

01-78-05

Burton Smith, University of Alberta

October 5, 1973

Fairbanks, Alaska

Series: Tanana Yukon Historical Society tapes

Burton Smith said he started looking at comparing land policies in the United States and Canada. Canada like the United States has a land policy on every acre of land. They have not followed any of them very carefully like the United States. He decided to look at the thought of land. Canadians are going through a period in which they are greatly concerned about image. They are leaping at every chance to define their distinctness. The report of the U.S. census in the last decade of the 19th century said the United States no longer had a frontier. It signals an end to a time when Americans could indiscriminately use their land. In the present century industrialization and a rapid expanding population have intensified use of land. No state has escaped the pressures of these forces. In all cases Americans have been asked to answer demands of ecology, ecologists, the economy, politics and politicians. With little time for study or reflection or some intelligent views of land policy and land use. American history appears to have very little guidelines for the present time. It seems to portray a confusion of reaction and response tactics to land settlement. He thinks the root problems lies in the complexity of land and what it represents. It is possible to discuss an intellectual view of both of them by comparing attitudes of Americans and Canadians. The Europeans who first settled North America shared a common heritage about land. It is based on the Judeo Christian notion that land must be used by man. It was man's supremacy over wilderness. Good land was used land. The discovery of the new world concept rekindled European interests in an earthly paradise. Those that settled in the American colonies were certain that what they did was new, fresh and grander than anything done before. Europeans were shocked by what they saw in the wilderness and their expectations were dampened by realities of the wilderness. They were able to recognize the possibilities of North America. This included the French and the British. From the earliest colonies dominion over the wilderness was synonymous with success. For the colonists the transformation of the wilderness into a civilization was a reward for sacrifice, definition of achievement and a source of pride. This great reservoir of land was just beyond civilization. It was a lure to the adventurer, challenge to the industrious, and a capital gain for the speculator. Just as important the free land acquired a spirituality in American thinking. Politicians and the intellectuals wove this spirituality into a national myth. He quotes President Jackson. William Gilpin, an early territorial governor of Colorado, maintained that progress was God. It was a god-like destiny to subdue the continent. Charles Kirk described the wilderness and the settlement of wilderness land in the west as the advancing host of civilization and Christianity. Frederick Jackson Turner who held that all of the American history has been colonization of the American west. Adding to the complexity of the American attitude to land are two additional elements. The first arises from land as a commodity. As a source of revenue in itself aside from what can be grown on it or mined out of it. Speculation in land was an essential part of the successful settlement of the American colonies. Sale of land was a prime source of revenue as early as 1618. At the time of the American Revolution land speculation was a well-established source of wealth. Some of American's greatest leaders were involved. The principle centers of land speculation were in

the large towns. The big operators were geographically democratic and didn't confine land speculation to any particular territory or district. Land speculation has been one of America's favorite past times in the 19th century and up into the 20th century. The second element concerns land as a socio-political proposition. Very early in American colonial development land ownership was linked with political power and social status. This idea was not native to American colonists. It was an extension of a traditional European view. In all of the colonies franchisement was tied to some kind of property qualifications. At the time of the American Revolution land and the access to land was bound to the cause of rebellion. The same thing continues into periods under the articles in the federation and the Constitution. The founders of the Republic were faced with the issue of private property versus public domain. Politicians maintained that the ownership of land was essential to a workable Republican government. During the 19th century this socio-political nature of land was thoroughly mingled with the economic and the sense of spirituality. What resulted was a creation of a confusing and complex metaphor that came to symbolize on the one hand economic success and social status and on the other hand the foundation of American freedom and nationalism. By contrast Canada's development of an attitude towards land were quite different. Much of this difference lies in spirit and not necessarily in practice. He also said if you're looking at new materials in land policy Canada's present nationalists somewhat anti-American have attempted to fashion a similar land myth particularly in the prairie west. An analysis of an earlier settlement of British Canada will show a similar cultural heritage and a similar political development up to the time of the American Revolution. There are essential distinctions. First one need only look at a map of Canada to see that the attitude towards land development in that nation bound to be distinct from those in the United States. One third of Canada is high arctic. It supports a population of 15,000. Another third is covered in boreal forests. It supports a larger population but only a small portion of the total number. That portion that is left supports the majority of Canadians. It stretches east to west but only extend 400 miles in a north-south direction. The majority of the population that lives in this 400 mile belt from east to west reside within 100 miles of the American border. Canadian leaders have had a propensity to view Canada politically and economically along this east-west axis and to reflect their attitudes toward the United States. This is true in land and land settlement. Canada did not have a steadily expanding frontier. The early Canadian settlements had a well-defined natural boundary that resulted from political pressures. Even after 1763 expansion westward was blocked by the pre-Cambrian Shield and governmentally by the British decision to develop the fur trade. Much of the early republic and early public sentiment was shifted towards settlement in the southwest, upper Canada or into the American states of the old northwest. The west itself for the first two hundred years was not directly governed by the British government but by a private corporation, Hudson's Bay Company. Other companies were involved. The net result was to develop attitudes towards land and land settlement that were based upon capital concerns rather than any sense of public domain. Likewise it is important to remember that Canada developed under a clearly designed imperial structure that did not exist to the same extent in the early American colonies and completely lack from the American Revolution on. In 1784 when the United States first developed a common land policy it did so with a preconceived notion of the nature of land. The revolution had created an image of land that was political in nature. When the first federal land policies were stated in the Northwest Ordinance of 1787 the political democratic concept of public land or public domain was evident. The United States has in theory followed the concept that land, a public trust, belonged to the people and should be used by the people. Throughout the 19th century from the Harrison Land Act, the Homestead Act and the conservation movement of the early 1900s federal land policies have been

defined with this attitude more or less in mind. Some corruption and land abuse has resulted from these public land policies the myth of public land is persistent. There has been a consistent belief that public land policies are a federal matter and the United States land policies have these federal attitudes. Canada did not have a politically oriented land policy. The land from the beginning was crown land. It belonged to the monarch. Power over it was exercised by the Parliament or its designates. In 1670 the Hudson Bay Company was granted complete control over Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories and more or less Alberta. For two centuries the company would combine interests of the fur trade with its responsibilities for governing this area. Up through 1763 and the establishment of British supremacy over the French in Canada the company reacted to French fur trading interests. After 1763 British interests which had taken over from the French resulted in a fierce competition with Hudson's Bay. As a result the Hudson's Bay Company held on more fervently to a no land settlement policy. In 1811 the Red River Settlement of Assiniboia was established in direct challenge to the Hudson's Bay Company but only on fur and not on land settlement. While neither the Hudson's Bay Company nor Assiniboia were concerned with public land settlement the conflict had the effect of encouraging some concern of public interest of western lands. In 1821 Assiniboia and Hudson's Bay combined under the leadership of the Hudson's Bay Company and the fur trade monopoly was extended to encompass most of Canada. There was nominal settlement in the Red River area. The reason behind the joining of the two companies was in part to keep the growing slow developing public sentiment in eastern Canada from pushing to the monarch a policy of free public land settlement. By 1850 a new threat to the British Canadian control of western land arose south of the 49th parallel. Within a single decade the Canadians looked on as the population of Iowa, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Minnesota's increased to over 3 million. Minnesota had 172,000 by 1860. It debated in that year a resolution for the annexation of the Red River settlement. The passage of the Homestead Act and the charter for the Union Pacific Railroad in 1862 revolutionized the functions of public domain in the United States. It had a terrific effect upon Canada and Canada's view of land from that point on. The rapid settlement of the American frontier made economic changes inevitable. Vigorous interests in western lands began to emerge in eastern Canada. In 1870 the Hudson's Bay Company gave up its monopoly over Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories. It did this for several million pounds and it still was able to maintain a lot of other land. These were incorporated into the new dominion of Canada. Moved by the desire to expand the basic economy and a fear of possible Americanization of the territory the government fostered a rapid settlement of the Canadian west. In the American situation the settlement of land was continuous settlement. In Canada no such environment existed. Settlers who came to the Canadian west were unsullied by any previous frontier experience except those coming from the south. They brought with them institutions that were tested and sophisticated in eastern Canada or Great Britain. He talked about the cattle industry in Saskatchewan and Alberta. In 1875 they had polo clubs, Sunday tea and cricket all on the frontier. The Canadian government had established a police force, The Northwest Mounted Police whose task was to pacify the territories. As a result the Canadian west developed without much bloodshed, violence and destruction that marked the settlement of the United States. He said that in the long run Canada's policy concerning the treatment of Indians, its use of land, pollution and so forth makes one wonder if the distinction was more important in spirit than it was in practice. One final distinction concerns with the responsibility of towards land on a national and local scale. In the United States the American colonies had for one hundred and fifty years enjoyed the privilege of creating their own land systems. The proclamation of 1763 that ended the French Indian War and subsequently the parliamentary orders in council leading to the Quebec Act of 1774 served notice to Americans that the

western land question was no longer within their jurisdiction. This interference of the pre-movement of colonists into the western land justified or not was resented in general by all Americans and became one of the causes of the American Revolution. Shortly after the Revolutionary War began the problem of disposing of vacant land in the west which were claimed by seven of the original thirteen states became a point of contention. If the revolution was successful and the seven states claiming the west were allowed to do so then the remaining states with definite boundaries would find themselves hemmed in along the coastline with no future in the west. The result was that all the states claiming western lands relinquished their claims and a national public domain was created. While land in the original 13 states remained under control of the individual states the newly created public domain was under federal jurisdiction. In a series of acts a land system was inaugurated which would be followed with few exceptions up to the present day. A new federal Constitution of 1787 did not interfere with the policy. Congress had the power to make all needful rules and regulations respecting the territories of the United States. The result is two land systems --the federal government and the public domain and state government and state lands. Much of the history of land in the United States centers on the struggle between these two forces. In the Canadian experience the question of responsibility for land policy was never to become an important public issue. The British Canadian colonists did not revolt nor did they connect in the same way as Americans the concept of land, freedom, democracy and revolution. The problem of land control in Canada differed from that of the United States. In the latter a series of purchases, including Louisiana, Alaska and Hawaii were supplemented by conquest and annexation to complete the most sustained movement of territorial expansion in the 19th century. The problem was one of dealing with newly acquired lands. In Canada the problem was never one of acquisition, but one of concentration and consolidation. After the French were conquered in 1763 the British established a system which included the Maritimes, Upper and Lower Canada, Hudson's Bay holdings, Saint Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories. Land belonged to the crown and was crown land. In 1840 the Act of Union created the Province of Canada uniting upper and lower Canada and gave to the province as crown designate the right of control over the land. In 1867 the British North America Act created the dominion of Canada in which the old province of Canada was divided into two provinces, Quebec and Ontario, plus the land controlled by the Hudson's Bay Company and some of the areas of the Maritimes. The company had turned their land holdings over to the new dominion in 1870. The provinces were given control over the land within their boundaries in much the same way states were in part in the United States. The Northwest Territories, Rupert's Land and the newly acquired British Columbia came under the jurisdiction of the federal government. And in neither the provinces nor the federal government did the concept of crown land ever give away to the notion of public domain. In all of these the land was never considered to public land but it was considered crown land and it was to be used for the good of the province. In most cases that it was found to be interpreted as for the good of the particular political party that was in power at that time. Canada did adopt many of the American policies concerning land settlement within the territories. It never adopted the notion that land settlement was somehow part of the democratic responsibility of government. As a consequence much of the land settlement in Canada and in particular the west has reflected the political notions of a particular federal party. Liberals, progressives and progressive conservatives have historically supported vigorously oil companies, capital investments of one sort or another for the benefit of the colony or the nation. Other political parties such as the CCF have looked at land policies in a different way. While in the American experience this desire to see land as a private enterprise fails to offer any long term direction. There was blunder, land misuse, corruption and violence. The realization in the United States that land is not

simply a commodity has finally dawned on American people. It is a natural resource. In Canada this decision has not dawned on any of the parties yet. The United States is further along in developing land programs for sane land use.