

**THE DEVELOPMENT OF PARKS & PLAYGROUNDS  
IN CANADIAN PRAIRIE CITIES  
1880 TO 1930**

**Manuscript for paper presented at CPRA Research Symposium, 1991 by Susan Markham**

**Abstract**

This research investigated the development of municipal parks and playgrounds in major Canadian prairie cities between 1880 and 1930. The study focused on two sets of factors, the urban reform movement and civic boosterism, in order to determine their impacts on the policies for and provision of municipal parks and playgrounds in Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton. The research proposition **that urban reform and civic boosterism were factors which significantly affected the development of parks and playgrounds in the cities** was addressed through three questions in the study:

- (1) Who were the advocates of parks and playgrounds, and what motives can be found in their rhetoric?
- (2) What (if any) policies were discussed and adopted by municipal decision-makers as a result of the rhetoric of the advocates of parks and playgrounds and the prevalent movements and attitudes of the time?
- (3) What actions were taken to establish and develop parks and playgrounds as a result of both the rhetoric and the policies?

While the research proposition was not supported by the findings, there was evidence of some impact from the two factors. When the "pattern of development" was divided into "process" and "product," it became apparent that the two factors had more substantial impact on the process of creating a awareness of park and playground issues and on creating organizations to manage and plan parks and playgrounds than they had on the product, the actual designation and development of park and playground sites.

There were two other, probably more important, influences on the development of parks and playgrounds. First, a number of individuals had a substantial impact in several cities. Second, changing economic and political conditions were, on occasion, used to the advantage of the cities as they were able to acquire park and playground sites.

**Part 1 - The Relevance**

The direction given to researchers who submitted their abstracts for review was that "the committee would especially like to see applied, practical or action research submitted;" and that "efforts which bridge the gap between practitioner and researcher are encouraged."

So --- how does "The Development of Parks and Playgrounds in Canadian Prairie Cities: 1880-1930" fit into this research symposium? Why am I in this room? Why do I think that this research is relevant (other than that it kept me out of pool halls, taverns and other dens of iniquity for a few years).

One of the things that I believe can be relevant to practitioners is the process that I use in my research; focussing on issues - looking not just at what happened, but also why events happened; realizing that when we try to understand the "pattern of development of parks and playgrounds" we must understand not just what was the product of the development of the delivery system, but also through what process did the community, the advocates, the staff and the political decision- makers go as they created parks and playgrounds.

That was the first bit of relevance, but, the second part is probably more important. That

is the need to recognize the role of the external political, economic and social environment on the development of park and playground systems. That can include individuals acting either alone or in alliances; it can include the media; it can include economic and political conditions on the local, provincial, national and international scene. We all operate in organizations that are subject to pressures from all quarters, both internally and externally, and we must be prepared to deal with these pressures.

Well, what might these grand realizations that I have come to do to help bridge the real or perceived gap between researchers and practitioners?

Research attempts to describe, to explain and to predict. Historic research certainly describes what happened and explains why events or decisions happened, but, I'm not convinced that historic research predicts and that history repeats itself. However, I am convinced that the models used in doing historic research and the findings that are generated can help us in recreation and parks create our own administrative/management models. Models to help understand how issues develop, to understand the process that they go through; and if we can understand the process, then perhaps we can control the process or at the very least, not be too surprised at the outcome. Now each of you can come to your own conclusions about the degree to which you want to control any process - I'll leave that to you. There is a limit to the help that any researcher can be to any practitioner.

Now, before I get into the findings of my research on parks and playgrounds in Prairie cities and the impact of urban reform and civic boosterism (or the focus of my life for 4 years), I am going to tell you the answer to my research question - the answer is no. After four years, the answer is no. Now that is a very terse, too succinct version of the answer; I rather prefer my husband's version (he got to proofread the dissertation); his version of the answer is that "after you cut through all the b.s. of the boosters and reformers, it took a good recession to get tax sale land for parks." He's a chemist - I originally took thousands of words to say the same thing. He also told me to talk mostly about the relevance of the research and little about the findings - something about "turgid prose" as one of my graduate committee labelled my writing style.

But, you are not here to listen to a lecture on how to do historic research, or how to write it, or on political process in decision making. I will now attempt to deal with the findings, and perhaps some of the usefulness will show up. Hopefully, you will get a sense of two things: firstly, how recreation is part of Prairie and Canadian history; and secondly, how we can look at history as part of today's recreation. I would like to come back to that point when we get to the discussion part of paper [Gyro Park in Fort Edmonton; every tree in Regina has been planted; two of our conference hotels are on or very near the sites of Regina parks]

## **Part 2 - The Research Process**

### **A. Background**

#### **1. Introduction**

My research investigated the development of parks and playgrounds in several Canadian Prairie cities (Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton) between 1880 and 1930. The central objective in the work was to determine if there were any common threads and links in the patterns of development of municipal parks and playgrounds in the various cities, and, if so, what these were, by examining the cities individually and then drawing comparisons on a provincial basis. I examined the work of the urban reformers and the civic boosters to determine their impacts on the policies for and provision of municipal parks and playgrounds. That narrow focus on municipally established and developed parks and playgrounds reflected the state of

municipal parks and recreation services in most cities in Canada and the United States during the time period of the study. That time period, 1880 to 1930, included, in the beginning years, the period when most Prairie cities were being established, and, in its final years, the period of enthusiasm and affluence that quickly faded with the fiscal crises of the 1930's.

Public parks and playgrounds have been developed for many reasons including those claimed by both the reformers and the boosters. Claims that parks would act as an attraction for new investment, new businesses and new residents have frequently been made by city administrators and city boosters in North America, both past and present. In addition, there were frequent assertions by promoters of the urban reform movement that parks and playgrounds were necessary services for both new and old residents which would benefit a city through the enhancement of its residents' physical and moral health. Past research about parks and playgrounds has, on occasion, accepted the rhetoric of these vocal promoters as evidence of the provision of services. However, the purpose of this research, following from the challenges issued by Weaver over a decade ago (1976, 1979), was to move beyond rhetoric, to ascertain if there were any resultant policies and any action, by determining the impact of two key groups, the urban reformers and the civic boosters. Past overview and comparative research about parks and playgrounds in Canada, including the work of McFarland (1970) and Wright (1983, 1984), as well as studies of cities such as Halifax (Markham and Edginton, 1979; Markham, 1980), Vancouver (McKee, 1978; McDonald, 1984) and Winnipeg (Cavett, Selwood and Lehr, 1982) laid the basis for this research.

## 2. Research Proposition

As I mentioned, the research sought and investigated the connections between, on the one hand, the rhetoric and actions of the various interest groups and influential individuals promoting reform, civic pride and planning; and, on the other, the development of municipal parks and playgrounds, through the following research proposition: **that urban reform and civic boosterism were factors which significantly affected the development of parks and playgrounds in the cities.** This proposition was addressed through three questions:

- (1) Who were the advocates of parks and playgrounds, and what motives can be found in their rhetoric?
- (2) What (if any) policies were discussed and adopted by municipal decision-makers as a result of the rhetoric of the advocates of parks and playgrounds and the prevalent movements and attitudes of the time?
- (3) What actions were taken to establish and develop parks and playgrounds as a result of both the rhetoric and the policies?

That research proposition reflected the previously noted need to move from accepting the rhetoric of the advocates to further analyses of policies and action. The research proposition and the responses to its attendant questions were then considered in light of an interpretive framework created from theories of policy making, decision making and pressure groups developed from the writings of Adie and Thomas (1982), Bella (1981), Doern and Phidd (1983), Edginton and Williams (1978), Higgins (1986), Pross (1975), Simeon (1976) and Stone, Whelan and Murin (1979). This framework suggests that four elements of the theories, namely ideology, environment, power and rational decision making, could provide explanations about the development of parks and playgrounds, and thus move our knowledge base from restating rhetoric to understanding of the source of policies and any subsequent action.

### **3. Sources And Methods**

The research used historical research methods, including the collection and analysis of primary and secondary source materials. Secondary source materials came from past studies in parks and recreation history, planning history, urban history and Prairie development (Markham, 1989). Primary source materials, either documents about particular issues or accounts by those directly involved in the issues, formed the basis for the preparation of detailed studies of the cities and the subsequent analyses and comparisons. They included files, minutes and reports of city councils, and planning and parks and recreation commissions; similar documents from boards of trade, councils of women, and other booster and reform groups; as well as maps and architectural drawings.

Using these materials, a case study of each city was prepared. The cities were then compared with each other, both within and between their respective provinces and between regions to establish if there were any substantial commonalities in both the patterns of development of parks and playgrounds, and the roles of particular individuals and interest groups, acting either alone or in alliances. The patterns of development were then reviewed in light of the interpretive framework.

### **4. Urban Reform and Civic Boosterism: Alliances and Opposition**

Both urban reform and civic boosterism involved efforts by individuals and groups to promote causes or actions which they favoured. The causes of the urban reformers were varied, including social welfare, public health, planning, and government infrastructure. Meanwhile, the civic boosters promoted their own particular communities with hopes that they would grow and become "better" - thus enhancing life for residents (or at least some of them). The causes and efforts favoured by both boosters and reformers, at times coincided although different motives may have driven each group.

The urban reformers and the civic boosters proceeded toward their respective goals through different means, with the reformers attempting to order and improve the urban environment, while the boosters emphasized urban growth and development. However, those goals had common elements; both groups were espousing efforts to enhance everyday life for civic residents, with the goal being to create a better city. The urban reformers' conception of this "better city" was defined by the city's health, including the physical, mental and moral health of its residents, and by the provision of services such as parks and playgrounds, utilities and good government which could benefit all residents. The reforms proposed can be described as being internal reforms, including services which would benefit those at the grass roots level and diffuse upward to benefit the entire city. In contrast, the civic boosters' efforts were to encourage growth and development, the benefits of which could trickle down to all residents. Growth and industry would provide employment and opportunity for all.

Parks and playgrounds were common ground for both the urban reformers and the civic boosters. To the reformers, parks and playgrounds were to assist in creating a humane environment where the physical, mental and moral health of all residents would be enhanced. To the boosters, parks and, to a lesser extent, playgrounds could be attractions for new residents who would bring investment and growth, and, thereby, prosperity to the city. In principle, the urban reformers and the civic boosters could agree that parks and playgrounds would be valuable to a city. In practice they might disagree about the priority that parks and playgrounds should have in any city's planning. Conflicts could occur if the reformers' efforts to provide base level community services did not coincide with the boosters' efforts to provide efficient, businesslike

government with relatively low levels of taxation. Reformers would frequently favour base level services, dispersed to all groups, including the disadvantaged, while boosters would favour highly visible attractions. Thus, parks and playgrounds can be common ground for both reformers and boosters, but serving different purposes, based on the reformers' and boosters' different conceptions of what constituted a "better" city.

## 5. The Interpretive Framework

As noted earlier this interpretive framework was created from theories of policy making, decision making and pressure groups developed from the writings of Adie and Thomas (1982), Bella (1981), Doern and Phidd (1983), Edginton and Williams (1978), Higgins (1986), Pross (1975), Simeon (1976) and Stone, Whelan and Murin (1979). This framework suggests that four elements of the theories, namely ideology, environment, power and rational decision making, could provide explanations about the development of parks and playgrounds, and thus move our knowledge base from restating rhetoric to understanding the source of policies and any subsequent action. From a review of those theories dealing with policy making, decision making and pressure groups; and the background review of urban history, urban reform and civic boosterism, and parks and playgrounds, it is possible to identify a number of elements which could most likely explain the development of parks and playgrounds in the Prairie cities. The approaches through which policy making, decision making and pressure groups have been viewed are complementary rather than competing, and are both nested and overlapping. Thus, the elements which can explain the development of parks and playgrounds are also not mutually exclusive, but are complementary; and each can provide a partial explanation for the various cities.

The four elements from the theories which should provide the most likely explanations are:

- (1) Ideology;
- (2) Environment;
- (3) Distribution of power; and
- (4) Rational decision-making processes.

The prevailing **ideas** associated with urban reform, particularly social reform, and boosterism, primarily the enhancement of civic prestige, were frequently noted in the background literature of the urban history in general and the development of the urban west and of parks and playgrounds in particular. Examples of the prevailing ideas to which policy makers were repeatedly exposed, and which thus may have influenced their decisions regarding parks and playgrounds, include: the work of the Commission of Conservation and of Thomas Adams; the rhetoric of the urban reformers which stressed ordering and improving the cities; rhetoric of the boosters which stressed the need for the cities to grow; the statements urging that parks be developed to promote better health or to enhance economic conditions; and the exhortations that supervised playgrounds be established to assist in the mission of social improvement. These ideas were transmitted by popular and professional journals of the day, by newspaper reporting, and by lectures given by experts either at national conferences or in their role as invited guests at local meetings. Thus, these ideas may be expected to have had a substantial impact in the cities. The literature provides many examples of the rhetoric of the reformers and the boosters; however, the study of their impact through policy development and implementation is frequently neglected.

The **environment** of each city included both changing and stable aspects. Changing

aspects included social conditions, political considerations and economic conditions. These three aspects are viewed as changing both on the world scale and on the local scale. While it may seem rather grand to deal at the world scale when considering the development of parks and playgrounds in these Canadian cities; in the four western cities during their infancy, world scale migrations from Europe and Asia to North America, urbanization of the prairies, world economic conditions and a World War were potential sources of impacts on the cities. Westward and northward migration increased the population of each Prairie city, particularly in the early years of the 1910's. The influx of new residents into each city created a demand for accommodation, leading to social conditions which were frequently cited by social reformers as problems which required alleviation. One mechanism promoted by social reformers as a means to alleviate urban problems was the development of parks and playgrounds, both to make the city more habitable and to make the residents healthier. Thus, aspects of the social environment may explain the development of parks and playgrounds. Fluctuations in the world economic environment had an impact upon the price paid for crops, the availability of markets for manufactured goods, the amount of available credit and the market for speculative land sales, thus creating crises in the various cities' tax bases and their revenue generation abilities. The political environment for each city included both legislation which had an impact upon the city, and political decisions which affected the role of the city, such as being the provincial capital or being on a railway line.

A more stable aspect of each city was its physical setting whose features included the presence or absence of a water body for both functional or aesthetic purposes; the presence or absence of tree cover to provide shade and possibly enhance property values; and the variety of topographic features to provide both impediments to development, and natural features to enhance the city. While the physical setting may have been relatively stable, views as to what constituted its positive or negative aspects not only varied between individuals and groups, but also changed over time, as did views on whether and how to preserve or amend parts of the city's physical setting. This combination of variations in the presence of physical features and changing views of it may have contributed to variation in the development of parks and playgrounds between the cities.

The notion of the **distribution of power** and the backgrounds of pressure groups (the urban reformers and the civic boosters) and the decision makers is a theme noted repeatedly in the policy literature. The groups in pursuit of the public interest, who advocated changes either by reform efforts or through boosting the cities typically came from middle class or business class backgrounds. It is possible to view the class backgrounds of the various reformers and boosters as predictors of both their actions and the expected recipients of the benefits of such actions. Thus, evidence could be present to suggest that any policies and their resultant outcomes were the consequence of the prevailing distribution of power and influence, and the notions of the public interest held by the "powerful." These notions could include the perpetuation of a stratified society, whereby the reformers and boosters strove to achieve their particular group's view of the public interest and thus perpetuate their particular class' values and beliefs.

The **decision-making process** noted in both the literature dealing with the creation of the bureaucracy to plan and develop parks and playgrounds, and that of the comprehensive planning efforts, was that of rational planning, emphasizing logical, long range, structured planning. Reform efforts to restructure government organizations included the creation of professional staffs to efficiently carry out policy decisions. Professional staff members were hired to add continuity to actions over the years and to make non-partisan decisions based on a body of technical knowledge rather than supposedly biased political decisions. The theme prevalent in

town planning was that of the "City Efficient," promoting health, hygiene and efficiency in addition to administering growth in the cities. Thus, rational planning and decision making involving identifying facts, using reason, measuring efficiency and establishing what is best, was the process promoted by the experts as the preferred method of proceeding.

As noted earlier, these elements are not exclusive or competing - they are complementary. For example, power has an impact on ideology, the ideas may be viewed as part of the environment, and the decision making process can be seen as part of a particular set of ideas regarding the operation of municipal policies. However, for this analysis, they have been separated. The workability of these four elements as plausible explanations can be tested through the analysis of the cities in the study.

## 6. Process And Product Model

In carrying out this research, the phrase **pattern of development** was initially used, as had been done by McFarland (1970, p. 38) in the first historical study of public recreation in Canada. This phrase was further interpreted to include the notions of **process** and **product** to explain the development of parks and playground services:

Through what **process** did each city move in discussing and initiating park and playground services?

What was the end **product**? That is, what services were implemented in each city by 1930?

The term **service** was defined as parks designated and playgrounds provided and supported, totally or partially by the municipal government in each city. Thus, playgrounds operated by a service club, but partially funded by a city grant would be included, as would the wholly funded municipal park system; but provincial legislature grounds and agricultural society grounds would not be included.

While the focus of the research was on parks and playgrounds, it was also necessary to consider comprehensive city planning efforts, particularly in the Prairie cities. Planning was included as part of the studies when it appeared that the establishment and development of parks and playgrounds was often part of the mandate of the various planning organizations and planning exercises. At times there was considerable overlap between park planning, comprehensive city planning and the work of planning experts.

The roles of particular individuals or interest groups acting either alone or in alliance is included in the **process** of developing services - specifically, in terms of the promotion of an issue either before or after it was recognized by the municipal decision-makers. The research began by considering only individuals or groups as promoters of particular issues. However, as it progressed, however, it became apparent that local newspapers were also active in promoting parks, playgrounds and planning issues. This promotion took the form of announcements of upcoming events, plus reports of events after they occurred, often coupled with exhortations in support of the issue on the newspapers' editorial pages. The rhetoric exhibited in editorials provides some of the most abundant examples of reform and booster sentiments to which local residents, voters and decision makers were exposed.

The following "Process and Product Model" describes the actions involved in initiating and implementing parks and playgrounds services:

Recognition, acceptance and promotion of an issue by an individual, interest group or newspaper

**WHICH COULD LEAD TO**

Formation of a community based advocacy organization

**AND/OR**

Recognition of an issue by municipal decision makers

**WHICH LED TO**

Discussion of the issue by decision makers  
and either adoption or rejection of a policy  
to pursue a deliberately chosen course of action (or inaction)

**OR**

Action without any policy decision

**WHICH LED TO**

Product (or lack of it): parks or playground or organizations to supply services

The organizations formed to deal with parks, playgrounds and planning could be part of both the **process** and the **product**. An organization would be part of the process when it was formed to be one of the advocates for a particular issue - for example, the various playgrounds associations. An organization could be part of the product if it was established as a result of deliberations by municipal decision-makers who desired to provide particular services. Examples of this would be a parks commission or a planning commission. The mere establishment of an organization did not guarantee that parks or playgrounds or planning services would be provided or that human or financial resources were available. Thus, even if an organization is part of the product, it may be seen as only one stage in the product.

## **7. The Urban West: 1880-1930**

The choice of these cities and a 50 year time period for this study reflects the settlement pattern and the prevailing social and economic conditions in the urban west.

The four principal publications outlining the development of the urban west differ slightly in their definitions of "urban" and in their emphasis on the significant factors in establishing and changing the patterns of urban development. (McCann, 1968; Careless, 1979) Voisey, 1975; Artibise, 1981) However, they all agree that what began in 1881 as an area dominated by Winnipeg, with little urban development elsewhere, soon changed. By 1911, in the wake of the coming of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and later the Canadian Northern Railway, the remaining four cities, Regina, Saskatoon, Calgary and Edmonton had emerged as major trade centers with their own industries and social and cultural institutions. Artibise concludes that, "in short, by 1914 the prairies had five fairly sophisticated cities." (Artibise, p.18.) One characteristic of this sophistication may be the development of a system of parks and playgrounds. In this study Winnipeg is viewed as the city dominating much of the development of the West because of its earlier establishment, its earlier entry into Confederation, and the more advanced state of its wholesaling and manufacturing sectors and its trade and communication links with eastern Canada, the United States and the expanding hinterland to the west and north. Winnipeg was often cited as a city which the younger communities considered worthy of emulating. The other four cities, in provinces which entered Confederation in 1905, have different patterns of growth, of legislation, and of action in municipal affairs. Table 1 shows the population in these five prairie centers from 1881 to 1931, the dates when each achieved village,



town and city status, and the dates when the various provinces entered Confederation.

**Table 1**  
**Canadian Prairie Cities: 1871 - 1931**

**Population**

Year	Winnipeg	Regina	Saskatoon	Calgary	Edmonton
1871	241	-	-	-	-
1881	7,985	c800	-	100	263
1886	20,238	?	-	?	?
1891	25,639	1,681	-	3,867	700
1901	42,340	2,249	113	4,398	4,176
1906	90,153	6,169	3,001	11,967	14,088
1911	136,035	30,213	12,004	43,704	36,643
1916	163,000	26,617	21,048	56,514	53,846
1921	179,087	34,432	25,739	63,305	58,821
1926	191,998	37,329	31,234	65,291	65,163
1931	218,785	53,209	43,291	83,761	79,187

**Incorporation**

Village	-	-	1901	-	-
Town	-	1883	1903	1884	1892
City	1873	1903	1906	1893	1904

**Province In Confederation**

1870	1905	1905	1905	1905
------	------	------	------	------

**B. Findings And Analysis**

**1. The Cities**

**a. Regina and Saskatoon**

The two cities in Saskatchewan developed with different functions and on very different geographic bases. These differences affected the development of the respective park systems. Regina, on a flat treeless plain with few of nature's gifts, had aspirations of being a grand capital and emphasized civic beautification on park lands that were transferred from the Dominion Government. Saskatoon, on a treed site around a river valley, proceeded more slowly with fewer grand intentions, acquiring parks which could also serve as sites for the fair grounds and for a railway river crossing.

Regina's parks were managed by a committee of Council, as numerous efforts to establish a semi-autonomous Parks Board or Commission failed. Saskatoon established its Parks Commission in 1908. This operated with the aid of provincial legislation, "The Saskatoon Public Parks Act" of 1912, which defined its duties and gave it access to a maximum mill rate, subject to Council's approval.

In both cities, comprehensive city plans were begun in 1913. Regina commissioned a planner of international reputation, T.H. Mawson, for its plan and received the preliminary plan ten years later. Saskatoon's plan was prepared quickly by its City Commissioner, C.J. Yorath. Each city was urged to carry out these planning efforts by local groups. In Regina it was the City Planning Association, with the support of the Mayor. In Saskatoon it was the Parks Board which

wanted the city to do some work "along the lines of modern Town Planning." Soon after each plan was begun, economic conditions changed and the assumptions of growth and prosperity were no longer appropriate.

The cities treated the planning of parks and playgrounds differently. Regina included parks and playgrounds within its comprehensive scheme. Saskatoon hired the Minneapolis consultants Morell and Nichols, to plan its parks and parkways. This was a separate exercise from Commissioner Yorath's comprehensive plan. Although both cities had urged the provincial government to enact town planning legislation, neither city responded quickly to the 1917 Saskatchewan Town Planning and Rural Development Act. The Act required cities to adopt development bylaws or a development scheme by the end of 1920, but only Saskatoon took the initial steps. And, even Saskatoon's preliminary steps stopped when its designated development engineer, Commissioner Yorath, left the City's employ to work in Edmonton. Regina did not seek authority under the Act to adopt development bylaws or a development scheme. Rather, at the instigation of the Board of Trade, it formed an advisory Town Planning Association in 1922, which evolved into the city's Town Planning Board in 1924 and Town Planning Commission in 1930. Saskatoon was much slower, finally creating a Town Planning Board similar to Regina's in 1927 and a Town Planning Commission in 1929. Under the Provincial Town Planning Act of 1928, the Town Planning Commissions were to act in an advisory capacity to council in town planning matters, to prepare a zoning bylaw and to prepare a town planning scheme. The comprehensive city planning efforts gave each city little to add to the process and product of municipal parks. More useful efforts were made in each city when parks were proposed, and in Regina's case developed, on Railway property, or when land was acquired to serve a particular local area such as the Northern Park in Regina in 1908 or land near Hill's Factory in Saskatoon in 1907 and the six sites purchased in that city in 1911-12.

Each city acquired land to aid in access to water. Regina did this early in its development when it acquired the Reservoir (now Wascana) Park. Saskatoon was later in acquiring river frontage, beginning in 1907, an island in the river in 1911, and river bank land beginning in 1919.

The most substantial park land acquisitions were made when each city became the owner of properties for which property taxes had not been paid. In both Regina and Saskatoon, as responses to the perceived demand for parks distributed throughout the cities and recognizing the available supply of land, parcels were designated as parks and added to the system.

The establishment of supervised playgrounds in Regina occurred much earlier and with the participation of more community organizations than in Saskatoon. Through the efforts of the Y.M.C.A., the School Board and the Regina Council of Women and with funds from City Council, the Regina Playgrounds Association operated from 1912 to 1914. Beginning in 1920, the Regina Playgrounds Commission supervised both playgrounds and other recreation opportunities. In contrast, it was not until 1918 that supervised playgrounds were operated in Saskatoon by the Citizens Educational League and then, after a ten year break, as an experiment by the Kinsmen Club, beginning in 1928. Despite its later start, however, Saskatoon developed a very comprehensive approach to managing playground and recreation activities in 1930, when the Playground Association was established with broad community representation including a member with experience in the Montreal Parks and Playgrounds Association. The Association hired its first full-time staff member, George Ward, in 1930. Regina's did not hire its first full-time staff member until 1938.

The two interest groups which had some involvement in parks and playgrounds in both

cities were the local Board of Trade and the local Council of Women. In Regina, both groups were substantially involved. The Board of Trade, which supported parks and playgrounds, was most active in its promotion of broader planning matters. The Council of Women's role was primarily a supporting one for specific projects such as the organization and funding of supervised playgrounds. An example of the contrasting, but complementary, roles of these two groups was their involvement in the formation of the Town Planning Association. Apparently, the Board of Trade instigated the Association, while the Council of Women was one of the organizations represented at the formative meetings. In Saskatoon, both groups were involved, but to a limited degree. In that city, individuals, in both appointed and elected capacities, often were more active than groups. Rev. E.B. Smith promoted parks and playgrounds from 1908 to 1923. Commissioner Yorath dominated the city administration from 1913 to 1922. Alderman Underwood and Professor MacKenzie worked with the Town Planning Board and Commission. Aldermen Mills and Pinder were instrumental in promoting and forming the Playgrounds Association which took on broader recreation-related responsibilities.

### **b. Calgary and Edmonton**

The two cities in Alberta were established to serve different functions. Edmonton served the northern fur and gold rush trade, while Calgary served the southern cattle industry. Both cities were affected by the arrival (or nonarrival) of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Edmonton hoped for the railway line, but Calgary received it. Calgary achieved town and city status first, as its population grew faster in conjunction with its role as a railway and commercial center.

There were no parks designated on early townsite plans for either Calgary or Edmonton. Thus, each city made deliberate efforts to acquire park land. Calgary's financial outlay for its first parks was minimal as it arranged for transfers of land from the Dominion Government. Edmonton first attempted to purchase land from the Hudsons Bay Company, and eventually purchased two parcels from private developers in advance of the subdivisions being sold for housing.

Each city was visited by Frederick G. Todd, a Montreal landscape architect. His primary purpose for visiting Alberta was to undertake work for the provincial government on the legislative grounds area in Edmonton. However, he contacted Calgary seeking consulting work. He was also engaged by Edmonton after the City was urged by the Board of Trade to engage in civic beautification. For both Edmonton and its neighbour, Strathcona, Todd prepared narrative plans with recommendations for setting aside certain types of parks with little guidance as to specific sites. Todd's planning work for Calgary was not completed due to a misunderstanding about the city's authorization (or lack thereof) to commission his work.

Both cities established an appointed Parks Board or Commission, but they had different beginnings, responsibilities and endings. The Calgary Parks Board was established in 1909 by City Council, seemingly without the promotion of any individuals or interest groups. In Edmonton, one individual, R.B. Chadwick, was very vocal, using his own persuasive words and deeds, as well as working through other groups to promote the establishment of a Parks Commission and supervised playgrounds.

The duties of the Calgary Parks Board were poorly defined - a situation which led to dissatisfaction on the part of both the Board and the aldermen. This situation resulted in the Board's enabling legislation being revoked and its abolition in 1912.

The Edmonton Parks Commission perceived its mandate as being very broad, including parks, boulevards, drives and public places as well as city planning and civic centre projects.

Although there was no evident dissatisfaction with the Commission's work, it was not reappointed by Council after 1912. This may have been the result of reductions in spending which struck hardest at non revenue-producing departments of the city administration.

Edmonton's city planning efforts in the 1910's were carried out by the Parks Commission which hired Morell and Nichols of Minneapolis to prepare a general plan. The decline of municipal funding early in 1913 led to the production of only a preliminary plan. Calgary, on the other hand, was still able to hire T.H. Mawson in 1913 and to receive and pay for his report in 1914; but, the City was unable to muster human or financial resources to implement any elements of the plan. Earlier, subdivision dedication bylaws were passed in each city with limited impact upon the usable park lands available to the residents.

Although both cities were involved in the Alberta Housing and Town Planning Association and its first conference in 1912, and thus contributed to the creation of the Alberta Town Planning Act of 1913, neither city took action to carry out provisions of the Act. In 1927, Edmonton Council appointed a Commission to promote and advise regarding town planning but did not prepare a comprehensive town plan. Two years later, after a new Alberta Town Planning Act was passed, the cities were authorized to appoint Town Planning Commissions to promote and prepare municipal plans and to hire staff. Both Calgary and Edmonton appointed their Commissions in 1929.

The various planning efforts and site selection committees produced very few new park lands. However, both cities began to reserve tax sale lands for park purposes early in the 1920's. Calgary's policy, beginning in 1922, resulted in the doubling of the number of park sites in the city during that decade. Edmonton reserved tax sale land and turned parcels over to local community leagues for use for their recreation purposes throughout the 1920's.

Both cities established supervised playground programs. Edmonton's R.B. Chadwick promoted the establishment of supervised playgrounds, using direct approaches to City Council and indirect approaches through the local Council of Women. The Parks Commission, of which he was a member, made some steps toward achieving his goals before funding diminished in 1913. After the city rejected the notion of a Recreation Commission and a staff person, the local Gyro Club took over the establishment and supervision of children's playgrounds, beginning in 1923. Calgary's supervised playground program started in 1917 when the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. promoted and assisted with supervised playgrounds. The City Parks Department took over complete responsibility in 1920. Edmonton did not take this step until 1944 when the Recreation Commission was established.

In both Edmonton and Calgary, the Board of Trade and the local Council of Women were active, but their involvement and activity levels varied. In Calgary, the Board of Trade made representations soon after the formation of the Parks Commission in 1909 and was somewhat involved in promoting planning in 1916, with limited results. The Calgary Horticultural Society seems to have been more involved and vocal. The Calgary Council of Women was not very active. The Y.M.C.A. and the Y.W.C.A. were intensely involved in promoting and supervising playgrounds - a role that the Council of Women played in other Canadian cities. Several individuals were frequently present and vocal in Calgary, particularly William Pearce and Rev. Dean Paget. It is difficult to measure the impact that particularly vocal, letter-writing individuals such as Mr. Pearce had, as the novelty of his continued contributions may have worn off with time.

Edmonton's groups and individuals included the Board of Trade, Council of Women, the Gyro Club, C.L. Gibbs and R.B. Chadwick. The exhortations of the two individuals were

frequently channelled through the interest groups. The Board of Trade made repeated approaches to Council in 1905, 1906 and 1911 promoting parks and planning. The Council of Women was less involved, although present in the playground and recreation matters in 1911-12 and 1921. The Gyro Club took on the most responsibilities, as it provided funds to establish and supervise playgrounds. While the first two groups (the Board of Trade and the Council of Women) were present and vocal, it seems that individuals, using the groups, may have been the most effective influences on parks, playgrounds and planning.

## **2. The Provinces**

I had originally intended that there would be a set of comparisons between the cities in Saskatchewan and those in Alberta. There does not seem to be any consistent pattern of development within each province that makes them sufficiently different from each other that comparisons can be made between them. Some, but not many, commonalities existed between the two cities in each province, often as the result of provincial legislation. Other commonalities existed between the two cities on the Canadian Pacific Railway line which was established in the mid 1880's. Additional common features come from cities' geographic settings, from the presence of outside planners, and the common contacts among individuals in each city.

Regina and Calgary had townsite plans laid out and controlled for the most part by the Dominion Government and the C.P.R. Both Regina and Calgary were able to acquire park land through transfers from the Dominion Government. These two cities were located on sites which required tree planting and imaginative use of water resources, although Calgary had substantially more water and vegetation resources with which to work. Saskatoon and Edmonton, situated on larger rivers, made attempts at some point in their development to acquire land along the rivers. But all four cities used water as a major feature in their civic beautification - such as Reservoir (Wascana) Lake in Regina, the Bow and Elbow River Islands in Calgary, Yorath Island in Saskatoon, and "Big Island" in Edmonton. Both provincial capitals located their legislative buildings overlooking a body of water.

All cities considered or developed a park at the main railway station in the town or city. Regina and Calgary, on the C.P.R. line, made the first efforts and developed parks which would provide visitors with positive impressions of the city. Saskatoon and Edmonton considered their sites with limited success.

Three of the cities established a Parks Board or Commission to plan and manage the park system. The exception was Regina, whose City Councils repeatedly would not give up any powers to an appointed body.

Three of the four cities became involved in local beautification and practical gardening through the use of vacant lots or undeveloped parks for gardens. Edmonton did not seem to have vacant lot gardening. Instead, it leased vacant park land for grazing, a use which was perhaps not quite as aesthetically pleasing, but very practical.

Each city was assisted in its planning efforts by outside planning experts, although local advocates often began the work to hire such experts and attempted to carry on after the consultants' plans arrived. In 1906-07 Frederick G. Todd did at least preliminary planning work in Regina, Calgary and Edmonton. In the 1912-13 period Regina hired T.H. Mawson, but Col. Garner and the Town Planning Association continued the work. Calgary also hired Mawson, but W. Pierce and Rev. Dean Paget worked locally. Saskatoon hired Morell and Nichols for park planning, but had City Commissioner Yorath prepare its comprehensive plan. Yorath and Rev. E.B. Smith continued the local work. Edmonton hired Morell and Nichols, but C.L. Gibbs

carried on until the late 1920's. In each city, the local advocates appear to have made more substantial, continuing contributions than the imported consultants. The local newspapers in all four cities made major contributions to the distribution of the rhetoric in support of parks, playgrounds and planning issues.

The Alberta Housing and Town Planning Association was created primarily for Alberta planners. Its first conference in 1912 produced sufficient interest in a provincial town planning act that a document very similar to the one discussed at the conference was passed in the Alberta Legislature four months later, in March 1913. Planners from other provinces were invited to attend and present papers - for example, C.J. Yorath of Saskatoon presented a paper, "Housing and Town Planning", at the 1914 conference.

In three of the four cities, the issues of parks, playgrounds and planning were advocated and considered separately, even though some individuals were common to all, and there were some "crossover" themes such as park planning which were intertwined. The exception was Edmonton, where two individuals, C.L. Gibbs and R.B. Chadwick, working partly with the Board of Trade, successfully encouraged Council to create a Parks Commission which took on all three issues as part of its short-lived mandate.

Each province passed town planning legislation during the 1910's and repealed that legislation, creating what was hoped to be more up-to-date, usable legislation, in the late 1920's. The Alberta Town Planning Act was passed in March 1913 soon after the Alberta Housing and Town Planning Association conference in Edmonton. However, neither Edmonton nor Calgary adopted a plan under the legislation. Although the cities in Saskatchewan discussed legislation in 1914, the Saskatchewan Town Planning Act was not passed until 1917, at which time Regina declared that the Act was "radical", "hastily prepared" and "inimical to the Cities' interests" while Saskatoon delayed as long as possible before requesting authority to carry out any planning.

Revised legislation was passed in Saskatchewan in 1928 and in Alberta in 1929. The Saskatchewan legislation was to replace an Act that had been touted as being very fine, but had proved to be less so. As the Journal of the Town Planning Institute noted, "the original Act . . . does not seem to have justified the high expectations of its efficiency which were entertained by onlookers and by this Journal."

The 1929 Town Planning Act of Alberta was promoted by Premier Brownlee as part of his campaign to beautify the province through town planning, rural development and provincial park creation. Brownlee's leadership is acknowledged by most authors. Although it is somewhat difficult to determine what specific event sparked his interest, it is generally accepted that on his return from a trip to Europe in 1927 he was very vocal in his promotion of rural beautification and town planning. When Horace Seymour of Vancouver contacted the Edmonton City Commissioner requesting information about the job as provincial planning advisor, he was advised to contact Mr. Brownlee himself as "he more probably than anyone else will be likely to dominate the situation."

In both provinces the cities quickly acted to follow the new legislation. In Saskatchewan, Saskatoon formed a Town Planning Commission in 1929, while Regina did so in 1930. In Alberta, both Calgary and Edmonton formed their Town Planning Commissions in 1930.

Comprehensive planning efforts did not provide the cities with park land. Rather, each city used a very pragmatic approach to park land acquisition in the 1920's. All four cities used land which had reverted to them because the owners had defaulted in the payment of their property taxes, when the boom and inflated land prices of the 1910's was followed by a

depression. Each city provided for local parks from the supply of vacant, city-owned land at its disposal. On occasion, internal financial transfers took place between the parks organization and the civic unit holding the land; but even in these cases the land was quite inexpensive. In three of the cities, the municipal government then assumed responsibility for land development. In Edmonton this responsibility was given to the community leagues. Edmonton also used such land to reserve from future use large portions of its ravines and river valleys.

In three of the cities the rhetoric promoting the development and supervision of playgrounds began in the late 1900's. In Regina, Broad Street park was set aside in 1907 and designated for play in 1910. In Calgary, the Calgary Herald began promoting playgrounds in 1909 with quotes from the Playgrounds Association of America. In Edmonton, R.B. Chadwick and the Council of Women began their involvement in 1911. Little was done in Saskatoon with the exception of one editorial, "The Child's Right to Play", in the Phenix in 1907.

Each city responded differently to the exhortations to action. Regina and Calgary established Playground Associations - Regina in 1912 and Calgary in 1917. In 1920, Regina established a Playgrounds Commission, while in Calgary the playgrounds came under the responsibility of the Parks Department. In Saskatoon and Edmonton, service clubs were initially responsible for supervised playgrounds. Edmonton's Gyro Club began its 28 year involvement with playgrounds in 1923. The Kinsmen Club of Saskatoon began its two year experiment with supervised playgrounds in 1928, ten years after the Citizens Educational League had made a very brief attempt in 1918. Saskatoon's playgrounds were soon taken over by the Playgrounds Association. There is no clear interprovincial or north/south distinction between the involvement of local groups. The Board of Trade was active in Regina and Calgary and most apparent in Edmonton. In Calgary, the local Horticultural Society was also very vocal about planning, possibly as the result of two of its Regina and Edmonton and even less in Saskatoon. The Y.M.C.A.'s and Y.W.C.A.'s were very involved in playgrounds in Regina and, particularly, in Calgary. Support may have come from the Council of Women, but the Y.M.C.A. and Y.W.C.A. had the staff who could carry out the actual playground supervision.

At least two factors can lead to success in the various groups' interest in parks, playgrounds and planning. Being articulate, with access to and the support of the local newspaper was helpful. Of more help was quick access to the municipal decision-makers. For example, in Edmonton, a motion passed by the Board of Trade in November 1905 was received and discussed by Council in three days; the Board's call for beautification of the city in 1906 was taken up by the Edmonton Bulletin, followed by a meeting with F.G. Todd and the awarding of a commission to him - all in 4 1/2 weeks. Consistently, in each city the Board of Trade had good access to the municipal decision-makers and used it when necessary. The Board of Trade's influence found in this research is consistent with that noted in Bloomfield's review of the various Canadian Boards' roles in urban development, including the promotion of planning schemes.

## **C. Analysis and Conclusions**

### **1. Urban Reform and Civic Boosterism**

The details of the rhetoric of urban reformers and civic boosters have been presented in an earlier section. Only a brief review will be given here.

Urban reform efforts began as a response to what was seen as the "sorry condition of cities." The reform movement and individual reformers, carried out attempts to order and improve the urban environment through the creation of, or changes to social welfare, public

health, planning and government infrastructure. The creation of municipal parks and supervised playgrounds was promoted as being beneficial to a broad range of recipients: there were to be improvements to the physical and mental health of individuals, to the social welfare of groups and to the physical and economic well-being of the city. Examples of these promotional claims were found in the records of organizations and newspapers in all cities.

The broad philosophy of civic boosterism is often stated as being the promotion of growth - that to be better, a city must be bigger, not just in size but also in the services which are provided to residents and businesses. To this growth ethic can be added what is a recurring theme in the records of all cities - that each city wanted to follow the lead of other progressive cities, to emulate larger, more established centers and preferably end up ahead, rather than behind, cities in the same size range and stage of development. Rivalries such as those between Regina and Saskatoon and Calgary and Edmonton developed when particularly desirable public designations or improvements were "up for grabs." Examples of this include the rivalries for designation as the provincial capital or for the provincial university. Frequently, comparisons were made with other cities when boosters were advocating creation of a parks commission or promoting specific park sites.

Throughout the description of events in each city, the "experts from afar" have frequently been present. Their visits in each city ranged from one-night speaking engagements to preparing comprehensive plans over a lengthy period. Consequently, the influence of such experts varied considerably because of both their length of stay and the reputations which they brought with them. In addition to the ideas which they transmitted, the reputation that each expert possessed became a source of booster rhetoric. Few events can be directly attributed to their presence and the cause which they were promoting. However, they did bring to the attention of local reformers and boosters current happenings in other cities which the local residents might consider worthy of emulation. Through the work of local individuals and groups, the imported ideas could be promoted and, occasionally, incorporated into the rhetoric and even, into policies and actions on the local scene.

## **2. Factors Affecting the Development of Parks and Playgrounds**

The analysis of the records for the cities in the study suggests that urban reform and civic boosterism did not significantly affect the development of parks and playgrounds. When the pattern of development is divided into process and product, it becomes apparent that the two factors had more substantial impact on the process than they had on the product. Each factor, urban reform and civic boosterism, had an impact on different aspects of the development and on different services.

In an attempt to clearly present the information which led to this conclusion, two formats will be used. A brief explanatory summary based on the descriptions presented earlier will be presented, followed by Table 2 which displays the information. The procedure used in both the explanatory summary and the table is to review the development of organizations and sites for parks and playgrounds, as well as the organizations for planning and comprehensive plans in each city, by reference to each factor.

In efforts towards creating parks organizations, there were considerable examples of urban reform rhetoric cited in Saskatoon and Edmonton. In Regina, reform rhetoric was cited, but little action was undertaken. While in Calgary, there was little evidence of reform influence, even though a parks organization was formed. There was little evidence of the reform rhetoric being effective in the designation of park sites in any of the case study cities, with the possible



exception of Saskatoon, where an attempt was made to locate a park in a residential area near a factory, presumably for the residents of the area who were probably workers at the factory.

Even though the evidence of urban reform ideas on parks and parks organizations was present, the evidence was not overwhelming. However, there were many examples of urban reform rhetoric present in the creation of playground organizations, suggesting that reformers were most definitely a factor in their creation. There was substantial evidence that local reformers, acting both as individuals and with groups such as the Council of Women and the Y.M.C.A., were influential in creating playground organizations in the early 1910's in Regina and Edmonton, and later in Calgary and Saskatoon. Although playground organizations developed early in Regina and Edmonton, only in Regina did the association develop and operate playgrounds at an early date. The development of playgrounds in Calgary did not occur until 1917. Edmonton's playground development did not begin until the Gyro Club became involved in 1923. Saskatoon's playground development was delayed until 1928 when the Kinsmen Club took on the project as an experiment.

The influence of urban reform on planning appears to be very limited. Arguments favouring housing and town planning were presented in Regina and Edmonton, and housing and sanitation were mentioned in Calgary. Meanwhile, Saskatoon's decision-makers were urged to engage in work "along the lines of modern town planning." Although arguments and discussions were present in each city, the link between reform rhetoric and the formation of a planning organization does not seem to have been as strong as that present in the formation of parks and playgrounds organizations. While the creation of a planning organization was frequently followed by the hiring of a planner to produce a plan, the plans which resulted appear to have been influenced very little by urban social reform principles. The primary reform influence appears to have come from attempts to rationally plan transportation and land use within the context of a grand (or grandiose) plan.

Urban reform influences were strongest on playgrounds, less so on parks, and of least impact on planning. Civic boosterism influences had much less impact on parks and playgrounds, while having substantial influence on planning.

There is little evidence to suggest that boosterism had an influence on the development of parks organizations or park sites, with one exception. That exception is the development of parks at Canadian Pacific Railway stations in both Regina and Calgary. These railway station parks were intended to improve the appearance of the town or city, providing visitors with an initial positive image of the particular community.

There were no examples of boosterism having an impact on the development of either playground organizations or playground sites.

On the other hand, booster arguments were present in justifying and forming planning organizations in Regina, Saskatoon and Edmonton, particularly in cases where plans were seen as evidence of being modern and progressive. While there is little evidence of boosterism in the formation of a planning organization in Calgary, boosterism was definitely present as the city hired Thomas Mawson, both for his expertise and his reputation which would create good publicity. Similar, but unstated, sentiments may have been present in Regina when they hired Mawson because he was a competent expert.

In summary, while both urban reform and civic boosterism made some impacts upon parks, playgrounds and planning, the impacts varied, with both factors having more impact upon the process than on the product. Table 2, which follows, displays in a summary format some of the information previously presented.



**Table 2**  
**Factors Affecting The Process And Product**

<b>Process and Product</b>	<b>Urban Civic Reform</b>	<b>Boosterism</b>
Parks Organization	YES	NO
Parks	NO	NO
Playgrounds Organization	YES	NO
Playgrounds	PARTIAL	NO
Planning Organization	PARTIAL	YES
Plans	NO	YES

### **3. Conclusions About Urban Reform and Civic Boosterism**

The proposition that urban reform and civic boosterism were factors which significantly affected the development of parks and playgrounds in prairie cities was not supported by the research findings. Urban reform had an effect upon the process of creating an awareness of park and playground issues and on creating organizations to manage and plan parks and playgrounds, but had less effect on organizations to do planning. Urban reform had little impact on the actual designation and development of park and playground sites. Civic boosterism had little influence on either parks or playground organizations or sites. Civic boosterism had substantial influence on the establishment of planning organizations in the 1910's and the commissioning of comprehensive plans. Very little implementation resulted from these plans when they were received.

There were two other important influences on the development of parks and playgrounds. First, a number of individuals had substantial impact in several cities. These individuals may have been influenced by reform and booster thinking but it was their personal efforts and dynamism that had an impact in the process and product of providing parks and playgrounds. Second, changing economic and political conditions were, on occasion, used to the advantage of the cities in acquiring and developing parks and playgrounds. The influences of individuals and the economic and political conditions were probably more important than the two factors cited in the proposition.

#### **D. References**

- Adie, R. F., & Thomas, P. G. (1982). Canadian public administration: Problematical perspectives. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Artibise, A. F. J. (1981). Prairie urban development. Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association.
- Bella, L. (1981). Politics of the right wing welfare state. Unpublished doctoral thesis, The University of Alberta, Edmonton.
- Careless, J. M. S. (1979). Aspects of urban life in the West 1870-1919. In G. A. Stelter & A.F.J. Artibise (Eds.), The Canadian city-Essays in urban history (pp. 125-141). Toronto:

- MacMillan of Canada in association with Carleton University Press.
- Cavett, M. E., Selwood, H. J., & Lehr (1982). Social philosophy and the early development of Winnipeg parks. Urban History Review, 11(1), 27-39.
- Doern, G. B., & Phidd, R. W. (1983). Canadian public policy: Ideas, structure, process. Toronto: Methuen.
- Edginton, C. R., & Williams, J. G. (1978). Productive management of leisure service organizations. Toronto: Wiley and Sons.
- Higgins, D. J. (1980). Local and urban politics in Canada. Toronto: Gage.
- Markham, S.E. & Edginton, C.R (1980). The Common of Halifax: Canada's first park. Recreation Canada, 37(1), 12-17.
- Markham, S. E. (1980). An investigation of the development of the Common of Halifax - 1749 to 1979. Unpublished master's thesis, Dalhousie University, Halifax, N.S.
- Markham, S. E. (1988a). "The development of parks and playgrounds in selected Canadian Prairie cities: 1880-1930 (Doctoral thesis, The University of Alberta, 1988). Dissertation Abstracts International, 49, 1271A.
- Markham, S. E. (1988b). The Impact of the urban reform movement and civic boosterism on urban recreation policy in Maritime cities: 1880-1930. Acadia University S.S.H.R.C. Small Universities Research Grant.
- Markham, S. E. (1989). Research bibliography: The development of parks and playgrounds in selected Canadian Prairie cities, 1880-1930. Wolfville, NS: S. E. Markham.
- McCann, L. D. (1968). Urban growth in Western Canada, 1881-1931. Albertan Geographer, 8, 65-74
- McDonald, R. A. J. (1984). 'Holy retreat' or 'practical breathing spot?': Class perceptions of Vancouver's Stanley Park, 1910-1913. Canadian Historical Review, 65(2), 127-153.
- McFarland, E. M. (1970). The development of public recreation in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Parks/Recreation Association.
- McKee, W. C. (1978). The Vancouver park system, 1886-1929: The product of local businessmen. Urban History Review, 3(1), 33-49.
- Pross, A. P. (1975). Pressure groups: Adaptive instruments of political communication in A. P. Pross (Ed.), Pressure group behaviour and Canadian politics (pp. 125). Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.
- Simeon, R. (1976). Studying public policy. Canadian Journal of Political Science 9(4), 548-580.
- Stone, C. N., Whelan, R. K., & Murin, W. J. (1979). Urban policy and politics in a bureaucratic age. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- Voisey, P. (1975). The Urbanization of the Canadian Prairies, 1871-1916. Histoire Sociale/Social History, 8, 77-101.
- Weaver, J. C. (1976). Approaches to the study of urban reform. Urban History Review, 2-76, 3-11.
- Weaver, J. C. (1979). Tomorrow's metropolis revisited: A critical assessment of Canadian urban reform, 1890-1920. In G. A. Stelter & A.F.J. Artibise (Eds.), The Canadian city-Essays in urban history (pp. 393-418). Toronto: MacMillan of Canada in association with Carleton University Press.
- Wright, J. R. (1983). Urban parks in Ontario - Part I: Origins to 1860. Toronto: Province of Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation.
- Wright, J. R. (1984). Urban parks in Ontario - Part II: The public park movement 1860-1914. Ottawa: Province of Ontario Ministry of Tourism and Recreation.