major source of demand for timber and urban sprawl also causes wilderness depletion.

Water storage

Prior to founding parks, Congress and Parliament assessed a region's potential for water power generation, at first for mechanical generation and later for hydroelectricity, as well as its potential for water storage for irrigation, household and industrial purposes. If a region had potential for one of these, then normally a park was not established. Mountainous areas are often
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best for water projects, but this did not greatly impede the founding of the early mountainous national parks in the West because fortunately Congress and Parliament underestimated future needs. Rapid population growth, economic development and increasing technological might led to unprecedented demand for water. One of the first major disputes over protection of a North America national park occurred early in the 20th Century when San Francisco lobbied Congress to permit dam construction in the Hetch Hetchy Valley, within Yosemite State Park.66

In the "battle" over Hetch Hetchy, the City of San Francisco provided retouched photographs of the Valley with a beautiful Lake in its basin: "Few scenes promised a more idyllic result. Not a ripple stirred the lake; rather its surface reflected the cliffs and waterfalls with mirror-like precision."67 The City maintained that not only would the Park be improved, it would be made more accessible to the public by a road to and across the Hetch Hetchy dam so that the Park would not serve only an elite group of mountaineers. Against this view preservationists held "that in reality the reservoir would be ringed by ugly mudflats and bleached rocks, especially when the water level fell during periods of peak demand."68 In spite of the then low attendance, park advocates contended that preservation of the Park in a natural state was necessary for the long term recreational needs of the growing population.

Ultimately the consumption value of a wilderness park and its intrinsic value were overcome by the consumption value of domestic water supplies. The City held a plebiscite which indicated popular support for the project because it would provide home electricity. Although preservationists maintained the dam could be located elsewhere, "the very ruggedness which included Hetch Hetchy among the nation's great natural wonders fated it to remain the favourite site for the dam."69 Congress agreed with the City's argument that the dam was in the public interest and so it was built. One of the first major disputes over the maintenance of a Canadian

68Ibid: 80.
69Ibid: 78.
national park concerned dam construction in Banff National Park (previously called Rocky Mountain Park); similarly, the first major dispute over Strathcona Park concerned dam construction.70

Since the battle over the Hetch Hetchy, dams have often been a factor in the founding and protection of national parks. In their advocacies for founding and protecting parks, preservationists have seldom spoken against the value of the water project at issue, but have more often reluctantly pointed to locations for dams outside of proposed parks or, in some cases, suggested alternative sources of electricity, such as coal-fired generators.

A movement to dismantle dams now generating electricity is unlikely because hydro generation is preferable for a variety of reasons to nuclear or coal generation. If the demand for meat was to fall it might be possible to destroy irrigation dams in selected instances. But the largest hydro projects so far in North America have been proposed for Northern Canada where they could generate power and also divert water to the United States.71 The huge capital costs of such projects, their known as well as unpredictable damages, and the many sources of opposition (including Indians, preservationists, environmentalists and nationalists), figure against them. However, the interests of large-scale capital and high level politicians in Canada the United States, residential demand and population growth indicate there will be major disputes in the 1990's over the Northern waters.72

Mining

Since mining requires less land than forestry or agriculture it has generally had less spatial impact on the location of parks. Still in cases where mining is extant or possible founding parks has been difficult. In some cases mining discourages founding parks at high elevation areas since many minerals are located in uplift zones. But, the range of minerals (metals as well as coal, oil and gas) and the varied North American geology, suggest that, unlike forestry and agriculture, mining has had a random effect on national park geography. Still in specific cases

71 Joyce Nelson, Sign Crimes/Road Kill (Toronto: Between the Lines, 1992), 173-186.
72 Ibid.
evidence of minerals has prevented the creation of a varied range of national parks and the mining industry lobbies against large parks anywhere in case the land contains some as yet unknown potential for mining.

Before establishing Yosemite and Yellowstone national parks Congress required repeated assurances that the land held no marketable minerals. In the Yellowstone case, Ferdinand Hayden, the director of the United States Geological and Geographical Survey of the Territories, staked his reputation on his opinion that the region held no marketable minerals. Congress trusted Hayden and so they founded Yellowstone Park. Minerals had little influence on early national parks in Canada because mining was initially not forbidden in them. However, when stronger criteria for national park status were established, evidence of marketable orebodies began impeding the creation and enlargement of parks. In some cases, national parks were established in zones which were not thought to contain marketable minerals; however, further mineral exploration, demands for new minerals, rising commodity prices, or new technologies has led to subsequent demands for mines in those parks (e.g., the Strathcona Park case detailed in the chapters below).

I noted Agricola's review of criticism of the mining commodity cycle above. In the Middle Ages this cycle was opposed for a variety of reasons: digging deep holes violated the sanctity of the earth; mining and secondary processing polluted water; the terrible working conditions of miners; charcoal-making for smelting led to deforestation; water pollution; and some of the products made from minerals were for military purposes, money and conspicuous consumptions products undesirable. Most of these problems are still extant and writ large with the development of huge mines extracting in some cases thousands of tons of ore per day. Criticisms are often made of smelting pollution which causes acid rain and global warming. Wilderness advocates are particularly concerned that these forms of pollution are incrementally damaging all terrestrial ecosystems, whether or not they are formally protected from resource
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extraction in parks. Moreover, although metal manufacture does not require as much timber as it did in the past, smelting and manufacturing metals requires large amounts of water and petroleum. Metal manufacture is one of the main sources of demand for energy. This has led to construction of dangerous nuclear reactors in the manufacturing zones of Germany, France, United States, Japan and Canada.

Some of the main uses of minerals include commercial and residential construction, electrical wire, highway construction and automobiles. The latter is likely the most substantial demand and is doubly insidious because both the manufacture and use of automobiles pollute, and consume large amounts of resources.

The idea of substantially reducing demand for agricultural land through vegetarianism is likely more feasible than substantially reducing the demand for minerals. The largest resource and secondary industrial conglomerates in the world have sectors in oil, gas, ferrous and non-ferrous metals, and automobile production. The production and maintenance of vehicles are among the highest sources of employment in the most developed areas of the world. Still the ecological and social benefits of substantially reducing the use of automobiles could be enormous at the personal, local, regional and global level.76 So the future could see a large conflict over the mineral-based commodity cycle.

Transportation
Sometimes parks could not be established in an area because of existing transportation routes and in other cases transportation routes are proposed after a park is founded. One of the first disputes over protection of an American National Park stemmed from an 1886 proposal to lay a railway line to transport minerals through Yellowstone National Park. Particular concerns were raised in Congress about the damage a railway could cause to the buffalo which, having been transported to the Park from the plains in a last ditch effort to protect them from extinction, were among the few remaining in the United States. In Congressional debate, William McAdoo of

76In Energy and Equity (New York: Harper and Row, 1974), Ivan Illich enumerates the problems automobiles cause and points to the personal, regional and global ecological improvements that could stem from a substantial reduction in their production and use. In Transport 2021 (Burnaby, B.C.: Greater Vancouver Regional District, 1993), P. Marwick et al quantify the benefits of substantially reducing automobile use in Vancouver and vicinity.
New Jersey extoled the sanctity of the reserve saying that, "the glory of the territory is its supreme solitude. Civilization is so universal that man can only see virgin nature in her majesty and primal glory, as it were, in these as yet virgin regions."\textsuperscript{77} He called on his colleagues to "prefer the beautiful and sublime...to heartless mammon and the greed of capital."\textsuperscript{78} Successive attempts to approve the line failed. The Park was sacred but Runte maintains "the project was turned down more because of the low quality of the ore at the proposed mine site than an interest in preservation."\textsuperscript{79}

In the 19th Century, railway lines accompanied the establishment of Canada's first National Parks and so blemished their natural quality from the first. When it was later proposed in the 1920's that the Trans-Canada Highway go through Banff National park, objections were not raised over the road itself. However, the Governments of British Columbia, Alberta, Canada as well as the CPR, Alpinists, conservationists, automobile associations and park officials participated in planning the route and design criteria to minimize ecological damage.\textsuperscript{80}

Even if special consideration is made to protecting the environment, roads are nevertheless insidious because the swath of pavement and parking lots are sure forms of wilderness depletion, vehicles kill many animals, and automobile noise and toxic pollution damage the wider environment. Road construction also leads to wilderness depletion elsewhere due to the huge amounts of petroleum, gravel and cement for roads and metals for bridges that are required. Generally, preservationists do not oppose roads because they receive vigorous support from people who require them for economic and social purposes: they carry people from home to work to shopping, unite people socially and move material from one phase of production to another.

\textsuperscript{77}Quoted in Nash, 1974: 114, 115.
\textsuperscript{78}ibid.
\textsuperscript{79}Runte, 1987: 55.
In his estimate of wilderness depletion in British Columbia, Eric Davies found that chronological road maps were the best way of distinguishing wilderness from non-wilderness. Roads indicated urban development as well as agricultural, logging and mining areas. Roads do not just follow economic development. In the 20th Century, road construction is often the first big step in the spread of the various factors of development: primary and secondary industry, urbanization, and population expansion. For these reasons, the group Earth First! has set itself the daunting task of starting a movement to oppose road construction. In their large-scale conception of the redevelopment of the productive forces, the group proposes that the extension of the road network be generally stopped and some existing roads be blocked off. Although roads, at least in outlying areas, often acquire popular support, it is still possible to conceive a better life with fewer or at least not more roads. Ivan Illich, for example, points to the many individual and societal benefits that would accrue from not just the general elimination of automobiles but also of the roads which guide them.

Initiatives to curb or reduce transportation development are not likely to emanate from the mainstream preservation movement. Whereas the deepest contradiction in the Middle Ages between the idea of hunting parks and the idea of preserving nature was the killing of animals, the main contradiction in today's park advocacy movement involves transportation. Preservationists often advocate that people come to parks from afar to enhance the economic and social rationale for park protection and because people who have visited a park sometimes become active in protecting it. It is a particularly tempting argument because tourism is also an increasingly important economic sector. But like other forms of tourism, wilderness tourism depends on transportation and so contributes incrementally to the transportation industry and associated pollution, road construction and overcrowding. In addition, increased wilderness tourism may not necessarily be a good idea in other respects. The number of people who go to
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wilderness destinations tends to fall with rising gas prices. Gas prices might rise because of resource depletion, war or a strengthening of the OPEC alliance. In some cases governments have raised the price of transport to lower traffic flows, pollution and congestion. Automobile gas taxes are probably the most common example of such disincentives. With mounting ecological problems these initiatives could increase, and airlines may be next. In some cases people attempt to voluntarily reduce the use of transportation to lower their personal contribution to pollution. Although wilderness tourism is a growing industry, demand could fall for these or other reasons with negative regional social and economic consequences if capital has been invested in it. So, it may be important for park advocates to emphasize the regional, rather than international, recreational and economic use of wilderness parks.

Conclusion
Since the 16th Century some sport hunters, nature lovers, and native advocates have conceived establishing large nature parks in North America. However, partly because of popular opposition stemming from the form of nature reserves that arose in Europe (i.e., aristocratic hunting and pleasure parks), park advocates did not succeed until the 19th Century. The preservation movement developed a stronger profile with the 1872 founding of Yellowstone Park in the United States and the 1887 founding of Rocky Mountain Park in Canada. There are differences between the forms of reserve conceived by the main interests (nationalist, recreation, tourism, nature preservation) that advocated founding and protecting these and further national parks. Recreationists, for example, often demand a stricter form of preservation than do tourism interests. Nature preservationists often demand a particularly strong form of preserve and in some cases advocate that reserves be established primarily for nature preservation. Lobbying by diverse park advocates, however, resulted in the formation of the national park systems of the United States, Canada and most other countries. These national parks serve as a form of consumption space which is compatible within the capitalist system.

Both production and consumption space, as well as their separation, are important to capitalism. Their separation allows for the rapid development of resource extraction sites as well
as machinery and large scale industries in production complexes. Individual (e.g. homes) and collective (urban and rural parks) consumption spaces in their present form allow for the satisfaction and development of citizens' needs within the capitalist context. Land reserved for collective consumption in rural and urban parks allows for re-creation of wage labour and social reproduction, and wilderness recreation creates employment and profits in the tourism industry. Wilderness preservation also helps maintain capitalism by slowing its tendency to destroy the biological and social conditions necessary for its existence. But while there is compatibility, conflicts often arise, in cases in which land is desired for both production and consumption space; normally the former has taken precedence over the latter as the development of the productive forces speeded up in North America during the 19th and 20th centuries. Wilderness lands, even if they are protected in national parks, are demanded as production space for primary and secondary industry profits, employment and low priced retail commodities. If industrial corporations or sectorial profits decline, a forestry union or a logger may not be able to negotiate a high wage package. Moreover, if the area of production space is limited, corporations may down-scale their operations or move, thus producing layoffs. Therefore, workers (particularly resource sector employees, who are most directly impacted by national parks) may oppose protection of national parks in general or in specific locales.

Resource-based corporations often need to increase levels of production and lower costs to compete on international commodity markets. One of the main ways by which these firms maintain a competitive edge is by acquiring ready access to all areas of land where profits can be extracted from resources. Therefore, individual firms and resource sector groups often lobby the state not to create, protect or extend national parks. Although secondary industries do not usually require direct access to wilderness lands, higher production costs in resource industries can lead indirectly to higher costs for raw materials. Therefore, individual firms and sectors that depend on raw materials (e.g. the pulp and paper industry's need for a cheap, continuous supply of wood) often join the anti-park lobby. At a larger scale in which capitalists have sometimes united to present a joint stance on the environment (e.g. at global conferences) they have tended
to be far less supportive of wilderness preservation than park advocacy groups. The needs of individual companies to compete, and the needs of capitalism as a whole to expand, have influenced their views. These factors help explain the insatiable corporate demand for wood, even in the most sacred parks. Wilderness protection can lead to increasing costs, not only for primary and secondary industries, but in a variety of other instances. Increased costs in these industries can also lead indirectly to rising costs for consumer goods. The public generally demands low prices for consumer goods. Therefore, in order to retain legitimacy the state tends to oppose nature preservation which curbs resource sector development and material consumption. While George Catlin in 1832 conceived of preserving a huge area of the western plains in a park, since then national parks and related reserves in Canada and the United States have tended to be located in areas with low market value such as mountains and canyons. Moreover, many of these reserves have been used for resource extraction or other wilderness depleting activities.

Historically, positions within conflicts over wilderness have become reversed in class terms. Middle Age aristocrats supported and the public opposed hunting parks. Now capitalists oppose and the public supports national parks. However, while park advocates (whether from a tourism, recreation or nature preservation perspective) lobby the state and challenge resource corporations, the sort of commitment that helped fuel the French Revolution has generally not arisen among today's preservationists, let alone among the broader population. Radical ecologists believe the importance of establishing representative ecosystems necessitates broad social economic transformation, to protect much of the remaining wilderness as well as to let some previously used environments which are marked for further use return to a natural state. Although one can conceive a situation in which improving standards of living accompany widespread adoption of some of the ideas considered above (popular vegetarianism, far fewer roads and cars, 30% of the land as wilderness), such measures would also rupture the capitalist economy as we know it. However, this is not likely to occur since these are not, at least so far, popular ideas. The degree to which the wilderness movement should undertake a broad critique
of society or become politically involved in issues outside of wilderness preservation, is debated among factions within the movement. However, a sustained campaign has yet to be launched against the impetuses for high levels of production and consumption in modern capitalism. For the most part, park advocates try to avoid charges that they are anti-development (or anti-American) and have achieved their main successes by focusing on specific wilderness areas, rather than tackling the broader issues of overall growth of production, non-wilderness consumption, and circulation spaces as well as population growth, i.e. accumulation. A few preservation groups have in some cases adopted forms of civil disobedience and destruction of property, such as emerged before the French Revolution, to achieve their goals, with some successes in protecting particular areas and with a measure of public acceptance. But they have not achieved the type of popular support for these tactics that might lead to a broadening of their objectives from the neighbourhood to global level, nor have they succeeded in stopping, let alone reversing, the trend to wilderness depletion under the exigencies of mass-consumption capitalism.
Chapter Four
Strathcona Park: From its Creation in 1911 to 1960.

Strathcona Provincial Park is well known among British Columbia park advocates, especially on Vancouver Island where the Park is located, as the first provincial park embracing much-loved forests, mountains and lakes. It is also well-known as the object of some of the most acrimonious disputes between resource extractors and preservationists in the province. The history of Strathcona Park illustrates the broader North American conflict over wilderness, in which park advocates interested in wilderness for consumption space battle with resource corporations interested in wilderness for production space. Use of the Park for resource extraction also illustrates the precedence wilderness for production space often takes over its use for consumption space. In spite of the initiatives to protect it, Strathcona Park is known for the tragedy of an abused park. As Ruth Masters, who has been hiking in the Park and fighting to protect it since the 1940's, explains: "Resource and hydro wealth has gone out of the Park by the thousands of millions, literally, as large tracts of the parkland have been logged, mined, burned, dammed, flooded, drilled, bulldozed, paved, poisoned - and stolen."

The analysis considers details of physical geography, regional settlement history, law, corporate behaviour, politics and citizen activism which influence conflict over the Park and help explain how it came to be so misused. Map 4.1 (67) shows the basic geography of the region and some of the sites that are referred to below. Regarding regional settlement history, one of the main influences on park histories have been the rate of regional economic development and population growth. Adirondack and Catskills State Parks served a population of over 2 million people within a one day travel in 1880 and serve over 55 million people today. Similar demands for park protection and mass recreation and tourism have not arisen in Strathcona Park because British Columbia only recently reached 3 million inhabitants and this Park is relatively isolated on Vancouver Island. On the other hand, Strathcona serves more recreationists than do most parks in Northern Canada and Alaska.
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Strathcona Park also has a distinct jurisdictional history as a British Columbia Provincial Park. Regional physical geography and details of Island settlement influence its location as well as demands for its recreational use and resources. In the latter regard, the existence of a rich mineral deposit was a prerequisite for the demand to mine in the Park. The details of Provincial law and the conflict between the mining industry and the Social Credit and New Democratic political parties also influences recent Strathcona history. The power of rhetoric in arguments and pleas for and against preservation in legislative debate, the media and other contexts, color the Park's history and influence its use. At the same time, aspects of the Park's history suggest that the power of resource corporations working out of the public view. The analysis will also address the exclusion of Indians from the Park on its founding and their involvement in the 1980's mining conflict. Particular attention is given to a regionally-constituted preservation group: the "Friends of Strathcona Park." I detail the opportunities and obstacles they face, the tactics they use, and their influence on the use of the Park. While the previous Chapters relied on secondary sources such as books and journal articles, since no volume addresses Strathcona history in the needed detail, the remainder of the work draws mainly on newspaper articles and interviews with members of the Friends of Strathcona.2

Chapters Five and Six concern the dispute over mining that commenced in the 1960's while this one, Chapter Five, concerns the Park's early history. Since it was the first provincial park, the history of Strathcona park represents the emergence of the struggle to protect wilderness as consumption space in B.C. Therefore the research question is phrased broadly: How does the
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struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space emerge in British Columbia? The regional particularities of this general struggle emerge in successive sections concerning: the Park's founding, its relatively low use for recreation and tourism, and its alienation for logging and hydro electricity generation. The analysis shows how the Park's low use for recreation use and high use for resource extraction tended to reinforce each other, increasing the rate of wilderness depletion.

4.1 The Founding of Strathcona Provincial Park on Indian Land

This section traces the European immigrants' initial exploration of central Vancouver Island and the steps that led to the preservation of an area for parkland in the centre of the Island by a 1910 Order-in-Council. Attention then turns to the 1911 passage of the *Strathcona Park Act* and a 1913 *Amendment* which substantially increased Strathcona's size. A third sub-section concerns the exclusion of Indians' from the Park during its creation.

*Delineation of Strathcona Park*

Hunter gatherers have lived on Vancouver Island for over ten millennium. Prior to contact with Europeans, coastal and interior native bands made hunting and gathering forays into the most remote regions of the mountainous hump on Vancouver Island where Strathcona Park was later located. The region provided bear, wolf, cougar, elk, deer, marmots, berries, crystals, fish and a host of other products. Native communities, with populations of about 300, along the coast east and west of the central Island depended largely on salmon which spawned in the life-giving waters flowing from the interior mountains. Spiritual quests were made into the highlands and songs celebrated the beauty of the mountains. One song of the East Coast Comox (later Comox) Indians titled "Mountains are Beautiful" had the chorus He-ne-e-neli (I love to look on them)."
Eighteenth Century Britains, Spaniards and Russians first saw the interior Vancouver Island mountains from their ships off the West Coast. In their relationship with Indians, the explorers were primarily interested in trading for furs. However, they investigated the potential of other resources. In 1778 Captain Cook questioned the natives as to the source of their copper, bronze and iron. Because of the daunting interior mountains, and the chance that no early explorer systematically explored the Strait of Juan de Fuca and the Strait of Georgia as they had some of the West Coast sounds, the Europeans did not at first realize that Vancouver Island was separate from the mainland. In 1792, Captain Vancouver of England, just ahead of Captain Valdez of Spain, was the first European explorer to confirm that "Vancouver Island" was in fact an Island. On his sojourn in the inland waters, Vancouver found that natives on the East Coast of the Island had European goods, including numerous rifles, acquired through overland and/or circumnavigation trade with West Coast natives, and also were familiar with many European customs and technologies they had heard of or seen.

The sea-based fur trade continued and land-based fur trade commenced in 1843 when the Hudson' Bay Company established, at the south end of the Island, a trading post called Victoria. As Tennant puts it, "The slow course of events changed abruptly and forever in 1858 when the first gold rush occurred. Tens of thousands of Whites flooded uncontrolled forward by land and sea." Although the Cariboo Gold Rush was the main attraction, at the same time extraction
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5The copper was acquired in the regional trade in native copper. The iron and bronze were acquired from floating debris from the East and through trade with the earliest traders and explorers. See T.A. Rickard "The Use of Iron and Copper by the Indians of British Columbia," *B.C. Historical Quarterly* (3, 1939), 25-50.


commenced on several orebodies in southeastern B.C., as well as on Nanaimo coal and Bear Valley gold, on the Island.

In 1864 John Buttle, a geologist-naturalist member of the Vancouver Island Exploration Expedition which was investigating the Island's interior, led a trek up the Bear (Bedwell) Valley, in the southwest of what later became Strathcona Park, and climbed a "high mountain rising from the side of the river."8 His interests was mainly in minerals, but in interviews later with the press he effused on the spectacular view to the east of glaciated peaks which he compared favourably with the grandeur of the Rocky Mountains. He also saw a lake in the distance which was named Buttle's Lake, since he was thought to be the first European to see it. To step ahead, in the context of Strathcona's 1911 founding, a debate arose over who first climbed its highest peaks and saw its main attractions. An 1896 explorer in the region, W.W. Bolton, extracted a confession from Buttle in San Francisco in 1910.9 Bolton (communicating to the elderly, bedridden and deaf man on paper) told Buttle that, since maps based on his description mistakenly included a large Island in the middle of the Lake, he had not seen Buttle's Lake. This may not have been Buttle's mistake. In his journal he wrote "I got a fine view in the direction of Comox, and more in the centre [sic] of the Island I saw a beautiful sheet of water, at the very least twenty miles long. It appears to be a chain of lakes averaging about two miles in width."10 Buttle's direction is correct and his estimate is only slightly wide and long. He must have climbed, what was later called, Mt. Tom Taylor or Big Interior Mountain. At any rate, in a 1910 letter to the *Victoria Daily Colonist*, Bolton said that Buttle had agreed he had suffered a mirage 46 years previously due to the sparkling glaciers. Since Bolton had considerable local influence at the time, the question arose as to whether or not the name "Buttle's Lake" should be changed. The *Colonist's* Editor, likely irritated with Bolton's behaviour with the elderly Buttle, suggested that if the policy was to name sites after their original viewer, the Indian moniker should be

applied to the Lake. In the end the apostrophe "s" was dropped so the famed attraction in Strathcona Park became Buttle Lake.

Vancouver Island ended up in British rather than American hands in the 1846 "Oregon Treaty". The 49th Parallel, which divided the nations for two thousand miles, was broken by the irregularities of Vancouver Island and the Gulf Islands. Britain got all of Vancouver Island including land south of the 49th Parallel. The British formally claimed the land with the establishment of the Colony of Vancouver Island in 1849 and the mainland Colony of British Columbia in 1858. In 1866 these were united and in 1871 the Colony joined Canada as the Province of British Columbia. Under the terms of Confederation, B.C. administered most of the public (Crown) land with the main exceptions being military land and CPR land. Barring these lands, areas that had mining, urban, or agricultural settlement and Indian land (however this might be seen), the Province could sell, lease or use the land itself. One of the options for at least some land was to found parks, leading the newly-formed Legislative Assembly in 1876 to pass the Public Parks Act.

One might wonder about this early interest in parks when Indians far outnumbered Whites in B.C., mining and the fur trade dominated the economy and Victoria, not yet surpassed by Vancouver, had only about 5,000 inhabitants. Yet capitalism in the east portended rapid economic development for B.C. and other relatively remote areas of Canada. As was related in the previous chapter, Niagara Falls' well-known fate indicated the desecration of even the most sacred places and, although Canada had not yet established a national park, Yosemite State Park (1864) and Yellowstone National Park (1872), as well as Eastern urban parks, showed the possibility for protecting selected areas from the advancing urban-industrial frontier.

Late in the 19th Century casual consideration was likely given to establishing a large park on Vancouver Island, possibly after the 1895-96 Laing-Bolton Expedition of the Island's interior. Following the Expedition, Laing and the aforementioned W.W. Bolton, wrote an essay about
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12 Statutes of British Columbia, 1876.
their trip for the San Francisco Overland Monthly. Part of their account will acquaint the reader with the Island's geography.

The Island itself is 270 miles long; its breadth, from over seventy miles down to not more than ten miles. It seems to naturally divide itself into three sections, the first from Victoria at the south to Alberni, one hundred miles away; from Alberni to Woss Lake and the Tahsis canal, another one hundred miles; and finally from the latter to capes Commerell and Scott at the extreme north. There is a marked difference between these sections, - rain in the north, snow in the middle, and genial weather to a remarkable degree in the south. There are small timber, swamplands, and good fishing, in the north; nothing but mountains, streams and lakes with perpetual snow, in the center; and large timber, excellent land, and good society, in the south. From the sea, the central portion looks anything but inviting, - mountains piled on mountains, peaks vying with each other which shall be the tallest and most pointed, huge banks of snow seemingly everywhere.13

The North, Central, and South division still holds. The "good society" presumably refers not just to the largest Island city and Provincial Capital, Victoria, but also to the British aristocratic tradition, as it is still sometimes said, "behind the tweed curtain." Bolton and Laing overlook the east-west bias which emerged in the late 19th Century. While Indian settlement tended to be evenly distributed along both coasts, European settlement generally spread from Victoria up the East Coast because, relative to the West, it is flatter for transport and has more agricultural land. It also had the most marketable timber, is sheltered from the precipitous westerlies and has the easiest access to Vancouver which, after the 1885 arrival of the CPR Railway, grew to be the Province's principal city.

When interviewed by the Colonist, Bolton raised the recreational potential of the North saying "the whole country from the northern end to great central lake" was "only of value to the sportsman, the artist and the mountaineer."14 He overlooked Comox agriculture, Cumberland coal mines and the incipient forest industry. Perhaps this oversight indicates a "worthless lands argument" in which park advocates point to a region's generally low utility while extolling its virtues for preservation.
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Although Bolton may have conceived an Island wilderness park in the 19th Century, the first formal consideration likely occurred at a 1905 meeting between the Victoria Board of Trade and the Provincial Government. There the Board and the Government struck a Committee which recommended preserving a rectangular area of land west of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo (E&N) Land Grant between Buttle Lake and Great Central Lake. Map 4.2 (75) shows this conception as well as the eventual shape of Strathcona Park.

The Committee's Report discussed the rectangular area's qualifications for preservation mainly as a hunting park.

Within the area is included some of the finest and most diversified scenery on the Island - mountains, lakes and fertile valleys - and is well-stocked with deer, elk, bear, beaver and many smaller fur-bearing animals; eagles, geese, ducks, grouse, quail etc. and the lakes and streams have an abundance of fish. Along the valleys is some of the finest timber land on the island framing an ideal hunting ground that has scarcely been touched, and yet is easily entered from Alberni.

Between 1905 and 1910, however, as much or more than hunting, regional newspapers and the newly-established *Westward Ho! Magazine*, published in B.C., generated interest in Western national park recreation, tourism and nature observation. In *Westward Ho!*, amidst many articles promoting urban and industrial development, CPR advertising effuses: "Mountain Climbing in the Canadian Rockies. At Banff, Lake Louise, Field, Emerald Lake, and Glacier are splendid Chalets and Hotels. At these world famed resorts you may ride, hunt, climb, sketch, botanize, bathe in warm mineral springs, or go boating. Words fail to tell of the beauty of this region which is one of the scenic marvels of the world." Several articles concerned mountain landscapes and mountain climbing, and one detailed the formation and interests of the Alpine Club of Canada. Several other articles addressed nature observation in a range of environments.
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16 Ibid.
17 *Westward Ho! Magazine* began publication in 1907.
18 CPR, "50 Switzerlands in one" *Westward Ho! Magazine* (1907 and 1908 editions).
In the ongoing debate over if and where to establish parks, an initial decision seems to have been made that the first provincial park would be established on the Island, likely due to an active lobby on the Island. In April 1910, "the movement in favor of having the government acquire Cameron Lake and Mount Arrowsmith," rectangular area as a provincial park was "spreading fast." The Vancouver Island Development League, the Vancouver Island Board of Trade and the Natural History Society (based in Victoria), actively promoted the plan. There were, however, serious impediments to it.21

Although it was "thought that the E&N Railway Company would cooperate, probably by donating the land which they hold...the timber which was so long ago alienated [would] have to be purchased."22 After the CPR grant of land bordering the east-west rail through the Province, the 1884 Esquimalt and Nanaimo (E&N) Land Grant was one of the next large grants of provincial land. In return for laying a railway from Victoria to Nanaimo, E&N acquired $750,000 and about one fifth of the Island's land: a large area (about 2,000,000 acres) of its most marketable East Coast land.23 The CPR purchased the E&N Grant in 1905, adding to its vast holdings, but did not change the name, so E&N is a euphemism for CPR in the region. The amount E&N demanded for the timber prevented the founding of a large park in the Mount Arrowsmith region.

A month later, in May 1910, the Cameron Lake/Mount Arrowsmith region is only one of several possible sites for emparkment.

Over half of the Vancouver Island Development League branches have written endorsements of the proposed national park on this Island and more are coming in every day. So far the verdict of the branches has been unanimous on the advisability of establishing a park, but several widely separated sites are suggested in some of the letters. It is anticipated that representatives of the Natural History Society, the Board of Trade and the Development League will take definite proposals to the provincial government at an early date, as each day that passes finds less good timber land in the hands of the province. It is doubtful whether a suitable site for a park can now be reserved by the government, as most of the accessible timber on the Island has now been staked. Failing the success of the Cameron park project it is quite likely that the

21 Anon, "Cameron Lake National Park: Movement to Secure Site is Growing: Board of Trade, Development League and Natural History Society Considering It," Times (April 19, 1910), 7.
22 Ibid.
23 Charles Lillard, Seven Shillings a Year: the History of Vancouver Island (Ganges, British Columbia: Horsdal and Schubart, 1986).
provincial authorities will be asked to assist in the preservation of several small tracts of good timber wherever such is found.\textsuperscript{24}

Though this \textit{Daily Times} reporter suggests it was impossible to establish a large park on the Island by that time, he points to the resurrection of the 1905 rectangular park saying "It is interesting to note that Premier McBride was approached by the Victoria Board of Trade five years ago, when large areas of the finest timber land were still unstaked, with a similar proposition and that the excellent opportunity for the establishment of a national park which then presented itself was not taken advantage of."\textsuperscript{25} The lost opportunity refers to the timber licenses around Buttle Lake, within the proposed park's boundaries.

From 1904 to 1907, in one of the most rapid tree sales in history, the McBride Conservatives sold Timber Licences to most accessible timber in the Province.\textsuperscript{26}  In 1904 under 1 million and in 1907 over 9 million acres of forest were alienated. In 1907, however, the Conservatives placed a reserve on further sales in the Province so that some unalienated land would remain in B.C.. Interior Island timber had a relatively low value at the time due to its distance from markets, the rugged terrain and the small trees at higher elevations. By the time that Buttle Lake tenures were granted in 1907, it was likely that most Island timber was either in the E&N Land Grant or was already staked. Since more tenures would have been registered were it not placed, the 1907 Reserve worked as an important step in the eventual founding of Strathcona Park.

Although aware of the difficulty of protecting the area when timber licences had been granted around Buttle Lake, the \textit{Daily Times} reporter continues more optimistically:

Although the matter was allowed to drop in 1905 it has been resurrected from time to time by various individuals and societies. Its most ardent advocates have been the provincial game warden while the Fish and Game Club, now defunct, also expressed its belief in the necessity of such a park. It is now thought that the scheme is in good hands and that, with the combined activity of the Natural History Society, the Board of Trade and the Development League it will be carried to its consummation.\textsuperscript{27}

\textsuperscript{24}Anon, "Branches in Favour of National Park: Development League Receives Reports - Lost opportunity of Five Years ago Recalled," \textit{Times} (May 11, 1910), 20.
\textsuperscript{25}Ibid.
\textsuperscript{26}F.J. Fulton (Chairperson) et al \textit{Royal Commission of Inquiry on Timber and Forestry} (Victoria: Queens Printer, 1910).
\textsuperscript{27}Anon, May 11, 1910, op cit.
A week later, at a May 16th meeting of the Natural History Society, it favoured the Cameron site, but if this was not possible "the provincial government should choose some other." The debate over whether to establish a provincial park, and if so where, had been going on since the 19th Century while the land was being alienated, through direct sales as well as the granting of forestry and other tenures, so it seems by 1910 the Society would be pleased if any large area were protected.

Finally, on May 31st 1910 the executive of the Provincial Government passed an Order-in-Council "creating a reserve of all unalienated and unoccupied lands in the vicinity of Buttle Lake for the purpose of the crown." The intention was "that this reserve shall constitute a magnificent provincial national park for the people of British Columbia quickly and easily accessible from the chief centres of population upon the completion of already projected transportation facilities." The appeal of the area concerned the significance of individual features, and their happy coincidence in one area.

Buttle's Lake is rated the largest fresh water body within Vancouver Island, and is especially distinguished for the magnificence and the variety of its scenic delights, mountains - perpetually snow-crowned - rising from its dense blue waters to a height of from seven to eight thousand feet, while charming waterfalls, majestic glaciers and fairy-like islands afford alluring contrasts.

The Order-in-Council depicts a right angle triangle with the apex on Crown Mountain and the hypotenuse formed by the western boundary of the E&N Grant. The straight line boundaries were a result of the limited knowledge of regional geography as well as the need to use straight lines so survey crews could stay in front of the industrial frontier. The rectangular shape proposed in 1905, even if suitably enlarged, would have been inappropriate. In addition to the E&N line, which was then being staked as the first main line on the Island's ground, a rectangular park would have entailed surveying in three more odd-angle lines. Rather than laying further lines using the E&N precedent, the Province went with a north-south grid, as had
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29 Anon, "Designed to Be Provincial Park: Reserve Placed on All Unalienated Lands in the Vicinity of Buttle's Lake by Provincial Government," *Colonist* (June 1, 1910), 15.
30 Ibid.
31 Ibid.
become common in the movement West. By opting for a triangular park they established a regional precedent for such a grid from which measurements could be taken either on the ground or a map. This bears on whether Strathcona Park would be a triangle or a square, but not on its general confinement to a mountainous region.

Being the Province's principal industry, mining and the influential Ministry of Mines posed a general impediment to possible enlargements of the Park. Although there were no mineral tenures in the Park, there were several coal mines on the Island as well as regional placer mining and many mineral tenures, indicating the regional mineral potential. Regardless of the E&N Grant the Cumberland coal fields would have precluded significant eastward extension. Some park advocates may have been bothered that all of the Park's main attraction, Buttle Lake, could not be included in the Park, since it was severed by the E&N Grant. But, even if the Government owned the land, eastern spread of the Park would be curbed by adjacent prime timber and agricultural land. It would have been extremely difficult to set aside an area with agricultural potential since the local demand for it was high and arable areas few. Furthermore, Strathcona was impeded from spreading significantly north or south by concentrations of timber licences or areas perceived as having marketable timber. The Park could have been most easily extended to the West which likely had few licences due to the steep terrain and additional distance from markets. If the Park were so extended, along with higher elevation biomes it would embrace coastal rain forests and Pacific beaches. Likely this idea arose since in 1872 Yellowstone had established a precedent in size (about two times that of Strathcona) and variety of landscape to which all later wilderness parks aspired. Indeed some advocates likely observed that if the park were extended to the Pacific, rather than holding that Strathcona matched the grandeur of other national parks, British Columbians could have fairly claimed that Strathcona, stretching from ocean to alpine, was the most magnificent park in the world. But the West Coast timber was likely seen as marketable due to its size and proximity to the Pacific over which lumber could go via the Panama Canal to Eastern Seaboard markets.

I am not aware of any complaints at the time by loggers, miners or preservationists over the location of the proposed park or its size. One writer referred to a "wave of favourable comment" for the proposed park.\(^{33}\) As in other North American cases, there was a movement to preserve a large area of land which was realized in a mountainous region, due to its adequate park values and because it did not contain significant amounts of exploitable resources or intrude on lowland areas of secondary industry and urban development. If some members of the Natural History Society felt the park should be located elsewhere or should be larger, they did not complain, probably out of relief that there would finally be a park somewhere in B.C.

A campaign in which writers competed in depicting the grandeur of the region was launched to have the triangular area established as a provincial park. C.H. Gibbons said the area "constitutes a veritable wonderland of mountain peaks and glaciers, tumultuous waterfalls, gem-like lakes and sombre forests."\(^{34}\) Nobody outdid W.W. Bolton's bombastic passion for wild scenery. After explaining his aforementioned visit with John Buttle to establish that Buttle had not seen the Lake in 1860, and confirm his own importance as an explorer, Bolton recounts the view seen on his 1896 Expedition into the region from the summit of, the Great Central Crags, "the king of them all":

Of all the magnificent birds-eye views I have had from the mountains of the Island this was the peerless one. Given a summit 7,500 feet up, a cloudless sky and Vancouver Island beneath you, what indeed should not be seen! Standing on the bared head of the king, with a snow of illimitable depth all around me, I saw glaciers gleaming on every side; and the thundering roar of snowslides resounding day and night; with on the west, the waters of the Pacific lying seemingly at ones feet, steamers and sailing ships plowing their way over a sea of glass; with on the east a mass of mountains of lesser height, in exquisitely utter lack of symmetry, till a tiny glistening line of silver tells the water of the Gulf; with to the north, the lake [Buttle's Lake] lying nestled amongst the hills and those everlasting ranges piled up as far as the eye can see; then back of me the Alberni Canal winding its sinuous way up from Barkley Sound, and the Great Central Lake far away below me; surely such a sight is grand in the extreme and a treasure that the whole province should be proud of.\(^{35}\)

\(^{33}\text{Anon, "Provincial Park Decision Lauded," Colonist (June 2, 1910), 2.}\)
\(^{34}\text{C.H. Gibbons, "A New British Columbia Playground" Man-to-Man Magazine [previously called Westward Ho! Magazine] (Nov. 10, 1910), 921-924.}\)
\(^{35}\text{W.W. Bolton, "The Proposed Vancouver Island Provincial Park," Colonist Magazine Section (June 12, 1910), 6-7; and W.W. Bolton, "The Provincial Park," Colonist (June 5, 1910), 15.}\)
Harry Johnson says "It was largely through [Bolton's] descriptions that the Chief became interested in the Buttle's Lake region as a desirable National Park." The "Chief" is Price Ellison, Minister of Lands in the McBride Conservative's Cabinet and the person most associated with Strathcona Park's founding. In the summer of 1910, Ellison organized and led an Expedition into the Vancouver Island Alps with 23 people, among them foresters, surveyors, a photographer, Ellison's daughter Myra, his distant nephew Harry McClure Johnson, W.W. Bolton, and packers and Indian canoeists. Several tons of food and equipment accompanied what was the most ambitious formal expedition to Buttle's Lake and the Alps to date. The Minister and his party would:

thoroughly investigate all the varied conditions as they present themselves in relationship to the important national park project - the feasible means of ingress to the wonderland, the forestation, the game preserve essentials etc. and [] to change the line of the reservation wherever and in whatever manner will make for better results.

Although it was possible to enter the park from the Courtenay or Alberni vicinity, Expedition leaders decided to set out from Campbell River. The route into Buttle Lake from Campbell River was well-known, and the trip up the Campbell River to Buttle Lake seemed the natural portal to Buttle's Lake and the mountainous region. But there was neither train nor road to Campbell River so the Expedition set out by steamer from Victoria, stopped in Vancouver for supplies, and then carried on to Campbell River. In Campbell River, presumably, they hired buckboards to take them over narrow logging roads to Upper Campbell Lake, and then set out by canoe. The foresters assessed the value of timber licences so that the government could subsequently negotiate with owners to acquire title. The engineers took aneroid readings on several peaks and added sites to the map of the region. Harry McClure Johnson, as he says, "of Peoria, Illinois, U.S.A., scriptor and one time student of law, Chief's nephew, or rather nephew of the Chief's wife; special assistant to the Chief", wrote a day-by-day account of the six week
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37Anon, "Ellison in Search of Vast Natural Park; Chief Commissioner and Party Will Leave Tomorrow for Campbell River, then penetrate Island," Province (July 4, 1910), ?
trek which shows some of the complexities and nuances in the views of the region as consumption space. 38

Johnson was one the team of nine which would ascend Crown Mountain. He describes the difficulties reaching Crown Mountain's base saying "The Chief is so discouraged by the constant climbing and descending all the time that he now orders us to camp as soon as we find water. There isn't even water. It all apparently runs off the side." 39 Nevertheless, Johnson and the rest of the party bounced back on the "great day" they ascended Crown Mountain to climax the expedition.

We return to the east side and see that we will have to pick our way across the east face of the mountain to the northeast side, across the main snow field. We do not like this because there is great danger of snow slides starting at any second. Even if we slip on the snow we would not stop sliding until we reached the valley thousands of feet below. We cannot tell whether we can do any better when we have crossed, but we are not going to stop here. Scotty warns us to not even whisper, and leads the way. 40

Having overcome the challenges they made the final assault: "As we near the top, Miss E. [Price's daughter Myra Ellison] went ahead, and was the first to set foot on the top of Crown Mt. Charlie was the second and I was the third (at 7.45 by the clock); Jim Haworth was fourth then came Twaddle and Ward. The Colonel was back helping the Chief." Then there was a dispute:

Miss E. had a British Union Jack in her hand as she reached the summit, and waved it joyously. I had a surprise in store for them, for I pulled out of my pocket "Old Glory", an American Star Spangled Banner larger than her Union Jack. While no one was looking I tied it to the barrel of the rifle and with a hurrah waved it over their heads... As the Colonel [Provincial Land Surveyor W.J.H. Holmes] came aboard, followed closely by the Chief, I waved it over them... "Shoot it" cries the Colonel. The Chief is taken aback but only says "Well you did put one over on us!" The Col. is highly incensed. "Throw out the American," he repeats over and over again, and hard presses me.

Ellison resolved the dispute by having the American Flag fly beneath the Canadian on the rifle.

After lunch:

with the words. "I hereby name you Ellison Peak, Crown Mountain," Miss Ellison broke a bottle of champagne over a cairn of rocks erected by the party, at the same time the Union Jack over the Star Spangled Banner of the United States being held above her head by the Chief. Then the Chief led in singing "God Save the King," and H. McClure Johnson in singing the first verse of "My Country, 'Tis of Thee". The Chief then led three cheers and tiger for King George V, and Miss Ellison fired the rifle.

38 Johnson, 1910: 27-49.
39 Ibid, 33.
40 Ibid, 36.
Johnson does not recount any ceremony pertaining to the Province or the proposed park, but he notes the Expedition's purpose in the first lines of the document he wrote which was, along with other memorabilia, left behind in a brass cartridge, in a butter-tin, in a small stone cairn: "A Party of the Provincial Government Expedition, headed by the Chief Commissioner of Lands, the Hon. Price Ellison, M.P.P. for the Okanagan District, [was] organized for the purpose of exploring the region surrounding Crown Mountain and Buttle's Lake with a view of setting aside the same as a Provincial Park."41

Further adventures had the party paddling south on Buttle Lake, exiting the Reserve by Great Central Lake, and thence to Port Alberni for a motorcar ride back to Victoria. Ellison was pleased with his wilderness experience and satisfied that no resources of unexpected value had been revealed. On returning to Victoria, he submitted a report recommending that the triangular area reserved in the 1910 Order-in-Council be made without boundary revisions into the first provincial park.

Many individuals and groups who had long lobbied also influenced Ellison's favourable decision. As noted above, Johnson singles out W.W. Bolton whose opinions on parks were likely influential because he was an eminent explorer.42 Moreover, he wrote evocatively on the worth of mountain scenery, was Head Master of the University School for Boys in Victoria ("the best equipped and most exclusive boys' schools in Western Canada"), was a guide on the Ellison Expedition and, Johnson tells us, was a "good talker" around Expedition campfires.43 Johnson likely goaded Ellison into submitting a favourable report by comparing the paucity of Canadian parks to American examples, particularly Yellowstone. Myra Ellison, who had a mountain, creek and falls named after her following the expedition, also likely influenced her father. Had accidents occurred (a serious possibility given the novice mountaineering abilities of some trekkers including the Chief who weighed, Johnson tells us, 217 pounds) or adverse weather soured the Minister on the park idea, his recommendation might have been less enthusiastic and

41Ibid, 38.
42Ibid, 27.
43Ibid.
as a result the Government might not have brought forward the Strathcona Park Bill in the 1911 Legislative Session.

*Legislative debate over the Strathcona Park Act*

The aforementioned 1876 *Public Parks Act* was superseded by the 1908 *Provincial Park Act*, but the Province did not use the latter to protect the triangular area in the central Island.\(^4^4\) Rather, in the 1911 Legislative Session, the Conservatives, under the leadership of Richard McBride, resolved to make the area into a statute park under its own act. The Ministry of Lands drafted the "Strathcona Park Bill" to better protect the region than did the 1910 Order-in-Council, by establishing a legislative mandate to withdraw land from resource extraction, and to acquire a mandate to make expenditures on park development.

The Strathcona Bill began by describing the triangular area as in the 1910 Order-in-Council; it then turned to the proposed park's purpose:

> 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 British Columbia, subject to the provisions of this Act and of the regulations hereinafter mentioned, and shall be known as "Strathcona Park."

The Minister of Lands was to care for the environment and lease land "for the accommodation of persons resorting to the park." The Bill called for the "preservation and protection of game and fish and of wild birds" but did not prohibit either fishing or hunting. Some Strathcona advocates wanted sport hunting to be permitted in the Park and may have supported its establishment for this reason. But the consensus of the auxiliary branches of the Vancouver Island Development League was that Yellowstone Park's precedent, where by 1910 hunting was prohibited, should be followed.\(^4^5\) As a result, regulations were introduced in 1915 that barred Strathcona hunting. Sport fishing raises fewer concerns among park advocates and has continued in the Park to the present.

The Bill was firm in its prohibition of resource extraction and other non-park uses of the park: "Except as in this Act provided, no person shall locate, settle upon, use, or occupy any

\(^{4^4}\)Statutes of British Columbia, 1908.

\(^{4^5}\)Anon, "Endorses Idea of Provincial Park," *Colonist* (June 10, 1910), 2.
portion of the park." It did not extinguish existing vested resource interests but would permit the Ministry of Lands to acquire "all or any of such vested rights" for a sum agreed upon through negotiation. The Bill does not specify what the Indians' interest in the Park might be. But this silence, with the above clause prohibiting settlement and use except as provided in the Act, as well as a clause allowing for the "removal and exclusion of trespassers" were likely conceived as giving the Minister of Lands the legal right to evict Indians who were hunting, gathering, trapping or residing in the Park.

Although the three main Parties (Conservative, Liberal and Socialist) supported the Strathcona Bill, there was a lively discussion in the Legislative Assembly on the Park's founding and what it portended for the future.

Though he had been promoted to Minister of Finance, on request of the new Minister of Lands and in "graceful acknowledgment" of his work in connection with the Reserve, Price Ellison sponsored the Strathcona Bill.46 Upon rising to move its second reading, Ellison was "received with most cordial applause" and began:

At the request of the honorable Minister for Lands, and with your consent, Mr. Speaker, I wish to move the second reading of the bill respecting Strathcona Park. I think that this province of British Columbia is to be most heartily congratulated not only upon the possession of such a provincial park but also upon the name that has been bestowed upon it, with the consent of his lordship. It has been said that a good name is everything. The name of Strathcona assuredly stands for all that is good and great. It is, too, one of the greatest names, financially known in Canada, and I both hope and trust that the Strathcona Park will in the years to come prove as great a success financially, for the advantage of the people of British Columbia, as has Lord Strathcona in his career as a citizen of Canada.47

Lord Strathcona (Donald Smith) first known for his work and investment in the Hudson's Bay Company, was best known for his role as the CPR's chief financier and promoter in construction of the transcontinental railway which at that time was the largest project undertaken in Canada. This led to him being accorded the honour of driving the last spike of the railway as well as being awarded the Lordship. Yet having the Park named after him did not pose much of a practical or ideological conflict for the CPR. Although I have not found that it publicly

47 Anon, "Buttle's Lake Park Preserve," *Colonist* (Jan. 27, 1911), 1, 8, 10.
supported the Park, beyond its principal director lending his name, the CPR likely approved the Park. The government and CPR expected that the corporation soon would extend its railway, then approaching Comox, to Campbell River, at which time it could profit from tourist transport and park accommodation. The CPR or Smith would not have worried about the withdrawal of land from resource extraction since the Park did not extend into their E&N property and, at any rate, the provisions that protected nature in National Parks were just beginning to be treated seriously. As Bella explains, "In 1911 Parks Commissioner J.B. Harkin tried to tighten national parks legislation. Mining was now officially incompatible with tourism. This could mean closing mines in parks. But both industry and the CPR needed coal more than the tourist income generated by a landscape free from industry."48

These issues do not emerge in Ellison's whole-hearted approval of the Strathcona name and he continues by elaborating the Park's recreation and tourism potential saying: "I only hope that more people of our own British Columbia in the near future will have the opportunity of visiting this park and its grand and imposing scenery. They will agree that any time and money they spend in doing so will be time and money well spent."49 This is the extent of Ellison's acknowledgment of possibilities for local recreation in his emphasis of Strathcona Park's overall potential for the "stimulation of tourist traffic hither."

It means everything to the prosperity of the people to have these well-to-do visitors come here and visit our beautiful natural park. The large amounts of money which these visitors will spend during their visits - the money that these beauty-loving tourists will leave in the country is clean money and money that will be distributed among all classes of our communities to their immense stimulus. It will mean a great thing to British Columbia thus to get thousands and hundreds of thousands to visit us. It will mean, in addition to the money they directly disburse during their visits, the making of the world better acquainted with this province its resources, its opportunities. It will mean world-wide advertising of our climate. It will mean that our population will receive large additions, and that investment in our industries will be given an impetus that will not be temporary.50

---

48Bella, 1987: 30. For objections to a Canadian capitalist acquiring the lordship, its location, spelling and pronunciation (in the only letter to a newspaper I have seen concerning Strathcona Park's founding) see A.J.M. Inverarity, "Strathcona," Colonist (Jan. 20, 1911), 11.
49Anon, op cit, "Buttle's Lake Park Preserve."
50Ibid.
Ellison maintained that, as in Switzerland, tourism could come to dominate the regional economy and urges support for the Strathcona Park Bill "as a simple business proposition".

Hawthorne, Leader of the Socialists, agrees that tourism might someday dominate the regional economy saying: "He [Ellison] says that it [the Park] will be a great asset. Then why not expand it? Instead of opening mills and mines and factories suppose the people simply go and visit each other. It would only be necessary to make roads and the money would come in. We should then have one big pleasure ground." Ellison was in agreement and interjected that was the situation in Switzerland. Hawthorne continued: "Then follow it out. Close up the mills and factories and let us go and visit the people of Switzerland, and let them visit us. It is a splendid view of the situation and shows the soundness of the hon. gentleman as minister of finance." Brewster, the leader of the Liberal Opposition, too urges rapid tourism development saying: "The government should be more far-sighted than to build for present needs alone. There was great development going on the West Coast of the Island. Alberni would soon be a railway terminus, and tourist travel, especially from the Orient would find from the West Coast of the Island its most ready access to this beauty spot." These seem heady times. As the title of one Man-to-Man article exclaimed "The Magnetic West Draws from all Points on the Compass: History repeats itself on the Pacific as it did on the Atlantic Coast."

Ellison stressed the immediate needs for transportation saying: "I hope the Government is alive to its responsibilities in this matter and will do everything that is possible, first of all by providing means by which people may conveniently get into the Park and in touch with its beauties." At the other end of the spectrum of interests from tourism to recreation, Hawthorne, the Socialist's leader, was "glad to see the desires of the common people being recognized" but was concerned that the common people would not be able to go to the Park since in his "knowledge of the common people there were only one or two that owned motors." However

---
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he trusted transportation would be made available and endorses the Park because "when all the
trees are gone elsewhere it would be pleasant to find a locality still wooded in Strathcona park,
so that generations to come would arise and call the finance minister blessed."56

Mr. Parker Williams expressed the legislators' main reservation to the bill; it did not concern
removing potential resources from exploitation. Rather, it concerned spending excessive
amounts of public money on a park which was so remote that few people would visit, especially
given the low regional population.57

No Member raised substantial objections and the Bill passed unanimously. One headline
exclaimed "All Approve of New Playground." The writer was pleased that "[f]or once a measure
has come before the House which men of all shades of opinion can support."58 Part of the reason
for the lack of opposition was that the Act did not expropriate existing forestry tenures or the two
existing mineral tenures in the Park. Still one might expect resource industries representatives to
speak publicly against the Park and the precedent it might set, or for some Member of the
Legislative Assembly (MLA) to speak out against it in the Legislature.

Leonard holds that there was little opposition to early provincial parks because it was
believed that there were bounteous untapped resources in the Provinces' interior.59 In contrast I
think, Strathcona and other early Provincial Parks were established precisely because the
resources were seen as limited. Bounteous interior resources did not benefit Island companies
which generally required regional resources to avoid transport and relocation costs, and so does
not explain their silence. Moreover, by 1911 even the interior resources were seen as
exhaustible. Indeed, Strathcona and other early parks were established precisely because it was
apparent that B.C.'s resources were limited. The aforementioned rapid sale of timber licences
and other problems with forest management had caused the government to strike the "Royal

56 Ibid.
57 Ibid.
58 Anon, "All Approve of New Playground," Times (Jan. 27, 1911), 3.
The reason logging interests did not complain loudly about Strathcona Park is likely because they were fighting the larger battle over these Commissioners' recommendations. The Commissioners recommended the Government continue the 1907 Reserve, limit the combination of licenses, and maximize the royalties from existing tenures. The Commissioners were particularly concerned that a monopoly might be created within B.C.'s forests through amalgamation of timber licences, particularly since many were held by American speculators. These American investments also help explain the aforementioned conflict over flags atop Crown Mountain between Harry Johnson, Ellison's distant American cousin, and Colonel W.J.H. Holmes, the Provincial Land Surveyor. They also help explain Ellison's reference, in his sponsorship of the Strathcona Park bill, to tourist dollars being "clean money." Presumably this is a comparison to dirty American money invested in the forest industry.

Frank M. Kelley, who hiked in Strathcona Park at the time of its founding and later became the Outdoors columnist for the Victoria Daily Colonist, commented on the influence that excessively rapid sale of timber licences and other economic problems had on Strathcona Park's founding:

Folks who remember the days when Richard McBride made the move to give B.C. responsible government will recall there was an overdraft at the banks, totaling

60. F.J. Fulton (Chairperson) et al, Royal Commission of Inquiry on Timber and Forestry (Victoria: Queens Printer, 1910). The Commissioners' Report helps explain the far-seeing visions of B.C.'s development in debate over the Strathcona Park Bill:

"It will be remembered that the number of [timber] holdings was probably less than 1,100 in the earlier part of 1905 began suddenly and rapidly to increase upon passage of the Act of that year that made the licences transferable. The growth of population in the West, the consequent awakening in the lumber trade and stimulus to speculation, were reasons on the surface that seemed to account for this eager staking of Provincial timber; but looking deeper, as the time went on, it began to appear evident that some powerful cause was behind the movement. In fact, realization of the limited extent of merchantable forest on the continent of North America had begun to dawn upon the more far-sighted among lumbermen. In certain regions of the United States the exhaustion of supply was already seen to be inevitable and near, while elsewhere throughout that country the remaining stands of timber had either passed into private ownership or had been included in the Federal Reserve...Hence the sudden opportunity of acquiring timber upon attractive terms and at a small initial outlay afforded by the Provincial Act of 1905 brought to a head as it were, the vague need for timber felt across the continent. As a result the staking of forests in British Columbia ceased to be a mere matter of local expediency, aroused vivid interest outside the Province, and soon assumed the proportions of a boom. Within less than three years there were more than 15,000 licences in existence, covering by far the greater proportion of the Province's accessible timber land."

$1,000,000. A lot of money in those days, and when more cash was wanted to carry on the bankers turned thumbs down on the request, suggesting the Legislature raise money's needed by marketing some of the country's resources like lands and forests. This was the start of a lot of land speculation. Huge blocks of land and timber were alienated all over the province. It worried Richard McBride a lot. That was how it came about that Strathcona Park was set aside for the pleasure of the people forever.62

To meet the growing needs of capital development, the Government became obliged to sell resources and increase borrowing so that it could pay for necessary infrastructure (such as surveying and road building) for resource development. This led to new debt problems and the need to sell resources even more rapidly to satisfy creditors. The rapid sale of provincial land, however, led the McBride Government to introduce a conservationist initiative (by striking the Royal Commission on Forestry) and a preservationist initiative (by establishing Strathcona Park).

The need for limited resources, subdued in legislative debate over the Strathcona Park Bill, emerges clearly in the 1913 debate over a bill to nearly double Strathcona's size. In 1912 the Province commissioned Reginald Thomson to develop Strathcona as a park and he recommended it be doubled in size.63 In 1913 Minister of Lands Hon. Ross brought forward a bill to amend the Strathcona Park Act stating:

Systematic prospecting and exploration of the park zone and environments has progressed, and it has been found that in order to realize the full advantages of the territory for public park purposes it is necessary to somewhat extend the boundaries to the established reserve, so as to bring within them features of exceptional interest or of especial scenic charms and also to control the natural and impressive entry portals.64

Ross detailed the importance for the Park of "four lakes at the summit of the Elk River which form a centerpiece for the Alpine vegetation adjacent thereto," and the need to protect "the feeding grounds of the elk herds which make this section of the Island their habitat."65 The Amendment passed but not as easily as the original bill to create the Park. Several MLA's commented that Ross was not as eloquent a park advocate as was Ellison. Moreover, while two years previously Ellison had focused on the positive values of the Park, Ross resorted to the "worthless lands" argument saying: "the lands by their uneven formation are generally useless.

63Frank M. Kelley, "Strathcona Park One of the Loveliest Sections in B.C.," Sun (March 13, 1943), ?
64Anon, "Nature's Beauty to be Conserved," Colonist (Feb. 5, 1913), 1, 14.
65Ibid.
save for scenic purposes. The revised boundaries now provide for the park an area of 800 square miles but it may be found when the present development programme is complete that a portion of this may, without disadvantages, be released for private utilization." 66 In spite of Ross's assurances, the expanded Park included Oshinow lake around which were timber licences and the Bedwell Valley in which there were mineral tenures, placer mining in progress and, an active mine that had produced 1,337 grams of gold in 1906. 67 MLAs as well as the Minister of Mines, were aware of this activity, yet no concerns were raised in the Legislature. Apparently, the support of powerful ministers and the leaders of all three parties silenced opponents, albeit with greater difficulty than in the original passage of the Strathcona Park Act. It is likely that Thomson conceived, as had some earlier park advocates, of further enlarging the Park to equal Yellowstone and other larger parks. But, in the end, behind-the-scenes opposition restricted the Park to mountainous terrain.

On the same day as the Strathcona Amendment, the Minister of Lands, Hon. Ross, sponsored a Bill to establish the second Provincial Park, Mount Robson Park. Ross: "made it plain that the generally rocky and mountainous character of its area and its average high altitude unfitted it for agricultural utilization, while its timber (although giving color and added beauty to the mountain slopes) was not of sufficient commercial worth to tempt the logger or the timber manufacturer. As for mineral potentialities - marble, mica and other mineral deposits are known to exist within the park boundaries - it is proposed to retain in the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council." 68 Unlike Strathcona Park which, since it was protected by statute, would require legislation to permit resource extraction, mining could be permitted in Mount Robson Park with the government's consent. Ross's statement and the poorly protected park clearly show the impediments resource-based industries were posing to further wilderness preservation.

66Ibid.
68Anon, op cit "Nature's Beauty to be conserved."
In spite of the praise for Strathcona landscapes, examination of its delineation indicates that, as in other North American jurisdictions, forestry, agriculture and mining significantly confined the Park in terms of both its breadth and location. Although these constraints do not emerge in legislative debate over the Park's 1911 founding, they appear when Ross was forced into the worthless lands argument in debate over the Park's 1913 enlargement, thus marking another phase in the provincial park movement begun by the 1876 passage of the Public Parks Act.

Strathcona's territorial extent was largely fixed by 1913 as surrounding resource extraction industries curbed its further expansion.\(^{69}\) The 1913 enlargement had, in the exclusion of several lots on the western boundary, added the first irregularities to the Park's original straight line boundaries. The next important addition, made in response to decades of lobbying, was the 1968 Forbidden Plateau addition which jogs around tenures and private property east of the Park. Moreover, this addition involved a slippery trade in which a large logging corporation, Crown Zellerbach, acquired 20,000 acres of timber in the Lake Cowichan region in exchange for its contribution to the Park.\(^{70}\) The 1979 Gold Lake addition, likewise made in response to extensive lobbying, jogs around tenures north of the Park. Resource industries did not just impede further expansion of the Park. While the Strathcona Park Act specified that the Park be used primarily for recreation and tourism and not for resource extraction, the reverse occurred. Before turning to this, I will consider how and why park advocates rebuff regional Indians from Strathcona Park.

*How Strathcona advocates rebuff regional Indians*

W.W. Bolton's views on Indians' use of the Island's interior demonstrates the perceived need to exclude Indians from consumption space as much as from production space and other areas. In his aforementioned *Overland Monthly* article, Bolton explained the departure of the Indian who in 1896 took Laing and Bolton up the Muchalat river for their expedition into the Island Alps:

---

\(^{69}\)For details of Strathcona's boundary and Park status see: Parks Branch, "Strathcona Tenure Review: Background Information for the Special Advisory Committee on Strathcona Park and Recreation Area" and "Strathcona Boundary Review: Background Information for the Special Advisory Committee on Strathcona Park and Recreation Area", submissions to Larkin et al, 1988.

\(^{70}\)Ruth Masters, interview with the writer June 29, 1991.
"No very serious rapids were met until four miles had been covered, then an extra heavy and dangerous one seemed too much for the Indian; and although the three of us offered every assistance, we could get him no further, so dumped the packs on a shingly shore line and watched him as the little craft danced down stream and out of sight."\(^{71}\) Fifteen years later in 1910, as part of the campaign to create Strathcona Park, Bolton dramatized the story.

At Nootka Sound \([\) we had said farewell to the rest of our party, who, foreseeing the danger of so large a band attempting to force its way through the Unknown, had wisely decided to go round to Alberni by water and meet us at the head of Great Central Lake. Then, with packs on our backs and rifle and axe in hand, we plunged into the Island once again, where no Indian would come despite lavish inducements of pay and from whence they assured us the Great Spirit would never permit us to return. For the Coast Indian is deadly afraid of the interior. He will venture but a few miles in at the furthest, and ever has his canoe handy in case of need.\(^{72}\)

C.H. Gibbons followed in like vein in his article, supporting Strathcona's creation, saying that the northern interior of Vancouver Island has "been shunned from time immemorial by the native races."\(^{73}\) Gibbons only evidence is the absence of Indian architecture in the region. Indian architecture, however, is less grand than that of Europeans and would have been especially modest in the Island Alps, which were more the site of native seasonal forays than permanent encampments. So the Strathcona lands were (as they were and still are among non-Indians) relatively little-used by pre-contact Indians. Still, before spreading their views, Bolton and Gibbons could have substantiated their arguments by asking the Indians. In the 1940's the anthropologist, Philip Drucker, by asking Indians, found detailed information concerning the various uses that Indians made of the region\(^{74}\). Indeed this way of satisfying the question is so obvious that by popularizing an unsubstantiated theory of Indian aversion to the land it appears that Bolton and Gibbon were trying to remove Indians from the land.

Price Ellison also seemed to deliberately erase Indians from the land. He told the Legislature that Strathcona (the Lord who likely never saw the Park) was a suitable name for the

---


\(^{72}\)W.W. Bolton, "The Proposed Vancouver Island Provincial Park," *Colonist* Magazine Section (June 12, 1910), 6, 7.


\(^{74}\)Drucker, 1951.
Park, since it "stood for all that is good and great." But in debate over the naming of specific sites he maintained (as Bolton recounts) that "names will only be given [mountains, streams, lakes] as they are mastered by men, and they will bear the name of the individual rather than fantastic titles and local objects." This view disparages the Indian place names for sites in the region which reflected natural and spiritual qualities of the land. Though Indian names often reflected events taking place at sites, these events had far older origins than how they were recently "mastered by [European] men." Ellison must have been aware of the wealth of Indian names for Park sites. He was not interested in simply naming sites, but in providing a rationale for the renaming of sites to obliterate points of Indian reference. At any rate, when sponsoring the Strathcona Park Act, Ellison ignores the interior bands north and south of the Park, the most obvious evidence of native use of the Strathcona lands, and states: "The Indians have never ventured from the coast to penetrate the interior of the Island..."

Part of the reason park advocates erased Indians from the landscape in this manner was to accentuate their own status as explorers. I previously noted Bolton's concern, while explaining his own prowess as an explorer, that since John Buttle had not seen "Buttle's Lake," it should not be named after him. The fact that Indians had seen, named, used and lived in the wilderness for millennia undercut Bolton's prowess as a mountaineer and explorer far more than did Buttle's 1864 view (or mirage) of the Lake. Moreover Indian uses of the land did not harmonize with planned Swiss-style luxury resort. As well, the larger issue present in the elimination of Indians from Strathcona land is the Province's provincial initiative to confine all Indians to small reserves.

The Colonial Government had established several Indian Reserves in British Columbia but generally had not signed treaties with Indians. After B.C. joined Canada in 1871, Indian Reserves were negotiated between the Federal Government, Indians and the Province. One

---

75 Anon, "Buttle's Lake Park Reserve," Colonist (Jan. 27, 1911), 8.
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month after Strathcona's founding, a meeting between Indians and the McBride Cabinet illustrates the Province's stance.

the interview was notable as bringing together, as never before in history, the principal Indians of every section of the province, the delegates including chiefs from the international boundary line on the south, the great Peace River district beyond the Rocky Mountains on the east, the west coast of Vancouver Island, and the Naas and the Skeena in the awakening north.79

On behalf of the 96 Chiefs, Chief R.P. Kelly brought forth a memorandum which:

set forth in brief the Indians' claim that the Indian tribes still hold full property rights in the unsurrendered lands of the province. This claim the memorandum said was acknowledged by Sir. James Douglas, by the Colonial Office, and afterwards by then Governor General Lord Dufferin. As it was now denied by the provincial authorities the Indians asked that it be submitted to the courts.80

Chief John Chilkaleetsa of Douglas spoke through the interpreter saying:

I wish to hear from you whether you claim that this country of British Columbia belongs to you and your government or does it belong to the Indians? If you claim that it belongs to you, then we are of opposite opinions, and I desire that we should go together to some big court house to have it settled.81

In response to these arguments Premier McBride maintained:

Indians had no title to the unsurrendered lands. Consequently the government would not go to the courts with the matter, because the government felt that there was no issue which the courts could be asked to settle. The Indians had been given large reserves, larger in fact than they needed, as many remained unoccupied, and if they wished they were able to take up homesteads in the same manner as the white man. The government was of the opinion that the Indians were well satisfied with their condition, and this question would never have been raised had not been for the pernicious activity of some white men who should have known better.82

The argument that Europeans should not explain the Law to Indians, some of whom did not speak or write English, was immoral. The Indians, then undergoing rapid depopulation from cultural/economic domination and disease, were not "well satisfied with their condition." They were strongly motivated to retain their traditional hunting, gathering and spiritual lands, as indicated by their delegation. McBride is only correct in saying that few immigrants were interested in assisting Indians. Certainly the Daily Colonist, in contrast to its support for the Strathcona Park Act, didn't support reservation of large areas of rural lands for Indians,

79 Anon, "Indian Delegates Meet Executive," Colonist (March 14, 1911), 15.
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We [the Editors] very heartily commend the action of the Premier in declining to permit a case to be stated to determine what is called the Indian title to the ungranted public lands of this province. The case for the Indians has been diligently worked up by some of their friends, who are doubtless actuated by well intentioned, if grossly mistaken, motives.83

There is little to report about Indians and Strathcona Park until the 1980's. By 1910 they were shunted into Reserves around the Park where they depended on the White economy and seldom made expeditions into the Park. Concerning the names of Strathcona sites, Stevenson explains: "Many of the names were suggested by Norman C. Stewart, a surveyor who worked in the park in the 1930's...Many other names were suggested by individuals, and some have no known origin."84 Few if any of the sites retain original Indian names and certainly no concerted attempt was made to apply them. One Indian name, the Bear River, was commonly known as such by miners and others until after its 1913 inclusion in Strathcona Park when it was renamed the "Bedwell River" in honour of Edward Bedwell, "second mate on H.M. Surveying Vessel, Plumper, 1857-1860."85

What explains the general exclusion of Indians from the land?. Broadly the Indians were swamped by the influx of non-Indians. But this was partly made possible and certainly made worse for Indians by moral decisions of Whites such as Bolton, Ellison and McBride who helped to popularize an unsubstantiated theory that Indians hadn't historically used the land (including the Strathcona area) at the same time that the Government was attempting to acquire all the provincial land for immigrants. This is particularly insidious when one considers that Indians were being decimated by disease and their economies increasingly dominated by non-Indians. As well details of the traditional Indian territory and spatial economy could have been revealed by examining early explorers' journals, by making inquiries of Indians, or by simply listening to what they were saying.86

83Anon (Editors), "The Indian Claim," Colonist (March 4, 1911), 4.
84Karl Stevenson et al Hiking in Strathcona Park n.d., ?
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86In his 1778 interaction with West Coast Indians Captain Cook, for example, enumerated the full range of interior as well as coastal resources in use. Concerning interior animal skins he observed "Bears, Foxes, Wolfs, Wild Cats, Rackoons, Pole cats, Dear, Martins, Ermin, Squirrels...." Most of these highly mobile animals require a large interior land-base to maintain population levels. Therefore, whether or not natives regularly visited all areas of the Island's interior, it was extremely useful to them. James Cook, The Journals of Captain James Cook on his
In terms of the impetuses for production and consumption, it is obvious that Indians had little money to invest in the land compared to investors seeking to exploit the forest and mineral resources. Therefore, when the Province attempted to resolve its debt problems and promote economic development by selling the forests and minerals, the Indians could not purchase the land, even if they wanted to buy what they regarded as their hereditary right in order to cut down trees or remove minerals. In this context of economic imperatives and bad morals, even land that was least needed for resources (e.g. Strathcona Park) could not form a possible token offering to the Indians. Rather, it was conceived as wilderness consumption space which, like regular production lands, was needed for economic development. So in addition to affronting production space, wilderness consumption space affronts Indian land.

As the legal conflict over Indian entitlement proceeded in the 20th Century, as required in the British Legal tradition of compensation for expropriations, Indians attempted to prove that they traditionally have used the land and should have it returned to them or, in some cases, be given suitable compensation. The Province in turn argued that Indians generally never used the land and so no compensation was required. We see evidence of this stance emerging in Bolton and Ellison’s elimination of Indians from the Strathcona lands and in the 1911 meeting between the Chiefs and the McBride Cabinet. From the Indians' perspective, although use of wilderness for consumption space may be preferable to logging or mining, the desecration of their hereditary lands was also extended by Strathcona Park's "creation."

4.2 Low Use of the Park for Recreation and Tourism

Historically, Strathcona Park has been used far more for resource extraction than as a park. Although many national parks have been used for a single resource extraction purpose, Strathcona has been used for logging, hydro-electricity generation and mining, as well as for highway construction. One of the main reasons behind these transgressions of the Strathcona Park Act is the fact that the Park was not heavily used for mass recreation and tourism, a fact which tended to weaken the arguments for the Park's protection. Strathcona tourism never got

---

going, first, because the McBride Conservatives' took an unrealistically enthusiastic approach to park development, and secondly, because succeeding Governments refused to develop Strathcona as a public park.

The McBride Government's failure to start Strathcona recreation and tourism

The McBride Government's enthusiastic approach to developing the Park as the Strathcona Park Act specified, as a "public park and pleasure ground," may have figured ironically against park development. The first problem pertained to the engineer that the Province originally commissioned to develop the Park.

In 1911 the Province hired Reginald Thomson, formerly Chief Engineer for Seattle Washington, to develop Strathcona Park. Although he is credited with helping to pass the 1913 addition to the Park, his overall influence on the Park is not so straightforward. Based on his experience working on survey crews in the region, J.E. Manning commented on the impact of hiring Thomson:

The action in the summer of 1910 of sending out the Strathcona Park Exploratory Party under the general guidance of the Hon. Price Ellison, Minister of Lands and Works, generated a very great interest in the scheme [to create a park] by the general public, and the matter was under general discussion everywhere. Therefore, when early in 1911 the word was published that an American engineer had been selected to supervise the development of the Park the plan was not well received by the public. The man chosen for this important post was Colonel Thompson of Washington, and evidently he was very capable, but many believed there were equally good men available in British Columbia, and so wondered on the choice.87

Thomson received 15,000 dollars a year, 3,000 dollars more per year than the Prime Minister of Canada and so "was the object of bitter protest by Canadian engineers."88 The Province hired additional Americans for important jobs on the team surveying the road into the Park, including the party chief who was an American railroad engineer. The park could still be expected to foster long-term economic development, but potential sources of park advocacy among park employees, engineers, and nationalists turned into sources of opposition.

The other main problem with the McBride Conservative's Strathcona development concerned the plans arrived at by Thomson and the Government. During debate on the 1913 Bill

88Stevenson, 4.
to enlarge the Park, Parker Williams reiterated his 1911 concern about park development by referring to the "huge expense involved in preparing these parks" to be used by only a "microscopical population." In spite of these concerns the Province and Thomson made ambitious plans for Strathcona.

They decided to plant trees and shrubs along the road being laid into the Park. One writer commented that "[t]hose who liked the wild scenery of the country" thought the ornamental trees "would destroy the individuality of the park." The project's extravagance, specified in a government report, proved even more troublesome.

For five and one-half miles of the road, extending from a point east of the north end of McIvor Lake to the West end of Echo Lake, the sides of the road have been carefully planted with various trees and shrubs. This planting used: 500 plane trees, 250 mountain ash, 125 elms, 100 ash, 100 chestnut. All of these trees were four years of age. There were also planted: 2,000 seedlings of ash and elm, one years of age; also 1,000 cuttings of a very choice Golden Willow, and 1,000 cutting of 'Tolmies Siberian Willow.' The report goes on to specify the use of 8,000 Ivy Plants, 2,500 broom plants, 300 pounds of broom seed, 200 pounds of grass seed, 15 types of herbaceous plants for which numbers are not given, and concludes its listing with an "etc".

Years later Wallace Baikie, a logger from the Campbell River region, complained about the road's grand scale.

The specifications called for clearing the right of way a full 33 foot width, with all the trees and bush to be totally contained and burned on the road allowance, leaving the sides clean for the planting of ornamental trees and plants. Most of the proposed road ran through beautiful stands of timber. These trees were felled in windrows, bucked into chunks and burned along with the tops and brush. What did not burn was bored with augers loaded with powder, shattered and piled and completely burned. This hardly represents an auspicious start for a park in the eyes of many observers. What surprised Baikie most of all is that the material could have been profitably used.

Thinking and writing as an old horse skid road logger I can only suggest what could have been done. They could have built a skid road down the full length of the proposed road which was never a mile from a lake. They could have hauled and dumped the logs into the lakes and sold them to I.T. Company who were heading into that area with their

89 Anon, "Legislative Report," Times (Feb. 5, 1913), 3.
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railroad, arriving ten or fifteen years later. I maintain that it would have been easier and cheaper to do that than to go to all that trouble and expense of burning up all of the fine timber.\textsuperscript{93}

Park critics likely did not appreciate the government's explanation that: "there will be no windrow of logs and brush lying along the margins of the road, liable to take fire and endanger the country" and that "another advantage which will be received from this entire consumption of the timber, will be the circulation of the air along the surface of the ground, thus aiding the drying of the surface of the road, very materially."\textsuperscript{94}

In spite of any resentments that may have arisen over the way the Government was proceeding, by 1914 Strathcona's development as a public park was well underway. The road to Buttle Lake would be completed in 1915. Two sites had been selected for hotel development in the Park. Trails were planned so that there would be "almost innumerable opportunities for exploration and sight-seeing connected with both hotel sites."\textsuperscript{95} Then in the fall of 1915 the project was stopped as result of WWI, but also due to complaints over excessive park expenditures. In 1915 the Victoria and Vancouver Island Development Association lobbied Premier McBride to open the road to Buttle Lake.\textsuperscript{96} Their delegation discussed the growing popularity of autocamping and argued that a road to Buttle Lake was important for tourism. McBride "said he agreed with the wisdom of opening up Strathcona Park" but noted that "there had been criticisms in the upper country when [the project] had begun and there had been severe criticism of the expert advice the government had obtained for the work." All the deputation could receive from the Premier was a commitment to publicize the park through a brochure which would explain the wonders of the region but also the "possible difficulty in travel in getting there."\textsuperscript{97}
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Still the McBride Government announced the "opening of a fine motor highway from Campbell River to Strathcona Park" in June 1916. Later in the year, however, everything began to go wrong for the Strathcona project.\(^9\) In September a *Times* reporter explained:

Much of the best timber in the park is the property of the Alvensleben interests which, it is understood, is held by the bank, and of the British America Timber Co. The buildings erected by the government have all been placed on private property [presumably the corporate view of Timber Licences]. The owners have notified the government that unless they purchase the land at once the buildings will be confiscated by them.\(^9\)

Next the Park's founders, the McBride Conservatives, lost the 1916 provincial election and the mandate that they had held since 1905, bringing to an end the ambitious development plans for the Park. Concerning the fate of the landscaping project, Walter Baikie commented: "They never did plant all those trees. There have been stories of stacks of such stuff, including seed, powder, mattocks and shovels etc., stored away. Nobody remembers what eventually happened to it all."\(^10\)

**Successive governments' failure to start Strathcona recreation and tourism**

It is not clear why a succession of provincial governments never seriously developed Strathcona as a park. In 1926 the *Colonist* Editor complained that "the present Government does not appear to have any policy whatever in respect to Strathcona Park" either to develop it or not to develop it.\(^11\) Nor have successive governments clearly stated their Strathcona policy. I think the Park's remote location, the lackluster campaign to force the Government to develop it and, most of all, its resource extraction potential all help explain governmental reluctance to develop Strathcona as a park.

The main impediment to developing Strathcona as a tourist destination was transportation from Victoria and Vancouver to Buttle Lake. When Strathcona was established, Mr. Brewster, (Liberal leader) explained the expected transportation improvements.

---


\(^11\) Anon (Editorial), "Strathcona Park," *Colonist* (June 2, 1926), 4.
I hope to see within the very near future roads put into such condition that an automobile may be driven from Victoria to Strathcona Park within a few hours and that not only will this pleasure ground be generally made use of by the people of the Island but also by those of the Mainland, the city of Vancouver being even nearer to it than is Victoria; and that the man who cannot afford to travel in automobile style but has his horse and buggy or his bicycle, may have the pleasure of an outing amidst this wonderful scenery and glorious surroundings. Railway communication will, within a very short time, give access to this beauty spot.102

The Ellison Expedition had taken a steamer to Campbell River since there was no road or rail. When the McBride Conservatives began building a road from Campbell River to Buttle Lake, they anticipated complementary rail and auto transportation improvements to get tourists to Campbell River.

In January 1911 the contracts were just being let out for completion of the last leg of the Victoria to Courtenay railway.103 Although there was no agreement with E&N, Premier McBride and Mr. Brewster anticipated that the line would be extended to Campbell River after it reached Courtenay. Part of the reason that the rail line never went ahead was because road succeeded rail as the main form of transportation. Construction of a through road from Victoria to the North Island was commencing in the early 1900's, but it did not proceed as rapidly as expected. The main reason the McBride Government hoped and expected the railway and highway would soon be built was their perceived social/economic importance as well as the related strong public support for them. The classic instance of popular support for Island transportation improvements occurred at the ceremony commemorating the 1886 completion of the Victoria-Nanaimo railway when: "a procession was formed at the head of which was Hon. Mr. Dunsmuir [E&N's main financier] in a carriage and so enthusiastic were the citizens that the horses were removed from the vehicle and the latter drawn through the streets by a large number of men, the crowds meanwhile cheering loudly."104 Similarly, by 1911 when Strathcona Park
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was established, the wilderness park movement paled in comparison to the popularity of the movement for highway extensions and improvements.\textsuperscript{105}

In spite of its supporters, the Campbell River railway was never built. The road to Campbell River wasn’t completed until 1919 and even then, although paving was started in the South, Northern sections were extremely rough.\textsuperscript{106} From a preservationist perspective, the slow development of regional transportation infrastructure fortunately curbed economic development and associated wilderness depletion, but it limited Strathcona’s recreational and tourist potential thereby diminishing these rationales for park protection.

Until the 1920’s arduous automobile travel on the Island discouraged even the most enthusiastic and affluent tourist from going to Campbell River. By the 1920’s road improvements made auto transport possible to Campbell River, however, and the major impediment to driving from Victoria to Buttle Lake, the chief attraction in the Park, was the completion of the ten mile connecting road.\textsuperscript{107}

In 1926 the Minister of Lands in the Liberal Government Hon. Mr. Pattullo, maintained the Park was too inaccessible for tourism. The aforementioned Strathcona Park advocate C.H. Gibbons argued that "[d]eveloped upon the original lines, Strathcona Park would prove a greater magnet to American pleasure seekers of discriminative tastes and moderate means than either Rainier or Yellowstone to mention but two similar parks of the Pacific slope."\textsuperscript{108} In 1927 he detailed: a method for deferring park-development costs over several years; the possibilities within the Park for water transport on Buttle Lake if it was served by a road; and the CPR’s continuing interest in building bungalow camps as soon as the connecting road was built.\textsuperscript{109} The Colunist was convinced that there was "not a shadow of doubt that for one thing thousands of the tourists who come annually to Vancouver Island would spend a much longer time here than they
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do at present. Such development, too, might well have the effect of keeping many thousands of our own citizens within the Province during their summer vacations.\textsuperscript{110}

However there were then (as well as later) severe limits to this type of economic rationale for the Park. Not only was the Island transportation infrastructure inadequate for mass tourism. Victoria did not grow to be a large urban centre, and tourists from the fast-growing city of Vancouver and from the United States were impeded by a ferry ride, which added both expense and over two hours travel time. Nelson and Wall's research indicates that since the 1920's sport fishing and hunting tourism have been popular on the north Island, but Strathcona's tourism potential was not realized because "the park was inaccessible by car."\textsuperscript{111} In spite of the Park's tourism potential, successive governments were extraordinarily reluctant to build the connecting road or otherwise develop the Park. I think the limited advocacy for the development of the Park and resource extraction companies' interest in the Park help explain governmental resistance to developing the Park.

Through its history, park advocates have lobbied for recreational and tourism development in Strathcona Park. Some recreationists who used the Park, however, did not advocate additional park development. Frank Kelly suggests that serious sport fishers, who were not deterred by the ten mile hike into Buttle Lake or who could afford to fly into the Park, did not promote park development because they did not want to share the sport fishing catch with others.\textsuperscript{112} In addition, the tendency of various local Chambers of Commerce and tourism advocacy groups had been to periodically pass motions and sporadically petition the government in person or through letters, rather than to launch a prolonged and concerted campaign. Still, there was little apparent opposition to park development and serious representations were made to the government for Strathcona's recreational development. There has been differences of opinion among the various interests (tourism, recreation and nature preservation) as to how the Park
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should be developed. Nevertheless, they all seem to note the importance of completing the connecting road to Buttle Lake which remained the Park's chief attraction.

Through the relatively stable economic period of the 1920's no road was constructed to Buttle Lake. In 1933 public organizations on the northern half of the Island urged the Minister of Public Works to have relief workers construct the road to Buttle Lake. These workers subsequently improved the trail to Buttle Lake, but did not build a road. In 1944 Frank Kelley commented that "even one comparatively short road over which motor cars could travel" would initiate park development, yet the Government persistently refused to build the road. In the early 1950's Alex MacQuarrie, the Executive Secretary of the Auto Courts and Resort Association of B.C. made detailed arguments concerning the economic potential of Strathcona Park. He commented "[t]he park has not been developed and any possible development has been held back by the lack of a connecting road." These and other writers have long advocated completion of the Buttle Lake road and have generally urged the province to develop Strathcona as a park, often focusing on its economic importance. So, even though no large campaign attempted to force the Province to develop the Park, one might have expected the government over the years to at least build the connecting road.

Evidence suggests that resource extraction industries have been the main impediment to park development. One impedient was the forest tenures in the Park. In 1929 the government purchased some of the forest tenures around Buttle Lake which had been enclosed in the original park boundaries for a cost of $335,000. Such expenses may have curbed further park development. A Colonist writer suggests that after a 1943 exchange of Buttle Lake timber for timber outside of the Park, the government wasn't willing to make further expenditures on the park, particularly while the War was in progress.
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Resource industries also diminished the Park's recreation potential. Logging, hydro
development and mining damaged the Park's natural qualities so governments had less incentive
to develop the park for recreation and tourism, and people were less inclined to demand access to
the Park and for amenities to be built.

Another impediment to park development concerns opposition to park development by
resource industries. If parks are developed as wilderness consumption space, then opposition to
resource extraction may increase among the more numerous recreationists and tourist
developers. In Strathcona's case, forestry, mining and hydroelectricity interests may have
directly lobbied government not to develop the Park for recreation or pro-industry legislators
may have opposed park development on their own initiative. The main early obstacle to
Strathcona's recreational development in this regard has been the hydroelectric potential of the
Burtle Lake/Campbell River watershed. Hydro potential was first recognized in the early 1900's
and by 1926 an Amendment to the Strathcona Park Act, considered below, permitted
hydroelectric development in Burtle Lake. The project remained under consideration and finally
went ahead in the 1950's. After construction of the dam, the noted Campbell River
conservationist Roderick Haig-Brown commented on the government's traditional reluctance not
only to build a road to Burtle Lake, but the difficulty in getting them to maintain the existing trail
to the Lake.\textsuperscript{118} He argued that the Province's refusal to provide adequate access was related to
its interest in damming Burtle Lake: "Unfortunately, the B.C. Power Commission became
interested in the watershed about this time [WWII]. There was, of course, no threat to
Strathcona Park or Burtle Lake - so we were assured - but it became strangely difficult to get the
provincial government of that day to show any interest in restoring the access that had been
previously provided by the excellent pack trail." Haig-Brown (a Provincial Judge) suggests that
the government did not want to develop the park because it would have increased opposition to
damming the Lake. The B.C. Power Commission's 1951 plan envisioned raising the lake level
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over forty feet. If access was provided to the Lake and chalets and autocamps provided around it, tourist interests would have to be expropriated before raising the lake level and recreationists' opposition to damming the Lake would have been even more concerted than, as we see below, it became. Knowing this, governmental hydroelectric interests since the 1920's likely opposed road construction to Buttle Lake and amenity development in its surrounding area.

The expense of further developing Strathcona as a park led some park advocates to lobby the Federal Government to make Strathcona a National Park. However, in negotiations the province has refused to turn over control of Strathcona resources to the Federal Government. A Province writer explained "the difficulty in the way of turning Strathcona Park over to the Dominion outright is the prospect of Buttle Lake, chief beauty spot of the reserve, being dammed for power purposes. It is said the Dominion would not care to take over the Park unless it were protected absolutely from industrial development like all other national parks." If Strathcona were to be made into a National Park then the Federal Government would likely have developed it solely as a park. Resource industries again seemed to have impeded the fulfillment of the Park's recreational potential.

In sum, several reasons seem to underlie the absence of the development of Strathcona as a public park. In spite of the original complaints about the McBride Conservatives' expenditures on the Park, its outlay was miniscule compared to its expenditures on transportation. Although the aforementioned landscaping project seemed excessive to many at the time, it cost less than $20,000. Total Strathcona expenditures to 1916, about half on road construction and half on amenity development, were under $400,000. At the same time, the government was spending about $10 million per year on railroad and highway construction. Completing the connecting road to Buttle Lake in 1915 would have cost only $60,000. If the McBride Government had
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simply built an ordinary road into the Park and not bothered with contentious landscaping and amenity development, an increased flow of recreationists would have visited the Park, helping to assure its use primarily for recreation and tourism.

Successive governments' also failed to develop the Park because of a combination of: relatively slow population and economic growth with related slow development of transportation infrastructure; lack of a sustained government initiative to develop the Park; and the absence of a serious public campaign to influence the government to develop the Park. Resource extraction industries curtailed recreational development of the Park due to: the cost of acquiring forest tenures; reduction of recreational values owing to continuing resource extraction; and the presence of resource industry advocates within successive governments whose influence has curtailed substantial recreation and tourism development.

4.3 High Use of the Park for Resource Extraction

While Strathcona Park has been little used for recreation and tourism it has been well used for resource extraction. To reiterate the comments of the long-time Strathcona advocate, Ruth Masters: "Resource and hydro wealth has gone out of the Park by the thousands of millions, literally, as large tracts of the parkland have been logged, mined, burned, dammed, flooded, drilled, bulldozed, paved, poisoned - and stolen."124 Of these, the main transgressions of the Strathcona Park Act up to 1960 concerned logging and flooding Buttle Lake for hydroelectricity generation.

Logging in the Park

Like many national parks, Strathcona was situated where it was both because of its limited potential for forestry as well as its high potential as a park. Nevertheless, there were some forest tenures in the Park on its creation, though on a smaller scale than in other Island areas. After the Park was established, the initial need was to acquire these tenures clustered around Buttle Lake and, after the 1913 addition, in the southeast of the Park around Oshinow Lake. The McBride Government attempted to arrange an exchange to acquire some of the tenures around Buttle

124 Interview with the writer April 29, 1991.
Lake, but an agreement could not be reached with the holders. But in the ensuing years two important victories for wilderness preservation were made by acquisition of timber rights around Buttle Lake.

In 1926 the Victoria Chamber of Commerce, lobbied the Liberal Government to acquire the tenures around Buttle Lake. The Minister of Lands, T.D. Pattullo, stated "[w]e can't have our cake and eat it as well. We can't leave timber standing and expect to build up a lumber industry." The issue was not settled until 1929 when the Conservatives, who were returned to power in the 1928 election, proposed purchasing the tenures for 335,000 dollars. The Liberal opposition opposed the plan. Pattullo maintained that the timber had little merit for preservation since it was "over mature." This was one of the first derogatory statements regarding the value of ancient trees in the Province. In the 1929 debate another Liberal MLA complained to the legislature that the purchase would only benefit wealthy residents and rich tourists who could afford to go to the Park. As has previously been outlined, there was no road into the Park at the time so extended vacation time and special transportation costs were required to venture there. Thus while the Liberal's had been in power they had refused to build a connecting road to the Park, and then in 1929 they complained that working class people did not go to it. The Conservatives were not swayed and purchased some of the tenures for $335,000. One writer said the purchase "represents the first important step taken by a provincial government to preserve large timber stands in anticipation of the day when they will be scarce on the Coast." Although there were extensive untenured forests in Strathcona Park, they were not promoted by the Park's creators who focused primarily on mountains, lakes and waterfalls. So, the 1929 purchase represents one of the first deliberate attempts to preserve a forested area for park purposes in B.C., albeit on a rather small scale due to the limited size of the tenures.
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The Buttle Lake timber issue arose again in the 1940's in the first "campaign" to protect Strathcona. When word of the proposed logging on the remaining tenures was broadcasted in 1941, a noted conservationist and nature photographer, Irving Brandt, came from New York to join the campaign. Brandt took photographs in Strathcona (the nicest photos of the Park I have seen), published them in the *Times Magazine Section*, and spoke out against logging around Buttle Lake.131 In 1942 it was reported that:

News that the loggers had actually gone into action against the tract, brought protests from conservationists and officers of travel organizations. Breaking of the news was followed by telephone calls to the Parliament Buildings from Vancouver and H.E. Harris and F.J. Bird of the B.C. Natural Resources League rushed to Victoria to make a final plea with the government to save the timber.132

William Reid, an American capitalist and president of Ducks Unlimited, who owned a summer home on Buttle Lake, was, "largely instrumental in starting the campaign to save the lake's stand of scenic timber."133 An important B.C. group, the Natural Resources Conservation League, made a detailed submission to the Provincial Cabinet.134 The campaign ultimately succeeded. In 1943, through an exchange for tenures elsewhere, the government acquired more of the forest tenures around Buttle Lake, both inside and outside of the park.135

Park advocates had launched a campaign to protect Buttle Lake timber because the Lake was one of the most loved areas in the Park (in addition to enjoying the surrounding beauty one could see thirty feet into the crystal clear water), and because, even though there was no road entry, Buttle Lake was one of its most accessible sites. However, they could not muster sufficient pressure to protect all Strathcona forests. I did not investigate in detail the sequence of logging in the Park. A Parks Division biologist, G. Jones, however, indicates that logging began on the 1907 tenures in the southeast of the park around Oshinow Lake and in the north in the Elk River Valley during the 1940's, and continued into the 1950's.136

Logging the steeply-sloped

---

banks of the Elk Valley and other areas in this mountainous region rapidly led to extreme erosion. Deer and elk require large trees to protect their winter food from the heavy snow. But because of the slow rate of forest growth exacerbated by severe erosion, in several areas of the Park, "two or three centuries will pass before the logged areas mature to replace lost winter range." In the 1960's a dispute arose over new forest tenures which were granted in the Park through notorious "exchanges" to acquire park land elsewhere in the province. I will discuss this in the Chapter below, but for the moment I will turn to the 1950's battle over the damming of Buttles Lake.

**Hydroelectricity generation in the Park**

As with many other national parks, Strathcona's location in a mountainous area led to consideration, following its founding, of harnessing the waters within its bounds. The hydroelectric potential within the Park arises in Price Ellison's 1911 glowing report on the beauty of Buttles Lake when sponsoring the *Strathcona Park Act*:

> It [Buttle Lake] is approximately eighteen miles in length by about a mile and half in width, its waters of crystal; and when I tell you sir, that the waterfalls which on every side come tumbling into it in clouds of spray would, if harnessed, be sufficient to develop sufficient power to meet all the requirements of British Columbia, you may grasp some idea of their number and the water they carry.

The potential of waterfalls around Buttles Lake arises again in 1915 in the formal plans to generate electricity for the ill-fated Strathcona chalets. By this time developing the Campbell River water shed for hydroelectricity generation with a large dam was under consideration.

In the 1927 Legislative Session the Liberal Government introduced a bill to amend the *Strathcona Park Act* to permit raising Buttles Lake's elevation for hydroelectricity generation. The Liberal Minister of Lands, Hon. Mr. Pattullo, declared that: "the raising of the lake while it might change the appearance of Buttles Lake, would not spoil it in any way for outing purposes. A number of the lower lying benches on the lake at the mouths of rivers will be flooded [] but
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other benches will be available for camping and for a hotel site further up the mountain sides." At any rate, "Strathcona Park is largely an Alpine resort in any case and that mountain climbing and other sports for which it is suited will not be affected by the power development." On second reading he considers the public's interest in the dam as well as the commonness of the Lake's scenery.

Mr. Pattullo held that the Legislature must decide which was of the greatest public interest, the preservation of this park or encouragement of a large industrial enterprise. He had seen Buttle Lake. It was very beautiful. But all the way from Vancouver to Prince Rupert there was wonderful scenery. "Indeed, all British Columbia is a park; we can never run short of scenery" he averred...By far the larger public interest carried in industrial development.

A Conservative MLA, Mr. Lyons, strongly opposed the plan:

The plans outlined by this measure, he averred, would entirely deface one of the most beautiful wonderlands on the Western Coast, an area of diversified charm without parallel in the Province, the Lake Louise section not excepted. To permit such a natural playground of future generation to be raped would be a calamity. The area should, in justice to the future, be conserved to the fullest extent.

This is one of the first uses of strong language in response to the Park's desecration. Further objections dealt with details of the project. The dam would generate power for the pulp mill of a single American Corporation, Crown Williamette, at a time when the Island home-electricity movement was just starting. Another Conservative argued that "[t]he case in reality is that of 100,000 horsepower going to the United States with no reservation for the necessities of our own people."

Several park advocates wrote letters to the editor but no public campaign arose to match that of the Sierra Club and others against the damming of Hetch Hetchy, indicating the relative weakness of the regional preservation movement. Due to this weakness as well as its own inclination, the Liberal Government amended the Strathcona Park Act to permit the dam. However an agreement on building the dam could not be reached with Crown Williamette. Thus 1929 found the Liberals and Conservatives again wrangling over the issue and Pattullo
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maligning Strathcona with statements such as: "[t]he lake is cold in summer. Women and children would never bathe in it and the shores are so precipitous and devoid of beaches as to be dangerous to children."\textsuperscript{146} In the end, however, the deal with Crown Williamette fell through.

Small municipal generators were built in the region in ensuing years; then in the 1940's a firm proposal to build large dams on the Campbell River again generated controversy. The first of these dams was at a site on the Campbell River near the community of Campbell River. Sport and commercial fishers were concerned that local salmon runs would be blocked. Nevertheless, in 1945 construction commenced on the John Hart dam with fish ladders added as a concession to fishers. The next dam project proposed within the Campbell River watershed led to one of the largest disputes over park protection in B.C.'s history.

In 1951 the B.C. Power Commission proposed to dam Buttle Lake.\textsuperscript{147} Those in favour of the project, as Pattullo did in his 1927 arguments to amend the Strathcona Park Act, pointed to the minor environmental damage a dam would cause. Park advocates, in contrast, stressed the dam's potential damage to park values.

It is impossible to raise Buttle Lake and not destroy its beauty. First, the shore line will be logged off and the timber sold; the stumps, windfalls, branches [and] unmerchantable timber will be left lying on the shore; dead trees, laden with branches, will drift out a hundred yards or so, and remain, gradually becoming waterlogged; the shores will be unapproachable because the shore-line will be strewn with debris. The beaches which have been a joy to campers and fishermen, will be flooded and, owing to the precipitous sides of the lake, new beaches will not develop. In place of its beauty, there will be left only a scene of devastation.\textsuperscript{148}

Consideration of the destruction also led the writer to a wider critique of Island development:

We have already turned over to the big logging and pulp companies, hundreds of square miles of Vancouver Island under the Forest management new scheme. Can we not reserve for our own enjoyment, at least one section of our own country? It can be done now but if we allow our whole country to be gobbled up by logging, pulp and mining companies, there will be nothing left.\textsuperscript{149}
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Park advocates did not object per se to the generation of electricity. Rather, they studied sources of electricity which did not involve damaging Buttle Lake. Optimistic opinions expressed favouring coal-fired or nuclear generation to solve ecological problems seem naive now that the environmental problems of these technologies are better known. But by far the strongest opposition expressed was that the dam could be located farther downstream on the Campbell River. Although this would still damage the habitat, at least Buttle Lake would not have to be flooded.

The dispute attracted enormous public attention; the Newspaper Index records over 800 newspaper articles in the four major Provincial dailies on the issue from 1951 till 1955. This is more publicity than Strathcona Park had received throughout its history, and it was likely as much media attention as was directed at any Provincial environmental issue before or since. Opponents forced the Government to hold two Legislative inquiries. They concluded that, subject to conditions such as logging before raising the water level, Buttle Lake could be flooded. Both of these inquiries were quickly criticized by a broad range of groups as being unfair.

This dispute occurred at turbulent time in B.C. politics. The Liberal/Conservative Coalition Government, which was formed to stave off the electoral gains of the socialist Canadian Cooperative Federation (CCF), lost the 1952 election to the newly-formed Social Credit Party (SCP). The SCP called an election in 1953 to try to improve on its slim majority over the CCF, and won a large majority. The leader of the SCP, W.A.C. Bennett, strongly advocated the Buttle Lake project and labelled the ad hoc collection of groups and individuals who opposed it an "organized pressure group" that were unwilling to abide by the dam's approval "by all democratic processes."^150

In spite of the imminent damage to Buttle Lake, and the active opposition, events seemed to conspire against its opponents. Ironically, Buttle Lake's situation in a relatively undeveloped public park strengthened arguments favouring the dam because land would not have to be
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^150 Anon, "Bennett Says Buttle Lake Antagonists Are an "Organized Pressure Group," Colonist (Sept. 13, 1955), ?
expropriated. While the original 1927 plan proposed generating electricity for a pulp mill, the 1951 proposal included power for public consumption as well as for industry. The consumption value of wilderness space was weighed against the consumption value of home electricity. Premier Bennett warned that if the project did not go ahead in the near future a "brown-out" might occur on the Island. Because the power would be dispersed over the Island, several Chambers of Commerce and municipal governments actively supported the project. Unlike the 1927 plan by an American corporation, the 1951 proposal was made by a public utility. At the time, the CCF held an internal debate over the project. Ultimately, however, it approved the dam, largely out of support for the newly-formed public utility, the B.C. Power Commission. The CCF had long argued that such a utility should be established, so they did not want to oppose one of its first projects.

The SCP announced its final decision on the dam in 1955. In the end, a site below the Lake was used but, nevertheless, the dam was so high that water was backed up into Buttle Lake. Calls were made for a further inquiry at the time, but the SCP would not agree. In September 1955, on the basis that the project violated the Strathcona Park Act, conservationists launched a suit to stop the dam, but eventually that action failed. By April 1956 work had commenced on the dam.

In 1958 when the project was completed, the B.C. Power Commission rubbed salt in park advocates' wounds by publishing before and after scenes of Park sites. In the case of Wolf Creek, cutting back timber and raising the Lake had "exposed a scenic waterfall". The higher level brought Myra Falls "into full view." One "interesting comparison" of the Buttle Lake
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151 Anon, "Gov't Won't Take Brown-Out Blame," Sun (Sept. 15, 1955), ?
153 Anon, "CCF Backs Buttle Dam Project," Province (Sept. 27, 1955), ?
154 Anon, "Supreme Court Asked to Stop Buttle Lake Project," Sun (Sept. 27 1955), ?
155 Alex Young, "Buttle Lake Power Job Under Way," Sun (April 27, 1956), ?
shoreline shows "debris as it was in 1955" and in 1958 "how Man can sometimes improve on Nature".

The flooding of Buttle Lake represented one of the great losses of the B.C. conservation movement and created lasting animosity. A recount of the battle over Buttle Lake by Roderick Haig-Brown, one of the most active park advocates in the dispute, illustrates this anger and outrage developing among Strathcona defenders:

At this stage [the 1951 announcement of the dam] the conservationists, well supported by the public, fought a long battle to save the lake and the park. The damsite was changed, the extent of the flooding was materially reduced and extensive clearing of the lakeshore was guaranteed.

But essentially the battle was lost. The park was violated, the primitive character and beauty of the lakeshore was completely destroyed, flats and beaches were buried under water and the creek mouths were flooded back to falls or box canyons.

The lake in fact became a reservoir, subject to ugly and depressing draw-down along barren shorelines. The magnificent Douglas fir stands on Wolf and Marble and Philips Creek flats were cut away.

A superlative natural asset, developed through 10,000 years, was reduced to something of quite ordinary dimensions within a year or two. The park behind it, with its timbered valleys and great alpine areas, remained, but the foremost value of the park, its splendid entrance and supreme show place, the one area that everyone could reach and enjoy, lost all its primitive character and nine-tenths of its meaning.157

Haig-Brown, writing in 1966, expressed bitter disillusionment.

The public was promised there would be compensations for this sad defeat. Park development would be immediate, extensive and spectacularly well-managed. There would be a fine access road to the foot of the lake, campsites would be built, beaches improved, trails constructed and maintained.

The whole affair was really a blessing in disguise, or so we were told: the public would at last be able to enjoy this splendid place in all its glory - or at any rate, all that was left of its glory. Ten full years have passed, the disguise remains perfect, the blessing is still unrevealed.158

The occasion of Haig-Brown's writing, and the subject of his further protest, was the government's approval during the 1960's for mining at Buttle Lake: the subject of the following Chapter.

Conclusion

This account of Strathcona's history illustrated the broader conflict between wilderness for resource extraction production space versus wilderness as protected consumption space. As well
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the analysis considered aspects of regional physical geography, regional settlement history, industrial development, politics and citizen activism which influenced the conflict over wilderness in central Vancouver Island.

Although mountainous areas are the most represented landscape type in the system of provincial parks, not all mountains in B.C. have been preserved. The lack of consideration to mainland sites, in 1910 debate over founding a provincial park, suggests that, in response to Island park advocates, an initial decision was made that the first provincial park should be located on the Island. There, existing forest tenures and the future market potential of Island forests impelled the debt-ridden and development hungry McBride Government to look to the mountainous hump in the central Island for its first wilderness park. Still, as was the case with proponents of other national parks, Strathcona's founders seemed to delight in mountain landscapes. Price Ellison's enthusiasm for the Island alps impressed everyone. The Natural History Society, which may have been interested in other landscapes, was delighted that finally a large area would be preserved. The Strathcona Park Act demonstrates a more unequivocal protection of nature than if the park had been created merely for economic gain. However, the legislators' primary reason for founding Strathcona Park was its potential for tourism economic development.

Business associations supported Strathcona's establishment mainly for the money it could generate. The CPR probably also supported the Park because it expected transportation and accommodation profits. Price Ellison stressed the role of the Park in direct tourism development as well as in promoting broader economic development. Because of this financial rationale for the Park combined with its low utility for resource extraction, as well as the considerable influence of the Park's powerful supporters, no serious opposition arose to Strathcona's creation.

There was no interest in including indigenous people in the wilderness park concept. The existence of Indians in the region for millennia contradicted the immigrants' notions of being its first explorers. Moreover, Indians did not harmonize with the concept of a Swiss-style wilderness park designed to generate tourism profits. More broadly, the same economic
imperatives (debt and the progressive movement) as well as racism that impelled immigrants to remove Indians from productive land in the province impelled them to exclude Indians from consumption space. So, W.W. Bolton and P. Ellison, on the basis of their limited knowledge of the region's history, broadcast the view that natives abhorred and shunned the interior of the Island, while Indians were being shunted into reserves where they were becoming increasingly dependant on the European economy as well as suffering from rapid depopulation due to disease and domination.

The aspect of Strathcona's history that receives most comment is the transgression of the 1911 *Strathcona Park Act*. In 1911 it was clear that resource extraction would remain an important aspect of provincial economic development, especially following the 1904-1907 timber sale. It was not clear, however, whether wood and other natural resources would be exported or used to develop indigenous secondary industry in a mixed economy. The legislators founded Strathcona Park as an active step towards establishing a mixed economy. The McBride Conservatives nearly achieved their goal of developing the Park for tourism: when they lost the 1916 election only two miles of road construction was required to start a flow of recreationists into the Park.

In ensuing years tourism development was promoted but lost some key supporters. The CPR could have influenced the Government to build a road into the Park or could have built one itself to provide access for the chalets it planned. But with the developing movement to exclude resource extraction in National Parks, the CPR lost much of its interest in Strathcona development. Although chambers of commerce periodically supported Strathcona development, major economic development bodies such as the Board of Trade and the Development League disappeared from Strathcona's history following its establishment. The province-wide forest tenures that the McBride Conservatives sold during the 1904-1907 period showed strong demand for timber and the government permitted domination of the B.C. economy by powerful forest corporations. They had developed a monopoly over development of the industry, exactly as feared by the 1910 Royal Commission on Forestry, and they acted to discouraged the
government and corporate groups from promoting wilderness parks, even in cases where parks could lead to broader economic development. This partly explains the government's disinterest in developing Strathcona as a park. However, as Haig-Brown suggests, Buttle Lake's potential for generating hydroelectricity was also an impediment. Hydroelectricity advocates in the government knew that if numerous recreationists enjoyed Buttle Lake, there would be furious objection to damming the Lake. So they exercised their influence to discourage recreational use of the Lake.

The development of a staples-based economy in B.C. may also help explain the generally low public interest in preserving Strathcona Park. As Patricia Marchak explains, many resource-industry workers are more concerned with acquiring higher wages to increase their consumption of material goods, rather than caring about alternatives for the province's future economic development or long-term care of its natural resources. This ideological bias may explain why park advocates never managed to launched a campaign to acquire forest tenures, other than those around Buttle Lake. And, in addition to increased interest in finding sources of electricity for residences and industry, this ideology also explains why there wasn't more opposition to flooding Buttle Lake. At the same time, the relatively slow population growth of the region and its lack of secondary and tertiary industry tended to curb regional demand for Strathcona recreation. This, in turn, tended to limit the size of the constituency attempting to protect Strathcona from resource extraction.

That the Park was not well developed for recreation and tourism was due, however, to more than the economic/ideological infrastructure of a capitalist staples-based economy. Marchak acknowledges the control exerted by resource industries over provincial development, but she still maintains governments and the public have been too complacent in allowing resource industries to dominate economic policy, to the detriment of increased economic diversification.159 I think that the evidence of Strathcona Park largely supports this argument. While successive governments spent million on transportation infrastructure throughout the
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province, they were reluctant to spend the small amount to build a road to Buttle Lake. Moreover, although many conservationists supported Strathcona's protection and development as a park, this active constituency could have been larger and received more public support.

The fact that people generally acquiesced to the course of events does not mean that there was harmony over Strathcona's fate. The relationship between resource industries, the province and the public was not as cozy as Marchak contends when she states that protests over environmental issues "have not received public support [necessary] to suggest that the governments have been out of step with voters." This understates the frustration felt by conservationists who advocated Strathcona's preservation, in light of government intransigence and neglect of their concerns since shortly after the Park's founding. It understates the anxieties of many Islanders who may have supported the dam but nonetheless saw it as an unfortunate consequence of industrialism as well as the pathos of Islanders who opposed flooding the Lake. Not just citizens' needs for employment and material goods but also corporations' quest for profits emerged as an alien force working against the provision of "a public park and pleasure ground for the benefit, advantage, and enjoyment of the people of British Columbia" as promised by the Strathcona Park Act. Many conservationists likely agreed with Haig-Brown's conclusion that, although there was a public debate over resource development, most important decisions were made behind the scenes between large, resource-based capitals and the government, rendering citizen protest futile.

We cannot know what would have been the fate of Strathcona's forests and waters if wilderness tourism had been part of a program of concerted economic diversification, such as was originally envisioned by the McBride Government, leading to, as Marchak says, a "mature industrial economy" in the province and on the Island. If secondary industry had developed, the provincial population today might be closer to 10 million rather than 3 million. As a result, demand for Strathcona's resources might have been even greater than was the case or the Park

160Ibid, p.31.
might have become the site of disputes over issues such as the spread of vacation homes, as is occurring in Adirondack Park, New York State.
Chapter Five

Mining in the Park and the Friends of Strathcona Park to December 1987

By 1960 Strathcona Park was used principally for resource extraction rather than for park purposes. This set a precedent for the 1960's construction of Western Mines' operation near Buttle Lake, since mining would have been difficult if there were chalets and thousands of recreationists in the near vicinity. Strathcona advocates launched an unsuccessful campaign to stop the mine. Since then disputes over the Western Mine and further mineral exploration and mining been the principal main protection issue in the Park and, more broadly, the main focus of struggle in the Province's "parks versus mining" conflict over an existing park.1 This and the following chapter detail the disputes over mining in Strathcona Park.

Attention is directed at the 1960's struggle over Western Mines, but mainly I consider the 1987-88 campaign launched by the "Friends of Strathcona Park" to stop further mineral exploration in the Park.2 The question to which research is directed in both chapters is: How do the Friends of Strathcona Park articulate the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space? The Friends support tourism, recreation and nature preservation while opposing mining and all other forms of wilderness desecration. The analysis below shows how practical application of their stand led them into diverse issues and practices at public meetings, in the news media, in a "blockade" in the Park at which 64 people were arrested, and, as a result of the blockade, in a Commission of Inquiry and a Court of Law. In addition to newspaper
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2 I held interviews with 13 active members in April 1991: Des Kennedy, Juan Barker, Dorrie Nagler, John Wilson, Karl Stevenson, Steve Smith, Marlene Smith, Ruth Masters, Richard Porter, Ernie Yacub, Dave Routledge, Susan Holvenstot and Kel Kelly. Open-ended questions concerned how these members got involved with the Friends and their experience with the group. Ruth Masters loaned me an extensive file of regional newspaper articles on the Friends and 1980's disputes over the Park. The titles of the regional newspapers are abbreviated in footnotes: Courtenay Comox Record to Record, Campbell River Mirror to Mirror, Campbell River Upper Islander to Upper Islander, Campbell River Courier to Courier and Comox District Free Press to Free Press. I also acquired information through attendance at several Friends of Strathcona meetings, several meetings of a coalition (the Tin Wis Coalition) the Friends became involved with, and through trail building in the Park with the Friends in summer 1990. Outside of several phone calls, my final interaction with group members was at their November 1992 symposium: "Where the Wild Things Are".
accounts, these chapters rely on interviews with thirteen group members. This chapter covers up to the end of 1987 when the blockade was imminent and the next chapter commences with the blockade itself.

This Chapter has three main sections. The first concerns the 1960's dispute over the Western Mine. Although the mine was operating in the Park, a 1973 government policy prohibited further mineral exploration and mining outside of Western's property in the middle of the Park. The second section concerns a government initiative in the 1980's to change the 1973 policy by permitting further resource extraction, especially mineral exploration and mining, in large areas of the Park and, as result of the policy shift, the 1986 formation of the Friends of Strathcona Park. The third section concerns the Friends' 1987 work up to December of that year when they were poised to strike the blockade in the Park to impede Cream Silver from carrying out exploratory drilling. The analysis illustrates the extraordinary pains governments sometimes take to promote wilderness as resource-extraction production space, even if evidence suggests that the public interest lies with park protection and even if a serious backlash protest among park defenders demonstrates the public interest.

5.1 Conflicts over Mining and Mineral Exploration in Strathcona Park to 1980
This section covers development of the technological, political, corporate and legal aspects of the Western Mine and mineral exploration in the Park which the Friends later address. It also covers the citizen activism trends later adopted by the Friends. Successive sections concern: the 1960's struggle over Western's mine, a 1973 moratorium on further mineral exploration in the Park and the subsequent legal battle that resulted from this moratorium.

*Western Mines* awful machine in the Park

Earlier twentieth century mining in the Bear (later Bedwell) and Drinkwater Valleys provided a foot in the door for later mining. After the Park's major expansion in 1913, it included the Bedwell Valley in which there were mineral tenures, placer mining in progress and, an active
mine had produced 1,337 grams of gold in 1906. The Strathcona Park Act did not permit mineral exploration or mining in the Park and provided for the purchase of existing mineral tenures. Following their founding of the Park, the McBride Conservatives attempted to purchase these tenures, but agreements could not be reached with their title holders. In 1918 the Liberal Party amended the Act to permit claim staking, mineral exploration, and mining. The Newspaper Index does not indicate any public debate over the amendment. My scan of the Colonist's coverage of the 1918 legislative session did not reveal debate over it. Though one might have expected the Conservatives who founded the Park to oppose the amendment, Sessional Papers show that it passed without debate.

The main evidence of opposition to this transgression of the Act is the fact that it was not simply repealed. The amendment indicated that the Government wanted simultaneously to mine and preserve the Park. It stipulated that no Crown grant could be made of the surface rights of mineral claims and that, in addition to the provisions of the Mineral Act, Strathcona claims were subject to "such further terms, conditions, and restrictions, including restrictions on the cutting and use of timber" that the Province prescribed.

Following the Amendment more claims were staked in central and southwestern areas of the park. In the 1940's, the Sherwood Mine near Della Falls and Big Interior Mountain, extracted and milled twenty tons of ore per day for a year or more. Yet, during the period the Newspaper Index cites only two articles suggesting any opposition to mining claims or mining. In the 1930's complaints arose over miners cutting timber in the Bedwell Valley and in the 1940's complaints over the use of mineral tenures for residential buildings (probably referring to the use
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4"An Act to amend the Strathcona Park Act," Journals of the Legislative Assembly - Sessional Papers (cited as JLA below) Bill no. 33, March 28, 1918.

5Ibid.

6Ibid.

of mineral tenures around Buttle Lake for summer homes). In 1941 the Department of Mines published two volumes promoting exploration and mining in the Southwest of the Park. They describe locations of ore and how to overcome the difficulties of mining in the region, but do not mention impediments that park status would impose on mining. In his volume on the history of Island mining, long-time prospector and miner, Walter Guppy, does not report any problems he or other prospectors encountered working claims in the Park prior to 1972.

The absence of serious objections to early Strathcona mining stems from the general ineffectiveness of the conservationist movement relative to the power and influence of the mining industry. It also stems from the relative remoteness of mining activity in the southwest of the Park. Many conservationists were probably not aware of Bedwell mining, especially when they were preoccupied with defending from logging and damming the much-loved and relatively accessible Buttle Lake area.

Miners increasingly broadened their attention from the southwest of the Park to other areas, including Buttle Lake. Although prospecting was carried out around the Lake before the 1960's, no mining had occurred. In the 1950's and 60's several factors (the end of U.S. wartime impediments to mineral imports, rising demand for metals on world markets and lower costs of ocean shipping to Japan as well as other markets) spurred development of the B.C. mining industry. Within this context, Western Mines' claims near Buttle Lake became marketable.

In 1959 Western Mines began to acquire what eventually came to 23 Crown grants in the Myra Creek area. These grants were a strong form of lease which included the rights of a property owner for a 12 year renewable period. In order to regulate modern mining, most
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governmental jurisdictions have eliminated such strong tenures. They distinguish between mineral claims (exploration properties) and mineral leases (development properties). A "mineral claim" is the relatively weaker form of title governments initiated so that, for example, a claim holder could not control large areas of land by registering a claim. When exploration reveals a marketable orebody, a corporation designs a development plan and applies for a "mineral lease" which a government may grant to provide the security of tenure necessary to raise capital for construction of a mine. But because of a mine's far-reaching social, economic and environmental impacts, there are numerous reasons for a government in the public interest to regulate the industry by refusing a lease. In 1957 the Social Credit (SC) Government amended the Mineral Act to eliminate Crown grants in favour of a system of claims and leases.

Western's 23 Myra Creek Crown grants were not sufficient to construct a viable mine. Beginning in 1959, under the amended Mineral Act, Western Mines registered 162 mineral claims in the Myra Creek area. In 1961 it carried out extensive exploration and in June 1962 reported to shareholders that work was underway "to prove up enough ore to justify going into production as soon as possible" at a "copper zone" on their Buttle Lake property. By September 1962, drilling and tunneling had located concentrations of silver, copper, lead and zinc with "an estimated net smelter return of about $16 a ton, which would give a net operating profit per ton of approximately $9 on a 500 ton a day operation." In 1963 the company reiterated its intention of building a mine and in December announced 750 tons of ore could be extracted and milled daily, slightly under the amount eventually achieved. In June 1964 the directors decided to move ahead with the project, pending final financial arrangements. Conservationists who followed business section articles on mining likely attempted to organize

13 Anon, "Copper Zone Indicated on Island," Sun (June 29, 1962), 23.
16 Anon, "Western Mill Plan Considered - Feasibility Study Shows Ore Supply to Run Plant Six Years," Sun (May 20, 1964), 23. The article refers to a forthcoming meeting.
opposition to the imminent mine. But, excepting Alec Merriman's June 1962 article, the Newspaper Index up to 1964 does not cite articles pertaining to any conflict over the mine.\footnote{Alec Merriman, "Its War All Over Again: Industry Stalks Strathcona Park," Sun (June 28, 1962). 13. Merriman predicts the problems of the mine, town and tailings which don't arise as important public issues until three years later.}

In 1964 concerns about Strathcona mining surfaced in the B.C. Legislature in a general debate over mining and logging in all provincial parks. Because the SCP began as a party of political outsiders, there was a period of time after they came to power in 1952 when big business exerted relatively little control over the political arena. In this context, the SCP had passed the 1957 amendments to the \textit{Mineral Act} to better regulate the mining industry. But in the 1960's the Party backed off on increasing regulation and adopted a more \textit{laissez-faire} approach. Ken Kiernan, while he was Minister of Mines from 1959 to 1963, initiated this retrenchment. In 1963 Premier Bennett moved Kiernan from the Ministry of Mines to the Ministry of Recreation and Conservation. In the February 18th 1964 legislative session, Kiernan began the work that eventually earned him the moniker "Minister of Wreck and Con" among B.C. conservationists. At that time he outlined the policy of "multiple resource use" of provincial parks and said "a mining operation of 100 acres or less can provide hundreds of jobs without damaging the aesthetic values of a park."\footnote{Paraphrased in Jack Fry, "B.C. Parks May be Mined Logged - Not Wrong, Says Kiernan: Must Be Over 5,000 Acres," Colonist (Feb. 19, 1964). 13.} Outside the house Kiernan later specified he was referring to Western's mine in Strathcona Park. A public outcry opposed the new policy and, with the Western mine under construction, its manifestation in Strathcona Park. In a phrase that was often repeated, Roderick Haig-Brown, called the new policy the "big steal."\footnote{Jack Fry, "The Big Steal is On' - Kiernan is Unfit for Job Says Haig-Brown," Colonist (Feb. 19, 1964). 13. Haig-Brown wrote two articles: "Mr. Kiernan Sets Back Park Thinking by 60 Years," Sun (Feb. 22, 1964), 6; "New Park Act Imperative - First Giant Step: Sound Legislation," Times (March 13, 1964), 3, 13. Also see Anon, "Gov't Park Plan Branded 'Suicidal' - Expert Declares Mining, Logging Ban Necessary," Sun (Feb. 25, 1964), 21; Jack Fry, "Parks Act Due in Year," Colonist (Feb. 28, 1964). 1; and Anon, "Some Wilderness Need Recognized," Colonist (Feb. 29, 1964). 13.}

In the 1950's the New Democratic Party's (NDP) precursor, the Canadian Cooperative Federation, had supported the S.C. Government's initiative to dam Buttle Lake.\footnote{The B.C. executive council of the CCF supported the Buttle Lake dam proposed by the B.C. Power Commission in 1952 and reiterated this support in 1955. The 1955 executive pointed to the importance of the dam} But in the
1960's debate over park alienations a serious disagreement arose between the SCP and the NDP over the founding and protection of provincial parks. At the March 12th sitting, park alienations occupied the legislature in what is likely the longest and most heated legislative debate that has ever occurred over provincial parks in B.C. The "battle of the parks" centred around Mr. Kiernan's controversial speech of Feb. 19th "heralding a new approach to industrial activity in parks." Kiernan denied any policy shift and explained that he was simply clarifying the existing situation since there were already many forest and mineral tenures in parks. Still, the NDP Opposition and the Liberals strongly opposed the apparent policy shift until debate ended after eight hours and 35 minutes when Premier Bennett "snatched back" Mr. Kiernan's estimates, abruptly cutting off the "marathon debate."22

In the public debate, which followed the stormy legislative session, the B.C. Federation of Labour distributed a pamphlet protesting "logging of mature timber and mining in large wilderness parks." The pamphlet, agreeing with Haig-Brown, called the shift in policy the "Big Steal", advised citizens that the "parks belong to YOU...Don't let it happen", and called on people to lobby Kiernan, the Premier and their MLAs. Conservationist associations also spoke strongly against the policy shift and expressed concerns about legislation Kiernan promised for the next session.23

In the February 9th 1965 Throne Speech the Lieutenant Governor revealed that the Government was going to repeal the Recreation and Conservation Act and introduce the Park Act which would permit more logging and mining in parks. In their responses to the throne speech, the NDP Opposition and the Liberals (who had several seats) objected to logging and mining in parks and especially to Western's mine in Strathcona Park. Kiernan's response represented a significant moment in the parks/mining conflict. Since the mine's concentrate
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23 Ibid.
24 Anon, "Public is Outraged At 'Steal' - Labour," Colonist (May 1, 1964), 8.
would be shipped to the United States he could not argue the mine would either satisfy the needs of B.C. consumers or lead to secondary industry in the province. As expected, he emphasized the public interest in mine employment and economic development. But he also stressed the rights of claim stakers saying "it is useless for people to scream for him to clear up a situation created years ago when the Crown granted mining rights within the park boundaries" and that "it would be ridiculous for the government now to make things so tough for mining companies that they would be unable to exercise their rights."25 Thus, he seemed to lump together the 23 old Crown grants with 162 recent chattel interest mineral claims in the Park, while inferring mining is an inalienable right. Regardless of details concerning Western's claims and grants, from this perspective prospectors and mine corporations with any type of tenure could not be stopped, even if their activities were not in the public interest.26 Kiernan's stand was similar to that of the manager of the B.C. and Yukon Chamber of Mines who also made a strong statement at the time concerning miners' rights. In an extraordinary illustration of the unbounded quest for lode, Thomas Elliot told the Burnaby Chamber of Commerce that "[r]estricting the inherent right of prospectors and free miners to search for and develop mineral deposits wherever they occur works against the progress of the mining industry in B.C."27 "Prospectors and free miners" are benign euphemisms for capitalist corporations which dominate the Chamber of Mines. The Burnaby Chamber of Commerce didn't object to this stand. In public debate, mining in residential areas didn't arise as an issue and Kiernan reassured citizens that mining wouldn't be permitted in neighborhood parks. However, miners' rights would prevail in provincial parks.

On February 25th 1965 Kiernan introduced the new Park Act to the Legislature.28 Conservationists and the NDP Opposition and the Liberal opposition appreciated the need for

---

25 Paraphrased in Anon. "Strathcona - 'Gov't Can't Bar Mining in Park,'" Sun (February 10, 1965), 10. Hansard transcriptions were not made until the 1970's so I rely on newspaper accounts.

26 In a note of extreme irony, on the same day that Kiernan pointed to the weight of law and history that forces the Province to permit mining in parks, regardless of the public interest, he told the legislature that "the basis of the dynamic society must be confidence, a sense of purpose and leadership" and "We [the SCP] will not feel the job is complete until we have taken care of every human need within the province that the people themselves without our help are unable to take care of." Quoted in Anon. "Quit Bellyaching, Opposition Told - Cabinet Minister Kiernan Complains About Complaints," Sun (Feb. 10, 1965). 10.


28 JLA. Bill no.20, 1965.
some of the changes to the Recreation and Conservation Act. But clear opposition was raised to Section 7 of the Bill. It stated that the government may "cancel or re-establish any park established under this Act, and may revise the boundaries of any such park to increase or decrease the area of the park or to consolidate two or more parks or to divide an existing park into two or more parks" without legislative debate, through order-in-council. Objections were raised to this Section because it was hoped that the Recreation and Conservation Act would be changed to give legislative protection to parks because of fears that Kiernan and the SC Government would use it to open up parks to further logging and mining. During two hours of criticisms of the Bill, Dave Barrett (later NDP leader) said "[t]he minister in this act is placing himself in the dangerous position of having to play God, and as good as he is, he cannot play God." The NDP Opposition and the Liberals voted against the Bill but the SCP used its majority to pass it without amendments.

Public debate over the Park Act continued in 1965 and conservationists turned to the immediate problem of Strathcona mining. In 1957 the Strathcona Park Act had been repealed and the Park was established as a Class A park by an Order-in-Council under the Recreation and Conservation Act. Then, in 1962, the Ministry of Recreation and Conservation under Ken Kiernan downgraded the Bedwell Valley area of the park to Class B status permitting resource extraction. In June 1964, with construction of the 750-ton-per-day mill already underway, Kiernan formally permitted Western to mine in a Class A area of the Park. A year later, on May 13 1965, two months after the Park Act was passed, Cabinet passed an Order-in-Council
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31 LA Bill no. 20, 1965. For amendments the NDP proposed see: Anon, "Parks Act Approved Despite Opposition - Steered by Kiernan," Colonist (March 27, 1965), 5.
32 O.C. no.835, 1957; O.C. no. 557, 1962. The A and B classifications make little sense. In a Class A Park resource extraction is permitted only if it improves the Park's character as a park. In a Class B parks resource extraction is permitted if it is not detrimental to the Park's character as a park. However the obvious incompatibility of mining and, for example, picnicking in a normal understanding would not permit mining in even a Class B park. For a history of the classifications see Haig-Brown's articles: "Mr. Kiernan Sets Back Park Thinking by 60 Years," Sun (Feb. 22, 1964), 6; and "New Park Act Imperative - First Giant Step: Sound Legislation," Times (March 13, 1964), 3, 13.
designating further areas of Strathcona Class B, including the area around Western Mines' property. The Class B resource extraction areas were about the same size as three protected Nature Conservancy areas in the Park, until orders-in-council were passed to downgrade these protected areas as well. Map 5.1 (132) shows Strathcona's zoning for industrial development.

In response to the imminent destruction of much of Strathcona Park through mining operations during 1965 to 1967, three main issues arose: a town that Western planned to build south of Ralph River by Buttle Lake, the tailing deposits from the mine and further mineral exploration in Strathcona.

In January 1965 Western formed a subsidiary to acquire and maintain "houses; apartments; hotels; motels; motorcourts; rooming and boarding houses; recreational, educational and community facilities; housing accommodations of any kind and nature; stores and business accommodations..." Over the next year concerns arose over whether the company should be permitted to build a town, where it should be located, and how big it should be. So in the 1966 Legislative session Kiernan moved that a legislative committee be struck to study the Western plan and make recommendations. After extensive deliberation, the Committee recommended that a small town to house the 250 workers and their families could be built near the mine and Cabinet subsequently approved the plan. Western's general manager Charles Campbell, however, later explained that the town would not be built until the road was complete. Even after the road was built, Western never built the town. One of its main problems was that Canada Mortgaging and Housing would not finance the town since known ore reserves only gave the mine a life expectancy of 25 years. Today the company buses workers to the site so a company town is not a concern of the Friends of Strathcona Park.

---

34O.C. no. 1401, 1965.
The tailing deposits from the mine were and remain a larger problem. Of the 750 tons of ore milled per day, about 150 tons of concentrate would be exported from the Province for smelting. The remaining 600 tons of finely powdered low-grade ore mixed with water and production process chemicals, called "tailings," would be deposited daily in the Park. It was first thought that the tailings would be deposited at land sites selected by the Ministry of Recreation and Conservation. But in February 1966 Western's Charles Campbell told the Committee, investigating the town, that tailings would be pumped into Buttle Lake. Fortunately, Campbell explained, although the Lake's water "may be a little bit murky", the tailings would not contaminate it. It was within the Committee's mandate to consider the town's sewage but it was not instructed to address the tailings problem. Yet Campbell told the Committee that the government had not officially considered potential pollution problems from the 600 tons/day accumulation of tailings from the mill which was under construction. Moreover daily doses of 600 tons of tailings posed a far more serious problem than sewage from a small town. So the Committee wound up its hearings by considering the tailings.

The Ministry of Water Resources, rather than the Ministry of Recreation and Conservation, was unexpectedly the licensing authority. But the Deputy Minister of Water Resources, in attendance to discuss the town sewage, was only apprised of this fact during Campbell's presentation to the Committee. Nevertheless, the Deputy Minister did not seem overly perturbed, assuring the Committee that he would send off "nasty letters" if it appeared pollution was imminent. Although it seemed particularly offensive to dump the tailings in the Lake, Campbell advised the Committee that this would be better than land deposits. Tailings could be pumped to 100 feet below the surface of the Lake but if they were deposited on land rain water would wash the impurities into the Lake's surface.

39 Jack Fry, "If Mine Dumps Into Buttle 'Murky Water But No Peril,'" Colonist (Feb. 17, 1966), 1, 2.
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In Kiernan's brief to the Committee he reiterated his argument that Strathcona mining did not stem from Social Credit policy. He specified it resulted from previous governments which had amended the *Strathcona Park Act* in 1918 and had granted claims (the 23 Crown grants) in the Myra Creek area in 1924. He further advised that the government would have to pay 30 to 40 million dollars to eliminate Western's alienations in the park. With concerns over the new problem of tailing deposits rising, in a March 1966 sitting of the legislature the NDP's Strachan made a detailed critique of Kiernan's Strathcona policies. He agreed that part of the justification for Strathcona mining stemmed from previous governments which had granted some of the claims. But he pointed out that 162 claims at the southwestern end of Buttle, essential to Western's profitability, were granted between 1959 and 1963 while Kiernan was Minister of Mines. Moreover, since Kiernan became Minister of Recreation and Conservation, his "every action" has been "directed toward giving the people with whom he dealt as Minister of Mines, everything they needed to utilize the property he gave them as Minister of Mines."

Strachan maintained that Kiernan changed parts of Strathcona Park from Class A to Class B status in the May 1965 Order-in-Council specifically in order to profit Western Mines. As for the tailings, Strachan said that "after Western issued a prospectus of its Strathcona holdings in 1962, the government passed an order-in-council placing Buttle Lake outside the jurisdiction of the Pollution Control Board."

With construction of the mine almost complete, however, on August 11th 1966, Western applied to the Pollution Control Board (PCB) to dump tailings in the Lake. Conservationists believed that because of general public dismay over dumping poisonous tailings into the Lake there would be public hearings; however, the PCB subsequently permitted Western to dump the tailings without such hearings.

---
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The B.C. Wildlife Federation was probably the most active group in opposing the tailing deposits and the lack of hearings on the issue.49 The Federation worried about damage to the fish habitat in Strathcona and the rivers flowing from it, as well the precedent being set for mine pollution without debate elsewhere in the province. The B.C. Chapter of the Canadian Society of Wildlife and Fishery Biologists prepared a report showing the potential dangers of the tailing deposits.50 Buttle Lake drains into the Campbell River from which Campbell River draws its drinking water, so the tailings were not only a park and fishery issue but also a vital public health concern. Campbell River opponents distributed bumper stickers saying "Drink Tailings - Campbell River's Exclusive Beverage."51 The Chamber of Commerce sent letters to MLAs protesting the absence of public hearings in Campbell River over the issue. Councillor Ken Forde distributed 2,000 petitions in nine central Island communities. The Campbell River and District Pollution Control Society organized a demonstration on the steps of the Legislative Building in Victoria.52 However, the most vigorous local opposition came from the Campbell River District Water Board.

The Board commissioned the B.C. Research Council to study the planned tailing deposits. The Council criticized Western's research and showed that there could be serious dangers from the tailings.53 The PCB failed to consider this evidence when it permitted the tailing deposits, so the Board went to the B.C. Supreme Court to have the permits repealed. The Court dismissed the case in October 1966 because the PCB was acting only in an administrative and not judicial capacity. The Board then appealed its case to the B.C. Court of Appeal which held in January 1967 that the PCB had indeed acted in a judiciary capacity and that natural justice had thus been violated.54 One Judge said "he could not conceive that the legislature, in creating the Pollution Control Act, had meant that a person's objections to interference with his rights should be so

51Anon, "Buttle Lake Battle Grows: Chamber, Councillor, Lawyer Fight Dumping," Sun (Sept. 27, 1966), 1, 2.
lightly dismissed" and the PCB "should not have denied the district opportunity to support its objections by material and technical evidence." Thus, the Court quashed the dumping permits.

After this ruling, conservationists were more outraged because the mine was dumping tailings into a holding pond which overflowed into the once-beautiful Myra Creek thence into Buttle Lake and the Campbell River water supply. Moreover, workers were building a tunnel to carry tailings into the Lake as if they had a permit. As a result, the Water Board launched a suit in the Supreme Court seeking an injunction on Western to stop it from dumping tailings into the overflowing ponds. The SCP used its majority to prohibit debate on the tailings but, during debate over spending estimates, the NDP argued that since Western was continuing to pour tailings into the Lake, the company was in contempt of the Court that quashed its permits. The NDP's Gordon Dowding charged that like union leaders who go to jail for contempt of Court, Western's managers and/or owners should be jailed.

In April 1967 Western went to the B.C. Court of Appeal seeking an eight month stay on the previous decision to quash Western's discharge permits. By that time the Supreme Court of Canada would have decided whether it would hear an appeal Western had launched over the lower court ruling. The B.C. Appeal Court considered the Water Board's research which showed that Western Mines' research had not established that there would be no negative effects from the tailings. The Court held that the onus was on the Water Board to prove there would be ill effects from the tailing deposits rather than on the government or Western to show that they would cause no harm. It then weighed the interests of 250 workers, Western's $15 million operation, and the $100,000 cost of another tailings pond against the possibility of pollution to Campbell River's water supply. In a crucial lesson to Island conservationists of the necessity to stop mining at the initial phase of mineral exploration, the unanimous decision found that the "balance of convenience" necessitated permitting Western to dump tailings while its appeal

---

proceeded to the Supreme Court of Canada. In April 1967 Western recommenced pumping tailings into the Lake.

During this legal dispute, Liberal Party Leader Ray Perrault suggested that a compromise could be reached if the main parties to the dispute had a meeting. A meeting was held in Ken Kiernan's office on April 19, 1967 with three parties in attendance: the directors of Western Mines; the directors of the Campbell River Water Board and their lawyer, Anthony Sarich; and, for the Government, Minister of Recreation and Conservation, Ken Kiernan, the Resources Minister, Ray Williston (who was responsible for the PCB), and Campbell River's MLA Dan Campbell. An agreement was reached and signed by the three parties on April 21st 1967 by which: (1) Western Mines agreed to drop its Supreme Court of Canada appeal; (2) the three parties agreed to share the expense of hiring a pollution expert to assess the danger of tailing deposits; (3) the PCB agreed to hold public hearings on the tailing deposits after the expert's report was submitted; and (4) the Government agreed that Western Mines would be the sole industrial user in that area of the Park.

The third main issue in the 1960's dispute over Strathcona mining concerned the last point of the above agreement: that Western would remain the sole industrial user in the vicinity. In 1964 Western Mines stopped staking claims in the mineralized belt outside of the area of its proposed mine and a small company called Cream Silver began staking numerous claims south of the Western mine in the Price Creek area. One month after he signed the agreement, Ken Kiernan permitted Cream to carry out mineral exploration claiming that "Cream Silver has the right to mine silver subject only to government guidelines." What this seemed to suggest was that

62 Larkin et al, 1988 (Appendix 4, p.6) is a table showing the history of claim staking in the park.
63 Anon, "Silver Exploration Permitted in the Park," Sun (June 13, 1967), 1, 2. The president of Cream Silver (and also industrial development manager of the Crown corporation B.C. Hydro) Frank Lang, said "his company
Cream Silver's legal rights superseded the Campbell River Board's concerns about public health as well as the agreement Kiernan and the others had just signed. Conservationists strongly opposed permits for more exploration that would further desecrate the Park; moreover, if, as a result of such exploration, another mine was built it would add to Western's unresolved pollution problems. Robert Strachan rejected Kiernan's stand that the Province was legally obliged to let Cream develop its claims, stating that he and his Party "are opposed to any mining in parks except when it is necessary to extract metals because of extreme shortages or in times of state emergencies."

The declining number of citations in the Newspaper Index suggests that by 1968 Strathcona mining had already faded as an issue. In 1968 the Campbell River and District Pollution Control Society complained about the absence of public hearings; nevertheless none was held. Also in 1968, G.B. Langford, who had been hired by the three parties, present at the meeting in Kiernan's office, requested more time to complete his studies.

Conservationists who participated in the 1950's campaign to prevent damming of Buttle Lake feel that, although they did not stop the dam, they at least influenced the Government to

---

64 His agreement in this respect is specified in a statement of fact in a 1988 trial. However, Kiernan breaking his vow does not seem to arise as a public issue in 1967. I have not seen the 1967 Agreement to confirm whether it specified no further resource extraction would be carried on in the Park. (Anon, "Lawyer: B.C. broke vow, so park protest valid," *Times-Colonist* (May 25, 1988), A3.
fell the trees before flooding, and to minimize fluctuations in the Lake's water level. However, little was achieved in the 1960's as to mining and logging in Strathcona. Part of the difficulty conservationists had in opposing Strathcona mining was that they were simultaneously involved in a struggle to stop logging in the park. During the 1960's, despite serious opposition, the SC Government swapped large areas of Strathcona timber to acquire small parks elsewhere, adding to the general distrust and animosity among Strathcona defenders. While conservationists were struggling over logging and mining in it, Highway 28, linking the East coast to resource communities on the West Coast, was built through the Park without opposition. Conservationists appreciated the 1968 addition of the Forbidden Plateau area to the Park. But it also left a sour taste due to Kiernan using this addition as an trade-off for mining in the middle of the Park. Moreover, what use were additions to parks if mining could be carried on in them? Similarly, any joy conservationists might have taken in there finally being a road to Buttle Lake was sullied by its construction and use mainly for industrial workers and mine haul trucks (taking their load to the Strait of Georgia) rather than for recreation and tourism.

Resentment intensified as additions were made to Western's mine from the moment it first caught conservationists attention in 1964, including a wharf, a road, a mill, tailing deposits, hydro projects on the small alpine lakes above the mine and, later, an open pit as well an underground mine. The latter development led Strachan to accuse Western of "subterfuge and deceit" and to argue that the company would not have been allowed to mine in the Park if it had been candid about its future plans. One business section reporter described the role that the

---


70 In 1929 T.D. Patullo conceived the Forbidden Plateau addition as a trade off for damming Buttle Lake. Anon, "New Attack Against Park Deal Launched," *Sun* (March 12, 1929), 22.


72 Quoted in Anon, "Real Plan Hidden Charges Strachan," *Times* (Oct. 26, 1966), 13. Strachan may have been right. Two weeks before Charles Campbell announced the company's plan to dump tailings in the Lake, he told reporters "Western feels it is a guinea pig in the park-mining experiment and as such is bending over backwards in proving the experiment can work, and possibly influence future policy decisions." As evidence of this commitment he showed the reporters drawings of buildings "to be made of wood, the facings in natural cedar, with splashings of colored aluminum. Even the concentrator will be built of wood and translucent colored plastic" (Dunc Holmes,
government played as follows: "Howls of protest are being carried through to the highest court in the land, but the mining company, with the provincial government running interference, goes resolutely ahead with production plan [emphasis added]."73

Adding insult to injury, opponents of the tailing discharges were repeatedly accused of being overly emotional. In contrast to scientific reports, Charles Campbell argued that in his opinion the minerals in the water would improve public health.74 Kiernan claimed to have drunk a glass of the undiluted effluent and said: "It was a bit cloudy and it tasted as if it had a little bit of baking soda in it, but it certainly didn't have any dangerous chemicals in it."75 When it became apparent that the outflow into Buttle Lake of 600 tonnes per day of finely ground rock would not be stopped, Kiernan stated "I've always understood that rock is heavier than water and sinks."76 Premier, W.A.C. Bennett, patronized conservationists that were concerned about tailing deposits by saying "[t]he worst pollution of the air is by people smoking and the worst pollution of water is by people drinking."77

Civil disobedience was used in the 1960's at Simon Fraser University and also in a dispute over proposed construction of a freeway through a Vancouver residential area. So it would not have been surprising if civil disobedience had been employed following the escalation of tensions over the Western mine to prevent Cream Silver from carrying out mineral exploration; however, such action did not happen then.

Both mining advocates and conservationists made use of the 1960's experience. Ministers of the Environment in the 1980's reiterated Kiernan's stand advocating the supremacy of miners' rights in parks. Conservationists' lingering animosity over the failed campaigns to halt mining

"Only Town is Missing - Western Rolls in Summer With First Trucks of Ore," Sun (Feb. 5, 1966), 24. In spite of these details, Campbell did not reveal the big plan to dump tailings in Buttle Lake which he must have been aware of since the company was stock piling ore for the soon to be completed mill. Campbell and directors likely knew the outrage tailings in Buttle Lake would cause and deliberately withheld information, as Strachan argued, so that by the time problems arose too much capital was invested in the project to stop it. The more serious question is how culpable the government was in withholding information.

74 Anon, "Buttle Lake Battle Won't Be Halted," Sun (April 11, 1967), 12.
77 Quoted in Ian Hunter, "Bennett Tells Mine Critics to Quit Smoking, Drinking," Sun (June 15, 1967), 39.
and logging in the 1960's helped increase citizen support for the Friends of Strathcona's 1988 blockade. Conservationists learned that B.C. Governments, especially those led by the SCP, will engage in apparent subterfuge to support mining interests. Finally, the 1960's dispute demonstrated the necessity of stopping mining at the initial exploration phase before capital investment occurs and workers are employed.

The NDP attempt to regulate the mining industry

This section concerns the NDP's attempts to prohibit resource extraction in parks and to regulate the mining industry. It also considers how these initiatives contributed to the NDP's 1975 electoral loss to the SCP, establishing the political situation that the Friends inherited.

The Strathcona mining issue died down after 1967 but did not go away. The NDP's Dave Barrett and Robert Strachan continued to criticize the SCP's managing of the Park. Jim Boulding, owner of Strathcona Park Lodge just outside the Park boundaries, who was later the principal founder of the Friends of Strathcona, complained in 1969 about a leak in a tailings pipe. Also in 1969, the expert hired to investigate Buttle Lake pollution found that no significant damage had been caused by the tailing deposits. However, a January 1971 Provincial Government report indicated an alarming increase in lead and copper concentrations in Buttle Lake fish. This prompted Mayor Ken Forde of Campbell River to state that "it can only be a matter of time before the tailings kill everything in the Lake and ruin our water supply." On December 9th 1971 Kiernan reportedly said he had ordered Western to stop dumping tailings in Buttle Lake. The following day he claimed he had been misquoted and had said only that Western had volunteered to begin using land deposits. In response Dave Barrett objected to the tailings as well as to a permit Kiernan gave Western Mines to explore on Cream Silver's claims.

---
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He then called Kiernan the "give-away gang secretary" for his role in opening up parks to logging and mining.82

In the 1972 legislative session another heated debate arose over Strathcona Park.83 Ken Kiernan defended mines in parks and said that some large wilderness parks might be downsized. He repeated his old argument that the reason there was mining in Strathcona was because of Crown grants that pre-dated the SCP's 1952 election; Strachan also reiterated in his rebuttal that the SCP and Kiernan had granted mineral claims and a lease which had made the mine possible. In response Kiernan yelled "that's not true" with his face "twisting in anger."84 The debate continued:

Barrett accused Kiernan of talking "nonsense and claptrap" about previously established claims in the park and charged: "You have bent over backwards to let mining companies into our parks." "I have listened to some awful trash tonight" snapped Kiernan, "and I'm getting fed up with this socialist attitude of slamming everything." "They're Commies," remarked Willis Jefcoat (SC - Shushwap).85

This bluster appears to have resulted from Kiernan's inability to defend his Strathcona policies without misrepresenting Strathcona's tenure history.

In its campaign for the 1972 election the SCP showed a film called Twenty Great Years which reviewed progress made in the Party's twenty continuous years in office. In its campaign, one of the ways the NDP criticized the twenty year term concerned the SCP's dismal record on parks. Dave Barrett, the new NDP leader, observed that while the number of parks had risen rapidly due to the creation of small regional parks, parkland acreage had simultaneously fallen dramatically as a result of cuts in the size of large wilderness parks.86 In addition, many existing wilderness parks, especially Strathcona Park, were used for resource extraction. Barrett

82Anon, "NDP Leader Flays Western Mines Handling - Kiernan 'Give-Away Gang Secretary,'" Colonist (Dec. 15, 1971), 28. After the main controversy over Strathcona mining died down, Cream and Western entered a formal agreement. From 1971 to 1973, Western explored for minerals on Cream's claims with the idea of "a close arrangement between the two companies being evolved should the exploration results warrant a combination of interests" (Cream Silver's Submission to the WAC, Williams et al, 1986) Western's 1971 Annual Report explains: "An option was taken on a 70% interest in the Cream Silver property." The 1972 Report explains: "Western holds 50,000 common shares of Cream Silver Mines" and details the extensive mineral exploration Western carried out on the Cream/Western property.

83Ian Hunter, "Kiernan defends mining in B.C. parks," Sun (March 30, 1972), 1, 2.
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promised that an NDP Government would end this multiple use of parks, a stand that likely contributed to the NDP victory in the November 1972 election.

As Raymond Payne explains, when the NDP came to office after decades in opposition it had three broad objectives regarding natural resources: to effect "a significant redistribution of the Province's income through increased taxation of resource corporations;" to promote "growth based on the diversification of the economy away from its reliance on the export of primary products;" and to develop "a broad regulatory structure designed to protect the public interest against the detrimental effects of unrestrained resource development."87 The goal of founding and protecting parks fell within the third of these broad objectives.

Premier Dave Barrett appointed Leo Nimsick to the Ministry of Mines and Bob Williams to the Ministry of Lands, Forests and Water Resources as well as to the Ministry of Recreation and Conservation. In a 1972 News Release, Williams explained the importance of parks for the "development and well-being of the Province's most important resource - its people." To this end, "It is proposed, then, to preserve some of the most outstanding examples of the natural heritage of British Columbia before it is too late by setting aside new provincial parks, by extending the boundaries of some existing parks, and by better protecting all provincial parks."88 In the Spring 1973 sitting of the legislature, the NDP increased the protection of some existing parks and established a group of new parks through amendments to the Park Act.89 Schedule A in the amended Act listed 71 existing parks that were made into statute Parks and Schedule B listed ten new parks which would be designated as Statute parks from the outset. As with existing B.C. parks, the new ones were located mainly in northern and high elevation areas with little potential for urban development or resource extraction. Conservationists would have liked more of the rapidly disappearing unlogged lowland forest to be protected; nevertheless, the new parks that increased wilderness parkland by 25% were generally appreciated. One park advocate

referred to it as "British Columbia's Parks Bonanza." The Liberals and Conservatives supported the amendments and the SCP Opposition, aware of the unpopularity of its stand on parks, did not object.

Strathcona was not made into a Statute park at this time. However, it received increased protection through a "moratorium on resource extraction in parks". In the Spring 1973 Session, the NDP amended the Mineral Act to prohibit claim-staking in parks. The existing tenures in parks were a larger problem. The NDP attempted to negotiate with claim holders for these tenures. However, it was difficult to reach an agreement with claim holders, especially since under the SCP Government, they had become accustomed to mineral claims granting near ownership of the land and the unknown ore in the ground. The NDP unsuccessfully attempted to acquire Cream Silver's Strathcona claims. If the NDP had passed an order-in-council prohibiting mineral exploration in parks, a legal challenge could have arisen. A 1990 Decision which stemmed from such an order held that claims stakers' deeds should not be turned into "meaningless pieces of paper" through an order-in-council. This decision indicated that if the province wanted to expropriate claims, rather than passing orders-in-councils, it should pass appropriate legislation. Likely the NDP considered this option, but, perhaps because they had a number of important objectives in its first term in office, it did not follow this course. Instead, the NDP amended the Mineral Act to require existing claim holders to apply to the Province for special authorization to work claims in parks, thereby bringing it in line with the Park Act. In addition, the NDP changed Ken Kiernan's policy concerning the issue of park-use-permits. Bob Williams' February, 1973 policy shift did not entirely prohibit mining and logging in parks. But in Class B parks the only resource extractions allowed were those which "seem necessary to the planned recreational use of the park, or those which are clearly demonstrated as not detrimental to the recreational values of the park, or those which cover a social service..."

91John Gibbs, "NDP hopes to build parks to 1952 level," Sun (April 13, 1973), 17.
demonstrated as vital to the public service." In effect, non-statute Class B parks became Class A parks via government fiat.

Concerning Strathcona Park, Williams explained that its uses for transportation, communications and hydroelectric generation would not be eliminated, and he further specified that the Government would not close down Western's operation. However, he also announced that triple stumpage fees would be charged for any timber cut by Western, that Western could not build a town and that the mine operation would be inspected on a weekly basis. By far the greatest limitation on Western however was its land-use restriction on its existing property in the form of a general moratorium on resource extraction in parks as well as additional legislation to better regulate the industry.

One of the main criticisms that the SCP and the mining industry levelled at the NDP in the 1973 legislative session concerned the Land Commission Act and amendments to the Mineral Resources Act. The amendments to the Mineral Resources Act strengthened the distinction between claims and leases. The mining industry opposed this amendment because it felt that staking a mineral claim should indicate property ownership in the same form as the old Crown grants rather than a chattel interest. In the 1974 session, the main SCP criticisms concerned passage of the Mineral Royalties Act.

The NDP had often criticized the SC policy of taxing only the profits of mining corporations with the result that firms which did not make any profits (for example, because profits were diverted into exploration) did not pay taxes. Indeed, the tax rate on the mining industry was lower than any other industry in the province. The NDP made a "fundamental decision" not to participate directly in mineral exploration or production through a Crown Corporation. Instead, it would amend the Mineral Act and pass the Mineral Royalties Act to regulate the
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industry and increase provincial revenues. After a stormy legislative debate with strong objections from Liberals, Conservatives and Socreds, in June 1974 the NDP passed the *Mineral Royalties Act* to compel corporations to pay for the ore they extracted, regardless of profitability.99

The principal mine industry groups, the Mining Association of B.C. and the B.C. and Yukon Chamber of Mines, launched a concerted campaign against this legislation.100 These groups sent dozens of delegations to lobby MLAs, organized public meetings, and disseminated their views in the television, radio and print media. They contended that NDP policy would lead to job loss and, ultimately, threaten the mine industry so that "the entire provincial economy was therefore in danger."101 Socreds, Liberals, Conservatives, chambers of commerce, major newspapers, engineers, stock brokers, and financial institutions joined the huge campaign. While large companies did not officially threaten to close their mines, their ads created the impression that this was a serious possibility.102 Moreover, they backed up their opposition "with significant reductions in their mineral exploration budgets" to pressure the government into changing its mining policies."103

Raymond Payne's research shows there are two main reasons why companies would leave the province or reduce their investments. Firstly, the lower provincial profitability attendant on the NDP legislation could make it more profitable for a company to invest elsewhere, even if a short-term financial loss occurred in the sale of fixed assets. Secondly, companies could reduce their investment or leave for a short time to force the government to change its offensive policies: that is, the industry could go on strike. Both possibilities arose in the case of Western's Strathcona mine at which the problem of increased taxation of the mining industry was

99Bill no.31, 1974.  
100The Association is formed of a select group of multinational corporations while the Chamber, although dominated by large corporations, also has numerous smaller mineral exploration company members and is involved in the Yukon as well as B.C. (Payne, 1982: 18).  
102Ibid, 18, 19.  
103Ibid, 21.
exacerbated by Western's restriction to its existing property by the moratorium on resource extraction in parks.

Following the June 1974 passage of the *Mineral Royalties Act*, an August 1974 report by the president of Western to shareholders explained that profits were down. Then, in December the Company announced that it was considering closing or cutting back its Myra Creek operation because of Federal and Provincial taxes, as well as the escalation of costs of labour and supplies in the face of declining metal prices. In January 1975 Western laid off 75 workers. At the company's annual meeting in May 1975 Western's president complained about:

> the savage, confiscatory taxation to which we and others in the industry are exposed. Under these conditions, there is clearly no incentive whatsoever to spend one cent in B.C. and all our activities have been diverted to other jurisdictions, whilst development on the mine itself has been restricted to the a point where it is directed towards already discovered ore.

Western's directors used these problems to explain the company's lower production level (with the consequent layoffs) and to rationalize to shareholders their earlier decision to make a large investment in a U.S. coal mine. The NDP and the United Steelworkers of America Local 954 objected to this position, particularly because the company had refused to provide documentation proving its declining profits. So, the question arises as to whether the impediments that the company faced actually forced it to lay off workers.

---

105 Anon, "Western Eyes Shutdown of Mine," *Sun* (Dec. 16, 1974), 29. When the NDP came into power metal prices were on a rise but in 1974 they went into a slump due to rising oil prices. At the same time the Federal Liberal Government disallowed mineral royalties as deductions against federal taxes. But the news media and public debate tended to focus on the problem the NDP's policy was causing for the industry, since this is where a lobby could have the greatest effect (Payne 1979, 1982). It is possible the Federal Liberal Government was attempting to make matters worse for the B.C. NDP, because of the broader national and international concerns about the election of socialists. At a 1972 meeting of Canadian and European investors in Europe, shortly after the NDP victory, "An array of high-powered Canadian business leaders [...] issued strong reassurance to European investors that their money and talents will be warmly received in Canada despite what some described as recent unsettling trends". However, the Canadian business leaders and Liberal MPs themselves aroused concerns by complaining about the problem caused by the NDP's election [Canadian Press, London, "B.C. Politics a Major Worry," *Times* (Dec. 1, 1972), 9]. In the 1974 Federal election campaign, Pierre Trudeau, the Liberal Prime Minister, while campaigning in B.C., spoke against the NDP at a Kimberly stop charging "the N.D.P.'s mining policies were selfishly motivated and undermined Canada as a whole" (Payne, 1979: 278).
One shareholder, John Whitworth, at Western's AGM charged that the US investment had been made at the request of officers from a large corporation called W.R. Grace & Co. which held 24.5% of Western's outstanding shares. He then described the deal as a "swindle" to take shareholders' money to put it into a coal mining operation in the U.S. and added: "I think it is damnable that shareholders are not getting any return (in dividends) at present." It seems that Western's financial woes were not as great as the directors claimed, providing evidence that the company laid off workers not just as a result of the shrinking profits stemming from the NDP's legislation, but also to force an end to the moratorium on resource extraction in Strathcona and/or to rescind the Mineral Royalties Act. Steel Workers and the NDP emphasized the latter interpretation. When the layoffs were announced, the president of the United Steel Workers of America Local 954 alleged that the proposal was a "cheap political move"; after the layoffs had occurred, he urged the NDP to nationalize the Company. Comox MLA, Karen Sanford (NDP), told the Legislature that Western "has been pleading poverty to exert pressure on the provincial government and discredit the Mineral Royalties Act."

While the mine industry launched a huge campaign to oppose increasing regulation of the industry, there was little support in the province for increased regulation other than from the Steelworkers. The NDP had several other equally contentious objectives which occupied most Ministers and MLAs. Meanwhile, no citizen group launched any campaign to support the government. The mine industry's campaign delayed and influenced the NDP legislation and policy. Moreover, Payne alleges that the lobby of the Association and the Chamber likely contributed to the NDP's 1975 electoral loss due to the bad publicity. Several ridings in which mines and mineral exploration were situated voted for the NDP in 1972 but switched to the SCP in 1975.

110 Anon, "Pressure tactics charged," Sun (Feb. 27, 1975), 7.
Probably upon election, the SCP considered continuing NDP mining policy, which would have represented a return to the early tradition of the SCP. As Payne explains: "The early [1950's] efforts of this administration in the mining field were more interventionist than its subsequent political rhetoric would indicate, and laid the groundwork for the more far-reaching NDP mining program of 1972-75."111 However, following the election the SCP rescinded the NDP's amendments to the Mineral Act as well as the Mineral Royalties Act. The NDP, presumably because it was cowed by its loss at the polls, did not oppose the reversal of the policy it had set.112 Payne shows that the NDP's electoral loss, followed by the return to the status quo of 1972 regulatory and taxation policy illustrates the power of the mining industry.

The control of the mining industry in British Columbia, like that of Canada as a whole, is highly concentrated in the hands of a small number of large corporations. The confrontation that developed between the NDP government and the mining industry brought into sharp focus the intimate relationship between politics and economic policy formation. The campaign that the mining industry waged against the NDP's mineral policy was one of the most powerful, sustained and effective efforts waged by an organized interest group in the recent political history of the province...113

So the strong influence which Western had in influencing the government to ignore the idea that mining is inappropriate in parks was replicated in the mine industry's general power over the government's policy on mining.

One cannot know what ecological problems the Province would face today had the NDP remained in power. A "green" political perspective might welcome the failure of the NDP's plans to develop derivative mining industries. Secondary industry would have likely increased regional pollution associated with smelting and refining. Such developments, when coupled with manufacturing, would likely have led to rapid population growth and increased demand for resources, leading to and even more rapid resource depletion. But because of the SCP's dismal record in founding and protecting parks relative to that of the NDP, the reelection of the SCP worsened the Friends' future problems relating to Strathcona mineral exploration and mining. The entrenchment by the 1976/77 legislative sessions of the rights of mineral holders proved
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troublesome for park advocates. Nevertheless, the NDP moratorium on resource extraction in parks gave non-statute parks such as Strathcona at least temporary protection.

*Legal conflict over mining in B.C. parks*

After enacting this moratorium, the NDP permitted limited mineral exploration in some provincial parks including the southwest corner of Strathcona Park. But generally the NDP policy was to prohibit mineral exploration in parks. Within this context, an important legal battle took place which set a precedent with which the Friends would later have to grapple.

During the brief NDP reign in the 1970's, a consortium of interests called the Tener group applied to the B.C. Parks Division for a park-use-permit to work its Crown grants in Wells Gray Park. The Division denied permission on the grounds that "the construction of 9 miles of industrial road across Park land" would conflict with clauses in the Park Act concerning Class B parks. Although the SCP was returned to power in 1975, and quickly rescinded most of the NDP's mining policies, the Socreds continued the moratorium on resource extraction in parks. So Tener's applications for park-use-permits in 1975, 1976, and 1977 were refused. In 1978 Tener again applied; this time the Parks Division refused the permit explaining that their policy was to refuse further mineral exploration in parks. However, Tener could submit a bill for expenses incurred to date in working its claim which the Government would reimburse. In response, Tener contended that the province was expropriating its claims and therefore it should be paid for not only for its expenses but also for its property: the ore in the ground.

In 1979 Tener sued the Province in the Supreme Court of British Columbia claiming $1,500,000 for expenses and $3,000,000 for the expropriated ore. The parties agreed that Tener's Crown grants gave them the right to the subterranean ore. Crown counsel, however, argued that Tener neither had the right to the surface land nor the right to access the claims on a road built through the park. Tener argued that it had the right *a prendre* to its ore. The Supreme Court of B.C. decided in favour of the Province. Tener then appealed to the B.C. Court of
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Appeal which subsequently found that Tener had suffered an injury which the Province must compensate. Eventually, the highest court in Canada, the Supreme Court of Canada, dismissed the Province's appeal in the 1985 Tener decision. In this case, it was found that Tener had both suffered an injury and that its ore had been expropriated. The Province owed Tener just compensation for both aspects.

The costs of the injury could have been tabulated through a formula which considered the investment Tener made on the tenures over some period of time as well as its lost opportunity costs. But no clear formula existed for compensating indefinite ore reserves. The costs of production could be deducted from the value of the ore in the ground. But the cost of acquiring claims in all actual and proposed parks would then be astronomical as a result of several factors: miners are optimistic about how much ore is in the ground while negotiating over expropriation; the costs of production and market values are difficult to estimate for an unknown ore; and there are hundreds of claims in provincial parks and other areas that conservationists recommend for parkland. If the Tener decision were extended to all mineral tenures in actual and proposed parks, the government would be forced to: (1) permit mining in parks in a similar manner to other areas; (2) change provincial laws pertaining to land use as it applies, for example, to Indian land claims, parks, mines and expropriation; and/or, (3) ignore or procrastinate over the Tener decision. Concerning Tener's claims, the SCP followed the first of these options by amending the Park Act. They revised the boundaries of Wells Gray Park which the NDP had made a Statute Class A Park in 1973; established the "Wells Gray Recreation Area" over Tener's claims so that Wells Gray, like Strathcona, became a "doughnut park"; and allowed for changes to be made to Wells Gray boundaries by order-in-council "solely for the purpose of providing access to the Wells Gray Recreation Area." The NDP did not oppose these amendments which
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passed in a group of Miscellaneous Statutes, underscoring the limited protection the Province afforded to Statute Class A parks.

Cream Silver had brought suit against the Province at the same time as Tener, but the B.C. Supreme Court waited until the Tener decision came down in 1985 before hearing Cream's case. Cream had not applied for park-use-permits following the 1973 moratorium but, instead, had attempted to settle with the Province. No agreement was subsequently reached, so Cream wanted the Court to extend the Tener decision concerning Crown grants in Wells Gray Park to Cream's mineral claims in Strathcona Park. Since Cream had not been refused a park-use-permit as had Tener, Justice Southin explained: "The only question before me is whether the right which the plaintiff has is 'land' within s. 11 of the Park Act. If it is, then the plaintiff will seek to show that the lands have been expropriated."122

Justice Southin held that Tener's 1937 Crown grants were different from Cream's 1960's mineral claims. After considering the definition of land in the Park Act and the amended text of the Mineral Act, the Justice held that Cream Silver's mineral claims were not an interest in land. She thus ruled for the Province and did not proceed to the second question concerning expropriation. Since Cream owned only the subterranean resource and not the surface land, the Province could have prevented Cream Silver from working its claims by refusing to issue park-use-permits. Cream's only remaining recourse would be to take the matter to a higher court.

After 1975 the reelected SC government generally maintained the NDP policy against mining and logging in provincial parks. By the 1980's, Buttle Lake had been flooded, extensive areas of the Park had been logged and there was a mine in the middle of the Park as well as Highway 28 running through it. Strathcona had become part Class B park and part Nature Conservancy. However, apart from the Park areas with existing industrial uses (including the mine property), the Class B areas were transferred into de facto Class A park (but not a Statute Class A park), by the NDP's 1973 moratorium on resource extraction in parks. At the same time,
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Strathcona and other parks were endangered by the Tener decision. However, this decision did not apply to Cream Silver's Strathcona mineral claims. But the extraordinary power that Western Mines demonstrated in establishing itself in the Park, as well as the power of the mining industry in general that was shown in its 1970's campaign against NDP policy, continued to threaten the Park: particularly after the election of a Socred Government clearly sympathetic to mining interests. This brings us up to more particular events influencing the Friends of Strathcona, as well as their defeated NDP allies, in the battle against mining interests in the Park.

5.2 The 1986 Formation of the Friends of Strathcona Park

This section first addresses the 1985 creation by the SCP of the Wilderness Advisory Committee to help resolve conflicts over wilderness lands. Attention then turns to how concerns that the Committee's recommendations would permit further resource extraction in Strathcona Park helped spark the formation of the Friends of Strathcona Park. Finally, I consider the Socred's January 1987 implementation of some of the WAC's recommendations for changes to Strathcona and how the Friends opposed those changes.

The 1986 Wilderness Advisory Committee

When the SCP was returned to power in 1975 it initially took a cautious approach to the park reforms that the NDP had made during its term in office. The Socreds did not create an immediate issue by making amendments to the Park Act or by overturning the 1973 moratorium on resource extraction in parks. However, in 1976 Mines and Forests Minister Tom Waterland, although he said he was only expressing an opinion and not announcing a change in government policy, argued that mining in parks was "not a bad thing...if it is done in such a way as to not degrade the park." On the other hand, in the 1976 legislative session Provincial Secretary Grace McCarthy, who was the most influential politician in rebuilding the SCP after its 1973 electoral loss, told the Legislature that there would be no further staking of mineral claims in parks and that the government was attempting to find an acceptable way of acquiring existing
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The matter continued to be debated within the Party and a year later in the 1977 session the Minister of Mines told the legislature that some mining may be permitted on Crown grants in parks. At the same time, however, the SC Government defended the Province's interests in parks in the Tener and Cream Silver trials rather than permitting these companies to carry out mineral exploration. Nevertheless, there were further battles over Strathcona and other parks during the early 1980s.

There was a minor dispute over Western's expansion in Strathcona. Western was a relatively small mine corporation which had difficulty arranging financing for development in the 1960's. Brascan Resources Limited, a large corporation, acquired Western in 1975 and the companies were merged in 1980. The consolidated Western operations were renamed "Westmin Resources" in 1981 and Westmin became part of the Brascade group in 1983. In 1979 Western found the H-W orebody. By 1981 there was sufficient capital in the larger corporation to dig a 750 metre shaft and to build new offices, hoists, compressors, conveyors and a 2,700 tonne per day mill. Westmin applied for permission to expand its operation and in 1981 Stephen Rogers, the Minister of Environment, authorized expansion. Colin Gabelmann (NDP), the North Island MLA, was concerned, particularly since an alarming report on Buttle Lake pollution was released in 1980. A further difficulty arose since Rogers had promised the Legislature that public hearings would be held before Westmin carried out its planned expansion. However, Westmin's president explained that when Rogers made his promise, drilling of the
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shaft was already well underway. Although Gabelmann and conservationists raised concerns, no large campaign was mounted against the expansion.\footnote{Likely the main opposition to the expansion plan occurred at one of a series of public meetings Bill Bennett and his cabinet were holding to meet with Island citizens. 150 angry residents attended the Campbell River meeting and expressed concerns about the still unresolved and now increasing problem of tailing deposits. Anon, "Cabinet gets pollution blast," \textit{Sun} (Jan. 20, 1981), 1.}

In the early 1980s, however, several acrimonious disputes arose over the establishment of other protected areas in B.C. In 1984 Indians and environmentalists resorted to civil disobedience to protect Meares Island from logging. In the aftermath of this dispute and during a developing conflict over a proposed National Park on South Moresby Island, in October 1985 the Scored Minister of Environment, Austin Pelton, struck a Special Advisory Committee, the Wilderness Advisory Committee (WAC), to "consider the place of wilderness in a changing society."\footnote{Bryan Williams (Chairperson) et al, \textit{The Wilderness Mosaic: The Report of the Wilderness Advisory Committee} (Victoria: Queens Printer, March 1986), 2.} Pelton advised the Committee to make recommendations that would "balance the concern for wilderness preservation with the jobs of those whose livelihood is dependent on the use of the limited resource base of the province." As the Minister explained this would be difficult for: "On the one hand, there are those who argue for total preservation. On the other, I have heard from equally respected British Columbians who advocate maximum resource use - even to the point of urging resource extraction in those areas which are currently subject to special preservation status."\footnote{Ministry of Environment, "News Release: Wilderness Committee Established," Oct. 18, 1985.} In addition to making recommendations on twelve proposed parks, in its three-month mandate, the Committee was called on to "address the boundaries of eight existing parks so as to determine if any adjustments are in the public interest." Strathcona was among the provincial parks to be considered.

In its Report, the \textit{Wilderness Mosaic}, the WAC made several recommendations in its three page section on Strathcona.\footnote{Williams et al, 1986.} It questioned why the Parks Division recommended that 22,000 hectares be deleted from the periphery of the park when it was "unable to make detailed proposals available" for exchanges that the Division said would compensate for such a loss. The WAC did not have the time or resources to consider the matter, however, and it suggested the
Parks Division plan the exchanges. But, recognizing the ire that could be aroused by deleting 22,000 hectares from the Park, and acknowledging its objective to resolve disputes over wilderness, the Committee also proposed that the Government hold a "public review" before implementing any changes recommended by the Parks Division.

In addition the WAC made a "specific recommendation" that the Government reclassify to "Recreation Area" the mineralized belt in the middle of the park. Recreation Areas, conceived by Kiernan in the 1960s, are established by Cabinet "for the application of the 'principles of multiple land use' compatible with their primary recreational use." Confusion and outrage arose over the term "Recreation Area" because it resembles the earlier classification, Class B park, and, it infers incorrectly that an area will be used for recreation free from resource extraction. The WAC Report does not specify whether the Committee meant that there should be claim staking for a period of time in the proposed Strathcona Recreation Area, similar to other newly designated recreation areas outside of existing parks. But Cabinet would be permitted to approve mineral exploration and mining in a Strathcona Recreation Area. If the Government followed this recommendation, clearly Strathcona would lose the protection it had enjoyed since the NDP had placed its moratorium on resource extraction in parks.

The WAC does not refer to the Parks Division in making its recommendation for a Strathcona Recreation Area. It does not mention the necessity of providing jobs in the region nor demands to the Committee for the establishment of the Recreation Area. The recommendation seems to be based on the Committee's assumption that "the precedent set by the Tener case will remain valid covering all claims established in existing parks..." This represents a strong stance since Cream Silver (which held 106 of the 171 claims in the proposed Recreation Area) was then in Court to determine if the Tener decision (upholding Crown grants
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in Wells Gray Park) could be applied to Cream's Strathcona mineral claims. The Committee released its report in March, 1986. The Cream decision, which held that the Tener decision did not extend to Cream's (and perhaps other) claims in Strathcona, was announced a month later in April of 1986. Extraordinarily, nine months later the Minister of Environment rationalized the creation of the Strathcona Recreation Area by referring to the Tener decision. I consider this aspect in the section below, but firstly turn to the formation of the Friends of Strathcona.

Formation of the Friends of Strathcona Park

Until recently park advocacy groups in B.C. included park protection with other objectives. For example, mountaineering groups were primarily interested in organizing expeditions but also worked for protection. The Friends are one of several groups that appeared in B.C. during the 1980s with the primary objective of protecting wilderness. Some, like the Western Canada Wilderness Committee and the Sierra Club, were concerned for all wilderness areas. Others focused on specific areas like South Moresby Island, Skagit Valley, Meares Island, Clayoquot Sound, the Stein Valley and Strathcona Park.

The existing mine, clear-cuts, and dam had made it obvious to park advocates that stronger strategies were required to protect Strathcona Park. The first event that led to the formation of the Friends of Strathcona occurred at a February 1984 Symposium on Parks in B.C. Following presentation by Jim Boulding of a paper concerning Strathcona's history of abuse, "Workshop participants stressed that there had been talk for many years about formation of a conservation group specifically to lobby for protection and improved management of Strathcona Park, and that it was now time for action." Although "a number of persons present resolved to organize such a group," it did not immediately form.

In some cases the importance of a problem and the belief that it could be resolved ensures that a group will arise to address it. However, it was not clear that a new group would or should arise to try to protect Strathcona Park since its use for resource extraction, despite serious
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opposition, had underscored the futility to many conservationists of trying to protect the Park. So the Friends of Strathcona Park may not have formed at all if Steve and Marlene Smith, and Jim Boulding had not made a commitment in 1986 to create the group.

Steve and Marlene's commitment to preserves the Park arose first of all from their experience hiking in it. Steve considered Strathcona Park a "wonderful jewel" which, in spite of its use for industry, was more pristine than many surrounding areas as well as the English mountains in which he had hiked in his youth. Marlene, who had emigrated to Canada from Holland, wanted to protect Strathcona because she didn't want all of the Island to be despoiled as she believed Holland had been. Although Steve and Marlene appreciated Strathcona's beauty, they likely would not have formed a group if it hadn't been for Jim Boulding.

Through Steve's work as a guide at the Strathcona Park Lodge, he and Marlene developed a friendship with its owner Jim Boulding. Jim and his wife Myrna acquired property on Buttle Lake near the Park in 1958, started the Lodge as a facility for tourism and outdoor education in 1965, and by 1986 could accommodate 200 guests and students. They used tourist revenues to finance outdoor education programs. Steve and Marlene admired Jim and Myrna's holistic teaching of outdoor skills and appreciated Jim's work in protecting Strathcona Park. Jim began advocating Strathcona's protection in the 1960's and was one of its leading individual defenders in the 1970's and early 1980's.

Jim impressed upon Steve and Marlene the threat of further resource extraction in Strathcona. The NDP moratorium on mineral exploration was still in effect in 1986, but Boulding believed the Government would use the WAC Report to justify further mining in Strathcona. His suspicion was aroused when the Minister appointed committee members who represented resource industries. He predicted that the WAC would recommend that mineral exploration and mining be permitted in Strathcona Park, and the Government would use these recommendations to rationalize allowing mineral exploration to proceed. Boulding stressed that although only exploration would be allowed at first, Western's development in the 1960's proved
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that such exploration can lead to capital investment in a mine which cannot then be halted. He believed that although Strathcona's history indicated the futility of conservation efforts, an active group which focused its efforts solely on Strathcona protection could prove more successful. As Steve explains, Jim persuaded Marlene and himself that one group could "bring together" the many people and groups who were interested in protecting the Park to develop the broad support necessary to stop further resource extraction in the Park.

Steve and Marlene were touched by Jim's personal request and by his devotion to Strathcona while he was terminally ill with cancer. As Marlene explained, "Jim Boulding asked me personally to take over for him and I felt very responsible." Boulding died in May 1986 shortly after he gave Steve and Marlene a copy of the WAC Report which had been released in March.144

From their discussions with Jim, Steve and Marlene developed a solid determination to stop governments from opening Strathcona to further resource extraction. Marlene's resolve stemmed partly from her background, which included work normally done by men. She is a Veterinarian trained to work on large animals and she is also a mountaineer who has led expeditions up high peaks. She applied her determination to Strathcona's protection. Reflecting on her decision and her extensive voluntary work, Marlene said: "My thought was that enough is enough and I'm drawing the line. I never thought whether or not it's going to be successful. It was just that my mind was made up that it wasn't going to get worse. They have done enough damage. I guess I became like a lioness defending her den." It is difficult to explain this type of strong individual commitment to resolving problems. Steve reflects that "previously I had stood on the outside of these things [disputes over parks] but then something was driving me...it was like somebody outside of me driving me."

Steve and Marlene's determination was an important factor in getting others involved and they quickly gained credibility. Before speaking out in public, they familiarized themselves on

144 Several articles pertaining to the Lodge, the Bouldings, and Jim's work in protecting the Park are included in Baikie and Phillips eds. 1986: p. 101-114. For reflections on Boulding's work and philosophy see Rob Wood, Towards the Unknown Mountains (Ptarmigan Press: Campbell River, 1991).
Park issues at the Campbell River Museum's file on Strathcona, explored damaged regions of the park, and talked to people who were versed with Strathcona's history of misuse and abuse. Their cautious enthusiasm, Strathcona's importance to them and others, the development of other single area groups, and the suspicion the government was planning to allow further resource extraction in the Park all contributed to the success of their presentations.

In April 1986 the Smiths made their first presentation to the Campbell River Environmental Coalition which at the time was not overly optimistic about the future of the proposed organization. Nevertheless, they encouraged Steve and Marlene by giving them their first donation: a $50.00 cheque. Then the Smiths spoke to other local groups including the Arrowsmith Ecological Coalition, Comox District Mountaineering Club, and the Friends of Clayoquot Sound. At these meetings they received further support and donations, and learned about tactics for park protection. Most of the people who joined with the Smiths hiked in the park and were optimistic an aggressive group could protect it. Like Steve and Marlene, they were fired up by the issue. As one early member, Ruth Masters, explains: "They were all dedicated hikers and environmentalists watching their turf being filched away in a huge breach of public trust."

The Smiths and Rob Wood, another of the early members, chose the name "Friends of Strathcona Park" similar to Friends of the Lake District in England and Friends of Clayoquot Sound on the West Coast of the Island. The ten or so initial active members were busy in the Summer and Fall of 1986. They chose a letter-head showing Cream Lake with Nine Peaks in the background. The Smiths wrote and distributed three newsletters to groups and individuals in central Island communities, explaining the history of Strathcona's abuse by industry, Cream Silver's current demands for mineral exploration, and the WAC recommendations which the government might use to cancel the moratorium on mining in parks.145 The newsletters urged
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people to get involved in protecting Strathcona either by joining the Friends, making a donation, or by writing to the Premier or to their MLAs.

A September 1986 meeting in Nanaimo that the Friends held in conjunction with the Federation of Mountain Club's of B.C. demonstrated their success in working with others sharing an interest in protecting Strathcona.\textsuperscript{146} Representatives of the Vancouver Island branch of the Federation of Mountain Clubs of B.C., the Sierra Club, Alpine Club of Canada, Island Mountain Ramblers, Friends of Clayoquot Sound, Vancouver Island Resources Society, Independent Hostel Association, and Campbell River Hiking Club attended the meeting. Mel Turner, a parks planner, explained the "Master Plan" for Strathcona Park using the WAC Report as his guideline.\textsuperscript{147} But "every single representative present voiced frustration and concern" with the Report. It was "unanimously agreed that the suggestions in the Report would do untold damage to our Park and further erode, yet again, this unique wilderness."\textsuperscript{148} The representatives agreed to several actions, including writing letters to Austin Pelton, the Minister of Environment.

The local press reported on the Friends' activities in 1986. The \textit{Courtenay Comox Valley Record} held an interview with the Smiths concerning the WAC's recommendations.\textsuperscript{149} Quentin Dodd mentions the Friends in a story carried in the Campbell River Upper Islander concerning Strathcona's 75th Birthday party. He described the event which was attended by well over 500 people and the arrival of Jack Kemph the newly appointed Minister of Environment.\textsuperscript{150}

Amid bright sun, the event opened with an introductory puppet show and featured music by the CAMPA Big Band throughout. Kemph arrived with an entourage of honoured guests, and an RCMP and bagpipe escort. The Program included demonstrations of water-bombing and dropping of fire retardant by various aircraft. Balloons, free pop, and helicopter flights were available.

In spite of the upbeat party, unprecedented in Strathcona's history, there was, however, an undercurrent of dissatisfaction with the Minister. In his speech Kemph pledged to hold public hearings before making any changes to the Park's status. However conservationists were not
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reassured. After Kemph's speech Dr. John Ross of the Vancouver Island Resources League cautioned the Minister: "If you try to take the Cream Lake area out of the park...you're going to meet frightful opposition." Kemph responded that he was a "firm believer in multiple use and you can have the best of both worlds" with both industrial development and recreation in park areas. Steve Smith retorted that with that kind of attitude the party "should have been billed as a funeral."

In spite of the Friends' activism and media coverage, by the Fall of 1986 they had not formed any serious campaign against the WAC Recreation Area recommendation or the large Park Division deletions. Nor did the government force a confrontation in 1986 by changing Strathcona's status. The Friends were waiting for a response to their presentation to Mel Turner of Parks and the Minister of Environment Jack Kemph and also for the results of the provincial election which might return the NDP with its clearer commitment to park protection. Their October 1986 Newsletter explains "the whole issue will be on the back burner" until after the November election.

Degradation of Strathcona Park in 1987

The Social Credit Party was reelected in the November 1986 election under the leadership of William Vander Zalm. On January 29, 1987 Stephen Rogers, the Minister of Environment and Parks in the newly appointed Cabinet, issued a News Release announcing changes in status of provincial parks. This made resource extraction in Strathcona Park into an important provincial issue. A Vancouver Sun article reported that "Strathcona loses the most land." The 22,000 hectares of proposed deletions to the Park vastly outweighed the 8,000 hectares of proposed additions. Moreover, the Cream Lake area, as suggested by the WAC, would "become a 'recreation area' in the heart of the park" in which mining would be permitted, albeit at the
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discretion of the Minister. Map 5.2 (164), a reproduction of the one accompanying Roger's press release, shows the large deletions and Recreation area.

The Friends were outraged. Their "URGENT NOTICE" stated:

A huge area (the heart of the Park) will be down-graded to "recreation status" to allow mining, etc. The whole of the Bedwell Valley is now slated to be logged and mined. Also areas such as Price Creek, Cream Lake, Mount Septimus, Big Interior Mountain, Nine Peaks and even around Della Falls (the highest waterfall in Canada) all come under the industrial shadow. This monstrous act will cut the (OUR) Park in two and ruin this beautiful, popular alpine area for untold generations to come. 157

The notice explained that Cabinet Ministers Pelton, Kemph, and Rogers had promised public hearings would be held before changes were made but now the Park was being further degraded without the promised hearings; thus, "they openly lied."

Prior to the Rogers' Announcement, the meetings the Friends organized or participated in were attended mainly by members of local mountaineering clubs and environmental groups. The Friends, however, used the Announcement to urge more people to defend the Park. The Urgent Notice invited "all interested groups and individuals" to "stand up and be counted" and to "consider the next step in this struggle". The local media, especially reporter Quentin Dodd, covered the organizational activities. 158 On February 21st, he reports, sixty people attended a 4 3/4 hour meeting at Nanaimo's Malspina College at which the Friends discussed their work in organizing local chapters. 159 The groups in attendance decided to request a meeting with the Premier and also to circulate a petition in local shopping malls. The likelihood that "time may be running out before" changes to the Park could be passed by a Cabinet order-in-council called for strong action. Although it was discussed, nobody liked the idea of tree spiking. At 1986 meetings civil disobedience (CD) had also been opposed. At the Nanaimo meeting, however, "almost half" of those in attendance felt non-violent CD was justified to create an uproar sufficient to stop the Government's plans.

157 Steve Smith, "URGENT NOTICE" (Feb. 19, 1987).
STRATHCONA PARK
STUDY AREA

From Ministry of Environment
News Release January 29 1987
After Rogers' Announcement, plenty of attention was focussed on this minister from an unexpected source. As Minister of Environment in 1981, Rogers had been involved in improprieties over Westmin Resources' expansion.160 Moreover, in 1986 he was obliged to resign as Minister of Forests over his widely publicized conflict of interest in a dispute over South Moresby, in which the provincial government was impeding a Federal initiative to establish a national park.161 Just before his Announcement of changes to parks, the NDP Opposition accused Rogers of a conflict of interest involving his financial interests in a forest corporation on Lyell Island which was part of the proposed South Moresby National Park. Rogers himself observed that, because of his family's extensive and changing ownership in resource firms, "as a Rogers" it was difficult for him as Minister of Environment to avoid conflicts of interest.162 In spite of this, Vander Zalm appointed Rogers to the Ministry and, shortly after, he announced the down-grading of parks.

Concerning Rogers' conflicts of interest, reporter Les Leyne pointed to the Rogers' family interest in Westmin Resources.163 Rogers did not own Westmin shares personally. But his explanation - "I don't own shares in the company. I am a beneficial shareholder of a trust which has some interest in this area" - was quoted as an example of his deviousness.164 Rogers could benefit indirectly by permitting Westmin higher discharges of pollutants into Buttle Lake. Concerning the Recreation Area, Baldrey and Barrett interviewed Westmin's executive vice-president who explained that Westmin "will not benefit immediately from the boundary changes, but may profit from them sometime 'down the road'".165 Westmin could profit from the Recreation Area, for example, by staking claims in it if granted permission, purchasing or working the claims of other corporations, or by milling at Westmin facilities any ore mined in it by another company.
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The NDP singled out Westmin's mine as its primary focus among Rogers' potential conflicts of interest. Joan Smallwood, the NDP environment critic, urged Rogers to resign as Minister of Environment because of this conflict of interest.166 The North Island MLA Colin Gabelmann (NDP) had previously wrangled with Rogers over Westmin's expansion in 1981.167 Gabelmann explained, "He's been in conflicts in other areas as a cabinet minister and in this Strathcona question clearly he is. Westmin Resources is a major beneficiary of his decision and the share prices of that company are most likely going to increase and he benefits from that."168 Therefore, "the best decision for Rogers would be to just get out of politics and go and make some money in the stock market."169

After Rogers' conflict of interest, the Friends attracted the attention of the provincial media for the first time. Les Leyne quoted Rob Wood's (president of the Friends' Campbell River chapter) comment that "[t]here is no doubt in my mind that the recreation area is specifically designed to benefit Westmin."170 In the regional media, Quentin Dodd reported a statement by Rob Wood: "It's not good enough for him [Rogers] to divest himself of these shares after the fact of the park being split...We're demanding his resignation and the postponement of the changes until after a public hearing [on the Government plan], as promised by three cabinet ministers."171 He went on to explain that the Friends had so far "been very careful to go through the diplomatic channels," but if the Premier did not postpone the redefinition of Strathcona's boundaries until after public hearings then it is likely that "our members are going to oblige us to consider Plan B, which is direct action." Mike Rewald, another member, said possible forms of protest could include staking symbolic claims on the Legislature's lawn or in Vancouver's Stanley Park or blocking Westmin's road into the park.172

On March 1st the Friends' organized a blockade at the Price Creek Bridge at the South end of Buttle Lake on the Buttle Lake Highway over which Westmin haul trucks take concentrate from the mine to the Strait of Georgia. The Friends' objective was to attract media attention by stopping Westmin's ore trucks for an afternoon. Westmin avoided a confrontation by stopping truck traffic during the blockade; however, the Friends had arranged for British Columbia Television (BCTV) to cover the event and the group got its widest media attention to date on the evening news.

Premier Vander Zalm at first did not rate Rogers' conflict of interest as serious. In reference to the Federation of Mountain Clubs' and Friends of Strathcona's criticisms of the conflict he said "[m]y goodness. I think that's just a picky thing by a special interest group." But on March 3rd, Vander Zalm moved Rogers to Bruce Strachan's Municipal Affairs portfolio and switched Strachan to the Ministry of Environment. A week after becoming Minister, Bruce Strachan issued a "Public Statement Concerning the Future Direction and Management of Strathcona Park" that explained how and why Strathcona would be re-classified. Then, in spite of improprieties concerning Rogers conflict of interest and without the promised public hearings, on March 14th 1987 Cabinet passed two orders-in-council. Order-in-Council no. 466 deleted large areas from the periphery of the park. It also transformed the remaining Class B and Nature Conservancy areas of the Park to their 1964 status as Class A park. Order-in-Council no. 475 established the "Strathcona Recreation Area" in the middle of the Park.
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These Orders increased tensions over Strathcona. However, in spite of their indignation, the Friends likely did not have sufficient resources in Spring 1987 for a sustained campaign involving CD. Moreover, the public likely was not sufficiently aroused to support CD. Finally, a continuing blockade of Westmin (the primary target at that time) could have been unpopular because it would put at risk 500 Westmin jobs. The Friends debated using further CD in response to the Orders, but decided to refrain for the time being.

5.3 The Friends of Strathcona's Work and Tactics in 1987

The existence of the January 1988 blockade, its nature, and its eventual successful outcome largely depended on the quality and volume of hard work the Friends carried out in 1987. In this section I consider: group objectives and organization; public meetings the group held or attended, their consideration of CD; a legal opinion they acquired, and the selection of an appropriate target for CD.

The Friends' objectives and organizational structure

Basic Strathcona issues were-well covered in newspapers and television broadcasts in 1987 and the Canadian Broadcasting Corporation (CBC) ran a series of detailed documentaries over its provincial network on Strathcona conflict. Following revelation of Rogers' conflict of interest, host Lucy McNeil on the Almanac Show interviewed some of the principal participants in the Strathcona dispute including Vince Collins (the Deputy Minister of Parks the highest level bureaucrat in the Parks Division of the Ministry of Environment), Stephen Rogers, Bruce Strachan (the new Minister of Environment), Merna Tattersall (President of Casamiro Resources which was doing mineral exploration in the Della Falls-Drinkwater Valley part of the Recreation Area), Vicky Husband (Sierra Club), and Rob Wood, Marlene Smith, and Steve Smith (Friends of Strathcona).

Since the Friends' inception in 1986, the group had been able to rapidly sign up new members as a result of danger to the Park and the media coverage of this. Additional hikers and other wilderness recreationists joined in 1987. But the outrage over the Government's downscaling of Strathcona drew many others to join the group or become active in other ways. Three
main issues were significant in attracting members: (1) the appropriateness of resource extraction in a park; (2) pollution since Strathcona's waters serve Campbell River and other communities; and (3) justice due to the lack of promised public hearings before the changes were made to Strathcona. Some mainlanders sent money and some later appeared on the blockade, but the Friends never sought memberships there. They concentrated on the Island where interest was highest. As awareness grew, the Friends' membership surged from 30 at the beginning of 1987 to over 1000 in the Fall.

In Canada non-profit Societies can acquire a tax number so individuals can receive tax receipts for donations. The Friends weighed the benefits of increased donations against the constraints that the Societies Act might impose on their activities. Their decision to form a registered Society followed the advice by a lawyer sympathetic to their cause who also donated the necessary legal work. The purposes of the Society of the Friends of Strathcona Park are:

(a) To preserve and protect the natural beauty of Strathcona Park for the appreciation of present and future generations. (b) To promote public awareness, understanding and enjoyment of the Park, its natural features, environment and ecosystems, its trails and other amenities. (c) To advance a sense of public responsibility and stewardship towards the Park, its natural features, environment and ecosystems.\footnote{FOSP, "B.C. Ministry of Finance and Corporate Relations Certificate of Incorporation no. S22789" August 14, 1988.}

These objectives were ratified at the groups first Annual General Meeting in May 1987.\footnote{FOSP, "Summer Newsletter" (May, 1987).} In May, the Friends published an eight page newspaper in which they outlined specific demands for: an environmental impact study on present and past mining in the Park; an inquiry into how the mine got into the Park in the first place; public hearings to consider the boundary changes; and, most importantly, reversal of the March Orders-in-Council pertaining to Strathcona.\footnote{FOSP & Western Canada Wilderness Committee, \textit{Sold Out to Mining Interests in 1987} (Summer, 1987).}

By Fall 1987 the group had organized the rapidly growing membership into local chapters in Campbell River, Courtenay, Port Alberni, Denman, Hornby and Saltspring Islands, Powell River, Parksville/Errington, Nanaimo, and Victoria. The Campbell River and Courtenay chapters were the largest and most organized, but by November each chapter had a president, vice-president, secretary and treasurer as well as a telephone tree system, public relations...
person(s), a fund-raising committee, a committee to collect information on the industrial use of Strathcona areas adjacent to their community and a CD committee.\footnote{FOSI. "Information For All Chapters" (Nov. 9, 1987).} There was some difficulty in coordinating the activities of various chapters; but the system allowed for flexibility in raising concern for the Park. Although the group's finances by 1987 were sufficient to consider hiring a part-time employee, the Friends adopted a policy that they have maintained to the present of operating on an entirely voluntary basis.

**Attending and organizing public meetings**

While environmental and mountaineering groups had cooperated with the Friends before the March 1987 Orders-in-Council, town councils and the Strathcona Regional District, with some persuasion by the Friends, gradually became sympathetic to the group's cause.\footnote{Quentin Dodd, "Comox Valley groups join Strathcona battle," Free Press (Feb. 11, 1987).} After the Orders-in-Council were passed a Friends' delegation attended town council meetings in all communities around the Park to solicit their support. In general the central Island town councils were concerned about mine pollution and its potentially detrimental effect on tourism, but they also acknowledged the potential for increased employment from more mining. The Friends' delegation asked the regional bodies to request the Province to rescind the March Orders-in-Council until the promised public hearings could be held. The delegation showed to the regional bodies the text of the promises that cabinet ministers (Pelton, Kemph and Rogers) had previously made to hold public hearings. This approach was successful. The District of Campbell River passed a motion and sent a letter to the Premier and relevant Ministers requesting that "you rescind any decision regarding boundary changes and creation of recreational areas in Strathcona Park until such time as previously promised Public Hearings are held."\footnote{District of Campbell River "Letter to Honourable W.N. Vander Zalm," (April 15, 1987).} The District of Tofino, Town of Qualicum Beach, City of Parksville, the Campbell River and District Chamber of Commerce, and the Regional District of Comox-Strathcona all sent similar letters.

The Friends' delegation also explained Strathcona's tourism potential and asked the regional bodies to send letters to relevant ministries requesting that a committee investigate this tourism
potential and methods by which it might be better realized. Motion were passed and letters were sent off. Regional newspapers covered the Friends' presentations, leading to public education on the issues and an awareness that community leaders approved to some degree of the Friends' stand. After the Friends lobbied the Comox-Strathcona Regional District (which represents local councils), one media account explained, "Opponents of recent boundary changes to Strathcona Park have come up with a credible ally."

The Friends also organized a number of public presentations in 1987. The Courtenay chapter put on several slide shows with speakers at Puntledge Elementary School in Courtenay. Local chapters organized similar presentations in other communities. The largest presentation was held in May at the Vanier High School gymnasium, Courtenay's largest public meeting place. The committee which organized the "big public meeting" arranged to have regional newspapers advertise the meeting and to have them publish articles announcing the forthcoming meeting. Karl Stevenson encouraged a large audience with this invitation:

The slide showing will have some excellent scenes from the park, and it will be short enough so people can stay interested...We'll have four or five good, qualified speakers and presentations will be short and concise as well. The subjects presented will include tourism, environmental issues, a brief history of the park and a summary of the events leading up to the decision to change the park boundaries...Coffee and tea will be available for anyone who wants them.

As a result of media coverage and posters, over 500 people attended. Mel Turner distributed the Parks Division's newspapers, but they were outclassed by the timely arrival of the Friends own newspaper. Titled "Sold Out to Mining Interests in 1987" the paper featured a front page photograph of Cream Lake. Articles concerned the history of Strathcona's abuse, the acid waste flowing from Westmin's mine, the imminent mining assault on the Cream Lake area, and the Park's tourism potential. The newspaper was circulated at the meeting and later distributed around the Province.
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Immediately after the March Orders-in-Council, the Parks Division announced that meetings on Strathcona were to be held during May in Gold River, Campbell River, Courtenay, Port Alberni, Nanaimo and Vancouver. A Friends' news release complained that the Parks Branch would discuss Park management within Strathcona's changed boundaries and classifications, but would not accept briefs or comments on those changes. This would be far different from the public inquiry into Strathcona's abuse and the Orders-in-Council that the Friends demanded. Therefore the Friends decided to organize the "Save Strathcona Caravan" that would accompany the government's open houses. The Friends invited all to attend and compare their stand on Strathcona with the Parks Division's version of events, thereby drawing people to the meetings and generating additional media coverage.

In the Fall the Friends organized a wilderness gathering in the Park which two hundred people attended. Included in the $10 voluntary registration fee were a harvest stew, a scavenger hunt for children, hot chocolate at the Saturday evening campfire singalong, and skits by Des Kennedy and Edith Wallace. At the rally fears were expressed that Cream Lake was in imminent danger because Cream Silver had received a park-use-permit: "person after person...expressed concern about the idea of industrial development within the park boundaries." A large strategy session was held and among the first CD training sessions was offered by the group.

*Popular opposition to mineral exploration and civil disobedience training*

There was also local opposition to the Friends' work. Reflecting on the Friends' work in 1987, Des Kennedy explained that it was an "up-hill struggle," especially in Campbell River. Mine corporations, miners and the business community opposed the group, but few spoke out publicly. No labour body, including the Canadian Association of Industrial Mechanical and Allied
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Workers (CAIMAW) which represented workers at Westmin Resources' mine, called for further mining in the Park. Those who publicly favoured mining in the Park were representatives of corporations that wanted to mine in it (Westmin, Casamiro, and Cream Silver), the Mining Association of B.C., and the B.C. and Yukon Chamber of Mines. These mining groups spoke out but did not launch a public campaign.

The Government, of course, favoured further mining in the Park, but some SC MLAs seemed reluctant to defend the changes. Comox MLA Stan Hagen was "on the hot seat" when he had to compare the Parks Division's presentation with the "Save Strathcona Caravan" display. Hagen commented on the quality of the Friends' representation and, after some urging from Steve Smith, promised to continue pushing the Minister of Environment to hold the promised public hearings. Thor T. Peterson, "a long time member and active supporter of the Social Credit party" sent a letter to the Campbell River Courier publicly apologizing to the Friends. He did not say that mining and logging should be banned in the Park, but he was embarrassed that the SC Government broke its promises to hold public hearings before making changes.

Through 1987 the Friends' actions increased public support for Strathcona's protection. The NDP issued a press release indicating it supported the Friends, but the Party did not actively demand the promised public hearings. Mike Harcourt, the NDP leader, did not become involved. The North Island MLA, Colin Gabelmann, however, was a strong advocate. He made a motion in the legislature on March 11th that the park changes that Rogers had previously announced be suspended until hearings could be held. On March 18th he presented a Friends of Strathcona petition with 6,342 signature to the legislature, requesting that the Government reinstate the moratorium on industrial development in the Park.  
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International Woodworkers of America Local 1-363, an unexpected supporter, sent a letter to the Minister of Environment and the Premier expressing the Local's concerns over the Park and requesting that the Minister of Environment "conduct hearings before implementing any changes to the park." Several letters to the editor in local papers spoke in favour of mining. However this compared to more than a hundred letters by members of the Friends and others condemning further mining and logging in the park as well as the government's lack of due process. Father Brandt, a local priest, spoke at the wilderness gathering and wrote letters to newspapers and an article in support of the Friends. Reverend Bogert-O'Brien, a local minister, wrote a letter to the editor expressing his dismay that further mining and logging was planned for Strathcona. A Friends newsletter explained their supporters included "Town Councils, Regional Districts, Chambers of Commerce, the I.W.A., Commercial Fishing Associations and Mariculture groups, senior citizens, University professors, and crosses all political affiliations."

In spite of popular support for the Friends' case, it became apparent that the Government would not change its stance. Neither the Parks Division nor the Ministry pressed charges when Casamiro Resources' carried out mineral exploration in the Della Falls area of Strathcona without a permit. In May the Ministry issued Cream Silver a park-use-permit for surface exploration which was carried out in the Summer. At the Wilderness Gathering, Marlene Smith summed up what had happened in the 1960s and could happen again through "a little bit of drilling, and then a little bit of blasting, and then a little bit of a road and then a little bit of a mine."

The development of the idea to use CD by the Friends was not the work of a few agitators. Some senior members knew from experience that traditional lobbying would not likely sway the Government. Members who had been active in the peace movement were familiar with non-violent CD and considered it an appropriate tactic for the Strathcona situation. The Nanoose
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Conversion Campaign, which had used CD to promote its concerns about American and Canadian military use of Georgia Strait for nuclear vessel testing, was another source of support with knowledge about CD. Members also learned about CD from the disputes at Meares Island and South Moresby, and from books on diverse subjects such as Ghandi’s campaign in India and the Franklin River Blockade in Tasmania, Australia. A few members knew about CD from participation in or knowledge of Mennonite resistance to military service. In the end, most members believed that CD was reasonable and justified in view of the imminent threat to the Park.

Members who had been involved in CD previously recommended that the group undergo training. When the training workshops began, there was debate in the group over whether CD was an appropriate tactic. However there was clear consensus that if CD was used, it would have to be non-violent since few members, particularly seniors, would want to participate in anything violent or dangerous. Therefore, attention at training sessions focused on the necessity of remaining calm if being assaulted by police. For example, members were drilled not to raise their voice or run and otherwise to maintain an air of dignity, assurance and conviction.

Another aspect covered at training sessions was the importance of maintaining cordial relations with employees, politicians, media, and police. This approach began before the blockade. The Friends organized a training session with the Campbell River branch of the RCMP. There, the Friends familiarized themselves and the local RCMP officers (many of whom had never been involved in CD) on the use of this tactic. They explained their commitment to non-violence, the seriousness of their concerns and they gave the RCMP advance notice of their intent to carry out CD if mineral exploration went ahead in the Park. This meeting aided in building favourable relations prevailing with the RCMP during the blockade.

Through 1987 the Friends advised town councillors, MLAs, and reporters that they were ready to use CD if further mineral exploration was carried out in the park. By publicly stating their intention to use CD, the Friends surprised no-one with their blockade.
The sixty or so most active members had to be sure that they represented the rest of the membership of nearly one thousand in the Fall of 1987. Although several groups, including the Sierra Club, were working on the Strathcona issue, the Friends had become distinguished by their consideration of CD. Few people with serious opposition to CD joined the group, especially after the one-day blockade in February of Westmin's ore trucks. The first CD training sessions were held in June and most local chapters had held workshops by the Fall.\textsuperscript{204} The Fall Newsletter sent out by the Central Coordinating Committee advised that the Friends had "changed some attitudes and misconceptions both with the public and within the parks management" and "public awareness has grown" yet there is "some depressing news". The bad news being Casamiro's and Cream Silver's mineral exploration in the Park earlier in the year and Cream's application for a permit to carry out drilling in the Price Creek area. So, the Committee explained, "Many people think [] that the time for talking is over and now is the time for some action...we desperately need a higher profile and Civil Disobedience workshops are available for this purpose." Any members who did not want to belong to a group engaging in CD could have voiced their opposition or resigned.

\textit{A legal opinion}

In Rogers' January Announcement of pending changes in Strathcona's status and throughout 1987, the government made economic and legal arguments to defend its Strathcona changes. The argument that further mining would lead to employment opportunities and economic development wasn't actively supported by either the small business community or labour unions. Most town councils in the communities around the Park supported the Friends' key argument that public hearings ought to be held as promised before further mineral exploration was permitted. Moreover, local governments were concerned about Westmin pollution, and also that of Mount Washington Copper's mine on Mount Washington, near Courtenay. The latter mine had provided employment for its year long existence, but it left behind a heap of poisonous tailings that had killed all the fish in the Tsolum River, destroying sport and commercial fishery. Mount
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Washington Copper's bond did not cover clean up costs and the Province wasn't sure how much these might be, or even if the mess could be cleaned up. All of this figured against the economic argument.

Without clear public approval of Strathcona mining, the SC Government rationalized Strathcona exploration and mining using the same subterfuge Ken Kiernan had used from 1965 to 1972. In his January 1987 Announcement, Stephen Rogers explained "[i]t is only with great reluctance that the government is making some of the tenure management changes today. However, in some cases, the only alternative to permitting controlled exploration would be to pay unacceptably high compensation fees to the owners of existing tenures whose rights have been clearly established by rulings of the Supreme Court of Canada." When Strachan replaced Rogers as Minister of Environment and signed the Orders-in-Council that allowed for further mineral exploration in Strathcona, he explained the general applicability of the Tener decision to mineral tenures in parks and stated "[t]he province simply cannot afford to gamble untold millions of taxpayers dollars to purchase these rights." Thus, like Kiernan previously, Rogers and Strachan referred to a multitude of mineral claims and a few Crown grants as if they were all Crown grants, and referred to these "rights" as if they were an inalienable right to mine regardless of any contrary public interest. This was an especially weak argument coming only nine months after the Province had won the 1986 B.C. Supreme Court decision which held that the Tener decision concerning Crown grants in Wells Gray Park did not extend to Cream Silver's Strathcona mineral claims, accounting for most of the tenures in the newly established Recreation Area.

In April the Friends began referring at public meetings and in discussions with Parks Division Bureaucrats, MLAs, and Minister Bruce Strachan to the apparently flawed legal advice upon which the Government was acting. By July the group had decided to hire a law firm to confirm their opinion, and by September had raised $5,000 for this purpose. Since the legal
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issue seemed obvious, the Friends did not believe a formal legal opinion would provide the
government with new information. However, they believed that a formal legal opinion would
generally add to the credibility of their cause. Moreover, it could provide the Government with a
way out of its stand on Strathcona mining, given the hostility it was generating. They requested
the Vancouver law firm of McAlpine and Hordo to advise if in their opinion the Tener decision
was "binding on the Province of British Columbia in its dealings with the holders of mineral
claims in Strathcona Park."\textsuperscript{208}

McAlpine and Hordo distinguished 35 Crown grants in the Strathcona Recreation Area from
136 mineral claims. In spite of their similarity, Tener's Crown grants, the solicitors noted, were
registered before Wells Gray Park was created, while all Crown grants in Strathcona were
granted after the Park was established. Since there was no clear precedent to draw on regarding
Crown granted claims in Strathcona, the solicitors concluded the Tener case "may not" apply to
them. As to the mineral claims, they concluded that "[i]t is our opinion the Tener decision does
not apply to 136 claims which are not Crown granted including 106 claims held by Cream Silver
Mines." What applied, the solicitors concluded, at least until it was appealed, was the 1986
Provincial Court decision which found that the Tener case did not apply to Cream Silver's
claims.

The Friends had hoped that the Tener decision would definitely not apply to Crown granted
claims in Strathcona because they were registered after it was established as a Park; but the
lawyers' Opinion concerning Cream's mineral claims was as expected. The Friends received the
Opinion on December 9th 1988 and sent it to Bruce Strachan, hoping it would provide him with
a rationale to rescind the March Order-in-Council, to withdraw a park-use-permit issued to
Cream Silver or, at the very least, to write back to the Friends explaining the different legal
advice he was receiving.
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The merits of a blockade and its target

The Friends considered staging rallies at the Legislature to focus attention of legislators and the media on the Strathcona issue. However, through 1987 their main plan for a major action focused on staging a "blockade" to disrupt workers and machinery in the Park. The type of non-violent blockade the Friends conceived requires preparatory work, blockade work, and defences of any arrestees. Even with extensive voluntary work, blockades can fail. The media, the public and the protestors themselves can perceive more evident, tangible objects such as workers, corporations, or machinery as a group's target rather than more abstract government policy and practices. A blockade that does not receive continuing active support will likely not achieve its objectives and, if a blockade turns violent, the media may quickly condemn blockaders rather than considering the issues.

In spite of these risks, the Friends leaned towards a blockade. As Marlene Smith explained, "blockades give the angry public an avenue to vent their anger, make a point, show the government you are serious, and focus media attention." Through the publicity they attract, blockades can also show the scenic appeal of an area and the damage that machinery can cause to it, perhaps prompting more public involvement in the issue and increased pressure on government to change its offending policy.

While the Friends were considering a blockade in the Park, they had to decide which company to target. In addition to mining, logging could also begin in areas that the March 1987 Orders-in-Council deleted from the periphery of the park. The Friends found, however, that most of these areas had been logged or the timber was unmarketable because of its small size and inaccessibility. The main logging firm in the area, MacMillan Bloedel, showed no interest in logging in the deleted areas. At the October 1987 meeting the Executive passed a motion to oppose any Bedwell Valley logging, but logging did not begin.209

The Friends used the February blockade of Westmin haul trucks to draw attention to Rogers' Westmin conflict of interest. Throughout 1987 they continued the long battle over Westmin
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tailings. They also objected to Westmin damming the Lower Thelwood Lake, with its clearing and burning of large Yellow Cedar trees before raising the Lake's level, and its failure to contain leaking oil drums. Still, Westmin was not the Friends main concern. Although Westmin could profit from the Recreation Area established in the Order-in-Council (indeed Westmin may have been the main reason for the Order), it held no claims outside of its Myra Creek lease.

Following the 1987 Order-in-Council mineral exploration could be carried out in the deleted areas or in the Recreation Area. Casamiro Resources aroused the Friends' ire by doing mineral exploration in the Drinkwater watershed, particularly since this Company maintained that it did not require a park-use-permit since it held Crown grants. At their November Executive meeting, the Friends decided to resort to CD if Casamiro carried out further exploration work without a permit. In December the Port Alberni Chapter organized a protest over Casamiro's exploration at which seventy-five protestors waving signs gathered at the closed local SCP office and then marched to Casamiro Resources Office. They complained that the Drinkwater Valley, where the Sherwood claims are, flows into lakes and rivers from which Port Alberni draws its drinking water.

While directing attention at Casamiro Resources, the Friends' main target was Cream Silver, which held claims in the Recreation Area. In the 1960's Cream began registering numerous claims south of Western's property. As well, Cream was the first company the Government permitted to explore in the area after activists raised a storm over the Western mine and its Buttle Lake tailing deposits. With its moratorium on resource extraction in parks, the NDP stopped Cream and other companies from exploring in the region. However, as Jim Boulding had predicted, the WAC recommended that the mineralized belt be made into a "Recreation Area,”
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and the March Order-in-Council established it. Cream was the obvious benefactor of Strachan's and Rogers' ignoring the B.C. Supreme Court ruling that the Teier decision did not extend to Cream's claims. A Friends' newsletter reported "Cream Silver was $1,000,000.00 in debt in 1985. Then it raised $350,000.00 by selling shares which doubled in value when the moratorium was lifted." The Government, as well as Cabinet, seemed keenly interested in helping Cream. The Assistant Deputy Minister of Parks, Vince Collins, referred to the Cream Lake vicinity as an area with "little or no park value" in his defence of the Order-in-Council which opened it to mining. At the same time the Parks Division's own publications highlighted the scenic, alpine beauty of Cream Lake. So, it was apparent that Collins was a poor defender of parks; through his actions he appeared to favour private and/or governmental interests in mining the Park over those of wilderness preservation. At one meeting between park bureaucrats and the Friends, Rob Wood accused Collins of lying to the public about the low park value of lands being deleted or changed into Recreation Area.

The Friends' close attention to Cream Silver was heightened by Cream's unflagging interest in drilling in the Park. The April 1986 Provincial Court ruling that the Teier decision did not extend to Cream's Strathcona claims did not deter its president's plans. After the Minister of Environment, Jack Kemph promised public hearings on Strathcona boundaries in August 1986, Frank Lang accused the Minister of "stalling." He went on to cite support for Cream drilling in the Park by the previous Minister of Environment, Tony Brumett, and the new party leader, Bill Vander Zalm. Cream launched an appeal to its April 1986 loss in the B.C. Supreme Court. But on December 1st Lang announced that the appeal would be deferred pending "what he expected to be a favourable decision from the Parks Ministry," to which Vander Zalm had just appointed Stephen Rogers. After Rogers' January 1987 Announcement of changes to
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Strathcona, Lang explained "[w]e will undertake geophysical survey work this spring and a major drill program later on this year. There is considerable surface mineralization but we won't know whether there's an orebody until after the drill program." Following the March 1987 Order-in-Council, Cream applied for a park-use-permit and in May received a permit for surface exploration. The Friends' Summer 1987 Newsletter reported Cream "has been cutting sitelines, had high voltage wires across the Price Creek Trail at several locations and is doing prospecting/exploration work around Cream Lake...The battle is on folks!" Nevertheless, they did not respond with CD at this phase of the exploration program.

In August 1987 Cream received another permit to carry out drilling in the Price Creek area between January 1, 1988 and June 30, 1988. In December the Friends sent the Minister a copy of McAlpine and Hordo's legal opinion, but did not receive a reply before their January 14th 1988 Executive meeting. At the meeting the actions of both Cream Silver and Casamiro Resources were discussed. Not only did Cream have a park-use-permit, but, under the Financial Assistance for Mineral Exploration (FAME) program, in perhaps the worst insult of all, the Government had given Casamiro and Cream grants to carry out exploration in Strathcona. Work would have to start immediately since the grants had to be spent before February, 1988.

Conclusion

In both the 1960's dispute over Western's mine and the Friends 1986-87 campaign there were three main issues: social justice, pollution, and parks. In the 1967 dispute the Campbell River District Council and its Water Board played the most important role in opposing mining interests in the Park from a public health and social justice perspective. In 1987 the Friends shared these interests but were also interested in protecting Strathcona Park as a pristine "wilderness park". While town councils in 1987 played a relatively modest letter writing and support role, the Friends led the opposition to mining interests. In 1967 the primary community involved was Campbell River, whereas in 1987 Courtenay and Campbell River both reacted. The NDP, and
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particularly North Island MLA Colin Gabelmann, supported the Friends. In 1967, however, the NDP and its leader, Robert Strachan, were especially strong advocates for park protection and pollution control. Activism began too late to stop Western Mines so the major battles were over its proposed town, tailings pollution, and further mineral exploration and mines. Further mineral exploration was put on hold with the NDP's 1972 election and its moratorium on resource extraction in parks but resurfaced shortly after with the strong role that the mining industry played in the NDP's 1975 electoral loss and the subsequent retraction of its mine industry regulations.

The initial mine provided a constant reminder of the continuing problem of Strathcona mining. For example, in the 1970's hikers on Flower Ridge could hear the Western mine and see a cloudy tailings plume extending from the its outlet for over four miles down Buttle Lake, which, before flooding and mining, one could see into for thirty feet. In addition many Campbell River citizens worried about heavy metal contamination of their drinking water. Therefore, I doubt the Government could have smoothly achieved its objectives for the Park merely by holding public hearings. The WAC did not mention public support for its recommendation for the Recreation Area in the Park. In fact it suggested that the public would strongly object to the deletions proposed by the Parks Division. The reason the Government did not hold the hearings was probably that the faction that was promoting logging and mining in parks knew public did not approve of resource extraction in provincial parks. As with Western's 1960's entry into the Park, with the Government "running interference" for Western Mines, the Vander Zalm Socreds also took an indirect approach to mining in Strathcona Park.224

For the Friends, the worst aspect of Government actions was not that Premier Vander Zalm appointed Rogers to the Environment Ministry or that Cabinet permitted him to make plans for resource extraction in parks; rather, the most insidious aspect was the Government's continuation of Rogers' plans to change Strathcona's status a week after he was forced to leave the Ministry

224 Ab Kent, "Business Views: Western Trial Run Soon," Times (Oct. 26, 1966), 13. Kent stated: "Howls of protest are being carried through to the highest court in the land, but the mining company, with the provincial government running interference, goes resolutely ahead with production plans [emphasis added]."
amidst allegations that he could profit from the charges. Marlene Smith explains that, given the trajectory the government was on, the March Order-in-Council was "only a formality." The conflict of interest blunder by the Socreds attracted much media attention. Because it was not clear how they could profit from it, however, the Friends did not directly focus on Rogers' conflict. Instead they stressed the Order-in-Council, the broken promises and the faulty legal advice accepted by the Government. The argument that the Government must pay claim stakers anywhere (let alone in parks) for the ore in the ground if the Government cuts off their permission to explore or mine was weak in the 1960's when Ken Kiernan developed it. It was further diminished by the 1986 B.C. Supreme Court decision against Cream Silver. These aspects of the Strathcona issue, as well as the possibility of further mining and logging in the Park, fueled opposition to the Government and support for the Friends.

A review of the Friends' activities shows a large amount of voluntary work. However, the large number of newspaper articles concerning the 1960's dispute over the Park suggests that conservationists did as much work then as did the Friends and others in 1987, and possibly even in 1988. The extraordinary aspect of the Friends' activism was their consideration of CD. As Des Kennedy explained, over the course of the year the Friends "exhausted all the possibilities" of traditional lobbying, but the SC Government remained adamant; therefore, the Friends resorted to CD. The membership was probably never completely unanimous about using CD but, as Kennedy explained, "[a]nswered with official lies, bullying and contempt, the group eventually informed the Government that any new mineral exploration in the park would be met with CD."225 By the winter of 1987 there was little support for the Government's Strathcona policies and an active, committed citizen group was poised to carry out CD to protect the Park.

Shortly after their January 14, 1988 executive meeting the Friends learned that Cream Silver had moved drilling equipment into the Park. The Friends believed that focusing on Cream Silver with CD could lead to increased public awareness in a number of respects: the history of Strathcona's looting, Cream Lake's beauty, mine pollution in the Park, the Environment

Ministry's ineffective defence of Strathcona, its broken promises, faulty legal advice and, finally, the consequences of the Orders-in-Council. The Action Committee decided that when Cream Silver had set up its drill rig at the Price Creek site specified in its park-use-permit, the Friends would stage an action at the site.
Chapter Six
The Friends' 1988 Blockade in Strathcona Park and its Aftermath

This chapter continues analysis of the research question introduced in the previous chapter: How do the Friends of Strathcona Park articulate the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space? The first main section concerns the crucial step in the use of the Park and in the Friends' development: the Winter 1988 blockade in the Park. A second section covers the Strathcona Park Advisory Committee (SPAC) struck by the Government in response to the blockade which eventually led the Government to improve Strathcona's protection. The third section deals with the other main result of the blockade, the trial of the 64 people who were arrested. The fourth section reviews a number of subjects related to the group's more recent work in protecting Strathcona Park, including: recent political (election of the NDP) and legal (cases on mining in parks) developments, the Friend's relationship to the "Tin Wis Coalition", and the rise of other wilderness depletion problems in the central Island area including a proposed inland freeway near the East Coast. Broadening the analysis in this manner leads to a richer understanding of the Friends, its members, and the continuing challenges faced by them and other group regional groups devoted to wilderness protection.

6.1 The Blockade in the Park
Although the Government denied it, the Friends' use of CD in Winter 1988 was the major factor in the formation of the Strathcona Park Advisory Committee which subsequently led to greater protection for the Park. The following sections describe the blockade: its setting, maintenance of the blockade camp, media representations and the surge of support for the blockade, negotiations over public hearings and the final arrests and rallies in the Park.

Setting the blockade
As explained above, in January 1988 the Action Committee decided that the Friends would use CD to block Cream Silver as soon as it started drilling at the Thelwood Creek site, two miles south of Buttle Lake, specified in its park-use-permit. However, this is not quite what happened. On Friday January 23, 1988 Karl Stevenson drove to the south end of the Lake and up the steep
gravel road to the Thelwood Creek drill site. There he saw the company had installed a cook trailer and was preparing the site with a bulldozer. But he didn't see the bunkhouse and the drill rig. He made the two hour return drive over icy roads to his Merville home and discussed with his wife, Sue, the setting that night of a blockade to prevent the drill rig from getting to the site. They were worried about the interruption in their affairs the blockade would cause, whether the media would cover a winter blockade in a remote park, and if the Friends would ultimately support it. Nevertheless, they decided to request the Action Committee members to commence an action that night; Karl then spent several hours telephoning members of the Action Committee. After many phone conversations between members, the Committee decided to set the blockade on the following morning. Karl arranged for the media and other protestors to go to the site and at about three in the morning, with Sue and his mother and father, he returned over snow-covered roads to the intersection of the Westmin Mine Road and the Jim Mitchell Road where he met several other members of the group. They parked their cars in the middle of the narrow entrance to the Jim Mitchell Road, which leads up to the Price Creek drill site and waited for the bunk house and drill rig to arrive.

The following morning a newspaper and television reporter and several more protestors arrived. Unbeknown to the protestors, the drill rig had been brought into the site the previous evening. But at about 10 a.m. a double wide trailer with the bunk house and several company pick-up trucks pulled up to the blockade of twelve people and several vehicles. Scott Tomlinson, the company geologist, asked the protestors to move and, when they refused, he radio-telephoned to the Campbell River RCMP. When the RCMP arrived they advised the blockaders they were liable to charges of blocking a public highway and mischief. However, they did not arrest anyone but advised them to reconsider their course of action. The police suggested to the drill crew they leave for the day so the protestors could deliberate. As Stevenson explained to the media "the police seemed really reluctant to arrest us."1 This reluctance likely stemmed from the company's lack of an injunction enabling the police to make

1Laurie Best, "Friends' blockade keeps miners out," Record (Jan. 27, 1988), ?
arrests, and from the RCMP's staff shortage for making a large arrest 90 minutes' drive from Campbell River. Likely a tow truck would be required to move the vehicles. Over the next week, the company crews tried several times to get through the blockade but each time they were turned back.

Once the blockade was established the Friends began organizing for a sustained confrontation in the Park. Although many of the protestors were mountaineers and hikers, and the site was car accessible, it proved difficult to maintain a winter camp with over twenty people at a site 90 minutes one-way drive for Campbell River members and longer for those who lived farther south. But there seemed to be sufficient support among the membership to maintain the blockade. In the second week, Dave Routledge said "[l]ast week was probably 10 or 15 below (Celsius) with a wind blowing, and then it snowed. But we had a fire going all the time and we've built a shelter...We've had a lot of firewood, food and other supplies delivered. People have brought tarps, and some have given money. Many of us have had to take time off work and it's costing us a lot but its a worthy cause." 2

Media coverage and an appeal to the Friends' membership through a phone tree drew needed protestors to the site. Not all of them were familiar with non-violent CD. To ensure that the blockade remained passive, the Friends held more workshops in Courtenay and Campbell River. At the site several members wore black arm bands and explained to newcomers the precise reasons the Friends were blockading as well as the philosophy and techniques of passive resistance. They also distributed handouts including the Code of Non-Violence which stated:

Each individual in this action must agree to adhere to the following: (1) Our attitude will be one of openness, friendliness and respect toward all individuals whom we encounter; (2) We will use no violence, verbal or physical, toward any person; (3) We will not damage property; (4) We will not bring or use alcohol or drugs other than for medical purposes; (5) We will not run; and, (6) We will carry no weapons.
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Another precaution the Friends took was to insist on non-violence in speeches during rallies they held in the Park. The Friends had to escort several people from the protest site and the camp for not following the rules, but by and large the protest remained peaceful.3

The Friends shared their coffee, food, and camp fire with the ten drill crew workers and explained their purposes to them. The crew's geologist Scott Tomlinson said, although workers were sometimes frustrated with uncertainties that the Friends' tactics brought to the work day, they were paid full wages during delays and "[m]ost of the workers sympathized with what the protestors are trying to do."4 The Friends also appointed Steve Smith to serve as a liaison with the RCMP. One of his tasks was, if possible, to inform the RCMP beforehand of whatever tactics the group planned. This approach encouraged the generally favourable relations of the Friends with the RCMP. Corporal Bill McBratney commented that "[y]ou're dealing with as good a group of protestors as you're going to meet."5

The Friends knew that their camp would come under scrutiny and wanted it to be impeccable, especially since they were criticizing others' environmental behaviour. The Minister of the Environment, Bruce Strachan, expressed the only negative opinions of the Friends' camp. His comments (made on a radio show) regarding loose dogs and the absence of flush toilets drew an indignant response in the Times-Colonist from one of the Friends' spokespersons, Des Kennedy. He wrote: "As a member of the Friends, I judge the group's conduct in the park above reproach. The only dog running loose in the area throughout the last month belongs to the drill camp cook. In fact, the Friends are demographically top heavy with grandmothers of impeccable civility and grace."6

So, the camp's success depended on the hikers' outdoor skills, preparatory work throughout 1987, and initiatives by group members. In the latter regard, Ruth Masters singled out Dave Routledge's work as the "linchpin of the camp."
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The first arrests

Through 1987 many active members had reached personal decisions to help with CD and if necessary to be arrested. Blockaders decided to buy gasoline and to spend the time to drive to the Park. Arrestees had to consider the time and expense of the arrest and trial as well as possible fines, jail and a criminal record. For many members there were also important moral considerations. For legal and tactical reasons, the Action Committee decided executive members would not be arrested so, for example, Marlene Smith could assist in the blockade but would not volunteer to be arrested. However, because she was one of the principal founders of the Friends and a particularly active member, Marlene felt that if she did not approve of the blockade, others in the group might follow suit: resulting in the blockade being called off. She agreed to the blockade in phone conversations on the evening of January 22nd, but stayed awake that night reflecting on her decision. Reflecting about her partly Jewish parents' WWII resistance to the Nazis in Holland she said, "My parents' example gave me the strength to stand up against 'law' that was created by humans to protect the status quo and their power positions, which could be devastating to other people and to the environment. If they could do it then I could do it." Following her sleepless night, Marlene resolved to support the blockade. For many of the blockaders, particularly those involved in CD for the first time, there was much personal agonizing over this step.

Protestors who had attended CD workshops were aware of the arresting procedure and at the blockade sheets were distributed to novices explaining the "Rights and Consequences of Arrest," "Support for Those Risking Arrest," and "Things Arrestees Should Know." Attention was directed to the need to arrange for a backup person to tend to one's personal and legal affairs while one was incarcerated, and to the need for witnesses to each arrest, preferably with video equipment.

Five days after the blockade was set, on Thursday January 28th, Cream Silver received a Court Order prohibiting the Defendants (Marlene Smith, Karl Stevenson, Jack Larson and the
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Friends of Strathcona) from preventing the Plaintiffs (Cream Silver its agents and employees) from drilling in the Park. On Friday the RCMP served the injunction. During the first days of the blockade many people indicated they were willing to be arrested. Anticipating arrests and taking advantage of the greater number of people who would drive to the Park on the weekend, the Friends arranged for protestors to arrive on Friday night. Campbell River RCMP attempted to "circumvent cameras" by arriving at 5:30 Saturday morning. To avoid the possibility of a confusing melee with the forty just-awakened protestors blocking the narrow gravel road with their bodies and cars, the RCMP gave the protestors time to decide how they wanted to proceed.

The Friends' original plan (to have five or more arrests with numerous spectators) was disturbed because fewer people than was expected had arrived the previous evening. The blockaders feared that this might indicate that active support was less than anticipated. Moreover, several of those who were willing to be arrested were needed for further work at the site, which would not be permitted under bail conditions. But the media was present, so it would not be appropriate to simply stand by. As Des Kennedy explained, "If we all stood aside, the cause would be lost. If we all were arrested, our momentum would be lost." So the group "opted to have three people arrested that morning and initiate a campaign of intermittent CID geared to attract increasing participation and public attention." The first three arrestees would be Kel Kelly, Carol Latter and Gordon Cyr.

Blockaders moved the vehicles and then all moved aside except the three to be arrested. The company geologist, Scot Tomlinson, drove to 18 inches from the three to verify they were indeed blocking the road and an Officer explained the Injunction to them: if they did not move aside, they would be charged with public mischief and obstructing a highway. Kel Kelly explains his final reflections: "I sat in a lawn chair and felt lonely but right. It was criminal the way the Park had been opened to big business and big Government. They were the criminals.

---

9Laurie Best, "Pre-dawn raid arrests protestors," Record (Feb. 3, 1988),?
10This account relies in part on the writer's interview with Kel Kelly on April 29, 1990.
12Ibid.
Carol and Gordon had similar feelings." Police carried their limp bodies one by one into the waiting cruiser. Although people had been arrested for CD when attempting to create wilderness parks in B.C., the Friends cite these three arrests as the first ever in Canada for protecting an existing national or provincial park. On the drive out the arrestees observed an RCMP road block which was turning back protestors. Later they found that this police blockade had been in place since nine o'clock the previous evening, which explained why reinforcements had not arrived after that time.

On the same day that the first arrests took place, the Hereditary Chiefs from the West Coast Nuu-chah-nulth Nation and the East Coast Laich-kwil-tach Nation signed a "Declaration of sovereign right to declare complete inherent title and ownership to the lands in question." The Nuu-chah-nulth claimed land from the West Coast to the height of the land in Strathcona Park and the Laich-kwil-tach claimed land from the East Coast to the height of the land. After signing this treaty at the east/west cusp near the Gold River Bridge on Highway 28, some of the Indians went to the drill site. After the arrests, the company pick-up trucks and the truck pulling the bunkhouse had moved past the Friends' first line of defence and driven five kilometers up the steep, rough, gravel road to the Thelwood Creek drill site, and were followed by about 200 protestors. The Indians held a ceremonial dance above the drill rig and Chief Jerry Jack welcomed the protestors saying, "I wanted to welcome you people to our land. If we all get together as one, we can do something about this problem. Our fight is together. Enough is enough." Other speakers berated the Government and spoke in favour of the blockade. Some of the protestors then blocked a bulldozer. The RCMP were called but they explained that they did not have sufficient resources to make further arrests. In the late afternoon it appeared that the
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RCMP were not returning that day so the protestors returned to their base camp at the foot of the gravel road. After Cream's trucks left for the day, the blockade was reset to prevent their return. The RCMP arrived that night at 2:00 a.m. and made four more arrests while bystanders sang "Oh Canada Glorious and Free". Dave Routledge waved a large Canadian flag in front of police cars carrying away arrestees. As Des Kennedy explained "we wanted to recognize that these were good citizens doing their duty."\textsuperscript{17}

On the following day, Sunday, the protestors advised the RCMP that they planned further CD at the drill site; the RCMP, however, said that they were on a skeleton crew and were therefore unable to make more arrests.\textsuperscript{18} After the drill crew workers finished assembling the rig, the protestors stood under it, preventing its ignition. They stayed there overnight and through the following day since the RCMP had still not arrived. The anxious wait ended late Tuesday when the RCMP arrived with two security guards hired by Cream. All but two protestors disbanded and mine employees erected a wire fence around the rig. The constables escorted Paul Scanlon and Mike Morrell to the police car; then, minutes later: "as if signalling victory, the drilling machine spewed out exhaust fumes and the roar of its motor drowned out another refrain of 'We Shall Overcome.'"\textsuperscript{19}

Cream's Scot Tomlinson explained that the rig would run 24 hours a day while the security guards patrolled the fence. The chief advantage for the company was that guards could make arrests using "reasonable force" immediately after protestors breached the fence, thus avoiding delays while waiting for the RCMP. The Friends discussed whether disturbing the flimsy fence constituted violence and decided it did not. All further CD involved stepping over or moving aside the fence and advancing towards the moving machinery so that the driller, in the interest of safety, had to shut down the rig. This form of CD at the drill site was in accordance with the Action Committee's original plan.
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**Media coverage and the surge of support**

The Friends believed that extensive favourable media coverage would attract donations, members and blockaders, and increase awareness of the issues, all of which would generate further pressure on SC and NDP MLAs to support the Friends' objectives. The Friends had a Media Committee and spokespersons to cultivate the media, but one of the main unknown variables in the blockade was the role of the print and television media. An independent Campbell River television reporter relayed the initial confrontation between the protestors and Cream Silver to BCTV for the Saturday January 23rd evening news. In the following weeks, both the CBC and BCTV flew reporters into the site. Numerous telephone calls to their station and other signs of public interest led BCTV to cover the blockade, at times nightly, on the evening news over their provincial network. Interviews were held with protestors, Cream employees and the RCMP at the site. Off-site interviews were held with the Minister of Environment and Parks officials. Videos showed the distinction between the drill machinery and the surrounding forested area. Views of the protestors often showed their picket signs; the only one which was repeated stated "Don't Cut the Heart Out of Strathcona Park" with a drawing of a heart in some cases substituting for the word. This became the main symbol of the Friends' cause, especially in several events staged around and on Valentines Day.20

Newspapers covered all the issues leading up to the blockade as well as details of the blockade, especially the arrests. Reporters described the circumstances of each group of arrests and tabulated the total. They explained the Friends' demands for hearings, withdrawal of the March 1987 Orders-in-Council, and for Cream to leave the Park. As well, they devoted particular attention to mine pollution.

After its expansion, Westmin had apparently curbed further Buttle Lake pollution by depositing its tailings on land, by sprinkling lime on the piles, and by digging containment

20 Other pickets included: Want to Drink More Mine Poison, Standing on Guard for Canada, Supernatural B.C. or Supernatural B.S., Cream Silver Get Out of Our Park, Park Plunderers Get Out, How Many Park Thieves Ever Got Arrested, Cream Silver Wreckcreation Area, Every Citizen has a Duty to Protect Our Canadian Parks, Multiple Use Means Multiple Abuse, Protect Our Salmon Resource from Mine Poison, Welcome to Strathcona Industrial Park, Full Public Hearings as Promised, Visit Your Alpine Plunderland, Creaming the Park, Mining the Shareholders, Make Your Pile in Patronage Park, and, Cream Silver Go Home.
sumps around the piles. But questions arose over the low bond that Westmin had been required to post and the likelihood that, after the mine was abandoned, the Government would eventually have to deal with the tailings piles which were accumulating at the rate of 2,000 tonnes per day.

A week before the blockade was set Joan Smallwood, the NDP's environmental critic, told a news conference that some abandoned mines leak sulfuric acid which frees environmental contaminants such as arsenic, copper and zinc threatening fish, wildlife and drinking water. Courtenay and Campbell River were among the communities near what she called "acid generating time-bombs."

On February 3rd Smallwood urged the Government to stop further mining in Strathcona Park because it "presents a threat to the public safety."

On Feb. 12th the Vancouver Sun's Glen Bohn wrote an evocative article on acid mine drainage stating:

When sulphur-bearing rocks are mined for their metals, broken up and exposed to oxygen and water, they generate sulfuric acid. The acid will leach metals out of the rocks, creating a toxic cocktail. Even more metals will be set free by a natural bacterium found in all acid mines - Thiobacillus ferroxidans. The bacterium multiplies, getting energy from the sulphur and iron in the rocks. The more bacteria, the more metal released.

On February 15th Bohn and Barrett reported on a paper commissioned by Cream Silver which pledged that if Cream established a mine in the Park it would implement a "well-designed reclamation program" to prevent acid drainage. However, Bohn and Barrett explained the difficulty of containing acid drainage at Mount Washington and Westmin mines. It then considered the possibility that heavy metals released from Westmin tailings could cause the unusually high cancer rate in Campbell River. Perhaps most worrisome, Keith Ferguson, from Environment Canada, said that tailings can produce acids "for decades, centuries, or perhaps millennia after mining has ceased."

Cream Silver's president, Frank Lang, contended mineral exploration should be permitted because it did not damage the environment and because there was only a slim possibility that a
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mine would result from Cream's speculative drilling. But he contradicted himself by pointing to the proximity of the test holes to Westmin's orebody and enthusing that a mine which might provide hundreds of jobs could be imminent. He showed "letters of praise and thanks from residents around his Hemlo Gold Mine near Lake Superior" supporting the employment opportunities offered by the mine; but, significantly, his presentation lacked any words of praise from a B.C. union.

Another problem with Lang's assurances came three weeks after drilling had commenced. Cream Silver's operating permit specified that all waste must be completely contained, and Lang had given a personal assurance that "the test drilling is completely non-toxic using all biodegradable materials." Yet, as Friends spokesperson Anne Cubitt explained, the Friends sampled water with "grey sludgy material reeking of diesel fuel and hydraulic fluids" flowing from the drill site. This pollution violated the park-use-permit, so the Friends complained that the violated permit should be withdrawn and submitted it along with a jar of the effluent to the Ministry of Environment. Cream Silver maintained the Friends were deceiving themselves; what looked and smelled like high concentrations of diesel fuel was in fact only a miniscule quantity. Nevertheless, Cream quickly dug a containment sump hoping the Ministry would not withdraw the permit. In response several members of the Friends drew attention to the pollution as well as the Government's unwillingness to fine or shut down firms which pollute by showing jars of the smelly effluent to politicians and the media.

These aspects of mineral exploration and mine pollution and the media attention led to support for the blockade. Don Cooper, a 72 year old WWII veteran and retired mill worker, who had previously worked at the Western Mine, specified concerns about pollution when he was
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arrested on January 31st. Another arrestee, Chief Russell Kwasistala, specified pollution as one of his main concerns saying that "[t]he quality of drinking water for all people in the area has deteriorated and we are not going to see our children poisoned." Believing that acid drainage damages inland spawning grounds and surrounding ocean, the United Fishermen and Allied Workers (UFAWU) also supported the blockade from its beginning. Kel Kelly cites water pollution as one of the most important reasons for the increasing public support for the Friends' cause. "The water issue is closest to home for most people...Strathcona Park is the watershed for communities to the east and west, north and south - Port Alberni, Parksville, Qualicum, Courtenay, Cumberland, Comox, Campbell River and Gold River."

The Friends were pleased that extensive coverage of the blockade and its causes in regional newspapers, provincial dailies and on BCTV had made their cause an important provincial issue. Newspapers not only covered the issues in articles; editorials in several newspapers, including the Vancouver Sun, commended the Friends' brave stand. Only Cream Silver, the Mining Association of B.C., and Premier Vander Zalm spoke publicly against the blockade.

With few detractors and many supporters, enthusiasm for the blockade grew. One sign of rising support was increasing membership in the Friends. When the blockade was first set the media reported that through 1987 the group's membership had grown to about 1,000. Shortly after the blockade was set, newspapers reported a sharp increase to 1,400 members. The Friends pointed to this indication of the popularity of their cause as well as to their wide range of supporters, including Indians. In spite of natives being a well-documented, fundamental component in earlier disputes over Meares Island and South Moresby Island, in 1987 the Friends had not cultivated support among natives or considered land claims relating to the Park. I am not sure why. Some members supported native entitlement and may have known that the 14 bands
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in the Nuu-chah-nulth initiated a formal land claim on the westerly Strathcona lands in 1980. But most group members had not followed native claims and rarely, if ever, saw Indians in the Park. Most members only found out about land claims on the Strathcona lands when Chief Jerry Jack welcomed the Friends to the Indian land. Further support was offered the Friends on February 25th when the Hereditary Chiefs issued a press release indicating their land claim, concerns about pollution, and their recognition of "those people including the Friends of Strathcona who have committed themselves to the protection of our Hereditary environment."  

A new coalition in which natives participated also supported the Friends. What was first called the Coalition, then the Strathcona Coalition, and finally the Tin Wis Coalition, began at a Vancouver meeting on Feb. 3rd 1988. Colleen McCrory (Valhalla Society), George Watt (Nuu-chah-nulth chairperson), Paul George (Western Canada Wilderness Committee), Joan Smallwood (NDP Environment Critic), and Simon Lucas (Chief of the Hesquiat Band) were at the meeting. Friends of Strathcona members participated, Kel Kelly acted as chairperson and Juan Barker took notes. But they also went to ask for assistance for their cause. Participants agreed to help with a rally that the Friends and others planned to hold in the Park on the following Wednesday, and to discuss a joint strategy and possibly to form a coalition later that day at Strathcona Park Lodge.

The Friends had so far held two rallies in the Park. On Saturday January 30th, after the first arrests, about 200 people attended a rally and blocked a bulldozer. The following weekend on February 6th the Friends staged another rally after which protestors marched from their base camp at the foot of the Jim Mitchell Road to the drill site with three life-size effigies of protestors provided by the Red Heart Theatre Collective.

Three days later on Wednesday Feb. 10th, in spite of it being a week day, about 300 people attended the rally at the Ralph River Camp Ground. Natives from the Nuu-chah-nulth and Kwakiutl Nations attended with ceremonial dress, and several of their leaders spoke from the
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38I relied on my April 29, 1990 interview with Juan Barker for information on this meeting.
stage through the public address system. George Watt, from the Nuu-chah-nulth, considered the possible negative outcome of native/environmentalist alliances, citing legal bills that natives had been required to pay without assistance from environmentalists after the otherwise successful campaign to protect Meares Island from logging.39 This may partly explain why no natives followed Chief Russell Kwasistala's example of being arrested at the Strathcona Park blockade. In spite of his reservations, Watt pledged Nuu-chah-nulth support for the Friends. Another Nuu-chah-nulth speaker, Archie Frank said "if you destroy the environment, you have destroyed everything that God gave you in this land...without the environment we are all dead. Progress can only go so far before you destroy yourself."40

Another speaker at the rally, Joan Smallwood, NDP Environment critic, referred to a letter of encouragement that the NDP leader, Mike Harcourt, had sent to the Friends. She then "pledged her party's support to Native peoples in achieving settlement on land claims and committed the NDP to participate in the campaign to save Strathcona Park."41

Frank Cox, a UFAWU organizer, was one of the main labour speakers. He pledged the UFAWU would co-operate with other organizations to save Strathcona Park and then continued: "we also see this [dispute over Strathcona] as part of a broader picture to bring together environmentalists, trade unions and native people around the broader vision to challenge the Vander Zalm government and others who are selling out the province." Until this point, the Friends had focused on the single goal of protecting Strathcona Park. But the government responding to their concerns with "official lies, bullying and contempt" lent credence to Cox's broad view of the Friends' problem and its solution.42

Kel Kelly, a Friends spokesperson and the first person arrested, seemed to concur with Cox's views. In his address, Kelly said: "It's become clearer as this issue grows, it is not just about Strathcona Park - its about the future of British Columbia." If the Vander Zalm Government succeeded in opening Strathcona to more logging and mining, further destructive policies and

39Juan Barker and Kel Kelly discussed Watt's speech in their April 1991 interviews with the writer.
40Glen Bohn, "Strife in Strathcona: 18 drilling protestors arrested," Sun (Feb. 11, 1988), 1, 2.
practices would likely follow. Alternately, stopping Strathcona's destruction could advance a more progressive agenda. Concerning Strathcona Park, Kelly explained that there seemed to be some progress in the group's dealings with the Government. Upon returning from a vacation that had begun before the blockade commenced, Bruce Strachan announced that the Government might be acting on "flawed" legal advice. Nevertheless, Kelly believed the Government's role in Strathcona mining to be particularly insidious. It not only permitted companies to explore for minerals in Strathcona Park but, under the Ministry of Energy's Financial Assistance for Mineral Exploration (FAME) program, it had granted $60,000 to help Cream Silver carry out drilling in the Park. Kelly advised, "We have a situation here where our government is using our money to encourage mining in our Park. It is really imperative that we not let them get away with that."

When the Ralph River rally ended at three p.m., about half of the protestors drove home. However, about 100 more drove up Jim Mitchell Road to the drill site and a further 30 went to the Strathcona Park Lodge for the planned coalition meeting.

Those who went to the drill site began picketing the rig. So far the Friends had been limiting arrests to small groups in order to get the most media coverage out of the limited number of people available for arrest. The force of the issues raised by speakers at the Ralph River gathering, however, led to a spontaneous rupturing of this policy. Some of the protestors moved the fence and approached the drill rig. Scott Tomlinson then signalled for the workers to stop the machine and it ground to a halt. Most of the protestors gathered around the rig in the mud and pouring rain. The security guards put the fence back up and threatened to arrest those remaining within it. Eighteen protestors stayed inside. These were too many for the security guards to arrest so they waited for the RCMP. When the RCMP came hours later, in a single car, 18 people still waited under the drill rig and were arrested. The arrests, which took about five hours to complete due to the shortage of police cars, brought the total number of arrests to thirty-one.

44Ibid. Also see Anon. "18 charged at Strathcona," Times-Colonist (Feb. 11, 1988), ?; Griffin, op cit, Feb. 17, 1988; and Anon. "Eighteen arrested in park." Free Press (Feb. 12, 1988), ?
At Strathcona Park Lodge about 30 people discussed coalition formation, wrote a draft constitution for the "Coalition" and addressed the "immediate concerns" about Strathcona Park. Following the meeting, the Friends issued a news release which explained that the Coalition meeting represented the first time that the participant groups, which were listed, had agreed to work together. The release also contained the Draft Resolution stating:

We support the Friends of Strathcona in their demands for: (1) An immediate end to exploratory drilling in the Park, (2) Preservation of the quality of water and habitat in the watersheds of Strathcona Park, (3) Open public hearings which are unbiased, legally constituted and well publicized, and which involve native, union and environmental group participation, (4) Restoration of the 1986 boundaries and status of Strathcona Park and (5) An end to mining, logging and other industrial use of the Park.

The Draft further stated: "We respect and support the right of the First Nations to resolve the issues of aboriginal title and native land claims." Finally it indicated opposition to the "policies of the Provincial Government in land use, resource management, and other areas", and the Coalition's intention "to establish an alternative agenda to that of the present Government."

When the Friends had originally set the blockade, members and reporters had been unsure of the degree of support that it would attract. On February 4th Browne had written that the first seven arrests had "chipped away at the central foundation of the group" and that "prevailing winds of disillusion, fanned by long days and nights of below-freezing temperatures, seem to be nipping the resolve of other protestors." On Feb. 4th Dodd too had considered the possibility that park protestors were "losing ground." But after the three events of February 10th, the Ralph River rally, 18 further arrests and the Coalition meeting, surging support for the Friends' cause was obvious. One media account reviewed aspects of the day's work and confirmed Kel...
Kelly's statement that the combined events of Feb. 10th made it a "historic day" as well as his assessment that "we have an endless supply of people to continue the blockade." 51

**Negotiations for public hearings and further protests**

The first contacts that the Friends had with the Government concerned Cream Silver's Injunction and the Friends unsuccessful appeal of it. Then, on Feb. 7th Premier Vander Zalm announced that further mineral exploration should be permitted in Strathcona. 52 He reasoned that if another mine was built in the Park, most recreationists would not know it was there, and that further mineral exploration and mining would benefit local communities. 53 The next day, February 8th, Bruce Strachan took a more conciliatory approach to the Friends' concerns referring to "new information" and particularly the legal opinion the Friends had acquired which suggested that the Government was acting on "flawed legal advice". But he was careful to state that the protest was not what led him to reconsider his stance. 54 Since April 1987 the Friends had been questioning the Government's legal advice; Strachan had received their legal opinion six weeks before the blockade began. The coincidence of Strachan's reconsideration of the Government's legal advice with the blockade suggests that the blockade, as much as new legal information, influenced him to reconsider that advice and to begin negotiations with the Friends.

Strachan entered into discussions with the Friends and a meeting was held between Strachan and the Friends on Feb. 25, five days after the Ralph River rally. Discussions concerned whether the Friends would take down the blockade, Cream would withdraw from the Park, the March 1987 Orders-in-Council would be rescinded and there would be a public inquiry on the Park. Strachan adopted a generally conciliatory tone. But after the meeting, at a press conference held by Strachan and the Premier, Vander Zalm indicated he was "not prepared to change his stance allowing mineral exploration in the park" and "hinted that he may well overrule Strachan on the
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53 Ibid.

54 Pamela Fayerman, "Victoria to take second look at allowing drilling in park." Sun (Feb. 9, 1988).
issue if necessary.\textsuperscript{55} Simply doing nothing, which is all Vander Zalm seemed to suggest, was not likely a serious possibility. The Campbell River Court and RCMP were being deluged with Strathcona work and Cream Silver's mineral exploration was being disrupted. The question likely arose in Cabinet as to taking further action against the protestors. Stronger legal or police action could have stopped the protest but might have led to declining S.C. popularity at the next election, particularly in Island ridings. In addition, it could have fueled popular support for the Friends' blockade as well as for broader opposition to the Vander Zalm regime expressed in the Coalition's Draft Resolution.

At the first meeting with the Friends, Strachan had agreed to stop issuing permits for further mineral exploration in the Park, and to hold a public review on Strathcona Park. But at that meeting and in four subsequent meetings he would not satisfy three of the Friends' other key demands. First, Strachan would not return the Park boundaries to their 1986 status while hearings were taking place and, second, he would not immediately revoke Cream Silver's park-use-permit. Thirdly, Strachan did not agree to a full public inquiry under the Inquiry Act. For the Friends an Inquiry was crucial. It would have the power to subpoena witnesses (including MLAs) as the Friends thought necessary to get at Government wrongdoing, which they believed was the source of their problem. Moreover, the recommendations of such a review would be binding on the Government. Strachan, however, contended that the Friends were advocating a costly and time consuming "witch hunt" which would produce little of interest. I think the analysis in the previous chapter shows that the Friends suspicions about Government improprieties were justified. Therefore, it is likely that one or more Socred MLAs and/or high level Parks Division bureaucrats strongly opposed holding an Inquiry with powers to subpoena witnesses concerning events leading up to the March 1987 Orders-in-Council, their passage and further defence, particularly after public questioning of the Government's legal advice.\textsuperscript{,}

The Friends did not achieve a full public inquiry as they desired, but their focus on the Government's broken promises to hold public hearings and their demand for an inquiry to be

\textsuperscript{55}Quentin Dodd, "Strachan promises park hearings." \textit{Courier} (Feb. 16, 1988), ?
held prompted Strachan to consider holding hearings of some sort. On March 8th, after the fifth meeting, the talks between the Friends and Strachan reached an impasse. Strachan explained to reporters that he would proceed with a public review (but not a full public inquiry) without further input from the Friends and that, although Cream Silver's current permit would not be withdrawn, he would not issue park-use-permits while the review was being held.\textsuperscript{56} Social Credit MLAs who supported the Orders-in-Council might have been mollified by the hope that the commission proposed by Strachan would recommend their retention; or they may have thought that, by the time the commission finished its work, active support for the Friends would have declined so that recommendations for improving Strathcona could be delayed. The public inquiry was to some degree acceptable to the SC caucus if only, as the Friends suggested, as a public relations gesture to buy time.

The Friends had little confidence in the proposed review. Dr. Bruce Wood said "I'm sure cabinet has already made up its mind to allow mining and logging in our parks, and the committee report will either justify those policies or cabinet will ignore the findings."\textsuperscript{57}

On February 23rd after the third unsatisfactory meeting with Strachan, the Friends and the Coalition staged a rally of 150 people at the Campbell River Court House to show support for the first three arrestees who were then being tried. After the rally the Coalition had a second large meeting at Thunderbird Hall in Campbell River. By then twenty-six organizations had joined or were interested in joining the Coalition.\textsuperscript{58} Those who attended discussed the long-term objectives of the organization, how it might be built and funded, its mandate and scope, and the need for an office. Although they had difficulty in considering how to accomplish all of this

\textsuperscript{56}Anon, "Friends out of ministry park review," \textit{Mirror} (March 9, 1988). \textsuperscript{57}Nancy Brown and Kim Westad, "Provincial park review 'inadequate public relations gesture,'" \textit{Times-Colonist} (March 11, 1988), D16.

simultaneously, participants agreed on "the need to remain focused for the moment on Strathcona Park." 59

Following the eighteen arrests on Feb. 10th, the Friends began to believe that the initial talks with Strachan were making some progress, so in the ensuing days there were few more arrests. Two arrests highlighted a Valentines Day rally and five protestors were arrested on February 23rd. The Friends' tactic (the 18 spontaneous arrests on Feb. 10th excepted) of having arrests made in small groups had successfully attracted the attention of the regional and provincial media, but had received little attention in the national media nor in the Federal Government which tends to concern itself only with national parks. After the talks with Strachan had reached an impasse and he had begun the non-judicial inquiry, Cream was still drilling. The Friends resolved to make a national issue of their cause by raising the total number of people arrested to over sixty.

On March 12th the drill rig (then at the third of its three holes) was shut down for six hours while the arrests were carried out. Two hundred spectators sang "Oh Canada glorious and free" each time a group of protestors was led or carried off. Twenty-six people were arrested, bringing the tally to sixty-four. 60 The well-known environmentalist, Colleen McCrory, then went to Ottawa to plead the Friends' case to the national media and to MPs, including the Federal Minister of Environment, Tom McMillan. McCrory acknowledged that because Strathcona was a provincial park it was not directly under Federal jurisdiction. Nevertheless, she held that its desecration deserved national attention because, as indicated by the 64 arrests, Vander Zalm was "working in total isolation not only of his own cabinet, but also the people who elected him" in the "gutting of B.C.'s park system." Therefore she believed that "the Federal Government has to recognize there's a maniac out there" and people across Canada have to "recognize there's a very dangerous situation." 61

Despite some national interest in the Strathcona issue, the Friends and

59 Ibid.
McCrorly generally never managed to cross the that barrier the national media has toward covering provincial parks.

The Friends had a last show of support to coincide with the conclusion of Cream's drilling of the three holes authorized by its current park-use-permit. On March 26th the Group staged a benefit rally at the Civic Theatre in Courtenay and the following day held a final rally in the Park. Throughout the blockade the Friends had commented on the wide range of people who supported them, including many elderly people. Perhaps their most active supporter was Ruth Masters who had begun hiking in the Park in 1938. During 1987 and 1988 she had a large billboard installed on the side of her pickup truck that stated "Quit Looting Strathcona Park"; she also spoke at public meetings and wrote newspaper articles on behalf of the Friends and she helped set up and maintain the blockade camp (particularly the outdoor privy). She was well-loved in the group for playing the national anthem, Oh Canada, on her harmonica (one time over the national CBC evening news), while protestors were, as she says, "being shoveled into the Paddy Wagon". In order to highlight the support of Masters and other seniors, the Friends organized a "grandparents' rally" to coincide with Cream's exit.

Among the 300 people who attended in the wind, snow and rain that brought to a close "a winter of discontent" were Anne Haig-Brown, the widow of the late conservationist Roderick Haig-Brown, and Leonora Towell, the 86-year-old daughter of Arthur McCurdy who in 1911 helped influence Richard McBride to establish Strathcona Park.62 These women urged the audience to protect all provincial parks both through activism and through their choice of candidates in provincial elections.63 Noted environmentalist and Coalition member David Suzuki, who had provided the most significant national attention to the Strathcona Park issue in his well-known Toronto Globe and Mail column, was the key note speaker. He discussed broader aspects of the environmental crisis as well as the particular importance of the Strathcona issue. An officer from the Comox Valley Old Age Pensioners' Organization said his group was
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62 Verne McDonald, "Friends put Strath fight on hold," Record (March 30, 1988), ?
"sending a resolution to the Provincial network of OAPs' annual convention urging support for a ban on mining in all B.C. parks."\(^{64}\)

Cream Silver, despite mounting protests, stated that it planned to return to complete its drilling program. The Friends indicated that they would cease their protests in the Park pending the outcome of Strachan’s review, but that their protest would re-escalate if Cream resumed its operations in the Park.\(^{65}\)

It is clear that the Friends' blockade and related Coalition activism influenced Strachan to strike an advisory committee. Less clear are the effect of the last arrests and the rally which took place after Strachan had announced that he would strike the committee. It may have influenced some Federal MPs to caution SC MLAs to adopt a more cautious approach to mining in Strathcona Park. The last protests also likely helped influence the Government to pass an Order-in-Council on May 19, 1988 prohibiting mineral exploration in the Recreation Area, instead of granting a permit to Cream Silver to continue its program. The elderly non-traditional activists, many of whom were also regional property owners, their growing fraternization with the Friends of Strathcona, and their proximity to the developing Coalition may have caused some SC MLAs to encourage Strachan to make the proposed review publicly credible, particularly over the selection of Committee members. There were negative comments from the Friends and other park advocates about the Chairperson, Peter Larkin, who had served on the Wilderness Advisory Committee which had first recommended that a large Recreation Area, in which mining was permitted, be established in the Park. But the three other commissioners, Frances Jones, Roderick Naknakim, and Jim Rutter, were generally accepted by the Friends and other conservationists.

6.2 Further Work for Legislation to Protect the Park

In this section I first consider the Friends' and others submissions to the committee, the Strathcona Park Advisory Committee (SPAC), which Bruce Strachan established. These

\(^{64}\)Ibid.

\(^{65}\)Anon, "Protest wraps up as drilling ends in park," Sun (March 28, 1988), ?: Anon, "Drill Rig to Leave Strathcona," Monday Magazine (March, 1988), ?
submissions help explain the Committee's recommendations for improving the Park, especially that there be no further logging and mining in it. Then I will turn to the Friends' further work to influence the Government to implement these recommendations.

Some members thought that the Friends should make a major submission to the Committee, while others believed that, in order to distance themselves from its findings, it would be best to not make a submission. Some also believed that the Friends should only make submissions to the inquiry that the Nuu-chah-nulth and Kwakiutl Hereditary Chiefs were planning to hold into Strathcona's use. The Chiefs planned their own inquiry because of their dissatisfaction with the SPAC, especially the absence of Native land claims in its terms of reference. This inquiry, however, was never carried out. Due to the timing of the collapse of the Chiefs' Inquiry, some members of the Friends and others had already forgone the opportunity to make submissions to the SPAC, leading to an initial problem in the hastily-made relationship between the Friends and natives. The result was that the Friends made one submission as a group to the SPAC and several group members made individual submissions on their own.

The Friends submitted their own arguments as well as those of their lawyers. The Friends began by explaining the circumstances of the 64 arrests that led to the striking of the Committee and requested it to "immediately recommend to the Government" that the charges be stayed. The Committee did not comply, but its review of the circumstances of the striking of the Committee as well as its recommendation both tended to legitimate the stand of the arrestees. The Friends criticized the role of the Parks Division and the Ministry of Environment in wilderness destruction in Strathcona Park. The Committee recommended that the "Parks agency work toward a greater commitment to reflect public concern for Strathcona Park" and generally to lobby more actively for parks in the Government. The Friends criticisms of the Committee's terms of reference may have been a factor in the Committee deciding to "interpret the terms of
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67 "Minutes: Strathcona Coalition Meeting" (July 3, 1988).
68 FOSP, "Submission of the Friends of Strathcona Park to the Strathcona Park Advisory Committee."
69 Larkin et al, 3, 4.
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reference as broadly as necessary in order to obtain all relevant information" and to "establish what is right for Strathcona Park, and from this, to make socially responsible recommendations that are both practical and environmentally sound."71 The Friends made a specific objection that native land claims were not in the SPAC's terms of reference. In this regard, the Committee noted that it lacked either the "mandate or the expertise" to address land claims, but it nevertheless made several suggestions for natives' inclusion in the planning process for the Park.72 Finally, the Friends advised the commissioners:

You must be forceful in your recommendation to protect our parks. If our existing parklands are not secure, it is very difficult to get excited about new additions to the park system. What happens to these new parklands when they are discovered to hold commercial tree stands or possible commercial ore bodies? Will these new additions then be reclassified as "areas of low park value" and be deleted?

The points made in the Friends' submission were repeated by others, but the commissioners may have paid particular attention to the Friends' arguments because of the active role the group played in the formation of the Committee.

The other aspect of the Friends' submission was the legal opinion they received from McAlpine and Hordo in 1987 and an additional analysis of the Park's legal situation by David Pederson of that firm. Pederson addressed the complexities and ambivalences of law pertaining to claims in Strathcona and concluded "the Committee is not a Court of Law and should not attempt to speculate as to any issue of compensation which might ultimately be determined by the Court." Rather it "should be focused clearly on the issue of whether mining activities are desirable in Strathcona Park." The Committee concluded, "our recommendations for government action must not be based on a poorly defined fear of compensation, but instead on the questions of: (a) whether the areas affected should be protected as parkland, and (b) whether the environmental impacts of mining in these watersheds should be tolerated."73 The Committee did not recommend closing Westmin Mine but recommended strengthening regulations for the operation. On the crucial issue of mineral exploration, the commissioners recommended that no

71Ibid, 5.
72Ibid, 82. The comments on the inclusion of natives in planning are not made in the Committee's numbered recommendations so I refer to them as suggestions.
73Larkin et al, 70, 71.
further mineral exploration be permitted in the Park outside of the Westmin Lease and that the Government acquire through negotiation or expropriation all mineral claims outside of the Westmin lease. Although many submitters maintained that the Government should acquire these tenures, the Friends' submission was particularly influential being made by a law firm: especially since Cream Silver ignored the case they had previously lost in Court and McAlpine and Hordo's legal opinion while continuing the company's dogmatic argument that the Tener decision extended to its claims in the Park.

Another influence that the Friends may have had on the Committee was submissions by individual group members. They made about 30 of the 224 written submissions of which I will consider three.

Ruth Masters' raised the most issues pertaining to the Park describing its "looting", through collaboration between industry, the Parks Division and the Ministry of Environment, while speaking from the sure basis of her experience in the Park that began with her first hike there in 1938 and continued to the present. Summing this experience up and explaining why Strathcona was likely the most mis-managed park in Canada, she commented: "if all the conniving, corruption, lies, land rape, patronage, stealing and vandalizing which make up the sorry history of Strathcona Park were ever documented, the story would not go into a volume, - you'd have a whole library." Ruth made it clear that the Strathcona issue would not subside if
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74 This may have been a difficult recommendation to make given the B.C. and Yukon Chamber of Mines submission which points to the importance of the Tener decision and then pays particular attention to a general statement on the issue of compensation: "The concept of fundamental Canadian justice must be applied to all legal mineral titles in British Columbia regardless of their location. Unless the area of existing mineral claims within parks is deemed by government agencies as being absolutely necessary to maintain park values, the exploration, development and production should be allowed to continue on such claims under responsible and responsive regulations. In the event that government feels that it is compelled to expropriate mineral claims before they can be adequately tested, compensation must be based not so much as on what has been spent on the claims but on the mineral potential" (Submission no. 181 to Larkin et al, 1988). The mineral potential can only be assessed by exploration. Therefore, if the Chamber's recommendation is followed, in order to expropriate claims the Province must compensate according to a company's estimate of "mineral potential", or permit exploration to assess the potential; adding to the company's investment and cost of expropriation at cost.

75 Cream Silver Mines Ltd. "Submissions of Cream Silver Mines Ltd. to Strathcona Park Advisory Committee." Submission no. 182. to Larkin et al, 1988). I do not know why Cream ignores its 1986 suit against the Government. Later cases suggest it could have got a legal opinion to indicate the weakness of Southin's decision and so it could have at least indicated its intent of appealing the 1986 decision.

the Committee took a middle course in its recommendations concerning further resource extraction in the Park: "The Protest Camp equipment is in storage, ready for use again, on short notice" in the event that the Park again needs to be "physically rescued."

Rob Wood's submission constituted the Friends preliminary concept for the Park. Five sections addressed how to improve the Park by: (1) phasing out industry, by acquiring mineral tenures and restricting Westmin's operation; (2) increasing recreational use of the Park by building peripheral service villages and by improving trails and campgrounds; (3) promoting the Park as a regional recreation resource, and worldwide tourism destination; (4) protecting the watersheds; and, (5) by making several additions to the Park. Drawings and maps illustrated the suggested improvements. The conclusion included notes on public hearings, democracy and the Canadian heritage, and recommended making Strathcona a Class A Statute park. Wood's submission was likely particularly influential on the commissioners, and especially Peter Larkin who several times had expressed frustrations with oral submissions which focused only on the Park's misuse rather than on how it might be improved.

Peggy Carswell, who was on the Friends' delegation that toured local councils in 1987 and on the Friends' committee that negotiated with Strachan, as well as serving on the Board of the Regional District of Comox-Strathcona, made numerous points in her submission. The motions that the District and local councils passed, in response to the Friends' delegation, were included in a separate submission. However, in Section One, Carswell explained how the short notice given for the SPAC prevented local governments from passing appropriate motions to make a full submission to the Committee. She recommended that in future commissions, a lead time of six months be provided. Sections Two and Three concerned the watersheds of the Regional District and recommended that the Task Force on Community Watershed Management be resurrected to study water pollution before further industrial activity be permitted in the Buttle
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Lake/Campbell River watershed. Section Four included a preliminary proposal for the terms of reference for a proposed study to develop a tourism and recreation strategy for Strathcona Park. Section Five urged that the 1987 Order-in-Council be rescinded and that future downsizings in Park be made only after public input and legislative debate. Section Six concerned the appropriate form of legislative protection for parks. Section Seven recommended that a permanent Advisory Committee on Strathcona Park be created with members from "Regional Districts, Chambers of Commerce, Tourism Associations, Outdoor Clubs etc." In Section Eight she recommended that four areas be added to the Park and seven others be considered for additions. Finally in Section Nine she recommended that local governments and groups be encouraged to apply for funding to make improvements to the Park. At various points Carswell referred to the high level of support in the Regional District of Comox-Strathcona and/or its member communities for her recommendations. Small businesses and regional tourism bodies didn't make submissions to the Committee. Therefore, the submissions by the Regional District and Carswell were the surest evidence that the Committee had of support for the Park's protection and how it could be developed for recreation and tourism.

The Committee observed the almost complete indifference of the Government toward developing Strathcona as a park. It found that, extraordinarily, "highway signage does not inform the traveller how to find the Park" and that, once in the Park, it was a challenge to find out how to access its "tremendous recreation resources." It made six recommendations for developing the Park's tourism and recreational potential. One was that the Government "convene a Strathcona Tourism Strategy meeting" involving Councils and Chambers of Commerce, Parks Division, Ministry of Tourism, Outdoor Recreational Council, and related organizations "to develop a common strategy to promote the recreational use of Strathcona Park."82

80 Peggy Carswell, "Maximizing the Economic Benefits of Strathcona Park to Communities in the Mid-Vancouver Island Region: A Conceptual Proposal".
82 Ibid, 86.
The 224 written and 125 oral submissions showed the variety of opinions about Strathcona Park, and indicated that the public (at least those involved in the issue) generally supported Strathcona's protection. I reviewed the 224 written submissions. Five of these were not for or against the Park's protection but pertained to requests for information from the Committee. Only 17, three by individuals and 14 by corporations and their interest groups, advocated further resource extraction in the Park. Logging interests didn't request access to Strathcona's forests but pointed to the need for the limited amount of Crown and private timber around the Park for regional economic development. The Committee considered these limitations in their recommendations for additions to the Park. The pro-mining submissions contended that: mining benefits regional economic and employment development; mines don't damage parks; resource industry transport routes improve recreational access; mine tours serve as tourism destinations; mine pollution is overestimated; the Mine Development Review Process is sufficient for environmental protection without special Park requirements; and, finally, that the Tener decision applies to mineral claims in Strathcona thus expropriation would require compensation for the ore in the ground. The Committee granted little credence to these arguments in its recommendations.

About 200 of the 224 submitters indicated that they were in favour of improving the Park as a park and had serious concerns about further resource extraction. Although 200 submissions are not significant in terms of the Island's population, fifty-five of these submissions were made by groups indicating broader support for park protection. For example, the Campbell River Labour Council's submission supporting park protection specified that it represented 5,000 unionized workers. The submissions ranged from single sheets to ambitious briefs by the Sierra Club, B.C. Wildlife Federation and Outdoor Recreation Council.

Concerning resource extraction in the Park, the Buttle Lake dam issue had subsided, but one submitter and long time Strathcona advocate, Syd Watts, recommended that, since mainland electricity now came to the Island, the Lake should be returned to its original level. My count
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indicated the most common affirmation, made by 82 submitters, was that "mining and logging" should not be permitted in Strathcona Park. Thirty-two recommended that the Government acquire forest and mineral tenures. Some of these considered the Government's flawed legal advice and stressed that expropriation should be carried out based on out of pocket investments in exploration. The second most common concern, made in 69 submissions, was the problems that mine pollution cause for fish habitat and drinking water, independent of park values. Fifty-three submitters highlighted the damage that mining causes to park values. Objections were raised in this regard to all the effects of the Westmin mine, including: noise, appearance, effluents, dammed alpine lakes, and the danger of mine trucks on Park roads, and particularly on Highway 28 by the Strathcona Park Lodge. The submissions made a jump from many considerations of regional problems mining causes for Strathcona Park and regional waters to about 20 writers who considered broad global problems of population and economic growth in an industrial society. No criticisms were made of possible ecological problems caused by Strathcona minerals at loading facilities on the Strait of Georgia for Strathcona lead, zinc, and copper concentrates, the shipping of this material to Japan, smelting it, or manufacturing it into commodities for consumption and their ultimate disposal. This contrasts with the debate over uranium in the Province which focused on the ecological problems of provincial uranium mining but in which the entire uranium-based commodity cycle was also critiqued, leading to a complete ban on uranium exploration and mining in the Province.

Concerning park values, sixty-nine submitters advocated tourism, sixty-two recreation, fifty-nine wilderness preservation, and forty-two the necessity of wilderness for future generations. Some of the tourism advocates had extraordinary faith in Strathcona tourism, recommending that the Park become an "international tourism destination", which was, as one submitter stated, "sustainable in perpetuity." Fewer representations, twenty-three, discussed Strathcona's value for science, education and spiritual renewal as well as the rights of nature. About ten writers explained that, though they did not go to it, they enjoyed thinking of the areas of untrammeled wilderness in the Park. Only seventeen submissions, four of them made by native groups,
mentioned Indian land claims. The lack of interest in land claims was probably due to the fact Island conservationists, like those in many other jurisdictions, have only slight interest in native issues.

Regarding the Government's management of the Park, only five submitters criticized Rogers' conflict of interest. This relatively low number may be the result of the Friends' strategy of focusing on other issues, such as the Orders-in-Council. Fifty-two submitters complained about the Orders-in-Council. Thirty-two criticized the Government's decision making process. Forty-four criticized the flawed legal advice that the Government claimed to be acting on (the Friends' confirmation and broadcasting of this point was probably the main influence on the high number of these submissions). Fifty-two submitters, in among the most bitter denunciations of the Government, criticized the euphemism "Recreation Area" and the "double speak" in a newspaper published by the Ministry of Environment immediately after it created the SPAC. Forty-eight submitters questioned the SPAC's credibility and considered the likelihood that the Government would not act on its recommendations should it favour protecting the Park. Thirty-eight recommended that the Park be granted stronger legislative protection especially as a Class A Statute park. Others were concerned that even Statute protection would be insufficient and called for a higher form of protection in order to avoid Strathcona's further degradation at the hands of the legislative majority of a short-sighted government. Some of these submitter specified that a public body should be appointed to govern and protect the Park.
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85 Ministry of Environment and Parks, Strathcona News: Advisory group hearings begin May 19 (Spring, 1988). For the Friends comments on the paper see Anon, "Environment ministry newsletter called cynical manipulation," Times-Colonist (May 10, 1988), D1. The Committee chair, Peter Larkin, sent a letter to Bruce Strachan on May 2nd, subsequently published in the Record, expressing his "committee's unanimously deep concern" regarding the "ill advised paper" and makes a detailed textual analysis of the newspaper and how it impinges on the government's and the Committee's integrity. Peter Larkin, "Mr. Strachan," Record (date ?).? The Friends May 1987 Newsletter was very critical of doublespeak: "In January 1987, the Government of B.C. announced its capitulation to those who wish to mine and log the park. Roughly 69,000 acres would be deleted from the park, to be balanced by additions of 'equitable value' but only totalling some 20,000 acres. In addition, a gigantic swath of virgin land through the heart of the park, running from Buttle Lake to Della Falls, highest waterfall in North America, and embracing some of the finest alpine scenery in Canada, would be designated 'recreational area'. How nice you might think, to have all that land set aside for the public enjoyment. But 'recreational area' in the language of Government doublespeak, means mining and logging...In March 1987, the park deletions and the so-called recreational area were passed into law by an Order-in-Council, thereby neatly sidestepping the possible inconvenience of open debate with the legislature."
A philosophical debate also took place over the demands of contemporary society and how to resolve the parks/mining conflicts. Cream Silver maintained that "Government should be urged to adopt and publicize the concept of multiple land-use - there is little room in modern society for one dimensional thinking." Westmin Resources contended: "With increasing population and a growing awareness of the finite limits of our land and resources, land-use conflicts have become more common. Society is being forced to gradually abandon the luxury of expanding the number of single purpose land-use areas, but rather to rely more on a multiple land use or shared resource concept in order to maintain both a high economic standard as well as an enjoyment of our natural environment."

This represents a purely theoretical view which is devoid of historical experience: people do not and never have enjoyed a "natural" environment in which mines are located. If a "high economic standard" means maintaining a high standard of living, it is true that an industrial form of a high standard in this regard, such as is found on Vancouver Island, contributes to the use of Strathcona for resource extraction. This is something that Islanders will have to address (in a more fundamental way than recycling) if they want to protect Strathcona, and the environment in general. Many analysts believe that we need to start thinking of forms of living that are pleasurable, but do not destroy our life support systems; in my opinion, this would lead above all else to a reduction in the mineral-based commodity cycle. The few submitters, other than Westmin, who considered ecological generalities tended to accept the merits of our contemporary standard of living; however, they also stressed that they would accept a lower living standard in order to protect the Park.

It is not so much economic/population growth or an ambiguous subject ("Society is being forced") that has resulted in resource-based economic development in Strathcona which brought Islanders into conflict, as the Westmin writer suggests. Rather, specific groups such as mine employees, mining capitals and their interest groups as well as their advocates in the SCP, have
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influenced the form of and place of development (a mine in Strathcona Park) that stimulated social conflict. Nick Chernoff, from the Communist Party of Canada, commented: "The record shows that, over the years, succeeding governments have been responding to pressure from absentee industrialists and not the ordinary people in the area. If the Park is to be preserved, then the wishes of the people must prevail." Several submitters resented the "cramming together" of activities as a response to tenure holders' rights, the need for employment and population/economic growth as envisioned by multiple use advocates. For example, John Wilson, a geologist and member of the Friends, observed that "two-hundred ton ore trucks are not permitted on highways - they belong in open pit mines; airports don't coexist with powerlines; and mines are not allowed in the Vancouver watershed. Similarly, the concept of 'park' doesn't include provisions for heavy industry."89

The oral presentations, like the written submissions, were dominated by arguments in favour of protecting the park. When this pattern became apparent, Peter Larkin commented that, although submissions were ten to one in favour of protecting the Park, the Committee would make its recommendations based on the submissions' substance rather than quantity in favour of one side or the other. In the end though, the Committee agreed with the majority recommendations. The title of the SPAC's report "Restoring the Balance" makes a clear distinction between its contents and the earlier document "Striking the Balance" which Bruce Strachan issued after he permitted Cream Silver to explore for minerals in Strathcona Park.

The SPAC Report's concluding statement declares:

"Strathcona Park was long ago recognized by British Columbia as a special place deserving of preservation. It is now time to endorse that it is a park in the fullest sense. Failure to act resolutely now will only lead to more difficult and expensive solutions in the future. Strathcona is foremost an important wilderness reserve, with considerable potential for associated tourism and outdoor recreation.90"

In this and the recommendation that no further mineral exploration be permitted outside the Westmin lease there could be no clearer endorsement of the Friends' stand.

The Friends' victory

Rather than making "Restoring the Balance" public when he received it on June 27th 1988, Strachan withheld, it explaining "[i]t will come to Cabinet's Environment and Land-Use Committee and then to Cabinet, who will make the decision on when to release the report." When the blockade ended, the Friends attempted to catch up on their personal lives. However, they did arrange a rally at the legislature in Victoria, carried out public education on Strathcona, worked on their submissions to the SPAC, and attended the trials of the 64 defendants. The May Order-in-Council prohibiting mineral exploration would not expire until August 31st, but the Government continued to refuse to release the SPAC Report. In June Cream Silver applied for a park-use-permit and in July Frank Lang issued an official statement, which explained that the company's claims in Strathcona were their top priority and that further exploration could lead to a $300 million construction project which would provide long-term employment of 500 people. Lang went on to point to the irrationality of park advocacy groups and said "[o]ne [presumably the Friends] is led with semi-religious fervor, believing the wilderness and tourism value to be supreme...regardless of most any other benefit, this group is adamant in opposing mining operations within park sites and united in their mistrust in mining companies."4

In response to these and other indications that mineral exploration might recommence in the Park, the Friends, "a once-obscure environmental group whose membership [had] mushroomed to 3,000 members after the arrests this winter", returned to the Park, and set up a "watch dog camp" about 200 yards from the Price Creek Bridge. Des Kennedy explained that the camp was "to assist visitors, conduct CD workshops and maintain a watch against industrial
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91 Anon, "Cabinet Decides its Fate - Strath Report Kept Secret," Record (July 6, 1988). He reiterated these comments in Glen Bohn, "Strathcona report kept under wraps," Sun (July 22, 1988).
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intrusions." The Friends had "a team of 10 CD trainers" and, although the group hoped it would not be necessary, "any plan to move mining equipment into Price Creek, or anywhere else in the park, [would] be met with resistance...if the Government is foolish enough to allow the company in, they will find us waiting for them."96

One can appreciate the group's high wire act. Membership was approaching 3,000 and still rising, as were donations, and it was summer so more people would attend rallies in the Park than in the previous Winter. At the same time, the verdicts on 61 of the accused, for whom the Friends were paying legal costs and had agreed to cover the cost of any fines meted out, had not yet been handed down. Moreover, Cream Silver had launched a civil suit, which would be heard after the Crown's case against the defendants, against some of the protestors for damages it claimed to have suffered during the winter blockade.97 But the Friends' show of force at this time and/or the SPAC's recommendations caused the Government to reconsider its stand on resource extraction in Strathcona Park.

On August 26th the Government extended the moratorium on mineral exploration in the Park to December 30th. Then, on September 1st, Terry Huberts (who replaced Bruce Strachan, to become the fifth Minister of Environment in two years) released the SPAC's Report and issued a news release.98 Huberts described the public interest in protecting Strathcona, particularly since it is the first Provincial Park, "so it is time to clear up old mistakes made at Strathcona so that the Park can achieve its potential as first perceived so many years ago." Therefore, "no new tenures will be issued, and no new mineral exploration or logging allowed." He specified "[t]here will be no new mineral exploration in Strathcona Provincial Park, except for the Westmin Site."

Des Kennedy was concerned that through a nuance of wording, resource extraction might still be permitted; he therefore described his initial reaction as "cautious ecstasy."99 But went on, "If in fact what we're talking about is an end to new mining and an end to logging we would be

96Ibid.
97Quentin Dodd, "Park mine ban gets extended," Upper Islander (Aug. 30, 1988), ?
slavish in showing our appreciation to the Government. It's all we could ask for." The Announcement was seen as a victory for the Friends of Strathcona as well as a firm policy statement which would be difficult for the Government to later reverse.100

The September Announcement indicated the Government's intention of following the SPAC recommendation that there be further public discussion before legislation setting the Park's final boundaries. In effect, the Master Plan Process begun in 1987 would recommence, except this time the terms of reference would include park boundaries and the elimination of mining and logging tenures. When Huberts announced the re-formation of the "Strathcona Park Steering Committee" it included three community members and four Parks Division members. The Friends approved the appointment to the Committee of Peggy Carswell and Jim Rutter. Jake Maselink, the new Deputy Minister of Parks who would chair the Committee, was vastly preferred by the group to Vince Collins whom he had replaced. However, they would have preferred that the Committee follow the SPAC recommendation for a Committee of five "that represent the spectrum of public perspectives on Strathcona, including local community interests, environmental interest groups, recreation groups and park associated, compatible business interests."101 Moreover, the Friends disapproved of the Committee because a representative from their group was not permitted to serve on it.102

At Committee hearings the Friends and others continued their lobby for a return to 1986 boundaries and for a Class A Statute park. The Government moved slowly in that direction. In February of 1989, while the trials were still in progress, the Ministry of Environment announced that the Park would be returned to its 1986 status; however, two days later a spokesperson explained that the release announcing the changes was a "draft" that was released in error.103 In June 1989, with the trials over, the Government passed an Order-in-Council making the
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Recreation Area into Class A park. In Feb. 1990, as result of a survey, the submissions and its own work, the Steering Committee recommended that the boundaries be fixed much as they were before the 1987 Order-in-Council and the Park be made a Class A Statute park. Finally in the 1990 legislative session the SC Government amended the Park Act. As noted above, Schedule A is a listing of previously created parks which the NDP made into Statute Parks in 1973 and Schedule B is a listing of ten parks which the NDP then established as Statute Parks. The 1990 Amendment added a Schedule C, making 23 more existing Parks into Class A Statute parks, among which is Strathcona Park. The Recreation Area created in the March 1987 Order-in-Council shrank back to the Westmin lease. Concerning the deleted areas, the Friends, and especially Marlene Smith who had made a personal commitment, were particularly pleased that the Bedwell Valley was returned to the Park. There remains several small areas that were not returned to the Park including an area in the Park's southeast which may be used for further resource extraction in exchange for other additions for to the Park. This has remained a thorn in the Friends' side. The Amendment attracted less attention in the press than the September 1988 Announcement; the Friends' role, hailed as a victory for the group in 1988, was only given a passing mention in several articles. But I think this analysis makes clear that the Friends' activism, mainly their blockade but to and including their lobbying of the Steering Committee, saved the Park.

The Friends also attempted to influence the Steering Committee's plans for Strathcona recreation and tourism. In 1989 the Friends of Strathcona Park Advisory Committee (FOSPAC),
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106 The Parks Division proposed calling the Westmin lease "Myra Park" after Myra Ellison who was the lone woman on the 1910 Ellison Expedition confirming the value of the region for the first provincial park. Westmin had named its Strathcona property "Westmin Resources Ltd. Myra Falls Operations" after Myra and her namesakes, Myra Falls, Myra Mountain, and Myra Creek over which their lease lies. One of the Friends' minor victories was stopping the extension of Myra's name as a benign euphemism to the now heavily-polluted industrial area. However, the Amendment refers to the area as "Strathcona - Westmin Park". In Spring 1993 the Ministry of Environment began referring to the mining zone as Kieman did: "Class B park" [Ministry of Environment, Strathcona Park Master Plan (Victoria: Queens Printer, 1993)].
led by Ernie Yacub and Rob Wood, held public meetings and produced a "Working Plan For Strathcona Wilderness Park", and in 1990 they further clarified their plans for the Park. While the Friends' original objective was to stop resource extraction in the Park, in this Working Plan they dealt with the tension between the demand for Strathcona recreation and tourism versus retaining it as a nature reserve. The resulting concept includes: core park areas which would see no human visitation, other areas where only non-motorized transport and no-trace camping would be permitted, and further areas where there was already road access which would permit auto camping. Additional autocamping and other intensive recreation facilities would be contained in "buffer zones" around the Park. The Friends could broadcast this plan if they disagreed with the Steering Committee's plans and it served as a guide in their submissions to the Committee.

The Steering Committee came up with three "Draft Management Options for the Park" which were simply called X, Y and Z. These were distinguished mainly by the changes that would have to be made to the park environment to accommodate visitors:

Option X emphasized the desire to maximize wilderness in the park. Option Y portrayed a concept that would see the wilderness made more accessible by designated trails, backcountry facilities and aircraft [landing facilities]. Option Z suggested that the park become more accessible with the construction of a north-south parkway linking Buttle Lake with the south end of the park via the Drinkwater Valley.

The Friends appreciated the increased recreational use which could stem from option Z. As the Committee explains this would "provide less energetic park users, or those with time limitations, an opportunity to enjoy viewpoints currently accessible only on foot." But in her address to the Committee, Marlene Smith spoke out sharply against option Z's "north-south parkway":

What a red herring! How dangerous! It proves that the Park's planners still bow down to the mining lobby! I would like to point out that the proposed road is located exactly where the mining claims in the park still ARE - yes ARE; Cream Silver and Casamiro claims are not eliminated yet! The first time I heard about this road was in March 1986 in a discussion with Colleen Kendall, then public relations person for Cream Silver. Do
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you need any other proof? You have only to see avalanches roaring down into the Drinkwater to realize the insanity of constructing a road there!\textsuperscript{112}

Except of course for mining. In a newsletter, the Friends' Executive urged group members to contribute to the planning process and suggested that Option X was the best.\textsuperscript{113} Partly as a result of the Friends' advocacy, the majority of the public responses indicated that Option X, which emphasized maximizing the wilderness area in the park, was preferable. Although this is the most wilderness-oriented option, it would see the improvement of existing trails and campgrounds as well as the construction of new ones. Road access to the Park would also be improved under Option X, particularly along existing logging roads.

Indians are also included in the new plans for Strathcona. The Draft plan reviews the historical geography of the Bands in the lowland and coastal areas around the Park and considers the ways in which pre-contact natives interacted with the mountainous hump on the Island.

\textit{It is believed} that the park area was used for hunting, trapping, gathering medicines and herbs. The wet mild climate allowed for the wearing of bark fibre for clothing, and the harvesting of yellow and red cedar probably occurred in the subalpine in the late spring and summer. These clothes were especially valuable when the climate was too hot for skin clothing to be worn, and became an important trade item. Yellow cedar bows and paddles were also a popular trade item. Berry picking expeditions were often long trips made into the park area. \textit{We are told} that the park was also a very spiritual place where individuals would go to communicate with their holy spirits or "Temen-Wos". Oral history continues to spread the native names of the mountains, lakes, rivers and valleys. Based on this traditional use, these ancestral lands are part of land claims awaiting settlement [emphasis added].\textsuperscript{114}

With introductions such as "It is believed" and "We are told", this a somewhat tentative view of the past existence of Indian activities in the region. But it is a strong stand for a Ministry of Environment document when the Province is entering land claim negotiations with Indians. At any rate, because of the native tradition in the region, future planning will "[d]evelop appropriate management, information and education strategies in consultation with native peoples."\textsuperscript{115}

In Spring 1993 the recently elected NDP Government released the completed Master Plan for Strathcona's development as a park, bringing to the end a problem that arose shortly after the
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1911 establishment of the Park. The fact that this plan does not include provisions for further logging and mining is mainly due to activism by the Friends of Strathcona.  

6.3 Sixty-four Defendants

The trials of the arrestees were a main part of the Friends' work from the first arrests on January 30, 1988 until Spring 1989 when the final decisions came down. After the drill-site arrest, the main difficulty in the arresting procedure was a bail condition which prohibited defendants from going within 5 kilometres from the protest/drill site. Some of the arrestees who would not agree to this condition spent several days in jail. In the sections below I shall begin with the trials of the first three defendants and the political debate over the trials, and then turn to the trials of the remaining 61 defendants.

The First Three Defendants and Political Debate Over all the Accused

There was a delay in bringing the first three arrestees to trial at the B.C. Supreme Court in Campbell River. Because of his involvement in the dispute over the Buttle Lake watershed in 1966/67 and/or because he expected to be subpoenaed by Defence Counsel, Judge Sarich disqualified himself from hearing the case. When the trial resumed with Judge Collins presiding, Defence Counsel presented a statement of fact, agreed to by Crown Counsel, which said:

...in 1966, the Greater Campbell River Water District board successfully obtained a B.C. Supreme Court injunction quashing a provincial waste disposal permit given Western Mines Ltd., the predecessor of Westmin Resources Ltd. Because of the injunction, and a pollution charge the board brought against the company over waste disposal, a meeting was held in April 1967 involving Ken Kiernan, then the Minister of Recreation and Conservation, the company and the board. The statement said it was agreed the board would drop its court action and objection to permits if public hearings were held on a report to be compiled on Western's waste disposal plans and if Western remained the sole industrial user in that area of Strathcona Park. But within weeks of agreement, the statement said, the provincial government gave permits to Cream Silver
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119 This account of the trials relies on newspaper articles and my interview with Juan Barker. Further research could begin by tracking down the lawyers, acquiring court documents, and paying for a transcription of the tape recorded proceedings.
for exploration in the area. In addition, the promised public hearings have never been held.\textsuperscript{120}

Judge Sarich was the Campbell River Water Board's lawyer. Because the hearings were not held and Cream was still in the Park, Defence Counsel argued for a stay of proceedings because "[t]he Government cannot be permitted to use this court to prosecute persons who have at the root of their activities reminding (the government) of its outstanding obligations."\textsuperscript{121} In addition to Judge Sarich, Defence Counsel planned to subpoena three former MLAs, including former Minister of Recreation and Conservation, Ken Kiernan.

Crown Counsel argued that a stay of proceedings for the reasons specified could lead to an "endless cycle" of protests. The Judge ruled against the stay because there was no evidence that concerns about broken promises in 1967 motivated the accused.\textsuperscript{122} Although the failure of the 1967 Agreement may have involved improprieties and could have contributed to the 1988 use of CD, the defendants were not aware of the Agreement and so even if its failure was unjust and allowed both mining in the park and invited CD, it did not excuse the same.

Defence attorneys also argued that the Crown had failed to prove that Cream Silver existed with appropriate documents and, as Dodd summarizes:

the offence had not taken place in Strathcona Park as laid down in the charges but in Strathcona Recreation Area. That there had been no real obstruction but merely a symbolic gesture to make a political point. That the Crown had failed to prove the criminal intent on the part of the demonstrators necessary to allow the charges to stand. That the Criminal Code of Canada's sections on mischief foresaw political actions and do not provide protection against the obstruction of "incorporeal" or intangible "property", such as the right to explore for minerals.\textsuperscript{123}

On June 2nd Judge Collins stayed the mischief charges. But he found the defendants guilty of blocking a public road, albeit with modest conditional discharges and six months' probation sentences. Nevertheless, for the defendants there was bitter irony, while the MLAs, whom they thought should be accused, were free. Natural justice could be partially restored with an
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acquittal, while injustice would be exacerbated with a guilty verdict. Some of the defendants' supporters in the gallery wept during sentencing. One of the defendants, Kel Kelly, commented "[i]f you were to look into the eyes of the Friends of Strathcona in the courtroom, you would find fear, sadness and rage as we watch democracy slip from our hands." 124

The defendants and the Friends could have been vindicated either by a courtroom acquittal or by the Attorney General agreeing to dismiss the cases against them. At their May 1988 AGM the Friends decided to lobby Attorney General Bud Smith to have the charges dismissed against all the defendants. 125 This became a serious possibility after the Government's September release of the SPAC Report and announcement that the Government would act on some of the Report's key recommendations. Des Kennedy, explained that the defendants had been vindicated by public opinion, the SPAC Report, and the changes in government policy, so: "It seems to us it would be a good idea not to waste taxpayers' money" by taking these cases to court. 126 A Vancouver Sun Editorial on Sept. 6th, shortly before the remaining 61 defendants came to trial, urged "[s]ince the government policy has now fallen in line with [the defendants'] protest, there no longer appears to be any good reason to proceed with their prosecution. Mr. Smith should order the charges withdrawn." 127 NDP MLAs did not comment publicly on what should happen to the defendants until October, eight months after the first arrests and one month after the release of the Committee's report and the Government's announcement. In October, Bob Skelly and Colin Gabelmann lobbied Attorney General Bud Smith to drop the charges because, as Skelly explained, the decision to allow mineral exploration in Strathcona "was bad law which the Government finally admitted was bad law." 128 On October 24, 1988 John Cashore, who replaced Joan Smallwood as the NDP's environment critic, wrote to Bud Smith. Cashore was pleased with the SPAC Report and Government's intention to act on its recommendations. 129
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But he believed this vindicated the defendants, so he contended that Smith should dismiss the charges. Smith wrote back to Cashore explaining that the Government had struck the Committee and was acting on its recommendation in response to the expression of public interest and not to the alleged criminal activity, and so the Government's new policy on Strathcona did not excuse the blockaders.¹³⁰

Delegates at the SC Convention in October, following the announcement that there would be no further logging and mining in the Park, did not openly criticize the Government's change in policy.¹³¹ However, to avoid the possibility of similar problems arising again, several delegates spoke against land being withdrawn from resource development; they also asked Bud Smith to protect from protestors people who have legitimate rights to harvest resources. Regional Development Minister Elwood Vetch was amenable to this approach stating that "[w]e must have the environment protected but in so doing we can't have crazy environmentalists running the show."¹³² Smith added that a large part of the problem stemmed from the carefully orchestrated protests of environmentalists that the media are only too willing to report. He also noted that those resorting to use of CD should "more appropriately share some of the costs of law and order when they do their deeds."¹³³ Not only were blockaders arrested and found guilty, the blockade seemed to be leading to a toughening of laws against CD.

The trials of the remaining defendants

When the trial of the 61 remaining defendants commenced on October 24th, Crown counsel explained that he was dropping charges on Don Cooper because of his frail health and low level of involvement in the protest.¹³⁴ Another issue before the court concerned the case of Chief Russell Kwasistala who contended he should not be convicted of stopping a mining corporation

¹³⁰Les Leyne discusses the return letter in "AG bound he'll prosecute protestors who saved park," Times-Colonist (Oct. 27, 1988). ?
¹³²Ibid. For conservationists' response to Vetch's comments see Nancy Brown, "Crazy environmentalists warn protest will continue," Times-Colonist (Oct. 25, 1988). ?
¹³⁴Mark Hume, "Protestor hits Crown for setting him free," Sun (Oct. 27, 1988). ? Cooper had worked for Western Mines in the Park years before and had plenty he wanted to say so the Friends believe that Crown Counsel dismissed charges so he would not be heard in Court.
from damaging land which belonged by hereditary right to the Laich-kwil-tach Nation. This case demanded judgment from the court on whether this land claim was valid and, if so, whether Kwasistala had a right to defend it from mineral exploration. Russell also maintained that since the Laich-kwil-tach had invited the protestors to defend their land, the non-native defendants could also make a colour-of-right defence of native land. A colour-of-right based on, as Juan Barker explains, "the belief that the aboriginal land claim superseded any other jurisdictions" and the "argument that not to act in defence of that land claim was a worse crime than to actually break the law."\textsuperscript{135}

There was agreement among the defendants concerning the issues over which they had become involved in the conflict over the Park and had been arrested. Disagreement, however, arose over the possibility of native entitlement to Strathcona which had only arisen as issue in the midst of the blockade. In general, since the natives' key demand is the right to determine the land's use, they are reluctant to state how they will use the land should a land claim succeed. Park advocates generally want assurances that the land will be used in a certain manner. Even if natives agreed to a certain form of use, park advocates would query whether natives would or could follow through on this agreement. While some of the Strathcona defendants held this cautious approach to native land claims, others felt that land claims to Strathcona Park should be settled forthright in favour of the natives. In the pre-trial conference it emerged that some of the defendants might make sole use of the colour-of-right defence of native land, others might make it a part of their testimony, and some might not use it at all.

It would take three court days to "resolve whether the claimed Indian ownership of the land and a resulting invitation to non-natives to be there form a sufficient defense against the Criminal Code charges of obstruction and mischief which the protestors face."\textsuperscript{136} If this was found to be a sufficient defence, the court could then proceed to hear lengthy testimony as to the validity of the ownership claim and the defendants' claim that they were attempting to defend native land. The Federal Government may also have had to be brought into the case. As the
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complexities mounted, Kwasistala extricated himself from the proceedings. As Kwasistala explained to me, Judge O'Donnell (in his chamber) told Kwasistala that if he wanted to pursue a land claim he would more likely succeed in a civil court rather than the criminal proceedings in which he was then engaged. Kwasistala agreed. But he did not recognize the Court and therefore would not enter a plea, so Crown council entered a not guilty plea on his behalf. Judge O'Donnell did not include this nuance in his account of the trials, stating that Kwasistala "pleaded guilty to obstruction in order to expedite the proceedings." At any rate, Kwasistala was found guilty of obstructing a highway but was granted an absolute discharge. He did not retract the offer of hospitality to the protestors, so the non-native colour-of-right argument concerning defense of native land proceeded.

Over the winter of 1988-89 the remaining protestors were tried. There were several main points in the complex trials from which one of the main benefits the Friends believed they had acquired by the time they were over was a useful education in law and the legal process.

The accused were classified according to the circumstances of their arrests. Two groups of protestors were arrested for mischief and for blocking a highway. The first of these groups was the original three people arrested who were tried in June and found guilty of blocking a highway. The second group came to trial in the winter of 1988/89. The remainder of the accused were tried for mischief pertaining to blocking a bulldozer or for obstructing drilling under various circumstances at one of three different drill holes. The defendants were also defined according to their arguments. There were three main types of defence. Steve Lawson and Aden Crane proceeded solely on the colour-of-right defence of native entitlement to unsullied land. The remainder of the accused were divided according to whether or not they used native entitlement as part of their defence. These and more detailed arguments were made depending on what the Friends' legal committee, the accused and lawyers felt was moral, truthful and/or likely to succeed in law. The Friends' lawyers sometimes gave the defendants conflicting advice. Many of the defendants took the advice of one lawyer that it was best to defend themselves by

speaking from the heart as to why they had engaged in CD. The defence focussed on, for example, how the circumvention of the Strathcona Park Act, the improprieties of the 1987 Order-in-Council, ongoing pollution problems and the circumstances by which the accused came to understand these matters, all legitimated their use of CD. When the defendants raised points concerning their possible vindication by the SPAC recommendations and the Government's acting on them, Crown council objected that this was not at issue since it had occurred after the arrests. Judge O'Donnell then sustained these objections.

In order to avoid repetition and thereby expedite matters, the accused came forth in groups and could make defences on previously heard arguments. Because of this procedure, the Judge withheld sentencing until all cases were heard so that those tried later would not have the benefit of knowing which defences would prove successful.

In a further twist to the proceedings, one of the defendants, geologist John Wilson, introduced map evidence showing that the first of Cream Silver's three drill holes was on Westmin Mines' property.139 Since Cream did not own the claim, Wilson maintained the case against the defendants charged with protesting at the first hole should be dropped. O'Donnell would not admit these government maps as evidence because Wilson had not had them certified. Wilson subsequently had the maps certified and introduced them as evidence in the defence of those accused of disrupting work at the second drill hole. But, as Wilson testified, the second hole seemed to be exactly on the border between the properties of Cream Silver and Westmin and thus did not provide clear evidence of claim jumping.

After all 59 cases had been heard, Judge O'Donnell assembled the accused for sentencing. Steve Lawson and Aden Crane were the only ones charged with blocking a highway and mischief and also were the only ones who relied solely on the colour-of-right defence of native land. The Judge did not address (at least as reported in media accounts) the native rights issue but held that the exploration team were within their rights to go through the blockade to go to bed at the drill-site bunkhouse.140 Nevertheless, Juan Barker believed that the Judge found

139 Anon. "Mine's map not correct expert says," Mirror (March 1, 1989), ?
Lawson and Crane guilty to make it clear that he did not countenance the colour-of-right defence of native land.

Surprisingly, the remaining 57 defendants were acquitted: the Judge "spotted a loophole in the Crown's case." The loophole was the Crown's failure to prove the existence of the 1987 Order-in-Council establishing the Recreation Area by formally submitting it as evidence. When the Judge announced the acquittal: "After a few moments of calm the packed public gallery, which had defendants, supporters and observers, spilling into the aisle, erupted into cheering, clapping and hugs." There was a measure of satisfaction in the decision. The Friends were relieved that there would be no fines, which they had agreed to pay. The Defendants' decisions to be arrested had been made voluntarily and their commitment to the Strathcona cause remained firm, but few of them had anticipated the amount of work and time that the trials ultimately involved. As Dodd commented, the ruling "brought an end to untold hours of court appearances and arguments." The defendants had also attended numerous pre-trial conferences and meetings with lawyers. The Friends' legal committee of six met repeatedly both with the defendants and with the Friends' five lawyers, who were sympathetic to the cause and volunteered at least some of their time. Therefore many of those in the gallery were pleased that all this work had finally come to an end and that the defendants were not found guilty. Still the result was far from satisfactory for many defendants and their supporters.

Juan Barker commented that he would have liked to have seen the Judge's reasoning on the arguments brought forth. This must have also upset many of the other defendants who had pondered various arguments for about a year, only to have the trials wrapped up by a brief statement from the Judge on case law regarding the missing Order-in-Council. Barker was particularly concerned that the Judge had not ruled on the colour-of-right defence of native land, which he felt was the most credible. Kel Kelly was upset that Aden Crane and Steve Lawson were found guilty since he had become convinced over the previous year that the Park indeed

143 Ibid.
144 Ibid.
belonged to native Indians. He said: "We're here as intruders. Sooner or later we'll have to deal with that."\textsuperscript{145} Steve and Marlene Smith believed that one of the Friends' main goals in the trial was to set a precedent in Canadian law that, under some circumstances, it was permissible to engage in CD to protect the environment. Because of the Government's blatant breach of the public trust and the protestors' vindication by its change in policy on the Park, they believed that the defendants might be acquitted on the basis of their colour-of-right. Although the defendants were acquitted it was on the basis of the loophole, so no such precedent was set. Protestors are still arrested for using CD to protect nature in B.C. and none has yet been found acquitted on a colour-of-right argument.

The Friends and their supporters, however, were pleased that most of the defendants were at least found not guilty. Crown Counsel was surprised that the Judge himself revealed the offending technicality. The Judge said that he would "likely have convicted the protestors of mischief" were it not for the loophole that he had noticed. It is likely that O'Donnell exercised his own judgment in using the loophole to acquit the defendants. Although the Order-in-Council had not been submitted by the Crown as evidence, this was due to an oversight rather than subterfuge. The Judge may have merely been trying to rid himself of the whole affair. But he likely would not have produced the technicality to enable the acquittal had he not approved to some degree of the defendants' arguments. Since the judgment concerned the technicality, speculation arose as to why the Judge believed that these protestors' CD was to some degree justified. Barker believes:

What got us acquitted was that some of us did defend ourselves and the Judge leaned over backwards [by finding the technicality] to acquit everybody in that position because the Crown hadn't provided enough information, and because it was a shallow legal argument. Our integrity influenced the Judge. We showed we weren't anarchistic and that the Government hadn't lived up to its responsibilities.

The protestors' apparent vindication with the release of the SPAC Report and the Government acting on some its principal recommendations may also have influenced the Judge. Other possible influences may have been the information concerning Westmin's ownership of one of

\textsuperscript{145}ibid.
the drill sites, the advanced age of some of the defendants, and the Friends' success in maintaining a strict code of non-violence and cooperation with the police at the blockade.

6.4 The Friends' Work, Influence and Limits to 1992

In this final section of the chapter, I begin by considering the Friends' declining membership following the September 1988 Announcement that there would be no further resource extraction in the Park and their subsequent work on Strathcona issues, especially relating to Westmin Mines. Attention then turns to recent legal cases in the parks/mining conflict and the newly elected NDP's consideration of legislation to expropriate mineral claims in B.C. Park's. Next I address the "Tin Wis Coalition" that the Friends became involved in during the blockade. Finally I analyze the NDP's general attempt to resolve conflicts over wilderness in B.C. by changing the decision-making procedure, as well as examining disputes over Clayoquot Sound and a freeway proposed for the central Island, in which several members of the Friends became involved. This approach provides a broader view of some group members' work and of central Island ecological problems in general.

Declining Membership and the "Watch Dog" Role in the Park

It is not always the case, but the Friends' 1987/88 campaign illustrates the possibility that one of the main implications of creating a group that is focused only on a specific problem is that once the crisis is resolved, either way, the group's membership can rapidly decline. When the Government announced in September 1988 that there would be no more logging nor mining in the Park, the Friends' membership stood at 3,000. Few of these members, however, renewed their membership for the following year, so by the May 1989 AGM the group had only 200 members.146 Membership bottomed out at this point and stood at 300 in 1992. With the decline in membership there were also fewer active members. About fifty people attended meetings or actively participated in some other manner during 1987. About 100-200 people actively participated in the Friends' blockade. By 1990 this figure had fallen to about 20 people.

---

146 FOSP, "Executive Minutes", June 2, 1989. Under the group's constitution, memberships do not last a year but only until the year's end.
A lot of time and effort went into organizing the local chapters and committees into a working group. After the September 1988 Announcement this structure remained but only in skeleton form. This would not be a problem if the group's objectives were fully resolved or if there were no further important tasks. However, the trials of 61 defendants were still in progress, and the September Announcement indicated only that the Government accepted in principal the SPAC recommendations. The Friends' October Newsletter points to the group's victory indicated by the Announcement but continues: "We must preserve the Park not only for one single park but to ensure that the entire provincial park system is preserved. Therefore, we must work to ensure that the Larkin Report recommendations are actually implemented". Accordingly, "the importance now of member participation and financial support cannot be overemphasized." After the 1990 amendment to the Park Act which made Strathcona a Class A Statute park, the Winter 1990 Newsletter pointed to many problems the group had to deal with including: "exchange lands" southeast of the Park that were not returned in the September Announcement, the difficulty of dealing with Westmin Mines, ongoing mineral claims in the Park, possibilities of logging on the periphery or within the Park, proposals to route a power line through the Park and to raise the level of Buttle Lake. While there had been enthusiasm with most of the Friends as the committees and chapters were originally formed in 1987 and 1988, tasks accomplished and objectives achieved, feelings of discouragement began to invade the group as the membership declined, fewer local chapters and committees reported to the AGMs, and the work of protecting the Park was left to the same few people.

At the 1989 AGM the Friends passed a further objective for the group. In addition to their primary focus on promoting and protecting Strathcona Park, the group will work: "To actively promote the creation and preservation of other parks and wilderness preservation areas in the appropriate areas throughout British Columbia, and other related issues."147 The group has been able to contribute to successes in protecting other wilderness areas. However, it has been limited by the down-scaling of their local chapters and their declining membership.

147FOSP. "Newsletter," (Summer, 1989).
The salient aspect of the Friends' campaign was that people who joined it helped to resolve an immediate threat to the integrity of Strathcona Park. The Friends' campaign may also have helped cause improvements in other areas. The Friend's most important broader influence was the defence of the moratorium on resource extraction in parks which had protected Strathcona and other parks since 1972. If the 1987 SC Government had succeeded in violating the moratorium in Strathcona Park, then more parks would likely have been opened to resource extraction. Therefore, the Friends' victory likely protected numerous provincial parks.

Another aspect of the Friends' broader influence concerns some individuals whose first involvement in any issues was over the Friends' blockade. After this was ended, some of these individuals dropped out of the Strathcona conflict but went on to participate in other important issues, indicating another positive aspect of the Friends' campaign. Those who remained active in the Friends commented that, while in 1987 they were ignored, brushed off or treated with disrespect by the Parks Division and other government representatives, after the blockade they were finally listened to. This became apparent in the Friends' dealings with the Parks Division at Master Plan sessions, with the Environmental Ministry and with Westmin Mines. The Friends have thus been able to maintain their influence in spite of their declining membership. Another positive aspect of the campaign is that although the Friends' membership has dispersed, their network remains alive. There is some question over what issues the Friends could use to reactivate this network and also over the future use of CD. But generally the group gained a credible reputation among conservationists (many of whom generally disapprove of CD but approved of the Friends' use of it to protect Strathcona Park) and have maintained their high profile with their more recent work. Therefore should another crisis arise, the Friends could reactivate the network for CD or any some other action necessary to protect the Park.

Westmin Resources, recent parks/mining cases and possible expropriation of mineral claims

This section concerns further problems the Friends have recently addressed in what they call their "watch dog" role. I shall first consider the Friends' objections to the Westmin mine in the Park then turn to recent judicial decisions on mining in Strathcona Park, and finally address the
NDP's recent deliberations over whether to expropriate mineral claims in actual and proposed parks in B.C.

The Friends have never tried to eliminate the Westmin mine from Strathcona Park because of their concern for the 500 Westmin workers and the opposition of those workers, Westmin Resources, local businesses which depend on the mine and the local public in general would make to its closing. But the Friends have objected to the ongoing pollution as well as the small bond that Westmin has been required to post to cover costs that may arise from acid drainage after it leaves the Park. The Westmin issue that the Friends became most involved with concerned its plan to lay an underground electric cable into the Park to power its operation. Currently, hydro electricity generated from the small alpine lakes around the mine, supplemented by diesel generation, powers the mine's machinery. The possibility of getting power from outside the Park arose in the 1980's after the Cheekye Dunsmuir Line extended the mainland power grid to the Island.\textsuperscript{148} Although there may have been some benefits to the company's plan, the Friends nevertheless opposed it. If the company was to invest more capital in its operation, it would be all the more likely to resist leaving when its orebody within the Westmin lease is depleted. Moreover, with increased power the company would be able to extract ore at a faster rate so that it might sooner demand access to ore outside of the current Westmin lease, with the support of 500 local workers. Additional power could also be used to fuel other forms of industrial development or large ski and hotel developments in the Park. The possibility that the Government and Westmin might go ahead with this plan without the Friends' consent was one of the main contexts in which the group considered using further CD. However, the electricity issue came to an end for the moment when the NDP turned down the company's application for the plan.

\textsuperscript{148}Consideration was given to the needs of the Island mining industry in making the decision to extend the mainland grid. See L.M. Grasley, \textit{Global Copper Trends and Prospects for British Columbia} B.C. Hydro, Load Forecasts Department, Mineral Sector Studies (Nov., 1981).
With or without a new power source, Westmin is intent on extracting all ore within the vicinity of its mine. As one Westmin official told Dave Routledge, "If there's mineral in the Park, we're gonna get it". The law is still ambivalent on their chances.

In Casamiro Resource v. British Columbia 1990, Casamiro brought suit against the Province in the Supreme Court of British Columbia arguing that its Crown grants had been expropriated without compensation by the November 25, 1988 Order-in-Council that the Government had passed as a first step toward increasing Strathcona's protection by halting mineral exploration in the Park. Crown Counsel argued that Casamiro knew that the Government might regulate its Crown grants due to their location within Strathcona Park. Justice D.B. Mackinnon ruled:

The plaintiff was certainly aware that permission from the authorities was needed before he could proceed with any venture. To this extent there was, as suggested by the Crown counsel, a cloud which it operated under. However I do not think it reasonable to conclude that Sherwood would believe they owned this property under a thunderstorm in the form of possible expropriation without compensation. MacKinnon went on to rule it was inappropriate for the province to turn Crown grants "into meaningless pieces of paper" through Orders-in-Council. He held that since expropriation had occurred compensation must be determined under the Compensation Act. The Crown's appeal to the B.C. Court of Appeal was dismissed. In that case, Southin and Cummins ruled that 19 Crown grants had been expropriated and compensation was due pursuant to the Expropriation Act. This would require compensation for expenses incurred in working the grants and for Casamiro's property, the ore in the ground. The Crown subsequently appealed the case to the Supreme Court of Canada.

Cream Silver v. British Columbia 1991 is not Cream's appeal of its failed 1986 suit against the Province but is new suit by Cream based on the possible expropriation of its claims through the 1988 Orders-in-Council. Judge Maczko however referred to Southin's 1986 decision that because Cream had only mineral claims, and not Crown grants, the company therefore held only

151 Ibid. 1991.
an interest in the subterranean minerals and did not possess the surface rights to this land, which was required to access the minerals. Southin had referred to relevant acts and legal definitions in making this decision. Maczko took a different approach. He noted that in spite of any distinctions that might emerge between Crown grants and mineral claims in the wording of documents, in practice the Government treated them in the same manner. In Strathcona Park, Casamiro and Cream (before and after the NDP moratorium on exploration in Parks) had to "jump through exactly the same hoops" to work their claims. So, he ruled that "the content of the interest held by Cream Silver is identical to the content of the rights granted under a Crown grant and that both interests are subject to granting of a park use permit to give practical effect to those rights." Moreover, "Whatever Cream Silver had must have had some value. The Crown permitted and encouraged investment and exploration in mining. The company raised public money, invested it in exploration and found something of value. The Crown has taken that value away and deprived the plaintiff of any opportunity to capture a return on its investment." Concerning the Crown's argument that Cream knew it was establishing claims in a Park to which access may be refused, referring to the precedent of the Appeal Court decision concerning Casamiro's Crown grants (Casamiro v. British Columbia 1991) and to his contention that mineral claims were the same as Crown grants, Maczko ruled that this was not sufficient justification for expropriation without compensation. However, the Crown had only expropriated a chattel and Maczko did not specify how compensation would be determined for this.

Maczko commented on the Court's role in disputes arising through expropriation by Order-in-Council without compensation: "If the Crown wishes to confiscate property it can do so by specifically providing that the property will be taken without compensation. The courts must presume that the legislature knows the law that if a statute is silent on the matter of compensations the courts will presume that the legislature intended that compensation should be

155Ibid, 73.
paid where property is expropriated." This is the strongest suggestion I have noticed in parks/mining cases that the Government should pass appropriate legislation if it wants to acquire mineral claims in B.C. parks.

In March 1992 the NDP Government struck the Commission of Inquiry into Compensation for the Taking of Resource Interests under the single commissioner, Richard Schwindt. The Commission was to focus on logging and mining. As it pertains to mineral tenures, some of the main factors leading to the creation of the commission were: the 1973 moratorium on resource extraction in Parks; the court cases that followed the moratorium; the Friends' blockade and other objections to mining in parks including the SPAC; the cases which flowed from the blockade and, finally, a developing dispute over the Tatshenshini-Alsek region in northwest B.C. which is valued for emparkment but targeted for a copper mine. The Commission was "to inquire into the principles and processes for determining whether, in what circumstances and how much, if any, compensation should be paid, to the holders of resource interests that under an enactment have been or are taken, for public purposes and without the consent of the holder, by the crown or another authority..."156

John Wilson, a geologist member of the Friends of Strathcona, had told the SPAC that "[i]f the government has some responsibility it presumably is only to compensate for claims held before the Park was created. Claims acquired after the Park's formation were a gamble and need no compensation."157 Schwindt considers this option in his general analysis of "moral hazards" and economic development. As he explains, if a corporation is over-insured it is more likely to take a risk.

If timber and mining companies are assured of the reservation price [full compensation or the price at which a property owner is indifferent about a taking], they will make no distinction between an area with a highly valued alternative public use and one without...Proponents of the "government taking as a market risk" argument conclude that compensation is unnecessary for (and is likely to impede) the efficient allocation of

---

resources. In their view, property holders should treat the possibility of expropriation as a market risk and act accordingly.\textsuperscript{158}

I believe that if this type of market efficiency argument (leaving aside a social justice argument) could be applied to Strathcona mining, especially given the 1966 statement by Charles Campbell that the company's mine in Strathcona Park was a "park/mining experiment."\textsuperscript{159} The "market risk" argument could also be used to rationalize expropriation without compensation of many mineral claims and Crown grants in Strathcona Park. When Cream Silver began exploration in 1967 it must have, or at least should have, been aware of its uncertain future in Strathcona in view of the area's status as a cherished provincial park as well as objections by the District of Campbell River, the NDP and conservationists to further exploration. This was mounting evidence of the failure of the original "experiment", especially in the form of Buttle Lake tailing deposits. As Wilson says, they gambled. Therefore, their claims could be fairly expropriated without compensation. In his deliberations, Schwindt did not reject the moral hazard argument outright but neither did he use it to urge that expropriation in some cases be made without compensation.\textsuperscript{160}

Schwindt first recommended that provincial legislation be amended to make a clear distinction between claims (exploration properties) and leases (development properties). This would reestablish the 1957 SCP agenda on regulating the industry.\textsuperscript{161} Then, concerning mineral claims, he recommends the establishment of:

- a cost based compensation policy for exploration properties. There are several reasons for this decision. First, calculation of expenditures is tractable. Second, compensation of direct exploration costs satisfies one definition of fairness. That is, the claimant would be returned to the position which would have existed had the investment in

\textsuperscript{158}Schwindt, 1992: 25, 26.
\textsuperscript{159}As noted in the chapter above, after the company had invested several million dollars in the project, while Western was stockpiling ore and two weeks before it announced its plan to dump tailings in Buttle Lake, Dunc Holmes paraphrased Campbell as saying "Western feels it is a guinea pig in the park-mining experiment and as such is bending over backwards in proving the experiment can work, and possibly influence future policy decisions." He discusses details of how the company is trying to be responsible but doesn't mention the imminent tailings to reporters. [Dunc Holmes, "Only Town is Missing - Western Rolls in Summer with First Trucks of Ore." \textit{Sun} (Feb. 5, 1966), 24]. Also see, Tom Carney. "Western's Buttle Lake Project Example of Mine Gambles in B.C.." \textit{Times} (Nov. 16, 1966). 15. After Western's pollution of Buttle Lake had arisen as an issue, the NDP leader, Robert Strachan, commented that if Western had been candid about its plans the company would never have been allowed to build its mine (Anon., "Real Plan Hidden Charges Strachan." \textit{Times} (Oct. 26, 1966), 13.
\textsuperscript{160}Schwindt, 1992: 28-33.
\textsuperscript{161}Payne, 1982.
exploration not taken place. Simply, the claim holder is reimbursed out-of-pocket expenses. Third, this policy is practiced, either *de facto* or *de jure*, in other jurisdictions with no identifiable, significant distortions of exploration incentives. Manitoba and Alberta are cases in point. Further the procedure was followed in settlements involving establishment of the Kluane National Park.162

Having recommended cost-based compensation Schwindt also recommends that "[c]ompensation for exploration properties should be based on the reasonable costs of acquiring and holding the claim over the past five years, plus a nominal rate of interest..."163 If this recommendation were followed, it might be possible for the government to purchase all mineral claims in provincial parks because it excludes the cost of exploration carried out in these parks before the 1973 moratorium and little such exploration has taken place since. The $50 million capital investment Geddes Resources has made in the last four years (their estimate) in their Windy Craggy claims at the proposed Tatshenshini Park may be too high to compensate in this manner due to the possibility that the public would refuse such a sizeable payment in order to establish a wilderness park.164 At the same time, Schwindt is not rigid: "the distinction between interference with a property right and a taking should be mutable to accommodate changed conditions. Therefore the issue should be dealt with on a case by case basis by legislators, or, in the final instance, by courts."165 Concerning the Geddes Windy Craggy proposal, such a policy would allow the government the option of delaying permission for the mine, providing short term protection for the area: but leaving the problem of Geddes' interests for future conservationists and governments to grapple with.166

Although it can set low-cost terms for expropriation, the larger problem for the NDP in striking any legislation to expropriate mine claims in existing and proposed parks is the mobility of mining capital and its effects on B.C.'s economic development. Schwindt, however, observes that expropriations for out-of-pocket expenses is a policy that is followed, "in other jurisdictions with no identifiable, significant distortions of exploration incentives."167 But increasing

---

162Schwindt, 1992: 132, 133.
165Schwindt, 1992: 147.
regulation of the B.C. mining industry has proved troublesome for a B.C. Government, as Rosemary Fox of the Sierra Club explains in her discussion of Geddes Resources' Windy Craggy claims:

B.C.'s New Democratic Party government may be sensitive to threats from the mining industry, since the mining lobby played a major role in the NDP's defeat when it was last in office in 1975. Cominco Ltd. (which owns about 20 per cent of Geddes) has also threatened to pull all of its exploration out of B.C. if the government does not speed up the processing of mining proposals (including Windy Craggy). 168

Other companies have also threatened to leave the Province. Contemporary problems of expropriation and governmental regulation may exceed the scope of the geography of profits in Canada. Prospectors who since the end of the California Gold Rush have looked broadly to the north now look to the south. 169 Many comments have recently been made in the media that mineral exploration and mining corporations are investing more money in Latin America than in B.C. because of the rich ores, minimal environmental standards (in some cases none) and lower labour costs there. In the debate over Geddes' Windy Craggy property, Tom Waterland the president of the Mining Association of B.C., made a particularly strong statement about the actions that companies would take if any expropriation of mineral claims takes place: "If they're going to retroactively change the rules, you'll never get anyone to invest another cent in B.C." 170 He suggests that there will be company-by-company decisions on investment locations based on profitability criteria. Although he does not recommend that companies leave the province immediately in order to influence the government, if companies believe that the 1973-1975 reduction of investment and capital flight from the Province was an important factor in bringing the SCP back to power in 1975, they may now reduce investments in order to force a change of government and/or policies. Regardless of the intent of Waterland's statement, it should make the NDP take a cautious approach to expropriating mineral claims, especially in light of the Party's history in the 1970's. Nevertheless, in Spring 1993 the NDP announced that it was

169 In 1975 the main movement seemed to be to the Yukon. See Bob Shaw, "B.C. mining companies turning to the Yukon." Province (Feb. 11, 1975), 16.
170 Les Leyne, "Mining association astounded at NDP for halting review." Times-Colonist (July 21, 1992), D7. Waterland was the Minister of Mines in 1976 and 1977 when the SCP rescinded the NDP's legislation on mines.
establishing a provincial park in the Tatshenshini-Alsek region and that it was going to compensate the mining corporation for the mineral claims; however, it has not yet indicated by how much.

Marlene Smith is particularly concerned that the NDP may pass legislation or negotiate agreements that necessitate paying high compensation to Cream Silver and other companies with claims in Strathcona Park. The NDP might argue, she reasons, that this was necessary because of the Tener precedent; they might then hold a public review which could conclude that technological advances have resolved acid generation, that the region needed mine employment and tax revenues and that mining was essential to reduce the provincial debt. Such a Committee could then argue that it was in the public interest to open parks to mining instead of paying high compensation to expropriate claims. Therefore, with the numerous mineral claims still in the Park, the main problem that the Friends have addressed, has still not been resolved, particularly since Westmin has only ten years of reserves at their current rate of extraction (3,300 tons/day). 171

Although the Government is apparently in the process of writing legislation stating the general terms and conditions of future expropriations, neither the Friends nor any other conservation group is making a large public issue of the matter. This may prove to be a serious

---

171 The main instance in which NDP has argued that the weight of legal rights and investments, rather than the public interest, necessitates going ahead with a large industrial project, concerns the Aluminum Company of Canada's (ALCAN) Kemano Completion Project which will see the diversion of 80% of the Nechako River with, in the minds of its proponents, little effect on the environment. The NDP struck a Commission to consider the issue: Murray Rankin and Arvay Finlay, Alcan's Kemano Project (Victoria: Queens Printer, 1992). It considered the extraordinary improprieties of the project. For example, a group of Indians first heard of the project several weeks before the water would be raised over their homes, burial grounds and hunting grounds. The commissioners thought the improprieties allowed a legal justification for halting the project without compensation, in spite of several hundred million dollars already being invested it. However, because of the project's benefits, the impossibility of spending hundreds of millions for expropriation, and the capital flight that would stem from expropriation without compensation, the commissioners recommended the project proceed. Premier Mike Harcourt ignores the expropriation option and the problem of capital flight in his Announcement that the project would go ahead. In a similar manner to Kiernan when he opened Strathcona Park to mining in the 1960's and Rogers when he reopened the Park to mining in 1987, Harcourt says, "Although I and my government reject the kind of deal-making that led to the project's approval [i.e., by the SCP], we must accept Mr. Rankin's conclusion that the Settlement Agreement is nevertheless legally binding. Breaking the agreement could cost B.C. taxpayers well over half a billion dollars in compensation to Alcan for construction to date and may cost many millions more for lost electricity." The project will go ahead despite an acknowledgment that it may not be in the public interest. Mike Harcourt, "News Release - Premier Announces Review of Kemano Completion Project" (Jan. 19, 1993).
limit to the provincial conservation movement. Payne affirms that one of the main reasons that the NDP could not carry out their 1970's legislative initiatives on mines was that citizen groups never actively supported the Party's efforts, so that mine interest groups held sway.172 With a reduced membership, the Friends cannot strike committees for various purposes as they did in 1987 and 1988. Their position on mineral exploration is well known, so it is not certain what could be gained from further lobbying the government on a regular basis. The NDP is aware of the loss of credibility that it might suffer among conservationists and others if it changed a policy that it set in 1967 (against further mineral exploration and mining in Strathcona Park) and maintained through the Friends' campaign. Moreover, the Party knows that the Friends would mount another blockade should the NDP permit further mineral exploration in Strathcona Park.

The Friends, the Tin Wis Coalition and the Tsitika blockade

This section first concerns recent developments in the "Strathcona Coalition", which the Friends became involved with during the blockade and then turns to a blockade in the Tsitika Valley which figured against solidarity in this Coalition.

In 1991 Frank Cox sums up the Strathcona Coalition's formation as follows:

Early in 1988, in response to conflicts about the use of Strathcona Park land on Vancouver Island, an alliance of native, labour and environmental organizations was formed. Because similar land use conflicts existed throughout B.C., often pitting environmentalists, natives and workers against each other, it was felt that it was necessary to facilitate discussion among us and to help to find what common ground could link us in the search for real alternatives to existing land use policies.173

---

172I think that the proposed legislation is a crucial matter which raises important questions not only about the parks/mining conflict in B.C. but about mining development in world society. If conservationists succeed in influencing the NDP to expropriate mineral claims (through the use of the blockade technique if not lobbying), are they setting up conditions that force capitalist mining interests into the developing world, as the mining corporations say will occur? I say this only because I think there are increasingly few areas in the Province where citizen movements will not oppose, with I think very good reasons, mining. For example, is there anywhere on the Island where a large mine should be built considering the serious pollution problems with Westmin's mine and with the only other large mine on the Island (Utah Mines operation in the northwest of the Island)? If citizens are forcing mining out of the province, should they be considering how they might influence regulations in the south or whether we want the products that derive from minerals mined under lower environmental standards? That these questions arise out of the conservation movement's activism but are not Provincial issues, points to a limit of the movement. Alternately, of course, that the NDP may not even move to expropriate claims, due to the power of the mining lobby and the province's interest in economic growth, point to a narrower limit of the provincial conservation movement.

In February 1989 at Tin Wis on the West Coast of the Island, the Strathcona Coalition held a Conference at which the name of the group was changed to the "Tin Wis Coalition" and an accord was established. The Friends sent a delegate to the conference and to other Coalition meetings, and at their May 1989 AGM agreed to sign the Tin Wis Accord. In October 1990 the alliance held in Port Alberni the Second Tin Wis Conference called "Claiming Community Control." The invitation explained: "The conference is being organized to examine the effects of global pressures on one region of the province from an economic and environmental perspective, and what might be effective local initiatives in response." Port Alberni and the Clayoquot Sound region would be the focus of discussion. However, it was also hoped that the conference would prove significant to people who do not live in this region: "...we look forward to this conference as an opportunity to further build the coalition and alliance between important social forces such as the Aboriginal peoples, environmentalists, and the trade union movement, particularly at a time when such unity is so threatened and so necessary for real progressive change." The Conference had a measure of success in building an alliance, but how much the Coalition can practically accomplish is not yet clear. As Juan Barker puts it, the Coalition could "bloom or whither."175

On the negative side, shortly after the Second Conference a dispute in the Tsitika Valley on northeastern Vancouver Island acted against solidarity within the Coalition. Conservationists were disenchanted with a public process that had begun in 1971 which had resulted in a decision that the "upper" Tsitika could be logged. Since then, they had become increasingly insistent that the "lower" Tsitika should remain untouched because it was the last partially unlogged East
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174 Tin Wis Accord: "1. We commit ourselves to active support for the recognition, by all non-native governments, of aboriginal title and rights; and for the immediate commencement of governmental and community processes to negotiate treaties between native nations and non-native governments. We recognize that these rights have not been and cannot be extinguished. 2. We further commit ourselves to develop and implement a process of learning and sharing within and between native and non-native communities and organizations, with a goal of developing trust and a shared vision about we can justly and sustainably share in this earth. This includes a process of learning about the full meanings of terms like democracy, community, local control and ownership. 3. In accordance with the above, we further commit ourselves to develop and implement mechanisms for native people, trade unionists, environmentalists, women, youth and others to work together on a regional basis to resolve resource development and environmental issues and conflicts and to further the process of developing a 'peoples' alternatives to the further policies of the present government."

175 Interview with writer April 29, 1991.
Coast valley and because the Tsitika flows into Robson Bight where many whales congregate. Conservationists believed that if the balance of the watershed was logged the resulting siltation would disturb the whales' habitat. At the same time, one of the largest resource corporations in the Province, MacMillan Bloedel, wanted to log the remainder of the Valley. Susan Holvenstot explains the start of the 1990 battle as follows:

Two weeks after a second successful and well-attended Tin-Wis Conference in October 1990 in Port Alberni, a major confrontation was taking place in the Tsitika. MacMillan Bloedel (MB) unexpectedly began falling operations in the lower Tsitika before promised public input sessions with the Tsitika Follow-Up Committee (TFC) were held. Environmentalists mounted a five-week protest camp with road and bush blockades." While the Friends of Strathcona's blockade was what Des Kennedy calls "a textbook case of nonviolent resistance as a tool in environmental causes", everything seemed to go wrong for the Tsitika protestors.

MB's decision brought more than one hundred Industrial Woodworkers of America (IWA) loggers into a direct confrontation with conservationists. Some of the protestors had not undergone training in CD and used confrontational tactics against the workers. The President of the Union Local, Sy Pederson, probably the most active IWA participant in the Tin Wis, had a difficult time persuading the loggers not to use violence against the environmentalists. He also wrote a letter to the Times-Colonist opposing the blockade. In spite of its impact, no group claimed responsibility for the blockade. The Western Canada Wilderness Committee seemed to be the most involved organization, but, since it does not condone CD, its directors would not support members involved in the blockade. One protestors chained himself under a van and another poured gasoline around it so that the chain could not be cut with a torch. This and
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176 See Philip Dearden's article for background to the Tsitika dispute, "Paper policies, window dressing can't help Tsitika," Times-Colonist (Nov. 21, 1990), A4.
179 Larry Pynn explains "several protestors were literally dragged kicking and screaming" from the site by the RCMP. L. Pynn, "Squaring Off. Tsitika protestor defiant despite arrests," Sun Oct. 31, 1990), 1.
181 See Anon, "Wilderness group accused of staging illegal blockade," Sun (Oct. 24, 1990), B7: Anon, "MB resumes Tsitika logging plans," Sun (Oct. 26, 1990), A21; Glen Bohn, "Man quits WCWC board over his arrest," Sun (Nov. 9, 1990), B8.
other unusual tactics led some loggers and others to call the protestors "ecoloonies". It was alleged that a protestor had strung 1.6 kilometers of fish line around trees which fallers could trip on, leading to accusations that environmentalists were threatening fallers' lives with "terrorist tactics." A Native group, the Tlowitsis-Muntagila band, claiming the lower Tsitika, engaged in an extended, unsuccessful legal battle to stop logging in Cut Block 101, and was left with legal expenses. Loggers organized a rally of 1,000 protestors whose presence dwarfed the approximately 100 conservationists outside of the Tlowitsis-Muntagila Supreme Court hearing in Nanaimo. The IWA's president, Jack Munro, and others spoke against blockaders who interfered with their jobs. As Pynn explains, it was an unpleasant confrontation: "Environmentalists mingled quietly but uneasily, swamped by feisty and occasionally abusive loggers watched by more than 30 RCMP traffic and auxiliary members." The Supreme Court did not strengthen the injunction, as requested by MB, against protestors so they could not come within 15 kilometers of logging operations. But the Judge said that if protestors continued to interfere with logging operations, they would be dealt with more harshly by the Courts. Finally, MB issued a writ "seeking damages against protestors for nuisance, trespass, intimidation and conspiracy to injure the company and its business." Several aspects figured against the protestors. Suzan Holvenstot believes that the Friends of Strathcona's task of protecting a Park from mineral exploration was simpler than the Tsitika blockaders' task of protecting tenured Crown land from the largest company in the largest provincial resource industry. Moreover, it was even further for protestors to drive to the Tsitika site than to Strathcona Park and the road was not paved, so people were less willing to

183Judith Lavoie, "'Terrorist tactics' laid to protestors: Fish lines strung through Tsitika threaten lives of fallers, wildlife," Sun (Nov. 16, 1990), A2.
185Larry Pynn, "Court okays Tsitika logging despite "sacred shrine" claim," Sun (Nov. 6, 1990), B1, B2.
186Ibid.
187Judith Lavoie, "MB happy court raps protestors, but no ban," Times-Colonist (Nov. 16, 1990), A1.
188Larry Pynn, "Protestors slow loggers in Tsitika Valley," Sun (Nov. 7, 1990), B5.
189Interview with the writer April 29, 1991.
drive to the site. Holvenstot thinks the fiasco illustrates the importance of careful preparation for a blockade and the necessity of remaining in close communication with workers who will be impacted by it.\textsuperscript{190} What was worrisome to Kennedy and Holvenstot, more than the difficulty of the task or the disorganization of the protestors, was their belief that after the Friends' blockade, the Social Credit Government played a more active role in controlling CD. Minister of Forests, Claude Richmond, during a tour he made of central Island communities while the Tsitika blockade was in place, exacerbated tensions by telling workers they would have to "fight for their jobs". In an article he wrote on the matter, Kennedy discussed how the "debacle in the Tsitika" showed that the SC Government and MacMillan Bloedel "artfully manipulated woodworkers, protestors and the press to achieve their own cynical purposes."\textsuperscript{191} These purpose might have been more than simply logging the Tsitika. Whether by the design of the SCP and the logging industry or by coincidence, the Tsitika blockade fragmented the alliance between natives, labour, and environmentalists that had been strengthened at the Port Alberni Conference shortly before the confrontation began. The dispute illustrates the fact that a blockade is a serious matter and raises the possibility that the State may manipulate events, causing considerable disruptions to alliances that oppose its policies.

Although the Tsitika Blockade had a short term negative effect on Coalition solidarity and failed to halt logging Cut Block 101, there were also positive results. In 1992 the NDP Government placed a 5 years moratorium on further logging in the lower Tsitika. Holvenstot thinks the Tsitika blockade as well as Research completed in 1992 which indicated that logging could damage the Robson Bight whale habitat were factors behind the change in policy. Moreover a group which developed out of the 1990 confrontation, the Friends of Tsitika, has since been working on resource development in the Tsitika region. For example, they have worked with other groups on a campaign to stop the export of raw logs.


The Tsitika confrontation and other related difficulties led Kel Kelly, who is active in both the Friends of Strathcona and the Tin Wis, to reflect on the Friends' relation with native groups around the Park. In some respects the Friends have recognized their unexpected native supporters. The Friends planned to build a trail up the Megin River from the Pacific Ocean into Strathcona Park, but refrained because the Nuu-Chah-Nulth did not approve. The Friends have not changed their Constitution to recognized native land claims in the Park, but they have indicated they might support such claims. The Working Plan for Strathcona Park, approved at the May 1989 AGM, states that it "is meant to be without prejudice to native land claims." The Friends also signed the Tin Wis Accord and donated $500 towards the Port Alberni Conference.

Still, Kelly is concerned about the lack of consultation between environmentalists and natives (especially those who support conservation issues) during environmentalists' campaigns over Strathcona Park and other wilderness areas. Speaking at the Tin Wis workshop at the 1991 British Columbia Environmental Network AGM, Kelly explained:

As environmental workers, we are a "wedge" of the capitalist society that on some levels does not accept, or any longer believe in continuous growth, economic consumption, and endless development. This belief and our continued learning about it is what we hold in common with some of the native people and nations in the region. It is my belief and worry that, having seen this window of cultural overlap, the environmental movement is now beginning to exploit it in the traditional fashion of Western European culture without following through on its responsibilities to the native societies of these lands. Concerning the Friends of Strathcona, Kelly argued that the group had not spent enough time cultivating ties with native groups. Because of this lack of initiative by the Friends and other environmental groups, native justice is not served and "the resources continue to be ruined or disappear at the same destructive rate." The Friends with their declining membership, have a shortage of resources to attend natives' meetings. But Kelly believes that members have not followed through on native issues by adequately educating themselves on native issues.

The Coalition's main difficulty remains breaking the discord between natives, environmentalists and labour that was evident in the Tsitika dispute. It has limited resources to address this task, particularly since many of the groups who joined the Coalition during the blockade stopped contributing after the immediate crisis in Strathcona was resolved. Although the Tin Wis Coalition planned to carry out a study of what went wrong at the Tsitika and how this type of confrontation might be avoided in the future, a shortage of resources prevented that.

Since its 1988 inception, the Coalition has not grown as conceived into a form of parallel government, with local chapters in communities around the province bringing together distinct interests and powers of natives, environmentalists and workers. But the 1989 Tin Wis and 1990 Port Alberni conferences achieved some concrete goals and facilitated an exchange of information that allowed activists to express their ideas to several NDP MLAs and MP's. Since the Port Alberni Conference, Tin Wis has focused on forest practice and especially decision making procedures in the industry. Many conservationists believe that reforming forestry legislation is important because of the regressive nature of current legislation. It is also recognized as a difficult challenge, since the Ministry of Forests, multinational corporations and the IWA strongly oppose some of the changes that conservationists believe could improve legislation. While the Friends and other conservationists believe that they managed to induce positive changes in the Parks Division through their activism in the 1980's, they realize that they have had little impact on the Ministry of Forests. The Friends and the Strathcona Steering Committee had particular difficulty during the Strathcona Master Planning process in dealing with the Ministry of Forests over public lands around Strathcona Park. As with the SC government, the NDP Forest Ministry is seen as a major stumbling block to reforming rural land use. The Ministry resists Tin Wis ideas on who should be represented in the decision making

process over forest use. However, the Coalition has generally maintained its overall credibility and may influence forthcoming legislation with its Draft Model Legislation.\(^{195}\)

*The NDP, the fight for Clayoquot Sound and the proposed Island freeway*

In the campaign for the 1966 election the NDP leader Robert Strachan said "the main concern of an NDP government would be to cut the ordinary person's cost of living, [cause] a significant speedup in the industrialization of the province and [promote] a general expansion of the government's role in society."\(^{196}\) Once elected in 1972 the NDP established an Environment and Land Use Committee Secretariat which Jeremy Wilson refers to as a "small, expert bureaucracy" to make centralized land-use decisions.\(^{197}\) But in its critique of the Social Credit Throne Speech in 1985, the NDP Caucus held that "decentralization of political and economic power is the only way to regain public control of public resources and guarantee balanced regional development."\(^{198}\) The decentralization concept was also embraced by the 1985 Wilderness Advisory Committee which recommended that regional public involvement be increased in decision-making to help avoid the type of confrontations that occurred over Meares and South Moresby Islands. The SPAC specified that public involvement in decision-making over Strathcona should be increased.

The newly-elected NDP in 1992 moved to decentralize decision-making in response to a number of factors, such as: the Party's 1985 shift in policy, the Friends' blockade, the development of the Tin Wis as a form of shadow government, and the WAC and SPAC recommendations. To this end the NDP created a Commission on Resources and Environment (CORE), under former Ombudsperson Stephen Owen, to "move British Columbia on a path towards a sustainable society."\(^{199}\) The Party reasoned that a changed approach was needed

\(^{195}\) "Tin Wis Coalition Forestry Working Group Draft Model Legislation - Forest Stewardship Act" (September 1992).

\(^{196}\) Anon, "Perrault Pledges Sweeping Reforms - Election Ordered 'By Big Business,'" *Sun* (Aug. 18, 1966), 1, 2.

\(^{197}\) Jeremy Wilson, "Forest Conservation in British Columbia, 1935-85: Reflections on a Barren Political Debate," *B.C. Studies* (no.76, Winter, 1987/88), 3-32. I have not evaluated whether the NDP strategy was to centralize control in 1972-75 or simply that they tended to take large corporations out of the decision making process, and this was conceived as centralization by Wilson and others.


because "[t]he traditional approach to land and resource allocation, based primarily on the responsibility of statutory decision-makers, is no longer accepted in British Columbia as necessarily the best way to make decisions....One of the main reasons that [CORE] was established is that the public feels alienated from the decision-making process, and is demanding more significant and meaningful involvement." The Commission would "focus initially on the Vancouver Island, Cariboo-Chilcotin and Kootenay regions because of land-use conflicts in these areas." As well the Committee was to immediately report on a large mine Geddes Resources proposed for the Tatshenshini-Alsek area of northwestern British Columbia which is also valued for a park.

CORE produced a Report on the conflict over the Tatshenshini which is the most significant dispute in the parks/mining conflict since the Friends' 1988 blockade. The Report suggested that the mine could be developed, stopped or delayed, but does not make a recommendation. In Spring 1993 the NDP announced that it was establishing the area as a provincial park to which end it would expropriate mineral claims in the region. This decision delighted environmentalists but, as noted above, outraged the mining industry.

CORE meetings which the Friends of Strathcona have attended as observers have been held on Vancouver Island. It is too early to comment on CORE's long term success in preventing the sort of disputes that occurred in 1988 in Strathcona Park and in 1990 at the Tsitika. But CORE seems to be a positive result of post-1985 activism by the Friends, the Tin Wis and other groups on the Island. But the battle over rural lands on the Island is far from over.

The NDP government had made pre-election promises that the area of protected land in the province would be increased to 12 per cent. In the summer of 1992, however, an ongoing controversy over Clayoquot Sound, located to the west of Strathcona Park, again erupted into an acrimonious dispute. Conservationists wanted the CORE process to be applied to resolve the battle over the Sound, but the NDP refused this request. The Friends of Strathcona support the
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blockade mounted by the Friends of Clayoquot Sound (FOCS) to reciprocate the FOCS's support for the blockade in Strathcona Park and because several Strathcona watersheds flow into the Sound. If the Sound was protected then parkland would extend from the Pacific and continued through the coastal forest, to the alpine peaks of Strathcona Park. The prospect for such a sea to mountain park was likely conceived by some park advocates when Strathcona was originally established, was also advocated in initiatives to establish a substantive national park on the West Coast during the 1960's (which the Province resisted), and became one of the main preservation issues in the province in the 1980's. The first logging blockade (albeit without arrests) in Canada occurred in 1984 on Meares Island, and then in 1988 arrests were made, thirty-six protestors, for blocking logging road construction in Sulpher Passage near Tofino. In 1992, a year after the NDP's election, sixty more protestors were arrested near Tofino and found guilty of contempt charges; bail was set at $3,000 in some cases and others were sentenced to twenty days in jail and/or given heavy fines, the harshest sentences meted out to date in blockades.\textsuperscript{202} Conservationists were outraged not only by the severity of the sentences, but because the blockade (like the Friend's blockade in 1988) was a "text book" perfect use of non-violent CD. As I write in August, 600 protestors have so far been arrested in 1993, raising by far the stakes of the 64 arrests the Friends of Strathcona organized in the Park. If the government does not act to better protect the Sound, the FOCS expect 1000 arrests to be made in 1993. Environmentalists, the public, B.C. Courts and the Province are just beginning to grapple with what is likely a Canadian precedent for the number of Defendants in a CD case.

Another problem for logging opponents in the Sound was that in 1992 some of them were sued in what is called Strategic Lawsuits Against Public Participation or SLAPPs.\textsuperscript{203} To recover their losses, corporations can issue SLAPPs against protestors who impede their interests. Steve and Marlene were SLAPPed by Cream Silver in 1988. Cream has not proceeded with the suit,

\textsuperscript{202} King Lee "Court sets $3,000 bail for logging protestor on contempt charges." \textit{Times-Colonist} (July 18, 1992), A8.

\textsuperscript{203} There are several articles on SLAPPs in \textit{The New Catalyst}, \textit{The Big Business contribution to public decision-making: If You Can't Beat 'em, Sue 'em} - SLAPPs (no.25, winter, 1992/93).
but that is not unusual. Protestors may be sued mainly to intimidate them, as indicated by the corporate practice of usually dropping SLAPPs before they get to court.

In spite of the risks of further CD under the NDP Government and new corporate initiatives, the Friends' primary role remains to protect Strathcona Park, especially by reaffirming their promise that CD will recommence if the Park is violated by further industrial development. The Friends, and the Island conservation movement in general, have operated within a difficult context. They had to launch one of the largest campaigns of the decade over any issue in B.C. to achieve their defensive victory in Strathcona Park and in maintaining the broader moratorium on resource extraction in parks. The Friends and other groups are obliged to resort to CD to achieve their main goals. But even though over 600 people have been arrested in 1993 for defending Clayoquot Sound, logging proceeds. The limited influence of the Island environmentalists is also revealed by their inability, so far, to stop planning on a freeway proposed for the East side the Island.

While the Friends blockade was still in place, at a March 1988 "town hall" meeting in Courtenay organized by the regional MLA Stan Hagen (SC), two main issues arose. Those present generally agreed that there should be no further logging and mining in Strathcona Park. They requested Hagen speak to the Social Credit Caucus, calling for meaningful public hearings on Strathcona Park. With apparent reluctance Hagen agreed. The other main issue concerned the proposal to build a freeway on the Island from south of Parksville to Menzies Bay north of Campbell River.

The proposed four lane freeway with possible further expansion to six lanes will be sited between the existing coastal strip of development and the Island's rugged interior. If the freeway plan is carried through, the resulting situation will be similar to California where the older Highway 101 winds up the Pacific Coast and the newer, wider Interstate 5 runs inland parallel to the coast. Similar to the State of California's arguments for building I-5 in the 1940's and 50's, the SC Government pointed to the current Island Highway's overcrowded condition and also to

204 Robert Freeman, "Hagen wants highway earlier - MLA tackles highway, park, issues at 'town hall' meeting." Free Press (March 2, 1988).
the proposed freeway's potential to further economic and residential development by more than doubling the existing traffic flow. Development could increase in existing communities and new development could begin at freeway interchanges. The Government also pointed to B.C. residents love affair with the automobile by promoting the freeway in the "Freedom to Move Transportation Strategy, Giving You the Freedom to Move" campaign. Those present lobbied Hagen to encourage the Government to "reduce a 10-year plan for the Island Highway to completion earlier," to which he readily agreed.

This project is endorsed by the NDP and the majority of Island citizens. The Campbell River Mirror published a supplementary section titled "The Island Highway: OUR LIFELINE" featuring affirmations by small business owners and regional politicians, as well as a trucker, a bus driver, and an RCMP Officer urging the Government to "BUILD OUR HIGHWAY TODAY." The NDP is committed to building the freeway and spent $25 million on southern sections of the project in 1992; the Party is presently delaying the project, however, because in a tight fiscal climate its cost is over one billion dollars. Some people objected to the Highways Minister about proposed tolls to pay for the freeway, but even this has not deterred many others who feel that "if we have to face a toll, lets do it rather than face the frustration and danger of the current road."

The Mid-Island Greens oppose the project because, in spite of the Government’s assurance that damage to the environment will be minimal and local communities will not be harmed, they believe:

(1) The new highway will provide a tremendous impetus for further destructive growth, eroding the environment and making Vancouver Island a more crowded and less desirable place to live. (2) Thousands of living and productive acres will be paved over while more vehicles burning more fuel at higher speeds will contribute to global warming.
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Currently Susan Holvenstot and several other conservationists are attempting to initiate a letter writing campaign opposing the imminent freeway.

**Conclusion**

Up to now the Friends' have won a battle over further mineral exploration in Strathcona Park that was begun in 1967, was reduced by the 1973 moratorium on resource extraction in Parks, and was reignited with the March 1987 Orders-in-Council. The Friends' victory resulted from the many latent sources of opposition to mineral exploration in the Park and from the questionable methods the Government used to effect exploration. It also stemmed from activism of the Friends and other groups, most of all from CD. But in very few cases has the Canadian Government or a province made as meaningful a change in policy in response to the type of citizen activism the Friends launched as the SC Government did when it moved to protect the Park. The Friends' cause, like those addressed in other environmental campaigns, was a "marginal" issue which might be won or lost depending on particular aspects of the battle. I think that the Friends' work, tactics and commitment as well as several coincidental factors explain their success.210

I considered the main aspects of the Friends' 1987 work in the chapter above but a few were omitted. For example, I did not consider their entering a float (which took second place) in the July 1st parade. In 1988, while she was in jail, Susan Holvenstot said: "There are up to 300 people working on this for the major part of their time - people who have missed days of work, or courses they were going to take, or time they planned on spending with their families. They have changed their lives completely for a period to try to stop this loss of wilderness."211 There were usually about 30 people at the blockade and other people were busy organizing supplies for them. Four rallies were organized in the Park and over 200 people drove to each of them from various points on the Island. Three important Coalition meetings that focused on the Park were organized and each attended by about fifty people. Those who attended in turn raised Strathcona
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211Nancy Brown, "Strathcona protestor jolted after trips to jail in 'cage'." *Times-Colonist* (March 17, 1988).
and Coalition issues with the organizations that they represented. Groups such as the Sierra Club made Strathcona one of their main issues over the period. Native groups organized several large meetings pertaining to entitlement, the Park, mine pollution, and the blockade. Among the Friends, ten committees of three or more members were active and presented reports at the May 1988 AGM and/or the Executive meeting the following week. These included the Action, Legal, Public Education, Fund-Raising, Office, Research, Long Range Planning, Finance, Newsletter, and Youth Section Committees. Five Local Chapters made reports at the 1988 AGM. The Chapters and Executive held numerous meetings to coordinate the campaign. The 64 arrestees were of course active in working on their defence with the Legal Committee. So Holvenstot's estimate is a realistic estimate of the amount of voluntary work that the Friends and other groups put into the campaign. This work was crucial for success.

Although some of the work that the group engaged in may have had little influence on the course of events, the following sequence points to the success of the Friends' main tactical decisions. In 1987 the Friends systematically lobbied regional governments, took the Save Strathcona Caravan to Master Plan meetings, held the "big public meeting," decided to use CD and carried out CD training. In 1988 they made the unprecedented use of CD over Strathcona Park and, in hindsight, we can affirm that they picked the right moment and the right target to use this strategy. Their CD induced the Government to create the SPAC, which the Friends' submissions subsequently influenced. The watch-dog base camp the Friends set up in the Park while the Government was considering the SPAC Report probably influenced it to act on the SPAC recommendations. The Friends' contribution to the Steering Committee likely influenced its recommendation to make Strathcona a Class A Statute park, and their ongoing promise of renewed CD should resource extraction recommence doubtlessly influenced the Government to eventually follow the Committee's recommendation by establishing Strathcona as a Class A Statute park. Finally, the Friends' lobbying the Committee was a factor behind the development of an appropriate Master Plan for the Park.

Some of the Friends' special skills as geologists, lawyers, writers and accountants were important, but often Committees were composed of people who had never performed such tasks. Still, as a result of their enthusiasm, they accomplished important goals. Consensus procedures, in the cooperative spirit that prevailed during the heat of the blockade, facilitated quick and effective decision making. Not only were people willing to work on the Strathcona issue, 64 people were willing to be arrested and would not plead guilty to attain a reduced sentence.

In addition to the group's work, tactics and commitment, I think several coincidental factors were important in the group's development and its success. The active concern Boulding and Steve and Marlene Smith, showed in starting the Friends in 1986 meant that a group was formed and ready for action by Spring 1987 when the Government announced further resource extraction in Strathcona Park. Broadly, the Friends' success corroborates Jim Boulding's belief in the Spring of 1986 that a single issue group, that Steve and Marlene started right away, could stop the government's plan (which Boulding correctly anticipated) to open Strathcona to mineral exploration.

I do not think that mining interests connected to the SCP would necessarily have profited by opening up the Park to mineral exploration after the 1975 election or immediately after release of the WAC Report in 1986, or by delaying permission to carry out mineral exploration in the Park for a longer time after the 1987 Orders-in-Council. If the 1973 moratorium was violated by whatever manner, it would have likely sparked a public reaction. However, the obverse of the Friends' picking the right moment to start a campaign and to erect a blockade is that the government's timing of its announcement of changes to Strathcona and its decision to permit mineral exploration in the Park were ill chosen.

The government's blunder in having Stephen Rogers announce the changes to Strathcona as well as the media's willingness to cover the blockade, favoured the Friends. If another important regional, national or international issue had occurred during the blockade then there would have been far less coverage. Had there been an unpleasant incident at the blockade, media reports could quickly have turned unfavourable. The Friends' received unexpected support from native
groups and the Coalition. Coalition support was partly due to the Friends' initiative, but also due to the chance that a coalition was forming while the blockade was in place.

I did not consider the results of the three holes that Cream Silver drilled. These showed little promise. If the results had been more positive, then mining corporations and their governmental allies would have pursued their interests with greater diligence.

The SPAC's recommendations and the Government's actions on them were mainly the result of pressure from the Friends and other conservationists. But they were also the result of the particular stance taken by individuals in the Committee and the Government.

Considering later decisions reached a different conclusion, Justice Southin's 1986 ruling that the Tener decision did not extend to Cream Silver's claims in Strathcona was a coincidence that favoured the Friends. This result may have been unexpected by the SC Government. Given its strong interest in opening Strathcona to mining, the SCP could have pursued the case against Cream under the assumption that Cream would win the case (rather than simply permitting the company to explore), in order to acquire a rationale for more exploration. As it happens, the Government was obliged to ignore its victory in Court. The other decisions that worked neither for nor against the Friends were the Judges' decisions on the 64 defendants. Five defendants were found guilty of blocking a highway; charges were dismissed against Cooper; Kwasistala was granted an absolute discharge and, most significantly, 57 defendants were acquitted on the basis of the loophole Judge O'Donnell found.

Finally, broader social/economic trends on the Island likely helped the Friends. Resource industry employment and capital are declining in importance while secondary and tertiary development are increasingly important. In spite of declining resource industry employment, there is steady population growth on the Island (about 3% annually) related to secondary/tertiary development as well as to residential development for retired people. Such broad developments tend to reduce the number of supporters for resource extraction and increase the number
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supporters for recreation and tourism development (as well as for transportation development such as the proposed freeway), so they likely favoured the Friends.\textsuperscript{214}

In sum, the 1980's campaign to save Strathcona Park shows that an extremely good issue, a large amount of committed, cooperative work, and correct tactical decisions were necessary for the Friends to effect a change in policy, but coincidental factors also played an important role in the Friend's development and success.

The Strathcona campaign also illustrates the general limits of the conservation movement in B.C.. One of the largest provincial campaigns in the 1980's was necessary to protect an existing park. In spite of all the Friends' work, the mineral claims are still in the Park and the Friends must maintain an ongoing presence, impeded by a reduced membership, as "watch dogs" to discourage the government from permitting further exploration. The ideas developed in the Tin Wis Coalition (i.e., to form a parallel government that might prevent the forms of conflict that emerged in Strathcona from resurfacing) faltered after the direct stimulus of the Strathcona issue was removed. Even more troublesome for Island environmentalists was the dispute that arose over the Tsitika in the last days of the SC Government and, after the NDP's election, the equally acrimonious dispute over Clayoquot Sound. The CORE process is a hopeful sign but the NDP Government refuses to apply it where it would seem most appropriate, in the dispute over Clayoquot Sound where over 600 people have been arrested to date of writing. Finally, regional development of a tertiary economy with related population growth (which ironically favoured the Friends) boosts the broad, active support for the Island freeway which bodes ill for wilderness protection on the Island. The second growth forest on the East Coast will be cut by a wide swath of pavement. Related projections of population growth and economic development, in existing communities as well as at freeway interchanges, will produce increasingly intense regional wilderness depletion. In the context of ongoing accumulation opportunities in the area, increasing demands on Strathcona Park are assured, but probably, as the Friends know as they

brace themselves for the next decade, as much for intensive tourism development as for resource extraction.
Chapter Seven - Conclusion

Wilderness Depletion: From the Global Scale to Central Vancouver Island

This thesis set out to explain wilderness depletion and the struggle over it at the large and small scale. The initial consideration was that a broad structural analysis would reveal that Strathcona Park and other wilderness parks are a form of wilderness consumption space that is important for recreation, tourism and nature preservation, while acting to block the expansion of production and circulation space as well as non-wilderness consumption space. A broad research question addressed these themes: What is the origin and nature of the struggle between wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space? Chapters two and three concerned the general history of this struggle while the remaining chapters concerned its particular manifestation in the conflicts over Strathcona Park.

In Chapter Two I first considered the troublesome role that wilderness depletion has played in history. Wilderness depletion cannot be explained simply as an acceptable trade-off for the benefits of civilization. Early farmers, who altered wilderness far more than their hunter gather predecessors, often had a harder life than those predecessors. More than human ingenuity or increased satisfaction of needs, the great difficulty that farmers had returning to hunting and gathering (due, for example, to population growth and wilderness depletion) tended to cause the spread of farming. Farmers knew the benefits of hunter gathering through their collective historical memories, continuing interaction with hunter gatherers and their own wilderness economic sector. Hunting and gathering in the wilderness was often preferable to clearing land and hoeing, and wilderness goods were often valued delicacies. Farmers also knew the difficulty of returning to hunting-gathering once the population had grown and logging, grazing and farming degraded the wilderness landscape used by hunter gatherers. So farmers often cut back the wilderness reluctantly because of the excessive labour that it entailed, because it meant to them the spread of the often cursed farming life, and because it caused the loss of yet another area for the wilderness economy. Thus, even in the early years of farming, initiatives sometimes arose to protect wilderness from agriculture and intensive forestry and wilderness took on connotations of consumption space, juxtaposed to production and circulation space.
Concerning early urban relations with wilderness, I began by noting that humans' ingenuity at better satisfying their needs cannot alone explain urbanization. The overall benefits of the urban life way are not always apparent over that in pre-urban farming or hunter gather communities. More than ingenuity or the benefits to urban elites, rising urbanism was an effect of increased population density attendant on farming. This allowed for enough surplus value to be extracted within the transportation range of cities to feed them, especially if they were located downstream from resource-extraction zones. The interrelation of class, patriarchy and the military also provided the social/economic foundations of early urbanism. Even more than in the Neolithic era, wilderness depletion accompanied new social economic structures and quickening population growth, all of which encouraged a positive view of wilderness but prevented its protection or a return to the hunter gatherer life way. Due to the widespread perceptions of the negative aspects of urban life and the positive aspects of hunter-gatherer life, cutting back wilderness was a source of anxiety, as is illustrated by the Epic of Gilgamesh. Against the advice of some of his peers, Gilgamesh felled a virgin forest. Among the factors which led to the centrality of wilderness to the Epic as well as the tragic result of its destruction, was likely the perceived importance of wilderness as a park for recreation, tourism and nature preservation.

Concerning European urban history, I first addressed general conflicts in balancing farming and forestry and then turned to the acrimonious disputes that were aroused by hunting parks and sport hunting. With the strict distinctions in urban society between leisure and work as well as rich and poor, sport hunting often dominated urban elites' leisurely interaction with wilderness, rather than gathering, contemplation, sightseeing or hiking. The rise of this form of wilderness recreation among the upper classes did not derive from some innate pleasure in slaughtering game species but from aspects of society related to the military, state pride, conspicuous consumption, patriarchy, class and meat eating. Although sport hunting in Europe developed into animal slaughter as a spectator sport, as it had in previous epoches, this form of sport nevertheless did not appeal to the masses to the same degree as had contests with wild animals in the Coliseum in the declining Roman Empire. Rather, as the excesses of sport hunting increased
with the advent of capitalism, an unrepentant distaste among the masses arose against the aristocratic relations with wilderness. This animosity stemmed from many sources common to earlier urban history and also from new forms of opposition associated with the advent of capitalism. The demise of aristocratic sport hunting was partly caused by the extension of some democratic practices to the peasantry which at the same time, also tended to further nascent capitalism. Peasants freed from the tyranny of the sport hunting economy were made available for economic activities more conducive to capitalism. The demise of aristocratic sport hunting also provided a stimulus to capitalism: the new bourgeois class listened to the perennial criticisms of sport hunting (particularly after some of the French royalty were executed partly for their form of sport during the French Revolution), stopped forcing workers to engage in sport hunting and applied themselves to building capitalist productive forces. I concluded that the decline of aristocratic sport hunting illustrated the historical intractability of many ecological problems. Democratic sport hunting is a continuing ecological problem; moreover, capitalist productive forces depleted wilderness more thoroughly than those in any previous epoch.

Chapter Three covered how the struggle over wilderness for production, circulation and consumption space has emerged in North America. I first considered the establishment of Canadian and American national parks in front of the advancing industrial frontier and then turned to the values which inspire the establishment and protection of these parks. Such values are related primarily to recreation, tourism and nature preservation. There are conflicts between and within these values. Large corporations, such as the CPR, with a side interest in wilderness tourism often take a softer stand toward wilderness preservation than do recreationists. Recreation associations which promote sightseeing and autocamping often have a softer interest in preservation than do hiking associations. Nature preservationist associations often take a stronger stand for preservation than do recreation and tourism associations. Although there has been some difficulty in uniting groups possessing these differing values, all of them generally oppose the use of parks for production and circulation space.
I focused on the goal of preserving representative ecosystems, which, in the 20th Century, has acquired legitimacy among recreationists, scientists, governments and, broadly, the wilderness movement. Some advocates believe that it is sufficient for governments and citizens to move gradually toward acquiring and protecting representative ecosystems. Others argue that because of the overall importance of preserving representative samples of ecosystems and the many large gaps in present samples in all areas of the world as well as the threats to existing samples, a fundamental redirection of production, consumption and circulation is required to protect and extend world nature reserves. Some of the proposed changes to consumer practices may involve unpleasant trade offs in order to enhance the greater value of wilderness preservation. Others may actually improve standard of living in ways which are complementary to wilderness preservation.

Resource industries as well as their associated wider commodity cycles and transportation corridors pose particular difficulties to the solutions that preservationists seek, especially if actions are directed to protecting not just existing reserves and remaining unprotected wilderness, but also to the return of some now-used areas to a wilderness state. Agriculture and forestry have tended to restrict national parks to mountain and canyon areas where preservationists must contend with continuing incursions of forestry, grazing, hydro projects and mining. I noted the argument of park advocates and vegetarians that if society adopts a vegetarian diet, large areas of land presently used for agriculture could be returned to a wilderness state. However, the low popularity of vegetarian diets, and the difficulty of ensuring once land is taken out of meat production that family farmers and agribusinesses will not embark on other equally destructive uses of nature, both figure against significant reductions in wilderness depletion by this method. The mine-based commodity cycle is largely dedicated to automobiles, the production and use of which increases demand for mines in wilderness areas, depletes the natural resources extracted, pollutes all ecosystems and, with the spread of roads and parking lots, further depletes wilderness. Although there are ways of conceiving a dramatic reduction in automobile use, they are not being strongly promoted and, if they were, they might
contribute to an economic and social upheaval within advanced capitalism with unknown environmental and social implications. I maintained that wilderness depletion was likely to continue due to the difficulty of protecting wilderness from these and other main commodity cycles as well as from roads.

The case study of central Vancouver Island and the history of Strathcona Park illustrated the broader conflict over wilderness, in which park advocates interested in wilderness for consumption space battle with resource corporations interested in wilderness for production space. Frequent use of the Park for resource extraction also illustrated the priority wilderness for production and circulation space often has over its use for consumption space. However, the analysis also considered details of physical geography, regional settlement history, law, corporate behaviour, politics and citizen activism which influence conflict over wilderness.

Chapter Four concerned Strathcona Park's 1911 founding in central Vancouver Island and its history to 1960. Consideration of founding a provincial park began before the turn of the century and in 1905 attention focused on a rectangular region south of Buttle Lake. In 1910 the Natural History Society, the Vancouver Island Development League and the Board of Trade strongly supported founding a large park somewhere on Vancouver Island. In response the McBride Conservatives brought forward a bill in the 1911 legislative session to protect a triangular area in the centre of the Island as the first provincial park. In debate over the Strathcona Park Bill, the Minister of Lands explained that the mountainous landscape in the triangle was being reserved partly for the enjoyment of B.C. citizens but mainly so citizens and businesses could profit from Swiss-style tourism development with hotels and chalets. I maintained that the Park's location also stemmed from the low utility of this mountainous region for other purposes, such as logging and agriculture, and because the Park could not extend into the E&N land grant which cuts through the Park's main attraction: Buttle Lake. Still, the McBride Conservatives almost doubled the size of the Park in 1913. Further additions to the Park were more difficult to achieve and far smaller. Also, unlike the straight-line boundaries of the original park, the Forbidden Plateau (1968), Gold Lake (1979), and Megin Valley (1993)
additions were highly detailed results of park advocates extended struggle with, most often, forest corporations.

I considered the non-involvement of Indians in the Park's founding. This was partly a result of park advocates' contention that Indians feared and never used this remote mountainous region. Though there were no main native communities in the region, I referred to sources which indicated that inland and coastal bands used the mountains in seasonal hunting and gathering forays and for other purposes. Moreover, the evidence for this was obvious - indicating that park advocates wanted to remove evidence of Indians from the land. Three factors accounted for this: first, some Strathcona mountaineers ignored Indians to enhance their own prowess as original explorers and mountaineers; second, tourist interests didn't want Indians in the Park because they would conflict with the development of Swiss-style tourism; and thirdly, the erasure of Indians stemmed from the province's attempt to force Indians into small reserves. Part of the province's rationale for this is the argument that Indians never used or owned the land. In subsequent years Indians' remained excluded from the park, partly due to their lack of resources, partly due to their greater interest in coastal regions, and partly due to governmental resistance to satisfying native land claims. In the 1980's land claims were placed on Strathcona Park, but they have not yet proceeded to court.

Not only has the park not been used for Indians, it has generally not been used for mass recreation and tourism as conceived by its founders. This was partly due to the fact that the McBride Conservatives never managed to develop the park for recreation before they lost the 1916 election. Extraordinarily, successive governments refused to develop the Park. Part of the reason was, as ministers reiterated through the Park's history, its remote location to which few people would go even if it was developed for recreation. However, the noted B.C. conservationist, Roderick Haig-Brown, believed that the main impediment to the government developing Strathcona as a park stemmed from the powerful hold that resource corporations acquired over the province and the Park. For example, governmental advocates of damming Buttle Lake for electricity generation likely believed that if mass recreation were taking place
around the Lake, then opposition to raising its level would be enormous. So they exercised their influence to oppose recreational development in the Buttle Lake vicinity, especially construction of a road to the lake for park purposes. Similarly logging promoters in government likely opposed construction of the connecting road.

Despite the success of resource extractors in curtailing Strathcona's use as a park, several of the main battles in B.C.'s conservation history have been waged over the Park. As a result of several early campaigns, the government purchased forest tenures that were placed in the Park before its creation. The government, however, never purchased all these tenures and logging was carried out on many of them in the 1940's and 1950's. Additionally, in the 1960's the government granted further forest tenures in the Park and further large areas were logged. There are no more forest tenures in the Park, but this is mainly because most of the marketable timber in it has been logged on about 20% of its total area.

In 1951 the provincial crown corporation, the B.C. Power Commission, revised a 1927 plan to dam Buttle Lake for hydroelectricity generation. Conservationists did not oppose the dam outright but wanted it to be located further downstream in the Campbell River watershed so that Buttle Lake's level would not need to be raised. The recently-elected Social Credit Government and municipal governments on the Island, however, strongly supported the project for the industrial and home electricity it could provide. The NDP's precursor, the CCF supported the project because it was one of the first projects of the public electrical utility, which they had for years advocated should be established. The battle which began in 1951 involved two public inquiries and a court case as well as extensive newspaper coverage of five straight years of conflict. But construction began in 1956 so that today Buttle Lake's level is unnaturally high and fluctuates according to the needs of the turbines.

The continuing heavy use of Strathcona Park for resource extraction, coupled with its light use for park purposes, caused growing outrage among Strathcona defenders. Many Islanders saw the dam as an unfortunate consequence of an otherwise beneficial development of the regional productive forces. Critical conservationists likely agreed with Haig-Brown's assessment
that, although there was a public debate over resource development, big decisions were usually made behind the scenes between capitalists and the government, so that citizen protest over environmental issues is often futile.

Chapters Five and Six further narrowed the focus of investigation to the ways that the Friends of Strathcona Park articulate the struggle over wilderness. In terms of a broad social/economic analysis the Friends attempt to protect an area of wilderness as consumption space from conversion into wilderness for production space. As the introductory chapter explained, this form of broad social/economic "structural theory" can explain "why" groups act and particularly why they attempt to curb wilderness depletion. Such structural analysis, however, is limited for showing the development of particular park histories and "how" groups carry out their work as well as their successes or failures in particular conflicts.

The Friends' general problem was that by 1960 a precedent was set to use Strathcona Park for resource extraction while the group's particular challenge was mining and mineral exploration in the Park. In the 1960's the Social Credit Government permitted Western Mines to build a mine in the middle of the Park and when opposition arose to the mine the Socreds strongly defended it. The Minister of Recreation and Conservation, Ken Kiernan, maintained that the legal rights of mining companies could not be transcended, regardless of concerns expressed for the fishery, parks and public health. Ultimately the mine was built with the controversial tailings deposits in Buttle Lake. But in the dispute over Western Mines' Strathcona operation, the NDP opposition began to take a stronger stand in favour of parks.

When it was elected in 1972, the NDP passed a moratorium on resource extraction in parks which, as it pertained to Strathcona, prohibited exploration outside the bounds of the Western lease. The NDP, however, had little success in a broader initiative to regulate the mining industry. Moreover, the industry played a role in the 1975 return of the SCP to office, as well as in its retraction of the Mineral Royalties Act that the NDP had passed so that taxation of the mine industry would match that of other industries. Nevertheless, the SCP did not immediately lift the moratorium on resource extraction in parks. The SCP was reluctant to lift the moratorium
because resource extraction in parks is strongly opposed by citizens. Moreover, since the amount of marketable minerals in provincial parks (many of which jog around orebodies) is small relative to the provincial land base, so acquiring access to parks was not central to the mine industry lobby. Finally, in the early development of conflict over mining in the Park, the Supreme Court of Canada's "Tener" decision indicated that expropriating Crown grants in parks could require high payments for unknown ore reserves; however, the 1986 Supreme Court of British Columbia decision would not extend this precedent to Cream Silver's mineral claims in Strathcona Park.

As a result of indications that the SC Government was using the Wilderness Advisory Committee to rationalize opening Strathcona to mining, Jim Boulding, Steve Smith and Marlene Smith founded the Friends of Strathcona Park. Following a January 1987 announcement that the Park would be opened to further mineral exploration and mining, the Friends and others launched a campaign to stop this policy shift. The Friends became distinguished from many other local environmental groups by the large amount of work that they were willing to dedicate to protecting the Park and by their consideration of the use of CD to protect it. Fueling this extraordinary development was the distaste for mining in the Park and the way the Government was initiating it. Particularly, the March 1987 Orders-in-Council broke the promises of the current and previous environment ministers that hearings would be held before opening Strathcona to mining. Moreover, SC ministers of environment also ignored the B.C. Government's prior victory in court, arguing that the government would be obligated to pay unacceptable expropriation costs if it did not permit exploration. As a result of the Friends' work as well as the nature and related popularity of their issue, by December 1987 there was an active citizens group poised to carry out CD if further mineral exploration was carried out in the Park. Still, the government permitted Cream Silver to carry out further exploration. The Friends were ultimately successful in bringing together a series of issues (i.e., concerns for the Park, Indian land claims, pollution and social justice) into support for civil disobedience, which forced the government to strike the Strathcona Park Advisory Committee. The Committee ultimately
supported the Friends' positions and in September 1988 the government announced that no further logging and mining would be permitted in the Park. As a result of further work of the Steering Committee and the Friends ongoing threat to use CD, in 1990 the SC Government finally made Strathcona a Class A Statute park. The analysis showed how this success depended on a combination of elements: an extremely good issue; the work of the Friends and groups who supported them; the Friends' skilful use of tactics; and coincidental factors which favoured the group.

The Friend's struggle also indicated the limits of the wilderness movement in B.C. One of the largest campaigns ever mounted over any issue in the province (along with helpful coincidental factors) was required to protecting an existing park. Once the immediate threat to Strathcona had been resolved, the Friends continued their activities with the same few members playing a "watch dog" role over the Park. Their focus was on protecting the Park from further mineral exploration and mining on the mineral claims and Crown grants of Cream Silver and other Companies that the Friends had not succeeded in having eliminated from the Park, as well as on Westmin's expansion. The Coalition which originally formed during the Strathcona likewise has generally not flourished. The decline of the Coalition and the Friends would not have been a problem if the mineral claims and Crown grants had been eliminated from the Park, thus resolving the immediate objective of the blockade, and if the broader central Island issues that they addressed had been resolved. However, a particularly divisive dispute over the Tsitika Valley indicated that there was little common ground over environmental issues among regional Indians, environmentalists and resource industry workers. The escalation of tension in the dispute over Clayoquot Sound, with over 600 recent arrests and stiff sentences meted out to arrestees, indicates that the NDP reacts quite similarly as did the SC at resolving conflicts over wilderness, and is not willing to take special steps to prevent wilderness depletion from continuing, even in hotly contested areas. Thus, a political solution to stopping conflict over wilderness depletion and to stopping wilderness depletion has not been forthcoming and probably will not be for the foreseeable future.
Government policy in Strathcona's case illustrates the primacy that wilderness for production space often takes over its use for consumption space, even if it is demonstrably not in the public interest. This thesis has considered aspects of how capitalist corporations influenced B.C. governments to thwart the public's interest in setting aside Strathcona Park as a "public park and pleasure ground for the benefit, advantage, and enjoyment of the people of British Columbia". Perhaps even more troublesome, for opponents of wilderness depletion in the central Island, while environmentalists are attempting to protect its existing Parks and to empark its few remaining wilderness areas, a popular movement also supports the proposed Island freeway. In contrast to the seemingly singular interests of mining corporations in further mining in Strathcona Park, there is active broad support for the freeway initiative from large and small corporations as well as from citizens groups and the general public. The SC and then the NDP supported this initiative for the role that it could play in abating current congestion problems resulting from the high rates of local population and economic growth, as well as its probable role in spurring further growth. So more pervasive wilderness depletion will occur along the black-topped strip, at the freeway interchanges, and through growth of existing communities.

With ongoing growth in the province and the island there will be more indigenous consumption, particularly related to automobiles as indicated by plans for the freeway. However, there may also be less mining. Partly as a result of high labour costs and environmental standards in the province (as in other North America jurisdictions), some local mining companies are turning toward Latin America and other Third World areas. Still, in the context of ongoing economic and population growth, increasing demands for Strathcona Park are assured for intensive tourism development, related to development of a mixed economy, if not for resource extraction. With the advent of the freeway, regional pollution will increasingly threaten the ecology of Strathcona Park, compounding the problems caused by global pollution. Up to now, several members of the Friends and others have managed only to launch a small letter writing campaign to oppose the freeway. So I conclude that, although there will continue to be successes in protecting wilderness, an examination of the wilderness movement's limits, at
the large and small scale, indicates that the impetuses of production, circulation and non-wilderness consumption space will continue to prevail over wilderness preservation for the foreseeable future. Capitalism generates rapid wilderness depletion due to the spatial exigencies of production, non-wilderness consumption and circulation. It also generates citizen opposition to wilderness depletion leading to the acrimonious conflicts endemic to the system. In spite of the seriousness of the problem, however, opposition is not sufficient to curtail wilderness depletion. The analysis of North America and central Vancouver Island in this research tends to support ecologists who regard the conflict over wilderness depletion and the relentless continuation of wilderness depletion as fatal contradictions of capitalism.

Members of the Friends of Strathcona whom I have spoken to are concerned about these and other aspects of industrial development, both at the local and global scale. In my last contact with the group at their November 1992 wilderness symposium, "Where the Wild Things Are", their attention was turned to problems in and beyond the Park. Workshops were held on (1) wilderness education, (2) park management, (3) wilderness and forestry and (4) wilderness tourism. Subjects discussed in the workshops concerned: whether or not hikers should be permitted to go into or build fires in particular areas of Strathcona Park; the problems of creating and protecting various B.C. parks; the difficulty of dealing with the Ministry of Forests; and the challenge of involving more people in wilderness protection. Keynote speaker Elizabeth May's opening address and discussions over the weekend covered a host of broader issues, including the problem of international capitals' destruction of the environment, with reference to the Free Trade Agreement between Canada the United States and the imminent extension of this agreement to Mexico, as well as the issue of the negative influence that ozone depletion and global warming might have on all habitats. In a final comment on members of the Friends of Strathcona, I could only note that in the context of the issues raised at the Symposium their demeanors vacillated between optimism about what citizen activism has accomplished (particularly stemming from their 1988 blockade) and will accomplish in the future, to depression over what needs to be done, but is beyond the purview and influence of themselves
individually, their group, their regional and provincial governments, and perhaps even their society as a whole.
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