

C/

THE ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL STRUCTURE  
OF POLITICAL AGRARIANISM  
IN MANITOBA: 1870-1900

by

Brian Robert McCutcheon

B.A. (Hons.), University of Manitoba, 1966

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF  
THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in the Department

of

History

We accept this thesis as  
conforming to the required  
standard

THE UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA

April, 1974

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of History

The University of British Columbia  
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date May 1, 1974

### ABSTRACT

During the last thirty years of the nineteenth century agrarian movements swept the whole of North America. In the United States, the farmers' protest found expression in Populism; in Ontario, the Grange and the Patrons of Industry were the vehicles chosen by the rural population to express their grievances; in the Canadian West, seven agrarian organizations, the most important of which were the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, and the Patrons of Industry, attempted to improve the lot of Manitoba farmers.

Nineteenth century agrarian protest in Manitoba paralleled but was divorced from the birth of agrarian protest throughout the North American continent. Because the province was relatively isolated during the first twenty years following Confederation with Canada, Manitoba political agrarianism was insulated from outside influences during its formative years in the 1870's and 1880's. By the early 1890's an indigenous agrarianism, arising from the difficult agricultural conditions that the settlers at first encountered in Manitoba, and from the failure of federal policies put forward for the development of the Canadian West to meet the needs and the expectations of immigrants, had developed. Manitoba agrarian movements sought solutions to farmers' problems through local organizations which advocated programmes tailored to the needs of their members. The failure of nineteenth century

agrarian protest organizations to achieve redress of grievances resulted from weaknesses in organization and in economic and social structure, aggravated by inadequate rural leadership and by the interference of provincial politicians.

The most prominent feature of nineteenth century political agrarianism in Manitoba was its conservatism which stemmed from the farmers' failure to develop a sense of class consciousness. At no time did the farmers of the province see themselves as constituting a distinct economic or social class. Rather they saw themselves as individuals who co-operated to secure redress of grievances.

The lack of class consciousness on the part of Manitoba agrarian protest was rooted in the economic and social structure of nineteenth century agrarian movements in the province. While the members of the various farmers' organizations were united by their common British-Canadian cultural heritage and by their Protestantism, they were divided by occupation--non-farmers and farmers with non-agricultural business interests played a divisive role in the movements--and by their economic position as evidenced by the level of mortgage indebtedness which varied widely among delegates elected to annual conventions of all Manitoba agrarian organizations. Given the occupational and economic divisions, farmers' movements in Manitoba between 1870 and 1900 were unstable coalitions of individuals and of political and economic interest groups which were incapable of furthering an agrarian class consciousness. The inability of Manitoba farmers' organizations to become class movements precluded the formulation of an agrarian

vision of society. Instead the only common denominator among the discontented individuals and interest groups who belonged to Manitoba agrarian organizations was a desire for political, social or economic change that the members believed would serve their own disparate interests.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		page
	Introduction	xii
Chapter I	The Manitoba Agricultural Frontier	1
Chapter II	"A Happy and Contented People"	24
Chapter III	Great Expectations	69
Chapter IV	"A Solemn, Vigorous and United Protest"	128
Chapter V	"Farmers Rally to Your Posts"	197
Chapter VI	"Manitoba for Manitobans"	260
Chapter VII	Doorkeepers in the House of the Patrons	297
Chapter VIII	Conclusion	363
	Bibliography	373
Appendix A	A Note on Method and Sources	389
Appendix B	Platforms of Provincial Agrarian Organizations, 1883-1900	394
Appendix C	Biographical Sketches of Nineteenth Century Agrarian Leaders	399

# LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
I	Crop Acreages in Manitoba 1883-1904	6
II	Wheat Yield in Manitoba 1883-1904	7
III	Terminal Grain and Flour Rates to Fort William and Port Arthur, Ontario 1885-1905	10
IV	Wheat Prices at Liverpool, England and Winnipeg, Morden and Deloraine, Manitoba, 1883-1900.	15
V	Population of Manitoba by Birthplace	27
VI	Population of Manitoba by National Origins: 1881-1901	29
VII	Population of Manitoba by Religion	31
VIII	Railways Chartered by the Province of Manitoba: 1870-1901	51
IX	Immigration to Manitoba 1870-1883	71
X	Interest Groups Represented at Farmers' Meetings at Portage la Prairie, Brandon, and Manitou on November 20, November 26, and December 5, 1883.	104
XI	Political Affiliation of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	145
XII	Principal Occupations of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	151
XIII	Mortgage Debt in Township Six Range Five West, 1881-1901	154
XIV	Mortgage Debt in Township Six Range Six West, 1881-1901	155
XV	Patented Agricultural Lands Mortgaged in Township Six Range Five West: 1880-1900	156

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
XVI	Patented Agricultural Land Mortgaged in Township Six Range Six West: 1880-1900	157
XVII	Land Purchases and Mortgage Indebtedness in Township Six Range Five West: 1881-1891	158
XVIII	Land Purchases and Mortgage Indebtedness in Township Six Range Six West: 1881-1901	159
XIX	Value of Mortgage Debt in Township Six Range Five West: 1881-1901	161
XX	Value of Mortgage Debt in Township Six Range Six West: 1881-1901	162
XXI	Mortgage Indebtedness and Rate of Foreclosure Among Landowning Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	163
XXII	Date of Arrival in Manitoba of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884.	164
XXIII	Indebtedness and Foreclosure Related to Size of Land Holdings at Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	168
XXIV	Means by Which Property was Acquired by Landowning Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884.	169
XXV	Indebtedness and Foreclosure by Means of Acquiring Property at Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883 and March 5, 1884	170
XXVI	Last Place of Residence Before Immigrating to Manitoba of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884.	172

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
XXVII	Birthplace of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	173
XXVIII	Religious Affiliation of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	176
XXIX	Marital Status of Delegates to Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883 and March 5, 1884	178
XXX	Interest Groups Represented at Conventions of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Held at Brandon and Winnipeg on November 26, 1883, December 19, 1883, and March 5, 1884	180
XXXI	Interest Groups Represented at Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	203
XXXII	Principal Occupation of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885 and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	204
XXXIII	Political Affiliation of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	206
XXXIV	Date of Arrival in Manitoba of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885 and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	209

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
XXXV	Means by Which Property was Acquired by Landowning Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	210
XXXVI	Indebtedness and Foreclosure Related to Size of Land Holdings at Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	211
XXXVII	Indebtedness and Foreclosure by Means of Acquiring Property at Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	212
XXXVIII	Mortgage Indebtedness and Rate of Foreclosure Among Landowning Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	213
XXXIX	Religious Affiliation of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	215
XL	Last Place of Residence Before Immigrating to Manitoba of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885 and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	216
XLI	Birthplace of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	217

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
XLII	Marital Status of Delegates to Annual Meetings of January 16, 1884, January 21, 1885, and January 20, 1886 and at Conventions of December 5, 1883, March 4, 1885, and December 16, 1885 of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union	218
XLIII	Production in Bushels of Special Crops in Manitoba, 1880-1900	265
XLIV	Livestock in Manitoba, 1881-1901	266
XLV	Livestock Per Occupier in Manitoba, 1881-1901	266
XLVI	Number of Animals Killed or Sold in Manitoba, 1880-1900	267
XLVII	Number of Animals Killed or Sold Per Occupier in Manitoba, 1880-1900	267
XLVIII	Animal Products in Manitoba, 1880-1900	268
XLIX	Animal Products Per Occupier in Manitoba, 1880-1900	268
L	Principal Occupation of Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	299
LI	Interest Groups Represented at Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	300
LII	Last Place of Residence Before Immigrating to Manitoba of Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	302
LIII	Birthplace of Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	303
LIV	Date of Arrival in Manitoba of Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	305

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
LV	Religious Affiliation of Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	309
LVI	Marital Status of Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	310
LVII	Mortgage Indebtedness and Rate of Foreclosure Among Landowning Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	312
LVIII	Indebtedness and Foreclosure Related to Size of Land Holdings at Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	313
LIX	Indebtedness and Foreclosure by Means of Acquiring Property at Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	315
LX	Means by Which Property was Acquired by Landowning Delegates to Annual Conventions of the Patrons of Industry February 25, 1892, January 18, 1894, January 16, 1895, January 29, 1896, and January 19, 1897	316

## INTRODUCTION

The study of Western Canadian agrarian protest has long attracted the attention of historians and political scientists. For the most part, students of western agrarian unrest have focused their attention on twentieth century agrarian organizations, in particular, those of Alberta and Saskatchewan.<sup>1</sup> Early farmers' movements in Manitoba have not exerted the same appeal. With the exception of passing references in provincial histories of Manitoba,<sup>2</sup> oblique allusions to the existence of earlier agrarian organizations in works on twentieth century farmers' movements,<sup>3</sup> and a brief section in Louis Aubrey Wood's chronicle of nineteenth century agrarian movements in Canada,<sup>4</sup> the farmers' agitations that convulsed Manitoba in the 1880's and 1890's have largely been forgotten.

Indeed, there is considerable confusion about what organizations actually flourished during the nineteenth century in the province. Seymour Martin Lipset confuses the Patrons of Husbandry with the Patrons of Industry;<sup>5</sup> A. S. Morton does not distinguish between the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union and the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union;<sup>6</sup> and only L. A. Wood notes the emergence of the Independent Industrial Association.<sup>7</sup>

Despite the lack of precision in identifying nineteenth century agrarian organizations in Manitoba, interpretations of the movement are not lacking. Alexander Begg saw the farmers' agitation of the 1880's as an extension of the provincial rights

movement in the province.<sup>8</sup> Hopkins Moorhouse argued that nineteenth century agrarian protest arose when farmers "rebelled at their pioneer hardships", but failed after the movements were betrayed by leaders who were pursuing "selfish ends".<sup>9</sup> A. S. Morton, Donald F. Warner, and Paul F. Sharp contended that the American Populist agitation either invaded Manitoba directly or inspired farmers of the first prairie province to organize their own movements to secure redress of grievances which were common to the whole of western North America.<sup>10</sup> S. M. Lipset dismissed the Patrons of Industry in Manitoba as being "based mainly on opposition to the high protective tariff" with "little to distinguish it from the low-tariff Liberals."<sup>11</sup> And L. A. Wood saw Manitoba movements as extensions of agrarian unrest in Ontario.<sup>12</sup>

No interpretation treats nineteenth century agrarian protest in Manitoba as a phenomenon separate from the farmers' movements which flourished in other regions of North America at the same time. Nor does any interpretation see political agrarianism in Manitoba between 1870 and 1900 as important in determining the direction of agrarian action in the province after 1900.

Manitoba agrarian protest in the nineteenth century, however, was unique not only within the context of Western Canadian agrarian protest, but also within the context of Canadian and North American agrarian protest. Because the province was relatively isolated during the first twenty years following Confederation with Canada, Manitoba political

agrarianism was insulated from outside influences during its formative years in the 1880's. By the early 1890's, when outside agrarian movements first penetrated the province, an indigenous agrarianism had developed. Stemming from the difficult agricultural conditions the settlers encountered in Manitoba in the 1870's and 1880's and from the failure of federal policies for the development of the Canadian West to meet the needs and the expectations of immigrants, Manitoba agrarian movements sought solutions to farmers' problems through local organizations which advocated programmes tailored to the needs of the province's farmers.

The failure of nineteenth century agrarian protest organizations to achieve redress of grievances also resulted from local circumstances. Weaknesses in organization and in social and economic structure, aggravated by inadequate rural leadership and by the interference of provincial politicians plagued the major agrarian organizations founded by the province's farmers and led to the failure of the agitation. The rise and fall of Manitoba agrarian protest in the nineteenth century, consequently, paralleled but was divorced from the birth and eventual failure of agrarian protest throughout the North American continent.

To see agrarian movements which flourished in Manitoba in the last three decades of the nineteenth century as isolated phenomena, nonetheless, is to lose sight of their ultimate importance. One factor in the success and failure of political agrarianism in Manitoba in the twentieth century was the agrarian

heritage from the nineteenth century, admittedly modified by the experience of farmers after 1900. For Manitoba farmers the Progressive triumphs and disappointments of the 1920's were the outcome of forty years of organizing and agitating for redress of grievances.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. The most important studies of Western Canadian agrarian protest are: W. L. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967); Seymour Martin Lipset, Agrarian Socialism: The Cooperative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan, (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959); C. B. MacPherson, Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962); and Paul F. Sharp, The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada: A Survey Showing American Parallels, (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948). Still useful is Hopkins Moorhouse, Deep Furrows, (Toronto: George J. McLeod, 1918). The best work on nineteenth century agrarian protest movements remains Louis Aubrey Wood, A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1924). The only study of Manitoba agrarian protest is Gerald E. Panting, "A Study of the United Farmers of Manitoba to 1928", (An unpublished M.A. in history for the University of Manitoba, 1954).
2. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume III, (Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Company, 1894), Chapter IV; W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961), Chapter IX; James A. Jackson, The Centennial History of Manitoba, (Winnipeg: Manitoba Historical Society in Association with McClelland & Stewart, 1970), Chapters IX and X.
3. S. M. Lipset, op. cit., pp. 52-53; W. L. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada, p. 10; Paul F. Sharp, op. cit., p. 33; Harald S. Patton, Grain Growers' Cooperation in Western Canada, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), p. 33; Hopkins Moorhouse, op. cit., pp. 46-47.
4. L. A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 123-130.
5. S. M. Lipset, op. cit., p. 52.
6. A. S. Morton, History of Prairie Settlement, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1939), pp. 93-94.
7. L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 129.
8. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume III, p. 85.

9. Hopkins Moorhouse, op. cit., p. 47.
10. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 93; Paul F. Sharp, op. cit., p. 33; Donald F. Warner, "The Farmers' Alliance and the Farmers' Union: An American-Canadian Parallelism", Agricultural History, Vol. XXIII, No. 1, (January, 1949), p. 19.
11. S. M. Lipset, op. cit., pp. 52-53.
12. L. A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 124-129.

## CHAPTER I

### THE MANITOBA AGRICULTURAL FRONTIER<sup>1</sup>

On a May morning in 1872, James Penrose, Manitoba's pioneer photographer, set up his camera at the corner of Main Street and the Portage trail in the village of Winnipeg. Within a few minutes he had photographed the Broadfoot party which had recently arrived from Brussels, Ontario, and which was destined for the third crossing of the White Mud River where Donald Ferguson founded the Palestine settlement in 1871.<sup>2</sup> The photograph immortalized the Brussels immigrants as the vanguards of the great wave of settlers who set out to colonize the North West after Rupert's Land was acquired by Canada from the Hudson's Bay Company in 1869.

In the thirty years following Confederation with Canada and the end of the century, Manitoba's economy changed dramatically. In 1870, the fur trade was the economic foundation of the colony at Red River; all other economic activities were tied to it, either directly or indirectly. By 1900, although the Hudson's Bay Company continued to trade its goods for furs, its activities were concentrated in the northern fastness where the great tide of agricultural settlement could not threaten its supremacy. Agriculture, the weak step-child of the fur trade in Old Red River,<sup>3</sup> had grown to be the single most important industry in the province. Wheat had supplanted fur as the staple product upon which the province's economy rested.

The development of the wheat economy between 1870 and 1900 was a mixed blessing for Manitobans. Despite the tremendous growth in population and agricultural production, those years witnessed much discontent. One source for this discontent lay in the difficulties encountered by the settlers in adapting to the agricultural conditions of the province. Manitoba was one of the most fertile agricultural regions in the world, but paradoxically, in the late nineteenth century, the province was poorly suited to the development of a profitable commercial agriculture. Manitoba's climate and location combined to make the farmer dependent upon wheat for his cash income. The fact that world stocks of wheat were greater than were required to supply consumer demand meant that the price of wheat was extremely low. Isolated on a distant agricultural frontier; cursed with high transportation costs; and saddled with a short and relatively arid growing season, the Manitoba farmer found it difficult to compete in international markets.

(1)

The land to which the Broadfoot party had come was not the flat barren expanse of a later mythology but a land of considerable geographical variation. The plain stretching back from the lots along the Red and the Assiniboine Rivers was almost completely level, for here the land had once been the bottom of glacial Lake Agassiz. But beyond the escarpments which marked the beaches of the ancient lake, the land dipped and rolled, its flatness broken by hills and ravines and by small river valleys. Indeed, along the rivers and the escarpments, there were heavily

wooded areas, while the open prairie was broken by bluffs of poplar which had taken root in low-lying areas or along the edge of sloughs. There were vast expanses of open plain in Manitoba but these were largely to the south and west of present-day Brandon and formed only a portion of the arable land in the province. For the most part, Manitoba was a verdant parkland with meadows broken by bluffs and tree-bordered prairie streams.<sup>4</sup>

Manitoba was a region particularly suited to agriculture. With the exception of the portion lying within the Canadian Shield, the province contained fertile agricultural land. This was especially true of the area south of Riding Mountain, Lake Manitoba and Lake Winnipeg. Except for isolated pockets of wasteland, such as the Carberry Sand Hills and the marshes of the Red River Valley the whole of this area with its black soils was the equal in fertility of any other region in the world.<sup>5</sup>

The prospects for agriculture were, however, governed by the nature of the Manitoba agricultural frontier. This frontier had three distinctive characteristics: it was northern, relatively arid and isolated. These characteristics determined both the direction of agricultural development and the margin of profit for Manitoba farmers.

The growing season was short. The average length of the frost-free season in the Red River Valley was about 115 days, and west of the Valley between 100 and 115 days. North of Brandon and towards Riding Mountain, the average frost-free period was only 80 days.<sup>6</sup> This short growing season was suitable to only two types of crops: roots and cereals. Although cereals could be grown, only

barley and oats were assured of maturing. Wheat needed longer to ripen and, because of the fluctuation in the actual frost-free season from one year to another, there was always the risk of the crop being frozen. As for root crops, while they might be grown there was no market for them. There were no great cities within the Canadian West to which the farmer might ship his potatoes or turnips, nor was there a market in Eastern Canada or the United States as the local supply in both areas was sufficient to meet the demand.<sup>7</sup>

The amount of rainfall in the growing season was unpredictable. The average rainfall between April 1 and July 31 varied from 9.62 inches in the Red River Valley to 6.73 inches at Virden in the western part of the province. But the amount of rainfall could deviate from the average significantly: the standard deviation for Winnipeg was 3.10 inches or 32% of average, while for Pierson, it was 3.75 inches or 50% of average.<sup>8</sup> Such a widely fluctuating rainfall could in one season turn the land into a quagmire or into a near dustbowl.<sup>9</sup>

The Brief, relatively dry prairie summer was, despite its drawbacks, especially conducive to wheat-growing. The long hours of sunlight and the fertility of the soil made it possible for Manitoba farmers to grow a hard spring wheat which had a higher protein content and better milling and baking qualities than any other in the world.<sup>10</sup> The farmers quickly discovered the advantages their wheat possessed. Wheat production increased from 480,000 bushels in 1876 to just over 1,000,000 bushels in 1880.<sup>11</sup> In 1883, almost half of the land sown to crops was sown

to wheat, and by the end of the century almost two thirds of the crop acreage was devoted to wheat.<sup>12</sup>

International markets existed for wheat. The Industrial Revolution had made urbanization possible in Western Europe. With the exception of France, industrialized European nations had outstripped their food resources. These nations began to look to overseas suppliers for their foodstuffs. Canada faced keen competition from the United States, Russia, India and Argentina in European markets,<sup>13</sup> but Canadian grain dealers were able to make substantial sales. Between 1873 and 1879, Canadian wheat exports<sup>14</sup> averaged 4,973,112 bushels annually. Sales declined during the period from 1880 to 1891 when only an average of 2,864,933 bushels was exported annually. Even in these years, however, sales were large when adequate stocks of wheat were on hand. From 1892 to 1897, with increased wheat production, sales reached new heights with an average of 8,976,459 bushels being exported each year. In the next four years, 1898 to 1902, exports soared to 16,394,103 bushels annually.<sup>15</sup> The great increase in export sales after 1892 was the result of increased domestic surpluses, adequate rail transport and a more vigorous effort on the part of the grain exporters to penetrate overseas markets. By the end of the century the beginnings of Canada's pre-eminence as an exporter of wheat can be detected.

Between 1880 and 1900 Manitoba displaced Ontario as the source of supply for the overseas markets.<sup>16</sup> In 1881, practically all the wheat exported from Canada had been grown in Ontario, but by 1902, almost all Canadian wheat destined for export came from

TABLE I

CROP ACREAGES IN MANITOBA 1883-1904\*

YEAR	WHEAT ACREAGE	Ø	OATS ACREAGE	Ø	BARLEY ACREAGE	Ø
1883	260,842	(48.6)	215,341	(40.2)	60,281	(11.2)
1884	307,020	(63.8)	133,044	(27.7)	40,936	(8.5)
1885	357,013	(63.2)	157,026	(27.8)	51,189	(9.1)
1886	384,441	(62.5)	161,030	(26.2)	69,565	(11.3)
1887	432,134	(67.2)	155,176	(24.1)	56,110	(8.7)
1888	518,000	(68.3)	170,693	(22.5)	70,147	(9.3)
1889	623,245	(67.6)	218,744	(23.7)	80,238	(8.7)
1890	746,058	(71.2)	235,534	(22.5)	66,035	(6.3)
1891	916,664	(69.9)	305,644	(23.3)	89,828	(6.8)
1892	875,990	(67.0)	332,974	(25.5)	97,644	(7.5)
1893	1,003,640	(66.6)	388,529	(25.8)	114,762	(7.6)
1894	1,010,186	(65.5)	413,686	(26.8)	119,528	(7.7)
1895	1,140,276	(64.2)	482,658	(27.2)	153,839	(8.6)
1896	999,598	(63.7)	442,445	(28.2)	127,885	(8.1)
1897	1,290,882	(67.5)	468,141	(24.5)	153,266	(8.0)
1898	1,488,282	(68.9)	514,824	(23.8)	158,058	(7.3)
1899	1,629,995	(68.3)	575,136	(24.0)	182,912	(7.7)
1900	1,457,396	(71.4)	429,108	(21.0)	155,111	(7.6)
1901	2,011,835	(69.5)	689,951	(23.9)	191,009	(6.6)
1902	2,039,940	(65.9)	725,060	(23.4)	329,790	(10.7)
1903	2,442,873	(67.4)	855,431	(26.6)	326,537	(9.0)
1904	2,412,235	(64.9)	943,574	(25.4)	361,004	(9.7)

\* Taken from James Mavor, Report to the Board of Trade on the North West of Canada, with Special Reference to Wheat Production for Export, (London: Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1904), p. 51.

Ø The figures in brackets are the acreage as a percent of the total acreage sown to cereal crops.

TABLE II

WHEAT YIELD IN MANITOBA 1883-1904\*

YEAR	TOTAL YIELD (IN BUSHELS)	BUSHELS PER ACRE
1883	5,686,535	21.80
1884	6,174,182	20.11
1885	7,429,440	20.80
1886	5,893,480	15.33
1887	12,351,724	25.70
1888	7,000,000	16.20
1889	7,201,519	12.40
1890	14,665,769	19.65
1891	23,191,599	25.30
1892	14,453,835	16.50
1893	15,615,923	15.56
1894	17,172,883	17.00
1895	31,775,038	27.86
1896	14,371,806	14.33
1897	18,261,950	14.14
1898	25,313,745	17.01
1899	27,922,230	17.13
1900	13,025,252	8.90
1901	50,502,035	25.10
1902	53,077,267	26.00
1903	40,116,878	16.42
1904	39,162,458	16.52

\*Taken from James Mavor, Report of the Board  
of Trade on the North West of Canada, with Special  
Reference to Wheat Production for Export, p.61

Manitoba and the North West Territories. In 1880, Manitoba produced just over a million bushels of wheat;<sup>17</sup> by 1891 production increased to 23,191,599 bushels;<sup>18</sup> and by 1902 to 53,077,267 bushels.<sup>19</sup> As only a small percentage of the wheat produced was required for local needs and as the Canadian domestic market could absorb only a portion of the remainder, from 1885 an increasing percentage of Manitoba's annual wheat harvest was being shipped eastward to be sold in Europe.<sup>20</sup> At the end of the century, Manitoba had become the granary of Canada and one of the principal granaries of Europe.

The existence of markets did not necessarily lead to accessibility to those markets in the 1880's, nor did it mean high prices for wheat when accessibility was achieved after 1890, for Manitoba was isolated. Of all the means of transportation available in the nineteenth century, the one means suitable for moving wheat from the Canadian prairies to market was the railway. If the Red River had flowed south or if the Nelson River had not been barred by rapids, water transportation might have provided a practicable route to markets. The sheer bulk of wheat precluded the use of the traditional prairie freighters, the Red River cart brigades. Only the railway was suitable to transport wheat. The Manitoba farmer, consequently, was dependent upon the technology of the industrial revolution if the potential of the province for wheat-growing was to be realized.

Railway construction began in Manitoba in June, 1875, but it was not until 1878 that rail connection was secured between East Selkirk and St. Vincent, Minnesota.<sup>21</sup> Completion of the railway to

the outside world did not give Manitoba farmers an adequate transportation network. While the settlement frontier had raced westward across the province and well into the North West Territories in the 1870's, the railroad served only the old river lot settlements along the Red and the Assiniboine Rivers. Settlements on the Boyne River, at Palestine, and in the shadows of Riding Mountain and Turtle Mountain were far from railheads.<sup>22</sup>

Throughout the 1880's, the Canadian Pacific Railway and a succession of local companies struggled to build lines to service the whole province. By the end of 1885, rail connection was opened to Montreal and the branch line network extended.<sup>23</sup> But it was still insufficient to meet the needs of Manitoba farmers. Not until 1889 was most of southern Manitoba provided with rail communication to markets.<sup>24</sup>

The completion of the railway network which brought an end to Manitoba's isolation did not guarantee cheap access to markets. The distance to those markets was great and freight rates were accordingly high.<sup>25</sup> Farm supplies and consumer goods were more expensive in Manitoba than in Eastern Canada because they had to be imported, while the farmer received a reduced price for wheat, his major cash crop.

(ii)

From 1884, when the railway between Winnipeg and Fort William was completed, to 1902, Manitoba farmers had to sell their crop in a highly competitive market. They faced both high costs and declining prices. Whether or not they could make a profit in such a market depended upon the cost of producing and marketing a

TABLE III

TERMINAL GRAIN AND FLOUR RATES TO FORT WILLIAM AND PORT ARTHUR, ONTARIO 1885-1905\*

(IN CENTS PER 100 LBS.)

FROM	FEB. 15 1886	SEPT. 16 1886	SEPT. 1 1887	OCT. 1 1888	OCT. 19 1888	DEC. 4 1890	DEC. 11 1891	SEPT. 5 1893	AUG. 1 1898	SEPT. 1 1899	OCT. 7 1903
PORTAGE LA PRAIRE	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	16-1/2	15	12
BRANDON	33	30	25	25	24	22	22	19	17-1/2	16	13
BOISSEVAIN	36	31	26	25	24	22	22	20	18-1/2	16	13
WINNIPEG	28	28	24	21	21	21	21	17	15-1/2	14	10

\* SOURCE: R. A. C. Henry and Associates, Railway Freight Rates in Canada, (Ottawa, 1939), Schedule 33.

bushel of wheat.

The price the farmer received for his wheat was set in export markets, and particularly in the British market for which the largest portion of Canada's wheat exports was destined. As the price of wheat was determined by the consumer, fluctuations in the demand for wheat in the United Kingdom were extremely serious for the Manitoba farmer. From 1881 to 1902, as world wheat production increased faster than world demand, English wheat prices moved gradually downward.<sup>26</sup> Part of the decline in prices reflects the decrease in oceanic freight rates, but there was also a real decline in prices. This decline was passed on to the Canadian farmer.<sup>27</sup>

Estimates of the expenses entailed in wheat-growing vary. Farmers usually calculated costs of producing their crop at 65% of the price received from the local grain buyer.<sup>28</sup> This calculation ignored the fact that costs were relatively fixed and not dependent upon yield. Other observers repeated this error: Rev. Daniel M. Gordon when he calculated the cost of producing a bushel of wheat at 40¢;<sup>29</sup> John Dobbryn when he testified before the House of Commons Committee on Immigration and Colonization to the effect that wheat could be grown in Manitoba for 25¢ per bushel;<sup>30</sup> and The North-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller when it estimated that wheat cost 40¢ per bushel to grow.<sup>31</sup> In each case, if the yield per acre was five bushels rather than forty bushels, the cost must obviously have been higher.

Sometimes costs were estimated by the acre. Charles Cliffe, editor of the Brandon Mail, wrote in 1884 that wheat could be grown in Manitoba for \$11.50 per acre,<sup>32</sup> while Robert McKay, a farmer, implied that from his experience the expenses of wheat-

growing were \$12.73 per acre.<sup>33</sup> W. Bristol of Moosomin, North West Territories, estimated in 1885 that it cost him \$15.45 to grow an acre of wheat.<sup>34</sup> After consulting "a couple of farmers" in the Brandon district, the Brandon Sun decided that it cost \$8.95 to grow an acre of Manitoba wheat,<sup>35</sup> while William Postlethwaite of Brandon produced figures in 1893 which he believed demonstrated that wheat could be grown for \$6.48 per acre.<sup>36</sup> And the Brandon Experimental Farm which conducted field trials in the 1890's in an attempt to determine the costs of wheat-growing estimated the cost per acre at \$7.79.<sup>37</sup>

Obviously there was some confusion about the investment required to grow an acre of wheat. No two of the persons or publications providing estimates agreed upon the types of costs the farmer had to bear. Without some sort of framework within which the various estimates can be compared, their value is extremely limited.

James Mavor provides such a framework. In a report prepared for the British government dealing with the question of the production of wheat grown for export in Western Canada, Mavor came to some definite conclusions about the costs of wheat-growing. While he did not attempt to calculate the expenses the farmer was likely to incur, he did try to determine which costs could actually be calculated.

Mavor saw the costs of production falling into five categories: rent, interest on farming capital, insurance, wages and materials. He considered the first three categories to be irrelevant. Rent in Mavor's estimation was not an applicable cost

when dealing with Manitoba. Between 1881 and 1901, less than 10% of Manitoba's farmers rented the land that they cultivated. Those who did lease land usually did not pay a cash rent, but rather entered into crop-sharing agreements with the owner. Given such a situation where rent depended upon yield, it would be impossible to calculate rent as a cost of production.<sup>38</sup> Likewise, interest on farming capital was very difficult to determine. No statistics regarding interest were available and even if they were "wide divergences in the same district might be expected to occur".<sup>39</sup> As for insurance, figures for the number of farmers with hail, flood and fire insurance were lacking. In any case, Mavor saw insurance as an optional expense. Although he thought that the individual farmer should take the expense of insurance into consideration, Mavor did not believe that it could be calculated on a province-wide basis.<sup>40</sup>

Within the context of Mavor's framework, some comparison of the various estimates regarding the costs of wheat-growing is possible. Taking the estimates of those observers who provided detailed calculations and subtracting from them those costs which Mavor regarded as irrelevant, the expenses incurred in wheat-growing in Manitoba range from \$15.45 to \$5.99.per acre.<sup>41</sup>

A similar range in costs exists if the expenses of wheat-growing are calculated by the bushel. Assuming an average crop of twenty-five bushels to the acre,<sup>42</sup> at 40¢ per bushel, expenses would be \$10.00 per acre, and at 25¢ per bushel, expenses would be \$6.00 per acre.

In Manitoba during the nineteenth century, therefore, the normal costs of wheat-growing ranged from something in the order of

\$6.00 per acre to \$15.00 per acre. Such a range in the cost of production is not unreasonable. The higher estimates were made in the 1880's when higher transportation costs led to heavier expenses, while lower estimates were made in the 1890's when general deflation of prices and lower freight rates, resulted in lighter costs.<sup>43</sup> Furthermore, many farmers probably found that the costs of wheat-growing diminished as they became accustomed to the conditions of Western Canadian agriculture. Such at least was the opinion of The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller: it pointed out that William Postlethwaite's estimate was too low since he had the advantage of "the wisdom born of experience" which would "qualify him to farm much more economically than he did at first."<sup>44</sup>

(iii)

The price actually paid to the farmer for his wheat is difficult to establish. While statistics are available regarding the price of wheat on the basis of delivery at Fort William or Port Arthur, these statistics are of relatively little value in determining what the farmer received for his crop. The Fort William prices, which were compiled on the basis of transactions made by grain dealers, include freight costs to Fort William, handling charges, and profits of middlemen. The farmer received only a fraction, albeit a significant fraction, of the Fort William price when he sold his crop to an elevator company or to a local grain dealer.

Current prices quoted in local newspapers as being offered to area farmers are also suspect. Local newspapers as well as commercial publications tended to avoid publishing prices

TABLE IV

WHEAT PRICES AT LIVERPOOL, ENGLAND, AND  
WINNIPEG, MORDEN AND DELORATINE, MANITOBA, 1883-1900

(In Dollars Per Bushel)

	<u>Liverpool</u> <sup>1</sup>	<u>Winnipeg</u> <sup>2</sup>	<u>Morden</u> <sup>3</sup>	<u>Deloraine</u> <sup>4</sup>
1883	1.26	1.13		
1884	1.08	.86	.46-.51	
1885	1.00	.84	.40-.68	
1886	.94	.83	.41-.58	
1887	.99	.83	.47-.56	.52
1888	.97	1.05	.87-.96	.50-1.00
1889	.90	.99	.58-.60	.60
1890	.97	.90		.70
1891	1.13	.94	.65-.72	.70
1892	.92	.74	.45-.68	.48
1893	.80	.69		.40
1894	.69	.54	.39-.41	.43
1895	.70	.61	.44-.48	.40
1896	.80	.69	.57-.59	.70
1897	.92	.85	.72-.76	.78
1898	1.03	.69	.55-.59	.55
1899	.78	.70	.54-.59	.52
1900	.82	.89	.57-.73	

1. Yearly average prices for all grades.
2. Yearly average prices 1883-1889 and monthly average prices for October, 1890-1900. All prices are for Manitoba No. 1 Northern basis delivery at Fort William.
3. Range in prices during the month of October for all grades.
4. Monthly average prices for all grades in November.

SOURCES: The Canada Year Book, 1915; M.C. Urquart and K. A. H. Buckley, Historical Statistics of Canada, (Toronto; The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1965), pp. 359-360; Canada, Report of the Royal Grain Inquiry Commission, 1938, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1938), p.239; Morden Manitoba News; Morden Monitor; Morden Herald, Morden Chronicle; Norman E. Wright, In View of the Turtle Hill, (Deloraine: Deloraine Times, 1951), pp. 104-105.

that might deter immigration to Manitoba. Since provincial economic development depended upon continued immigration and since the owners of newspapers and commercial publications were heartily in favour of provincial economic development, their editors avoided publishing unflattering grain prices.<sup>45</sup>

Difficulties in determining grain prices would not be important were it not for the fact that neither the provincial nor the Dominion government kept statistics regarding farm income and farm expenses in the nineteenth century.<sup>46</sup> Wheat prices, consequently are the key, even if available statistics are not satisfactory, to establishing the margin of profit enjoyed by farmers in the first prairie province.

Taking the prices for wheat paid to farmers at Morden and Deloraine<sup>47</sup> as shown in Table IV and assuming an average crop of twenty-five bushels to the acre, in no year would the individual farmer whose expenses were 25¢ per bushel (\$6.00 per acre) fail to make a profit. At 40¢ per bushel (\$10.00 per acre) in expenses, there would be a number of years in which profits would be marginal. At 60¢ per bushel (\$15.00 per acre) in costs, the farmer would have suffered losses in a significant number of years.

But if the farmer harvested only fifteen bushels rather than twenty-five bushels to the acre, the number of years in which he suffered losses would increase substantially. With expenses of \$15.00 per acre (\$1.00 per bushel), in only one year would the farmer have made a profit--and then only if he farmed at Deloraine and received the top price available. With costs of \$10.00 per acre (67¢ per bushel) he would have suffered losses in all but five

years at Deloraine and all but six years at Morden. With expenses of \$6.00 per acre (40¢ per bushel) the farmer would not have suffered losses, but in many years he would barely meet his investment.

Although the margin of profit on wheat enjoyed by the farmer was sufficient under ordinary circumstances so long as the farmer kept his expenses down, the settler's livelihood was not secure. Throughout the 1880's and early 1890's, drought and frost caused widespread crop failures.<sup>48</sup> Because of the narrow profit margin on his principal cash crop, it was difficult for the farmer to fully recoup his losses in good years after a poor season.

Settlers were aware of the necessity of economical agriculture. Alexander Morrison, a farmer from Salterville, pointed out in 1894 that farmers "should not only be producers but should be manufacturers as well, and should aim at producing the largest amount of the best goods at the least possible cost."<sup>49</sup> Another farmer, William Howard of Arrow River, in a letter printed to encourage immigration, stated that "a man can do well in this country if he does not go beyond his means."<sup>50</sup>

The narrow profit margin of the wheat farmer is also reflected in the fact that large numbers of settlers failed to acquire title to their land after obtaining it from either the federal government or the Canadian Pacific Railway. Of 4,840,142 acres sold by the Canadian Pacific from 1880 to 1896 in Manitoba and the North West Territories, fully 26.5% was repossessed by the company when buyers defaulted in their payments.<sup>51</sup> Similarly, 37.4% of all homestead applications in the Canadian West between 1874 and 1896 were cancelled.<sup>52</sup>

For those farmers who failed, some did not succeed as a result of their own inability to adjust to changed agricultural conditions. Others attempted to farm with insufficient capital and fell victims to their creditors. A few were unlucky. But for most, failure could be blamed upon the conditions of the Manitoba agricultural frontier. W. L. Morton succinctly stated the difficulty confronting the settler in Western Canada:

The settlement of the West was an experiment in marginal agriculture, in which the costs, both material and human, were high, and the process of successful adaptation to new conditions slow.<sup>53</sup>

Agrarian protest in Manitoba was born in the conditions of the Manitoba agricultural frontier. Because of climate and location, the difference between profit and loss for the wheat farmer was narrow in any given season. Even the well-adapted prairie farmer was never more than a step from financial disaster. As a result, the Manitoba settler was particularly susceptible to the blandishments of agrarian protest organizations, and he was especially susceptible in those years in which he was adjusting to the conditions of Western Canadian agriculture.

The individuals who comprised the Broadfoot party which set out down the Portage trail in the spring of 1872, were not aware of the trials awaiting them. In the succeeding years they were to discover, through their own tribulations, the realities of farming in Manitoba. For some members of the party, the difficulties were to prove too much. Donald Ferguson, who met the Brussels immigrants in Winnipeg, gave up farming and opened a general store in Gladstone. Peter Ferguson and his family found that the Canadian

West did not meet their expectations and left. As for the remainder of the party, they remained in Manitoba, grappled with the difficulties with which they were confronted, and made their voices heard when agrarian protest was born in the first prairie province.

FOOTNOTES

1. By frontier I mean a geographic region adjacent to the unsettled portions of the continent.
2. Winnipeg Free Press, April 24, 1936, p. 22. For an account of the beginnings of Palestine see Margaret Morton Fahrni and W. L. Morton, Third Crossing: A History of the First Quarter Century of the Town and District of Gladstone in the Province of Manitoba, (Winnipeg: Advocate Printers Limited, 1946), pp. 11-20.
3. For an analysis of the state of Manitoba agriculture prior to 1870 see W. L. Morton, "Agriculture in Red River Colony", Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XXX, No. 4, (December, 1949), pp. 305-321.
4. There are several good descriptions of the physical geography of Manitoba prior to Confederation with Canada. The best of these is Henry Youle Hind, Narrative of the Canadian Red River Exploring Expedition of 1857 and of the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition of 1858, Volume I, (Edmonton: M. G. Hurtig Ltd., 1971) especially chapters VI, VII and XI. The best source for the physical geography of Manitoba at the time of settlement is the collection of surveyors' maps. Each land titles office in Manitoba has copies of the original surveyors' maps--all made in the early 1870's--for its district. These maps provide information regarding vegetation, water courses, and any prominent physical features.
5. For the soils of Manitoba see J. H. Ellis, The Soils of Manitoba, (Winnipeg: Manitoba Economic Survey Board, 1938).
6. A. J. Connor, The Climate of Manitoba, (Winnipeg: Manitoba Economic Survey Board, 1939), pp. 9-10.
7. W. W. Swanson and P. C. Armstrong, Wheat, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1930), p. 9.
8. A. J. Connor, op. cit., p. 12.
9. There was an extremely wet period between 1876 and 1879, and an extremely dry period between 1886 and 1890. A. J. Connor, op. cit., p. 13.
10. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 203; Duncan Alexander MacGibbon, The Canadian Grain Trade, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1932), p. 26.

11. Alexander Begg, Practical Hand-Book and Guide to Manitoba and the North-West, (Toronto: Belford Brothers, 1877), p 37: Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
12. See Table I.
13. A. H. Reginald Buller, Essays on Wheat, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919), p. 39.
14. In the discussion of wheat exports, I have used statistics for exports of domestically produced wheat. Canada's actual wheat exports were often much larger, and the difference is accounted for by the fact that the St. Lawrence route was chosen by American grain dealers for some of their exports.
15. Canada, The Statistical Year-Book of Canada, 1902, (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau, 1903), p.108.
16. Robert Leslie Jones, History of Agriculture in Ontario, 1613-1880, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946), p. 248; D. A. MacGibbon, op. cit., pp. 28-29.
17. Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
18. James Mavor, Report to the Board of Trade on the North West of Canada with Special Reference to Wheat Production for Export, (London: Printed for His Majesty's Stationery Office, 1905), p.61.
19. Ibid.
20. By 1885 wheat surpluses in Manitoba reached the point where exports became necessary to the economic well-being of Manitoba farmers. The distribution of exports between Canadian domestic and foreign markets cannot be determined. By 1900, however, most wheat exported from Manitoba was being shipped overseas.
21. Norman Thompson and J. H. Edgar, Canadian Railway Development, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1933), pp. 129-139.
22. For the expansion of settlement see W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, pp. 176-198.
23. H. A. Innis, A History of the Canadian Pacific Railway, (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1923), p. 140.
24. Ibid., p. 151; Norman Thompson and J. H. Edgar, op. cit., pp. 208-209.
25. See Table III.
26. See Table IV, p. 15.

27. James Mavor, op. cit., pp. 90-91.
28. Ibid., p. 59n.
29. Daniel M. Gordon, Mountain and Prairie, (Montreal: Dawson Bros., 1880), p. 307.
30. Canada, Journals of the House of Commons, 1885, Appendix No. 3, p. 22.
31. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, January, 1893, p. 27.
32. Charles Cliffe, Manitoba and the Canadian Northwest as a Field for Settlement. (Brandon: Brandon Mail, 1884), p. 30.
33. Canada, Journals of the House of Commons, 1885, Appendix No. 3, p. 27.
34. Brandon Sun, January 15, 1885, p. 1.
35. Ibid.
36. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, January, 1893, p. 19.
37. E. A. Osborn, Greater Canada: The Past, Present, and Future of the Canadian North-West, (London: Chatto & Windus, 1900), p. 231.
38. James Mavor, op. cit., p. 58.
39. Ibid.
40. Ibid.
41. The only estimate affected by Mavor's analysis was that of the Dominion Experimental Farm at Brandon. They included rent of land as a cost. As a result the original estimate of \$7.79 is reduced to \$5.99 per acre.
42. Daniel M. Gordon, op. cit., p. 307; The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, January, 1893, p. 27.
43. For a comparison of the deflation in general prices as compared with prices of agricultural commodities see Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book I, p. 52.
44. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, January, 1893, p. 27.

45. Even a cursory examination of the Manitoba press would indicate the various editors' desire for increased development. Each editor saw Manitoba as the brightest prospect for investment, immigration and business in the world. A common feature of each newspaper was a special edition that would be circulated in eastern Canada promoting the Canadian West. In such editions, the editors usually assumed that proposed projects had been completed and indicated as much in their description of their area.
46. The only year in which the Census Bureau printed farm income statistics was in 1901. The Census of 1901 only deals with farm income and does not deal with farm expenses, nor does the Census differentiate farm income by various field crops.
47. Both the Deloraine and Morden prices do not represent the full spread in prices offered at both points; only published prices.
48. A. S. Morton, op. cit., 83-85.
49. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, June, 1894, p. 153.
50. The Colonist, September, 1896, n. p.
51. James B. Hedges, Building the Canadian West: The Land and Colonization Policies of the Canadian Pacific Railway, (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939), p. 388.
52. Canada, The Statistical Year-Book of Canada, 1902, p. 69.
53. W. L. Morton, The Progressive Party in Canada, p. 6.

## CHAPTER II

### "A HAPPY AND CONTENTED PEOPLE"

In 1869 the infant Dominion of Canada purchased the vast patrimony of the Hudson's Bay Company. With this purchase the Canadian government acquired the responsibility for formulating policies that would lead to the development of the agricultural potential of the North West. Policies had to be devised that would provide for immigration, the distribution of crown lands, transportation, and for the financial support of the provincial government of Manitoba so that it would be able to undertake its constitutional obligations.

Despite the obstacles that a country of three million inhabitants encountered in developing its western empire, the new Dominion was able to devise workable programmes for the agricultural development of the North West. While these programmes were well-intentioned and in large measure succeeded in accomplishing the ends for which they were formulated, the federal government, which saw western development as an integral part of national economic expansion, was often ignorant of conditions in Manitoba and the North West Territories. Discontent unfolded on the Manitoba agricultural frontier and was directed at the federal government when Dominion policies failed to meet the needs and the expectations of Manitoba settlers.

(1)

In 1870 no one could have foreseen that the federal programmes for western development would lead to widespread discontent in the West. To the soldiers of the Red River

Expeditionary Force, sent to restore order following the Red River Resistance, Manitoba was the promised land. The Canadian and British volunteers were impressed with its agricultural possibilities; better yet, the province was practically empty. There were fewer than thirteen thousand people in the postage stamp province and these occupied only a tiny fraction of the arable land. Manitoba, it seemed, would soon be flooded with a "living stream of happy and contented people."<sup>1</sup>

The settlement of the Canadian West could not be taken for granted. Some immigrants, undoubtedly, would come from Ontario without encouragement and others, perhaps, from Great Britain as a result of the publicity given the Red River Expedition in the British press, but this trickle of newcomers would not be sufficient to develop the full agricultural possibilities of Manitoba. To attract immigrants, the Canadian government would have to compete with the United States, the Australian colonies, and New Zealand, all of which were touting the merits of their respective agricultural frontiers and all of which were quite willing to discourage potential immigration to Canada by spreading tales of hardships that the Manitoba settler was likely to endure.<sup>2</sup>

In competing for immigrants, the Canadian government's immigration policies incorporated the earlier programmes of the Province of Canada.<sup>3</sup> Immigration agents were employed in Great Britain and in Eastern Canada, and later in continental Europe. Pamphleteers and writers who extolled the virtues of the Canadian West as a field for immigration received official sanction and their works were distributed by the Canadian government. Grants of land

were made to colonization companies and these companies employed agents who actively solicited immigrants for Manitoba through personal contacts, public meetings, and newspaper advertisements. The programme of group settlements was greatly expanded. In the course of time, large tracts of land were set aside within Manitoba, first for the Mennonites, then for the Icelanders and French Canadians, and after 1896, for the Ukrainians. Other ethnic groups received smaller grants. All group settlements were encouraged not just by the promise of free land, but by assisted passage, by aid in the first difficult years, and by the reservation of land for future generations.<sup>4</sup>

Other immigration policies were borrowed. From the Americans the Canadian government took the system of railway land grants. While this policy was adopted as a means of financing railway construction in the unsettled districts of the Canadian West, grants of land to the railways gave them a vested interest in promoting immigration.<sup>5</sup> The greater the number of settlers who established themselves in Western Canada, the greater the volume of traffic on the railways and the greater the profits to the companies.

The Canadian Pacific Railway, the principal beneficiary of the federal railway land grants, took an active role in finding immigrants for Manitoba and the Territories. It had its own agents in Eastern Canada and in the United Kingdom and Europe; it assisted immigrants to the West through low fares; and it provided credit to those settlers who had insufficient capital but who wished to purchase their land from the Company.<sup>6</sup>

TABLE V

POPULATION OF MANITOBA BY BIRTHPLACE\*

CENSUS	1870	1881	1886	1891	1901	1906
TOTAL POPULATION	12,278	65,954	108,640	152,506	255,211	365,688
CANADA						
B.C.		25	26	55	167	301
MAN.	11,298	18,020	34,124	50,648	99,806	132,378
N.B.		341	704	718	820	1,224
N.S.		820	1,317	1,402	1,536	2,414
ONT.	118	19,125	34,121	46,620	67,566	79,002
P.E.I.		154	180	234	419	1,253
P.Q.	111	4,085	5,976	7,555	8,492	9,632
N.W.T.		6,422	520	785	2,053	1,416
CANADA (NOT GIVEN)	60					
BRITISH ISLES						
ENGLAND & WALES	125	3,457	10,322	16,017	20,392	41,403
IRELAND	49	1,836	3,621	4,553	4,537	6,137
SCOTLAND	248	2,868	5,982	7,444	8,099	15,086
OTHER BRITISH POSSESSIONS	10	72	200	280	489	636
AUSTRIA-HUNGARY					11,570	25,640
BELGIUM & HOLLAND					847	2,031
CHINA				31 <sup>o</sup>	209	572
DENMARK, NORWAY & SWEDEN		121	372	3,746 <sup>o</sup>	2,090	4,692
EAST INDIES					14	30
FRANCE	9	81	110	474	1,470	2,370
GERMANY		220	528	857	2,285	5,148
GREECE					3	176
ICELAND			1,998		5,403	5,495
ITALY		23	38	24	125	487
JAPAN					13	30
RUMANIA					110	710
RUSSIA		5,651	5,724	6,251	8,854	11,730
SPAIN & PORTUGAL		1		8	16	47
SWITZERLAND					134	167
SYRIA					63	170
TURKEY					6	235
UNITED STATES	116	1,752	2,322	3,063	6,922	12,023
WEST INDIES					32	121
OTHER COUNTRIES	27	771	238	1,565	35	1,229
AT SEA		7	9	7	23	7
NOT GIVEN	7	102	208	169	611	477

\* Based on data in the Census of Canada for 1880-1881, 1891 and 1902; the Census of Manitoba for 1870 and 1885-86; and the Census of the Prairie Provinces, 1906.

<sup>o</sup> Includes the number of native-born Icelanders in Manitoba as well.

Another feature of immigration policy borrowed from the American experience was the promise of free land. Under a provision of the Dominion Lands Act of 1872, any head of a household or any man of twenty-one years of age could, upon payment of a ten dollar registration fee, homestead one hundred and sixty acres of unoccupied land in Western Canada provided that land was available for homesteading. If the settler lived on the land for six months out of each year and brought thirty-five acres under cultivation, he could apply at the end of three years to the government for a title or patent as it was called.<sup>7</sup> It was believed that this policy would attract immigrants to Canada who would otherwise go to the United States.<sup>8</sup>

The array of Canadian immigration policies was reasonably effective in attracting immigrants to Manitoba. The province's population grew from 12,278 in 1870<sup>9</sup> to 255,211 in 1901.<sup>10</sup> Almost all of this increase was due to immigration. Of the 12,278 persons who were residents in 1870, 92% were natives of the province,<sup>11</sup> but by 1881, the natives were outnumbered by the newcomers. In that year, 62.9% of the population was born outside Manitoba.<sup>12</sup> By the beginning of the twentieth century, 60.1% of the population were immigrants,<sup>13</sup> and of the native-born population in 1901, the largest portion was comprised of the children of these newcomers.<sup>14</sup>

Canadian immigration policies were most successful in attracting immigrants to Manitoba from Ontario and the United Kingdom. As Tables V and VI illustrate, by 1881 Manitoba was primarily a British and Canadian province.<sup>15</sup> In that year, 29% of the population had been born in Ontario and 12.4% had been born

TABLE VI

POPULATION OF MANITOBA BY NATIONAL ORIGINS: 1881-1901\*

CENSUS	1881	1886	1901
English	11,503	25,949	65,542
Irish	10,173	21,180	47,418
Scotch	16,506	25,676	51,365
Other British	103 <sup>1</sup>	229 <sup>1</sup>	914
French	9,949	6,821	16,021
German	8,652	11,082	27,265
Dutch	506	244	925
Scandinavian	1,023	3,032	11,924
Russian <sup>2</sup>	24	381	4,976
Austro-Hungarian			8,981
Italian	41	72	217
Jewish	18	71	1,514
Swiss	10	22	204
Belgian			940
Half-Breed		7,985	10,371
Indian	6,767	5,575	5,906
Chinese & Japanese	43	183	210
Negro	25	30	61
Spanish & Portuguese	14	17	
Various	6	178	196
Unspecified	630	78	1,261

1. Welsh
2. Includes Polish
3. Chinese only

Sources: Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886; Census of Canada, 1901. No statistics were kept in 1891 regarding the national origins of the people of Canada.

in Great Britain,<sup>16</sup> while 58.1% of the population was of British origin.<sup>17</sup> Twenty years later, 26.5% of the population claimed Ontario as their birthplace, and 12.9% were natives of the United Kingdom,<sup>18</sup> while 64.4% of the population was of British stock.<sup>19</sup>

The British-Canadian composition of the population was leavened by newcomers from other European countries. In 1881, 2.8% of Manitobans were born in Iceland, while 8.5% were Mennonites born in the Russian Empire.<sup>20</sup> By 1901, in terms of national origin, 10.7% of Manitobans were of Germanic background, 4.7% were Scandinavian, 3.6% were Austro-Hungarian, and 1.9% were Russian.<sup>21</sup>

The changing composition of the Manitoba population was reflected in the religions embraced by the province's inhabitants. The duality of Old Red River of Protestant and Roman Catholic was ended by 1881. In the census of that year, the majority of Manitobans belonged to the three largest Protestant denominations in Canada: the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church and the Methodist Church.<sup>22</sup> Between 1881 and 1901 very few Manitobans were adherents of the small evangelical Protestant sects, but the increasing number of Mennonite, Lutheran and Orthodox Christians denoted the growth of non-Anglo-Saxon European immigration.<sup>23</sup>

(11)

Of all the immigrant groups, the Ontario and British settlers had the most difficult time before they adapted to the conditions of the Manitoba agricultural frontier. Neither group had any experience in dry-land farming and both were unprepared for the rigours of prairie agriculture. One farming technique

TABLE VII  
POPULATION OF MANITOBA BY RELIGION\*

<u>CENSUS</u>	<u>1870</u>	<u>1881</u>	<u>1885</u>	<u>1891</u>	<u>1901</u>
ROMAN CATHOLICS	5,452	12,216	14,651	20,571	35,672
ANGLICANS		14,297	23,206	30,852	44,922
PRESBYTERIANS		14,292	28,406	39,001	65,348
METHODISTS		10,070	18,648	28,437	49,936
BAPTISTS		1,673	3,296	16,112 <del>ø</del>	9,166
MENNONITES		7,776	9,112		15,246
DOUKHBORS					75
GREEK ORTHODOX					7,899
LUTHERANS		984	3,131	6,545	16,542
CONGREGATIONALISTS		343	997	1,815	1,884
BRETHREN		29	114	389	467
DISCIPLES		102	199	261	470
ADVENTISTS		8	18	32	519
JEWS		33	543	743	1,497
SALVATION ARMY				399	745
FRIENDS		43	66	124	124
MORMONS					65
PAGANS		2,173			1,234
PROTESTANTS	4,841 <sup>o</sup>	45	428	1,874	646
UNITARIANS		20	31	74	
UNIVERSALISTS		8	9	5	
EPISCOPAL REFORMED		1			
NO REGIGION		16	45		
VARIOUS SECTS		68	121	448	1,837
UNSPECIFIED	1,935	2,327	5,619 <del>/</del>	4,824 <del>/</del>	917

\* Based on data in the Census of Canada for 1880-1881, 1891, and 1901; and the Census of Manitoba for 1870 and 1885-1886.

<sup>o</sup> Includes all non-Roman Catholics in the province.

~~/~~ Includes pagans.

~~ø~~ Includes Mennonites.

that the British-Canadian immigrants had to learn was summer-fallowing. Summer-fallowing had disappeared in Britain during the agricultural revolution of the eighteenth century,<sup>24</sup> and in Ontario this particular farming method was used largely for the control of weeds.<sup>25</sup> In Manitoba summer-fallowing was necessary to conserve moisture. Constant cropping of the land--especially in the western areas of the province--depleted the sparse moisture reserves, and crop yields were lower than if the farmer had sown his crops upon summer-fallow. The Ontario and British immigrants quickly saw that the Mennonites who had immigrated from Russia and introduced summer-fallowing, were able to produce larger yields. By the early 1880's, the Anglo-Saxon newcomers were adopting this practice, but it was several years before summer-fallowing became general throughout the province.<sup>26</sup>

The Ontario and British immigrants were also reluctant to grow Red Fyfe wheat, although Red Fyfe was the one wheat variety with good milling qualities that usually ripened quickly enough during the short Manitoba growing season to escape the autumn frosts.<sup>27</sup> As late as 1892, Dr. John Pennefather was advocating the seeding of Golden Drop wheat over Red Fyfe.<sup>28</sup> By then his viewpoint was exceptional, but in the three decades following 1870, many farmers ignored other settlers' experience with Red Fyfe.

The transition from intensive to extensive agriculture posed further problems for the Anglo-Saxon immigrants. Agriculture in the United Kingdom was labour intensive,<sup>29</sup> while in Manitoba, where the cost of labour was high,<sup>30</sup> as on any agricultural frontier,

the farmer who was overly dependent upon hired labour was likely to find himself in financial difficulties. An example of too great dependence on hired labour is the farming operation of one English immigrant who owned Clovelly Farm near Headingley. This gentleman farmed on the grand scale. He purchased 480 acres of land for \$4,110 in 1880 and then spent a further \$25,070 during the next two years on the construction of improvements and on farming operations. Fully \$10,681 of these expenditures was incurred in living expenses and in wages paid to the hired labourers. Returns on this investment were meagre: only \$2,250 in two years.<sup>31</sup> While this individual did not land himself in financial difficulties, as he appears to have had abundant capital, other English immigrants did not fare so well.

Charles Stewart, a graduate of Cambridge University, located at Brandon Hills in 1881 and attempted to farm in the English manner, hiring men to do all the field work.<sup>32</sup> He did not have the capital resources to undertake such a farming operation indefinitely, and in 1885, after suffering two crop failures in succession, his mortgage company foreclosed when he could no longer meet his annual interest payments.<sup>33</sup>

Even those British settlers who adapted successfully to the new environment appear to have had difficulties in accepting the agricultural methods of the Canadian West. Edward Holmes, a young Englishman, studied North American farming techniques at Guelph Agricultural College before emigrating to Manitoba in 1881. Not satisfied with the theoretical approach at Guelph to farming, he took a job as a hired hand in Manitoba to learn more about prairie agriculture before buying his own farm.<sup>34</sup> He was well

aware of the realities of prairie agriculture after spending a year in Manitoba, but his letters home indicate that he was often amazed at the differences between English and Manitoban farming techniques. In writing his uncle, he expressed the hope that "when you are tired of the old world of travelling, you will come over and see the new one, and all its novel labour-saving arrangements." One could actually save money in farming, he marvelled, by buying a self-binder for \$340. The reason for this was the scarcity of labour, especially during harvest when "prices will be terrible, and men will not be got for love or money."<sup>35</sup>

The Ontario settlers had one advantage over British immigrants like Holmes and Stewart: many of them had pioneered on the Upper Canadian agricultural frontier before moving west. Since they had had this experience, the Ontario settlers were more likely to be accustomed to the rigours of pioneer farming and to be more willing than the British settlers to accept the frugal life of the agricultural frontier. As John J. Leach wrote Alfred Atkinson on the latter's arrival in the province from Brantford:

There is one thing you will all do wisely to adopt, and that is to disregard conventionalities /sic/. The people happily are free from care as to the kind of house the /sic/ live in, the rig they drive, or the work they follow. They do not think of apologizing if they have three beds, the cooking stove, and grindstone in a little house of one room, or if the family came to church with a yoke of oxen, and a home made jumper. And as it is in the country so in the towns.<sup>36</sup>

Of course, not all of the Ontario immigrants were willing to accept such conditions. Among those who found it difficult to adjust to the circumstances of Manitoba agriculture were emigrants

from towns or cities in Ontario. James A. Lang of Riverside, for example, a Presbyterian minister from Ottawa who took up farming in Manitoba, knew little of agriculture let alone prairie agriculture before he settled in Manitoba.<sup>37</sup> Lang's difficulties in establishing himself in the province<sup>38</sup> can be attributed as much to his inexperience in farming generally as to his inexperience in prairie agriculture.

Of all the immigrants to Manitoba, only the Mennonites and Ukrainians had any experience in prairie farming, and this was obtained on the steppes of the Russian and Austro-Hungarian empire. At the same time, conditions in Manitoba were different from those they had known in their former homes. The Mennonites encountered difficulties in making the transition from subsistence to commercial agriculture, and in adapting to the use of mechanical equipment to farm the land. Furthermore, both the Ukrainians and Mennonites arrived with insufficient capital and underwent years of privation while they struggled to bring their land under cultivation.<sup>39</sup>

As for the Icelanders, the sturdy fishermen of the northern Atlantic Ocean, they located on the shores of Lake Winnipeg rather than upon the open prairie. In "New Iceland", as the immigrants named the government reserve set aside for them, they attempted to recreate the society and economy of their homeland: agriculture becoming an adjunct of the Lake Winnipeg fishery. Like the Ukrainian and Mennonite settlers, the Icelanders lacked capital, and in addition, they suffered the ravages of a smallpox epidemic in 1876-1877 which severely retarded the development of "New Iceland".<sup>40</sup>

But the non-English-speaking immigrants to Manitoba, despite the hardships they encountered, came to the Canadian West for different reasons than the Ontario and British settlers. The Mennonites came to Canada to escape religious persecution;<sup>41</sup> the Icelanders were prompted to leave their homeland because of economic hardship and the wanderlust that periodically infected the Icelandic people;<sup>42</sup> and the Ukrainians emigrated "due to over-population, subdivision of land holdings, heavy taxation, and unfavourable political conditions."<sup>43</sup> Whatever the difficulties with which the Ukrainians, Mennonites and Icelanders met, they were not disappointed to the same extent as the English-speaking settlers when the process of adaptation to agricultural conditions in Manitoba proved painful and costly.

(iii)

The federal government can be censured for its failure to prepare the newcomers for unfamiliar agricultural conditions. The dissemination of information regarding farming conditions in Manitoba was left to immigration writers and agents. These individuals spread so many half-truths, distortions, exaggerations and outright lies in their pursuit of potential immigrants that many settlers arrived in Manitoba with expectations that were bound to be shattered by the realities of prairie agriculture.

The books and pamphlets of the immigration promoters were the major source of information not only for the intending settler, but also for the immigration agents.<sup>44</sup> Very few of these writers had any experience in farming in Manitoba, and those who had some experience were often those who had learned least from it.<sup>45</sup> Their

real interest in attracting immigrants to Manitoba was commercial. A great deal of money could be made from land speculation and by outfitting settlers, and some immigration writers had a vested interest in the success of enterprises whose purpose was to "farm" the settlers.<sup>46</sup>

The ingenuity of the immigration writers is best illustrated in those sections of their books and pamphlets dealing with the Manitoba climate. In the winter months southern Manitoba is one of the coldest regions on the North American continent and no other characteristic of the province was as likely to discourage prospective immigrants than the thought of the thermometer plunging to thirty, forty, or even fifty degrees below zero. One pamphleteer argued that Manitoba was actually warmer than the American Mid-West since the British North West was in a basin in which warm air was trapped and that the Rocky Mountains, being lower in British territory than in American territory, allowed "the warm winds of the Pacific" to blow into the Canadian West more readily than into the American West.<sup>47</sup> Sometimes it was claimed that because of the variation in the seasons, the Manitoba climate was decidedly preferable to that of every state in the American Union including California.<sup>48</sup> It was also claimed that because of the dryness of the air, Manitoba was really no colder than Ottawa or Toronto where the air was more humid and the inhabitants "felt" the cold more.<sup>49</sup>

The distortion of the facts concerning climate did less harm than other claims made by the writers. The yield of wheat was exaggerated. Charles Mair noted in 1869 that the farmers of Portage

la Prairie "will plant something like one hundred bushels of wheat each, and with an average yield will reap two thousand bushels of grain each farm."<sup>50</sup> Alexander Begg in 1877 argued that a comparison of the wheat yield of Manitoba and the best districts of the United States showed that Manitoba wheat averaged forty bushels per acre while no American state had a yield greater than twenty bushels per acre.<sup>51</sup> John Macoun's figures were more accurate than Begg's--he claimed an average yield of twenty-six bushels per acre--<sup>52</sup> but they were still exaggerated, and the American states, Massachusetts, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin, with which he and Begg chose to compare Manitoba's wheat-growing potential were hardly the most important wheat-producing states in the Union.<sup>53</sup> Although both authors included Minnesota, which was an important wheat-growing state, Macoun ignored Kansas and Nebraska,<sup>54</sup> and Begg commented that the "unoccupied land in the United States has been proved to be little better than barren waste..."<sup>55</sup>

This tendency to exaggerate was carried one step further by the most prolific pamphlet writer of all, Thomas Spence. In 1886, he declared that "large yields of wheat" rewarded even "poor culture", although by that time with the keeping of crop statistics, a "large yield" was "about twenty-five bushels to the acre, while careful cultivation has been known to bring as high as forty bushels, occasionally even more without manure..."<sup>56</sup>

In 1890, the Manitoba Department of Agriculture was just as emphatic, although less definite than earlier writers about the expected yields of wheat. "The soil, the climate and other natural conditions of Manitoba are peculiarly adapted to wheat-raising",

the Department declared, and "this means that the magnificent areas of Manitoba, comprising millions of acres of the most fertile virgin prairie, capable of producing the best quality of wheat the world has ever seen, the wheat fields of America are in the near future to be found."<sup>57</sup>

Reality was very different! Although the immigration writers were correct in claiming that Manitoba was an agricultural region "peculiarly adapted to wheat-raising", they were wrong in claiming that the average wheat yield was twenty-five bushels to the acre or more. Some farmers might be rewarded by forty, fifty, or very rarely sixty bushels of wheat to the acre, but the average yield of wheat between 1883 and 1902 was only 18.84 bushels per acre.<sup>58</sup> The highest average yield was in 1895 when the provincial wheat crop reached 27.86 bushels per acre and the lowest yield was in 1900 when the provincial average was only 8.90 bushels per acre.<sup>59</sup>

The immigration writers were also overly exuberant about the potential for other forms of agricultural endeavour in Manitoba. To Thomas Spence, Manitoba was the ideal agricultural region for "stock raising and wool growing." In his opinion, "wool would be the best crop to raise for some time to come for exportation."<sup>60</sup> He went on to state that the province was also an excellent region for dairy farming, orchards, flax and hemp culture, and bee-keeping.<sup>61</sup> Alexander Begg implied that Manitoba was ideally suited for the introduction of a sugar-beet industry,<sup>62</sup> and John Macoun devoted a lengthy section of his book to the advantages of growing roots.<sup>63</sup>

The Manitoba Department of Agriculture saw mixed farming as being the best form of agriculture for the province's settlers.

The Department warned the newcomers that "while wheat growing is, perhaps, the most attractive occupation", the settler would do well to note that "it is the general opinion of the most experienced that mixed farming will prove to be the safest and most remunerative /form of agriculture/ in the long run."<sup>64</sup>

But the limitations of the climate and the distance of Manitoba from potential markets restricted, for the most part, the farmer's agricultural activities to wheat-growing. Limited rainfall in the growing season and the short prairie summers confined farm production to cereals and root crops. High freight rates, because of the great distance from the Canadian prairies to potential markets, put the Manitoba farmer at a competitive disadvantage in Eastern Canadian, European and American markets for all but the higher priced (by comparison to the prices offered for other agricultural products) wheat exports.

Apart from raising expectations concerning the future of agriculture, writers also misled their readers about the future of railway expansion and the availability of cheap education for their children. J. C. Hamilton included a map of Manitoba in his book which he claimed was "framed from the most recent and reliable sources."<sup>65</sup> This map depicted railways as running from Fort William to Livingstone in the North West Territories, and from Winnipeg to Emerson. The book was published in 1876, and the first railway line in the province was completed in 1878! Charles Cliffe claimed that Manitobans enjoyed "cheap carriage for grain and other products to the Atlantic, via the Canadian Pacific and its water connections."<sup>66</sup> When Cliffe published his pamphlet in 1884, the Farmers' Union

agitation was at its height and one of the rallying cries of that agitation was the excessive cost of rail transportation.<sup>67</sup> Cliffe also argued that the Manitoba school system was "unequalled in the world" and that because the Dominion had laid aside "a large area of free lands for its maintenance", education was being conducted "at the least possible expense to the settler and tax payer".<sup>68</sup> His implication was that school taxes were low and the cost of education slight, a claim with which the Farmers' Union would have disagreed.<sup>69</sup>

The pamphleteers contended that any settler in possession of capital between \$500 and \$2,000 could succeed in establishing himself provided he was willing to work.<sup>70</sup> Within five years at the most, the settler would be a happy and prosperous Manitoba farmer. For those who had little capital it would take a little longer to establish themselves, but farmers who had arrived in the West with less than fifty dollars would testify that the settler lacking in capital could succeed.<sup>71</sup>

Immigration writers also misled the readers concerning the availability of farm land in Manitoba. Millions of acres of the most fertile land, they claimed, were available for homesteading in the province.<sup>72</sup> If the immigrant wished to buy land, there were "a number of highly respectable and reliable real estate agents" in Winnipeg.<sup>73</sup> Some writers did admit that there was speculation in land,<sup>74</sup> and one writer argued that land speculation was not "an unmixed evil, as it causes a number of capitalists to take a deep concern in the welfare of the country."<sup>75</sup> All writers insisted that there was more than enough free land for every immigrant. In

actual fact there were millions of acres of land on the prairies that were available for homesteading, and it made little sense to purchase land when a homestead could be had for a ten dollar registration fee. What the immigrant did not know until his arrival in Manitoba was that there was a limited supply of suitable free land. The settler could always find a homestead within the province, but if farming was to be profitable, the homestead had to be located near a railroad or in an area in which a railroad was likely to be constructed. But the area which possessed the easiest access to transportation was the Red River Valley where the federal government set aside large tracts of land for group settlements. By the late 1870's settlers discovered that most homesteads could be obtained only in the furthest regions of the province or in the North West Territories where years would pass before railways were built.

(iv)

Originally the federal government had hoped to avoid large-scale land reservations. Most members of the federal parliament could remember only too well the difficulties that had arisen in Upper and Lower Canada when large tracts of land had been reserved for the support of education and a "protestant clergy". In speaking in the House of Commons to the Dominion Lands Act in June, 1872, Alexander Morris, Minister of Inland Revenue, declared that the Act had been based "on the experience of the older Provinces of Ontario and Quebec" and that "every effort had been made to deal with the whole subject in such a spirit as would induce emigration /sic/ and deal fairly and justly

with the settlers already in the country."<sup>76</sup> Despite his assurances, some members were not completely satisfied. Senator J. O. Bureau wondered whether too much land was being reserved for railways, and he was somewhat skeptical of the wisdom of making land grants for the support of education. While he was "in favour of assisting Education by public grants", he recognized that "every care should be taken to avoid a repetition of such difficulties as arose in this country in the past."<sup>77</sup>

The Dominion Lands Act made provision for the purchase at the price of one dollar per acre of land up to a maximum of 640 acres. In the areas available for homesteading, a quarter-section of the land could be acquired. A settler who had homesteaded a quarter-section could also pre-empt and then purchase an adjoining quarter-section for the price of one dollar per acre. The Act also provided for Military Bounty Grants for former soldiers and militiamen. Two sections were to be set aside in each township for the support of education, and one and three quarters sections in each township for the Hudson's Bay Company in fulfillment of the terms of the purchase of the Company's rights.<sup>78</sup>

The decision to sell public lands for one dollar per acre was an open invitation to land speculators since the purchaser of public lands available for sale was not required to settle upon the land or to make any improvements to his property as a condition of purchase. As there were no land taxes in Manitoba until school districts and municipalities were established,<sup>79</sup> the one dollar an acre purchase price represented a very small investment which could return a very large profit when the land was sold after most

of the adjoining lands had been settled.

The Riddell brothers, Andrew and James, of Tobacco Creek took advantage of this provision in 1876 and 1877. Between them, they purchased 7,360 acres of land from the Crown in townships five, ranges five and six west.<sup>80</sup> Their investment of \$7,360 was amply repaid. Between 1878 and 1882, they sold 5,540 acres of land and from these sales, they made a very handsome profit of \$26,760.<sup>81</sup> Moreover, the Riddell brothers acquired nearly six times the amount of land that they should have received under the Dominion Lands Act. In the administration of the statute, officials, whether out of ignorance of dishonesty,<sup>82</sup> allowed men to purchase far more land than that to which they were legally entitled.

The provisions for Military Bounty Grants permitted Andrew Riddell to obtain a further 640 acres of land as he had served in the militia. This provision, like the purchase of land, did not entail any obligations on the part of the recipient. Although it was a noble gesture to reward the Empire's defenders with Crown lands, the Upper Canadian experience demonstrated that military land grants made land speculators out of good soldiers.<sup>83</sup> Andrew Riddell, among others, was quick to take advantage of the opportunity provided by the provision for Military Bounty Grants, and continued the tradition of the soldier turned realtor.

The right of pre-emption contained in the Dominion Lands Act also led to speculation. Because the homesteader could, for one dollar per acre, acquire a further 160 acres from the Dominion under this provision and thereby obtain a total of 320 acres for the modest investment of \$170, a farmer was tempted to acquire more land than he could reasonably expect to cultivate for some years

to come.<sup>84</sup> Some indication of the extent of the practice can be gauged by comparing the number of homestead entries with the number of pre-emption entries that were cancelled. Between 1873, when the Dominion Lands Act came into force, and October, 1889, when the right of pre-emption was ended, there were 44,641 homestead entries and 24,482 pre-emptions registered in Manitoba and the North West Territories; of these, 17,906 or 40.11% of the homestead entries and 13,401 or 54.7% of pre-emptions were cancelled.<sup>85</sup> The high percentage of cancellations of pre-emptions indicates that many farmers took out a pre-emption as a speculative investment.

The homestead itself was sometimes acquired as a venture in land speculation. Conditions that had to be met in order to qualify for a patent were not very onerous and these were not always enforced by homestead inspectors.<sup>86</sup> The exact extent of land speculation among homesteaders cannot be determined, but Edward Holmes noted that many of the homesteaders in his district sold out to land companies, Winnipeg land speculators or new arrivals. When the original settlers sold their land, they moved to other areas where they probably repeated the process.<sup>87</sup>

The decision of the federal government to reserve land for settlement by ethnic groups contributed to the diffusion of settlement. Under the terms of the Manitoba Act, 1,400,000 acres were set aside for Metis in Manitoba.<sup>88</sup> These lands were located in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg and in terms of the availability of transportation, they were the best-situated lands outside of the old river lots.<sup>89</sup> Very few Metis actually settled

upon their grants, preferring instead to sell the scrip which they received from the Dominion entitling them to 240 acres to Winnipeg speculators for as little as ten cents an acre.<sup>90</sup> The enormous Metis land grants rapidly fell into the hands of real estate dealers<sup>91</sup> who were in no hurry to sell their new found investments for reasonable prices.<sup>92</sup> The area in the immediate vicinity of Winnipeg remained unsettled long after most other areas in the province were filled up with newcomers. As The Commercial lamented in 1888:

It is a matter of astonishment to new arrivals in Winnipeg to learn that while the population of the new city exceeds that of all the other cities and towns of Manitoba put together, the lands around it are more sparsely settled, and a smaller proportion of them under cultivation, than is the case with the lands around any other town of any prominence in the Province. The astonishment increases, when the fact is learned, that among all the fertile lands of the Canadian Northwest, none are richer from an agricultural point of view, and in few districts are they more fertile /than/ these same sparsely settled, and almost unbroken prairie lands around Winnipeg.<sup>93</sup>

It would be another twenty years before the Metis reserves would be occupied.<sup>94</sup>

Other federal grants were made to foreign immigrant groups. The large area reserved for the Icelandic immigrants on the shores of Lake Winnipeg in 1874 was slowly filled,<sup>95</sup> while the eight townships reserved for the Mennonites to the east of the Red River in 1873 were filled by 1880.<sup>96</sup> To the west of the Red River, a further seventeen townships were reserved for the Mennonites but these were not occupied until 1890.<sup>97</sup>

Had the government reserved smaller tracts of land near transportation for group settlements in the 1870's and set aside more distant western lands for the expansion of these settlements,

perhaps some of the dissatisfaction that was to arise because of the poor location of the Anglo-Saxon settlers might have been prevented. As it was, the group settlement policy of the federal government helped to create a shortage of suitable land for Anglo-Saxon settlers.

There was one other aspect of federal lands policy that served to scatter settlement in the first prairie province. This was the land grant to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company. The federal government's contract made with the Syndicate in 1880 gave the Canadian Pacific Railway 25,000,000 acres of land and allowed the company to choose the land from alternate sections in townships throughout the Canadian West.<sup>98</sup> This agreement led to almost half the land in the western part of Manitoba being reserved for the railway company.<sup>99</sup> Similar land grants to the Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway, the Manitoba and North Western Railway, and the Hudson's Bay Railway<sup>100</sup> resulted in the reservation of other large blocks of land in the province. While all the railways were willing to sell their land at reasonable prices and on generous terms, the settler was not attracted to railway land as long as free land was available.<sup>101</sup>

Because of the Dominion government's lands policy, the settlement pattern in many areas of Manitoba resembled that of Upper Canada of a half century before.<sup>102</sup> There was one difference: instead of the clergy and education reserves being responsible for the chequerboard appearance of the settlement pattern, speculative land holdings, group settlement grants and railway land grants were primarily responsible for the diffusion of farms in the Canadian West. What Senator Bureau had feared would

happen in the North West had indeed materialized and problems arising from the settlement pattern would in the future haunt the politicians.

Since Crown lands were exempt from taxation and Canadian Pacific Railway lands were exempted from taxation for twenty years under the terms of the contract,<sup>103</sup> settlers, because of a narrow tax base in Manitoba, found themselves hard-pressed to provide for education and public works. In the 1880's, newcomers could not understand why they should have to shoulder the burdens of municipal and school taxation when a large and powerful corporation, with immense resources had not fulfilled its commitment to build the branch lines so necessary for the transportation of the farmers' crops to market.<sup>104</sup>

The diffusion of settlement meant high freight rates. A widely scattered agricultural community could not produce enough foodstuffs to raise the volume of traffic to the level necessary for setting lower freight rates. Until the railway lands and speculators' holdings were sold to immigrants, settlement remained scattered and freight rates high.

No question was so likely to arouse passions in the Canadian West in the nineteenth century, or for that matter in the twentieth century, as high railway freight rates.<sup>105</sup> To the Manitoba farmer, the freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, and later by other railways, were exorbitant and unjustified. The farmer did not understand that a small, widely-dispersed population, located at great distance from its markets and producing a small volume of wheat, necessitated the charging of high

freight rates if the railways were to be economically viable. All the farmer understood was that high freight rates placed a limitation on the profits derived from his endeavours.<sup>106</sup>

(v)

Although the first railway in Manitoba was completed in 1878, it was not until 1890 that the whole area south of the Assiniboine River was served with railway facilities. The settler was unconvinced that such a snail's pace in construction was, in fact, necessary. The truth was that the construction of branch lines could have proceeded more quickly if federal railways policy had been different.

Dominion railways policy was based upon two principles. First, the railway was regarded as a means of binding Confederation together.<sup>107</sup> The Canadian Pacific was the chosen instrument of this policy. But what the prairie settler needed was the transporting of his produce to markets; the construction of branch lines would fill his needs better than the completion of a transcontinental line. Without branch lines, too many farmers found themselves too far from railheads. The second objective underlying Dominion railways policy was the development of the Canadian West,<sup>108</sup> but the prairie farmer had to wait until the transcontinental railway was completed before he could expect action on the construction of branch lines. Canada simply did not have sufficient private investment capital within the country to expand railway construction, and attempts to attract outside capital had less success than the government or railway builders had hoped.<sup>109</sup> This was hardly surprising as Canada was a backwater in the context of the Western world; there were far better investment opportunities in

other areas of North America.

Since the Canadian Pacific Railway, despite the official support of the Canadian government and its massive land grants, had difficulties in finding capital, local railways were likely to encounter even more severe problems in finding financial backing. The Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway is a case in point. Chartered in 1878 and receiving a land grant from the federal government,<sup>110</sup> it had difficulties from the outset. John Christian Schultz, president of this enterprise, blamed the Canadian Pacific Railway for the failure of his company to acquire investment capital. As he wrote Sir John A. Macdonald:

Since meeting you [I] have visited Bowmanville to meet the financial Agent of the South Western R. and his correspondence shows plainly that interested parties have been the means of checking--possibly of destroying--our financial arrangements for building the road. --It seems hard that the first effort of the Syndicate should be to destroy a private enterprise which proposed to develop 295 miles of country and be a most important feeder to the CPR--<sup>111</sup>

By the summer of 1882, the Manitoba South Western was bankrupt,<sup>112</sup> defeated not by the efforts of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, but by its small size and its few connections in the capital markets of London or New York.

In fact, all local railroads chartered by the province, with or without federal land grants, were doomed to failure. Of 45 charters granted by the Manitoba Legislature between 1870 and 1900 only seven or 15.6% resulted in any construction.<sup>113</sup> And of these, only one--the Portage, Westbourne and Northwestern--survived for long. That enterprise continued until 1894 when it was absorbed into the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.<sup>114</sup>

TABLE VIII  
RAILWAYS CHARTERED  
BY THE  
PROVINCE OF MANITOBA: 1870-1901

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CHARTERS GRANTED</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CHARTERS DISALLOWED</u>	<u>NUMBER OF CHARTERS ACTED UPON</u>
1870			
1871			
1872			
1873	1		
1874	1		
1875	1		
1876			
1877			
1878			
1879			
1880	1		1
1881	4	3	
1882			
1883	9	1	
1884			
1885	1	1	1
1886	2		1
1887	6	4	
1888	5		1
1889	3		1
1890	1		
1891			
1892			
1893			
1894			
1895			
1896			
1897			
1898	2		
1899	4		2
1900	1		1

Sources: Robert Dorman, A Statutory History of the Steam and Electric Railways of Canada, 1836-1937, (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1938); Statutes of Manitoba, 1870-1900.

Provincially chartered railroads found the costs of construction heavy and the prospect of immediate returns on investment small. The provincial government could not match the generous land and money subsidies given by the federal government to the Syndicate. The province's limited financial resources were barely sufficient for the ordinary day-to-day administration of the services demanded by the populace. Since the federal government retained control of the province's natural resources, there were no provincial lands to be used as a subsidy for the construction of branch lines. Consequently, almost all Manitoba railway charters were nothing more than promises that falsely raised the expectations of farmers.

There was one practicable alternative to the Canadian Pacific Railway--the extension of the American railway network into Canada. Failing the construction of an American road in the province, a Canadian railway might tie itself into the American system, thus circumventing the effects of the federal railways policy. This would have the advantage of providing branch lines and competition to the Canadian Pacific Railway at the same time. The farmer would have the railroad network he desired and, he believed, the competition between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the American railways would have the effect of lowering freight rates.

Such a proposition was, of course, quite unacceptable if Canada was to remain a distinct economic unit in North America. The Liberal-Conservative government at Ottawa, having every intention of maintaining and strengthening Canadian economic independence, saw construction of the Canadian Pacific line as

one of the principal means towards this end.<sup>115</sup>

Nor was such a proposal any more acceptable to the Syndicate. Competition with the large established American railway companies was not relished by the corporation, as it would find itself without the financial resources to meet the challenge while completing the most ambitious construction program in railroad history. For the Canadian Pacific Railway, American competition was an open invitation to financial disaster.<sup>116</sup>

Sir John A. Macdonald accepted the reality of the situation in 1880. The contract with the Syndicate to build the Canadian Pacific Railway provided that

for twenty years from the date hereof, no line of railway shall be authorized by the Dominion Parliament to be constructed south of the Canadian Pacific Railway, from any point at or near the Canadian Pacific Railway except such line as shall run south-west or westward of south-west, nor to within fifteen miles of latitude 49.<sup>117</sup>

This provision was the controversial "monopoly clause".

The clause was misnamed. It did not provide for a complete Canadian Pacific Railway monopoly in the Canadian West. The company was given a monopoly of the carrying trade between Western Canada and the United States, although within Canada itself there was little to prevent other railway promoters from building competing lines. Indeed, the "monopoly clause" made specific provision for railways south of the Canadian Pacific main line so long as competing lines did not come within fifteen miles of the international boundary.

The real difficulty was that no other railway could raise sufficient capital to build lines in Western Canada in

competition with the Canadian Pacific Railway unless those lines were financed by American railroads. American railroads were not interested in financing railway construction in Manitoba and the North West unless they were granted access to the Canadian market. Since this access was denied them by the contract with the Syndicate, the Canadian Pacific Railway acquired a de facto monopoly in Western Canada.<sup>118</sup>

A less practical alternative to the Canadian Pacific Railway was to build a line through Canadian territory to Hudson's Bay. The project of a Hudson's Bay Railway commanded considerable support in Manitoba and two charters were granted by the Dominion to interested groups of entrepreneurs for the construction of such a line.<sup>119</sup> Despite the amalgamation of the two syndicates in 1883,<sup>120</sup> the Hudson's Bay Railway was not constructed in the nineteenth century. The brief shipping season of the northern ports which precluded any large-scale use of such a railway discouraged potential investors from risking their capital in such an enterprise.<sup>121</sup> There were also a number of technical difficulties in building a railway across permafrost.<sup>122</sup> Furthermore, any dilution of the national effort to complete the transcontinental railroad was unacceptable to the Dominion government as it did not want to find itself supporting two large-scale railway projects at the same time.<sup>123</sup> But rail connection to Hudson's Bay continued to be regarded by farmers as a panacea to Western Canada's railroad difficulties. The completion of the line in 1931, followed by its inability to attract a large volume of traffic, demonstrated that their dream was, in reality, a chimera.<sup>124</sup>

It is possible that rail communication for all Manitoba would have been completed sooner had there been no Canadian Pacific "monopoly". But cheap access to markets would have continued to elude Manitoba farmers. The American farmers provided with adequate railway connections had already discovered that fact by 1882. Railways tend towards natural local monopolies, and the only realistic solution to the problem of high transportation costs is for the government to undertake the regulation of freight rates.<sup>125</sup> Until this step was taken, high freight rates would continue to be one of the realities of farming life in the West.

In short, federal railways policy was not adequate to meet the needs of the Manitoba agricultural community. The Western Canadian farmer paid for the Dominion's decision to use the Canadian Pacific Railway as an instrument of nation-building. Branch lines were not constructed quickly because of the necessity of completing a transcontinental line, and American railways were barred from entering Canadian territory in order to protect the Canadian Pacific Railway during its first critical years.

(vi)

Federal tariff policies were no more acceptable to Manitoba farmers than Dominion railway policies. The higher tariff rates that the Macdonald government imposed in 1879 were necessary to raise the revenues that were needed to aid the Canadian Pacific Railway.<sup>126</sup> Initially, many Manitoba farmers supported this move.<sup>127</sup> They were not averse to selling their products in a protected market until they discovered that the Canadian market

was not large enough to absorb all their production. This discovery led to an abrupt volte-face, and as the poor showing of the Liberal-Conservative party in Manitoba during the election of 1882 demonstrates,<sup>128</sup> the experience of farming in the Canadian West converted many high tariff advocates into free traders.

While western development led to agrarian opposition to a high tariff, the opening of Western Canada led to Canadian industrialists demanding the maintenance of that tariff. As Vernon C. Fowke has argued, the merchants, transportation magnates and manufacturers of Central Canada wished to reserve the West for their own economic gain. They were not prepared to share this vast new hinterland with anyone, and in particular, with the American industrialists who would be the principal beneficiaries of any reduction in the Canadian tariff.<sup>129</sup>

When the Dominion government rejected the requests of Manitoba settlers for lower tariffs, it created hardships for the struggling pioneers of the West. All manufactured goods cost more in Manitoba than in Central Canada because of high transportation costs, and with the imposition of the additional burden of the tariff on manufactured goods, the cost of many necessities became exorbitant. When these expenses were applied against the low prices received for wheat in the 1880's and 1890's, the farmer believed that the federal government was discriminating against him.

This was particularly true with regard to farm implements. Manitoba agriculture was largely mechanized by 1880, and the cost of agricultural implements was an important expense that the farmer had to bear. When the settler found that he paid up to 30% more

for his agricultural implements than an American farmer who lived just a few miles away, he was dismayed.<sup>130</sup> Perhaps, the Canadian pioneer would have been willing to tolerate such a situation if the protected Canadian farm implement industry had produced equipment of good quality. Technology in Canada, however, was inferior to that in the United States, as was the system of supplying spare parts and service. Canadian-made cast iron equipment broke easily; parts were difficult to acquire; and service was poor. The Manitoba settler, therefore, purchased the better quality American implements; but because of the tariff, the cost of that equipment was not in proportion to its real value.<sup>131</sup>

(vii).

Alienation of Western farmers was further increased by Ottawa's attitude towards provincial finances. When Manitoba entered Confederation in 1870 the federal government retained control of public lands within the province. Since the sale of public lands was the most important source of revenue for any provincial government in the years immediately after Confederation,<sup>132</sup> Manitoba was left without any substantial revenues except for the federal subsidy. This subsidy was quite inadequate for a provincial government which not only had to provide for the general administration of the province, but had to provide the education facilities and the public works demanded by a rapidly expanding population.

Within three years after Confederation with Canada, it was apparent to the provincial government that the federal subsidy was inadequate to meet its responsibilities. Accordingly,

Joseph Royal led a delegation to Ottawa in 1873 in search of an increased subsidy for the province.<sup>133</sup> By the end of the 1870's such pilgrimages were an almost annual occurrence.<sup>134</sup> In spite of some re-adjustments in the subsidy to the province.<sup>135</sup> the increase in federal funds failed to keep pace with the demands placed upon the provincial government. As the Manitoba submission in 1879 argued:

The revenue at the disposal of the Government barely suffices with the most rigid economy to meet the ordinary, but absolutely necessary and imperative demands pertaining to an organized community, limiting to an entire insufficiency their efforts to meet the wants of education, the proper administration of justice, the executive functions of the Government, the duties of Legislation, and the maintenance of good order.<sup>136</sup>

Since Manitoba was a rapidly developing region, the province's needs were greater than those of the older provinces to the East. The Dominion did not recognize this fact, and it proved unwilling to make realistic re-adjustments.

In 1881, John Norquay, the Premier of Manitoba, demanded that the administration of public lands be turned over to the province.<sup>137</sup> The federal government, committed to a railway policy that involved land subsidies, refused to consider such a proposal. While it is unlikely that the Norquay government expected Ottawa to hand over the public domain, the new demand should have been construed as a sign of the increasing desperation on the part of the provincial authorities regarding the need to remedy the financial plight of Manitoba.

The conflict over the provincial subsidy which began in 1881 was to continue throughout the nineteenth century and well

into the twentieth century.<sup>138</sup> All Manitoba governments supported the rallying cry of "Provincial Rights" and all federal governments were equally determined to prevent what they regarded as unjustified raids on the federal treasury.<sup>139</sup> At the same time the lack of adequate provincial revenues caused the farming community to be thrown back on its own resources if schools were to be built, bridges constructed, and roads improved. It was clear to the farmers that relief from the tax burden they had to bear could only be attained if the federal government was more generous in its grants to the province.<sup>140</sup>

After only a few years residence in the Canadian West, immigrants--chiefly from Ontario and Great Britain--who had been convinced of the advantages of locating in Manitoba by the exaggerated claims of the immigration writers, found their expectations unfulfilled. Crop yields were not as bountiful as the newcomers had been led to believe; farm implements and supplies were dear, but wheat was cheap; the railway was slow in reaching newly-settled districts and when it finally arrived, freight rates were high; and neither schools nor public works could be financed from local taxes or provincial government grants.

The settlers identified the federal government's programs for the development of Western Canada as being at the root of the problems which which they found themselves confronted. Exaggerated expectations and difficult conditions combined to make the settlers impatient of delays in the implementation of federal programs and harsh in their condemnation of Dominion policies. Although the conditions of the Manitoba agricultural frontier were responsible

for many of the farmer's difficulties, it was the federal government which bore the brunt of the farmers' wrath when agrarian protest organizations were formed in the first prairie province.

FOOTNOTES

1. Captain G. L. Huyshe, The Red River Expedition, (London: Macmillan and Co., 1871), pp. 226-227.
2. Thomas Spence, Useful and Practical Hints for the Settler on Canadian Prairie Lands, (n.p., 1882), pp. 7-8.
3. For a discussion of the immigration policy of the Province of Canada, see Norman Macdonald, Canada: Immigration and Colonization, 1841-1903, (Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1966), especially Chapters VI and VII.
4. For a discussion of Canadian immigration policy after Confederation, see Norman Macdonald, op. cit., especially Chapters IX, XI and XII.
5. James B. Hedges, op. cit., Chapters II and IV.
6. Ibid., Chapter V.
7. Statutes of Canada, 35 Victoria, Cap. 23.
8. Canada, Debates of the Senate, May 6, 1872, p. 359.
9. Census of Manitoba, 1870.
10. Census of Canada, 1901.
11. Census of Manitoba, 1870.
12. Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
13. Census of Canada, 1901.
14. Ibid.
15. See W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, Chapters VII to X, for a discussion of the development of Manitoba into a British and Canadian province.
16. Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
17. Ibid., see Table V.
18. Census of Canada, 1901.
19. Ibid., see Table VI.
20. Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
21. Census of Canada, 1901.

22. Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
23. See Table VII.
24. Basil Williams, The Whig Supremacy 1714-1760, (Oxford: the Clarendon Press, 1962), p. 106.
25. Ontario Agricultural Commission, Report of the Commissioners, (Toronto: C. Blackett Robinson, 1881), pp. 382-386.
26. A. H. Reginald Buller, op. cit., p. 43; E. K. Francis, In Search of Utopia: The Mennonites in Manitoba, (Altona: D. W. Friesen & Sons, 1955), p. 116.
27. W. L. Morton, op. cit., p. 207.
28. Dr. John P. Pennefather, Thirteen Years on the Prairies, (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co. Ltd., 1892), p. 18.
29. Although somewhat later, A. G. Street contrasted the agricultural techniques of the West and Great Britain. He found that the principal difference was the lack of extensive hired labour in Manitoba. A. G. Street, Farmer's Glory, (London: Faber & Faber Limited, 1936), p. 146.
30. W. L. Morton, op. cit., p. 207; A. G. Bradley, Canada in the Twentieth Century, (London: Archibald Constable & Co. Ltd. 1905), pp. 288-289.
31. Mrs. Cecil Hall, A Lady's Life on a Farm in Manitoba, (London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1884), p. 171.
32. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M. G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, Part 2, T. Mayne Daly to Macdonald, December 16, 1883, 191552-191572.
33. Abstract Book No. 4, Brandon Land Titles Office, Brandon, Manitoba. See, in particular, instruments No. 6039 and 10328.
34. /Edward Holmes, Letters from a Young Emigrant in Manitoba, (London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co., 1883), pp. 70-75.
35. Ibid., pp. 152-153.
36. P.A.M., Settlement and Pioneers Collection, John J. Leach to Alfred Atkinson, April 18, 1894.
37. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M. G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, Part 2, T. Mayne Daly to Macdonald, December 16, 1883, 191552-191572.

38. Ibid., Minedosa Tribune, March 14, 1884, p. 2; Unnumbered Abstract Book, Boissevain Land Titles Office, Boissevain, Manitoba.
39. E. K. Francis, op. cit., pp. 55, 62 and 112-113; Vladimir J. Kaye, Early Ukrainian Settlements in Canada, 1895-1900, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1964), Chapters V, VI, VII and VIII.
40. W. H. Lindal, The Icelanders in Canada, (Ottawa and Winnipeg: National Publishers Limited and Viking Printers, 1967), pp. 113-138.
41. E. K. Francis, op. cit., pp. 28-36.
42. W. J. Lindal, op. cit., p. 76.
43. Dr. J. Oleskow to the Department of the Interior, Ottawa, March 16, 1895, as quoted in Vladimir J. Kaye, op. cit., p. 3.
44. Norman Macdonald, op. cit., pp. 114 and 149.
45. For example, see Alfred O. Legge, Sunny Manitoba: Its People and Industries, (London: T Fisher Unwin, 1893); Captain Edmund Goodridge, A Year in Manitoba, (London: W. & R. Chamber, 1882).
46. /David Currie/, The Letters of Rusticus, (Montreal: John Dougall & Son, 1880), p. 1.
47. /L. O. Armstrong/, Southern Manitoba and Turtle Mountain Country, (n. p., /1880/), p. 15.
48. /Anonymous/, Manitoba: The Prairie Province, the Finest Agricultural Country in the World, (Winnipeg: Department of Agriculture and Immigration, 1890), p. 6.
49. Alexander Begg, Practical Hand-Book, p. 44; Thomas Spence, Manitoba and the North West of the Dominion, Its Resources and Advantages to the Emigrant and Capitalist, As Compared with the Western States of America, (Quebec: S. Marcotte, 1876), p. 25.
50. Toronto Globe, March 28, 1869, as printed in W. L. Morton, ed., Alexander Begg's Red River Journal and Other Papers Relative to the Red River Resistance of 1869-1870, (New York: Greenwood Press, 1969), p. 407.
51. Alexander Begg, Practical Hand-Book, p. 58.
52. John Macoun, Manitoba and the Great North West, (Guelph: The World Publishing Company, 1882), pp. 207-208.

53. Ibid.; Alexander Begg, Practical Hand-Book, p. 58.
54. John Macoun, op. cit., pp. 207-208.
55. Alexander Begg, Practical Hand-Book, p. 72.
56. Thomas Spence, Canada: The Resources & Future Greatness of Her Great North-West Prairie Lands, (Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1886), p. 6.
57. /Anonymous/, Manitoba: The Prairie Province, pp. 19-20.
58. See above Chapter I, Table II.
59. James Mavor, op. cit., p. 61.
60. Thomas Spence, Manitoba and the North-West of the Dominion, p. 30.
61. Ibid., pp. 31-33.
62. Alexander Begg, Practical Hand-Book, pp. 109-110.
63. John Macoun, op. cit., pp. 220-224.
64. /Anonymous/, Manitoba: The Prairie Province, p. 21.
65. J. C. Hamilton, The Prairie Province, (Toronto: Belford Brothers, 1876), p. 63.
66. Charles Cliffe, op. cit., p. 72.
67. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 1.
68. Charles Cliffe, op. cit., p. 73.
69. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 1.
70. James Trow, Manitoba and North-West Territories, (Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1878), p. 87; Thomas Spence, Manitoba and the North-West of the Dominion, p. 27; Acton Burrows, North-Western Canada, A Practical Guide to the Fertile Regions of Manitoba and the North West Territories, (Winnipeg: H. S. Donaldson & Brother, 1880), p. 76; Thomas Moore, A Tour Through Canada, in 1879; To Which is Appended a Report on Manitoba, Specially Compiled from the Reports of the Farmers' Delegates from Great Britain, (Dublin: The Irish Farmer Office, 1880), p. 40; Henry Tanner, Successful Emigration to Canada, (Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1885), p. 18; Canada, Manitoba and the Northwest, (Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1887),

pp. 7-8; C. Cliffe, op. cit., pp 28-29; Dominion of Canada Manitoba and the North-West, the Great Wheat Fields and Stock-Raising Districts of Canada, (Montreal: 1879), p. 15.

71. See for example the testimonials in the Manitoba Colonist, February, 1889, pp. 375-376; May, 1890, n.p.; February, 1897, n.p.
72. See for example, /Anonymous/, Manitoba: The Prairie Province, p. 20; Acton Burrows, op. cit., pp. 82-84; Thomas Spence, Useful and Practical Hints for the Settler, p. 20.
73. Acton Burrows, op. cit., p. 40.
74. Thomas Moore, op. cit., p. 40; James Trow, op. cit., pp. 75-76.
75. /L. O. Armstrong/, op. cit., p. 11.
76. Canada, Debates of the House of Commons, June 7, 1872, p. 1046.
77. Canada, Debates of the Senate, May 6, 1872, p. 359.
78. Statutes of Canada, 35 Victoria, Cap. 23.
79. School districts were gradually established in the outlying districts beginning in the mid-1870's. Only a handful of municipalities were established prior to 1881, when provincial legislation created a province-wide system of municipal government.
80. Manitoba Lands Branch, Township Registers R-5W and R-6W.
81. Abstract Book 5-5, 5-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.
82. Whether government lands officials were simply ignorant or whether they were dishonest is almost impossible to determine. The settlers who found themselves in conflict with the lands officials, of course, accused them of dishonesty. See for example, /Edward Holmes/, op. cit., p. 131; H. H. Barnes, Journal of a Trip to Manitoba and Back, (Halifax: J. W. Daly, 1879), p. 12.
83. See Lillian F. Gates, The Land Policies of Upper Canada, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1968), for a discussion of the problems attending military bounty grants in Upper Canada.
84. Manitoba Free Press, January 17, 1887, p. 2.
85. Canada, The Statistical Year-Book of Canada, 1902.
86. /Edward Holmes/, op. cit., p. 131.

87. Ibid., pp. 128-129.
88. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 48.
89. See the map in A. S. Morton, op. cit., pp. 46-47, for the location of the Metis reserves.
90. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 49.
91. Ibid.
92. The Commercial, February 13, 1888, n. p.
93. Ibid.
94. A. G. Bradley, op. cit., pp. 259-260.
95. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 35.
96. C. A. Dawson, Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1936), pp. 107 and 117.
97. Ibid., pp. 107 and 119.
98. James B. Hedges, op. cit., pp. 21-25.
99. See the map in James B. Hedges, op. cit., facing p. 39.
100. Statutes of Canada, 43 Victoria, Cap. 53; 45 Victoria, Cap. 80; 47 Victoria, Cap. 25, Sec. 7.
101. John Warkentin and Richard I. Ruggles, Manitoba Historical Atlas, (Winnipeg: The Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, 1970), pp. 328-329.
102. For a discussion of settlement patterns in Upper Canada, see Gerald M. Craig, Upper Canada: The Formative Years, 1784-1841, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1963), Chapters II and VII.
103. Statutes of Canada, 44 Victoria, Cap.1.
104. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 208.
105. For a discussion of the freight rate question in Western Canada, see D. A. MacGibbon, Railway Rates and the Canadian Railway Commission, (Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917).
106. For the effect of freight rates upon local wheat prices see above Chapter I, Table IV.
107. Vernon C. Fowke, The National Policy and the Wheat Economy, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957), pp. 48-49.

108. Ibid., p. 57.
109. H. A. Innis, op. cit., Chapter III; G. P. de T. Glazebrook, A History of Transportation in Canada, Volume II, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1964), pp. 72-90.
110. Statutes of Canada, 43 Victoria, Cap. 53.
111. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1.(b), Vol. 264, J. C. Schultz to Macdonald, January 15, 1881, 119952-119955.
112. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 209.
113. See Table VIII.
114. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 209.
115. Vernon C. Fowke, op. cit., p. 48; James A. Jackson, "The Disallowance of Manitoba Railway Legislation in the 1880's", (Unpublished M. A. thesis, University of Manitoba, 1945), pp. 26-27.
116. Peter B. Waite, Canada 1874-1896: Arduous Destiny, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971), pp. 126-127.
117. Statutes of Canada, 44 Victoria, Cap. 1.
118. On the attempts of American railways to penetrate the Canadian West, see William J. Wilgus, The Railway Interrelations of the United States and Canada, (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937), Chapter VI.
119. Statutes of Canada, 43 Victoria, Cap. 57; 43 Victoria, Cap. 59.
120. Statutes of Canada, 46 Victoria, Cap. 69.
121. G. P. de T. Glazebrook, op. cit., p. 190.
122. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume III, (Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Company, 1895), pp. 436-438.
123. Brandon Sun, February 28, 1884, p. 1.
124. G. P. de T. Glazebrook, op. cit., pp. 191-192; a useful study of the Hudson's Bay Railway is H. Fleming, Canada's Arctic Outlet, (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957).
125. John D. Hicks, The Populist Revolt: A History of the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party, (University of Nebraska Press, 1961), pp. 60-74.

126. Vernon C. Fowke, op. cit., pp. 63-68.
127. P.A.M., John Christian Schultz Collection, John Gunn to Schultz, March 29, 1878.
128. Vernon C. Fowke, Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern, (Toronto: The University of Toronto Press, 1946), pp. 259-262.
129. Ibid., p. 261.
130. Peter B. Waite, op. cit., p. 125.
131. Nellie McClung, Clearing in the West, (Toronto: Thomas Allen Limited, 1964), p. 131; Merrill Denison, Harvest Triumphant: The Story of Massey-Harris, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1948), pp. 70-72.
132. Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book I, pp. 40 and 44-45.
133. Manitoba, Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1874, Appendix.
134. Delegations to Ottawa in search of an increased subsidy were sent in 1878, 1879, 1880, 1881, 1884, 1885 and 1886.
135. See J. A. Maxwell, Federal Subsidies to the Provincial Governments of Canada, (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), pp. 77-89.
136. Manitoba, Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1881 Appendix, pp. c-cl.
137. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume II, pp. 368-370.
138. For a discussion of the question of the provincial subsidy see Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book I.
139. See J. A. Maxwell, op. cit., Chapters VIII and X.
140. Canada, Sessional Papers, XV (10), No. 82; David Currie op. cit., p. 56.

### CHAPTER III

#### GREAT EXPECTATIONS

Between 1878 and 1882, the pace of settlement and of agricultural development in the Canadian West quickened to culminate in the great Manitoba Boom of 1881-1882. As the settlement frontier pushed rapidly westward across the plains, the postage-stamp province expanded territorially; towns and cities were laid out and businesses were founded; railways were constructed and more were projected; hordes of immigrants disembarked from the sternwheeled steamships at Winnipeg, Emerson and Morris or alighted from railway carriages at the St. Boniface terminus of the Pembina Branch railway. All this activity and development, seemed to augur a happy future for the inhabitants of the first prairie province. Such was not to be the case.

The immigrants who arrived in Manitoba in the first decade after its Confederation with Canada came with expectations that could not be met. Immigrants who planned to be farmers or to enter business in one of the towns or cities that were springing up overnight, had all been attracted to the province because of the opportunities that they assumed existed in the "New Canaan". The collapse of the Manitoba Boom in the spring of 1882 and the failure of the wheat crop in the autumn of 1883, combined with generally depressed economic conditions in Canada as a whole, abruptly ended the illusions of the newcomers and proved to be the impetus for protest. Manitobans blamed the federal government for their misfortunes and organized to petition that government to change

policies which they believed were responsible for their unhappy economic circumstances.

(i)

The first seven years after Confederation with Canada were years of steady but unspectacular and disappointing growth in population.<sup>1</sup> Anglo-Saxon immigration from Ontario and Great Britain was little more than a trickle from 1870 to the end of 1877. While the number of Anglo-Saxon settlers remained fairly constant and the bulk of newcomers were farmers from Ontario "a good number of whom were in easy circumstances",<sup>2</sup> many of the newcomers after 1874, when work began on the Pembina Branch railway, were transitory labourers who came to seek employment with the construction gangs and who left once the line was completed.<sup>3</sup> Only the heavy Mennonite migration from the steppes of Russia to Manitoba--over 6,000 members of the Pacifist sect found their way to the Canadian prairies between 1874 and 1876--<sup>4</sup> served partially to conceal the lack of appeal that the Canadian West held for intending immigrants.

At the time the small migration from Ontario and the United Kingdom was blamed upon the effects of the general economic depression which began with the collapse of the Northern Pacific Railway in the United States in 1873 as well as upon the grasshopper plagues which descended upon the province in 1874, 1875 and 1876.<sup>5</sup> But the underlying reason was the lack of rail communication. During the 1870's an estimated 505,000 persons left the Dominion, chiefly for the agricultural frontier in the Mid-West and the industrial centres of the United States.<sup>6</sup> This massive exodus from Canada would not have occurred if the Canadian North West had been more

TABLE IX

IMMIGRATION TO MANITOBA 1870-1883<sup>1</sup>

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>IMMIGRANTS</u>	<u>YEAR</u>	<u>IMMIGRANTS</u>
1870 <sup>2</sup>		1877	6,511
1871 <sup>3</sup>	136	1878	7,401
1872	1,400	1879 <sup>5</sup>	3,488
1873	1,256	1880	10,180
1874	3,016	1881	23,586
1875	6,034	1882	69,332
1876 <sup>4</sup>	2,572	1883	44,223

---

1. All figures are simply estimates as no attempt was made to actually count immigrants to Manitoba.

2. No statistics available.

3. Immigrants by way of the Dawson route only.

4. Number of immigrants accomodated at government immigration sheds.

5. Eight months only.

---

Source: Annual Reports of the Department of Agriculture, 1871-1884. Estimates given by immigration agents at Winnipeg, Emerson and Duluth.

---

accessible. Men and women, intent upon settling on a new agricultural frontier, chose the regions which had railway communication and ignored Manitoba which seemed destined to wait for some time before railways would be constructed.

The railway had been promised in 1871 as one of the terms upon which British Columbia entered Confederation. In 1872, the Canadian Pacific contract was awarded to a Syndicate headed by Sir Hugh Allan, but in 1873, the Pacific Scandal put an end to the project and to the government which sponsored it. The new Prime Minister, Alexander Mackenzie, adopted a more cautious railway policy, although he promised Manitoba a railway outlet to the United States. In 1874 the first sod was turned on the Pembina Branch line.<sup>7</sup> Work proceeded so slowly, however, that it was not until 1877 that the first locomotive and rolling stock arrived in Winnipeg aboard a barge. Only then did rail communication to the outside world seem imminent. When the first train pulled into St. Boniface from Pembina in 1878, the railway age had finally arrived on the Canadian prairies.

Delays in establishing rail connection led to widespread discontent in the rural areas of the province. Immigrants arriving in Manitoba had assumed that the whole province would soon be served with rail communication and many had located along proposed rights of way.<sup>8</sup> After a year or two of waiting, they realized that the railway would take time to reach them and that there was no guarantee of construction on projected lines. When they discovered the state of railway development in the province, some of the newcomers left Manitoba,<sup>9</sup> while others awaiting the coming of the

railway were often embittered by the hand that fate had dealt them. A stock farmer by the name of Shannon expressed what many of the settlers must have believed. When told by a Montreal Gazette reporter that the railway would reach the Palestine settlement in the near future, he replied "That's live horse and you'll get grass." As far as he was concerned, "the trouble with farmers here is that they are being humbugged with promises."<sup>10</sup>

The federal lands policy was attacked for setting aside so much land for the Mennonites and half-breeds. There were "great complaints" in the Pembina Mountain district about the idle lands in the Western Mennonite reserve which bordered that district. In contrast to the Mennonites, Canadians had to go as far west as Rock Lake to find lands that were open for settlement.<sup>11</sup> As for the half-breed lands, the government expected that many settlers would purchase them for reasonable prices.<sup>12</sup> But real estate speculators who were willing to pay prices above those which farmers were willing to meet, effectively withdrew these lands from the market.<sup>13</sup>

Another grievance that was keenly felt was the shortage of timber for building purposes. The federal government tried to conserve what forested land there was in the agricultural districts by restricting woodlot grants to forty acres each.<sup>14</sup> In some areas this policy had not been implemented soon enough and a few individuals monopolized the timber available for building purposes. These individuals were quick to take advantage of their opportunities to sell timber at prices which newcomers believed to be outrageous.<sup>15</sup>

Many of the pioneers who had arrived in the first years

of settlement and who had expected to profit from immigration in later years, were disappointed. New settlers at first created a local market for seed grain, draught animals and other livestock, but that market did not last long. The sudden arrival of many settlers in a district in a single season often stimulated the production of surplus agricultural products and caused a decline in prices in a year's time.<sup>16</sup>

The vehicle chosen to express the settlers' frustrations was the Patrons of Husbandry or Grange. An American organization, the Grange had entered Canada in 1873 and by 1877 was strongly entrenched in the rural areas of Ontario and Quebec.<sup>17</sup> A social club as well as a self-improvement society and a protest organization, the Grange busied itself by educating farmers in improved agricultural techniques and by petitioning the provincial and federal governments for redress of grievances.<sup>18</sup> When Ontario citizens decided to emigrate to Manitoba, they took the Grange along with them. By 1876, a number of lodges were established in the province, principally in the Gladstone district.<sup>19</sup>

None of the early lodges were formed as a political protest. The rural Granges were social organizations which had the added advantage of allowing the farmer to learn something of improved agricultural techniques.<sup>20</sup> Given the long Manitoba winters and the isolation of the settlers, any excuse for a social gathering was regarded as a blessing; the Grange meetings provided the excuse that the pioneers wanted.

The Grange evolved into a protest organization in December, 1877, when a new lodge was organized at High Bluff. The lodge was

founded to protest economic conditions in the province, the reasons given being:

that the merchants of Winnipeg, taking advantage of the isolated conditions of the country, make the prices of their own goods and the farmers' grain too. This they (the farmers) consider is not fair; and as they heard the Winnipeg merchants have leagued together for their own benefit, a league for the benefit of the farmer was the least they could do in self-defense. Many have become grangers who never would have thought of it, had we had rail connection.<sup>21</sup>

To the farmers of High Bluff what was needed was the completion of a railway west from Winnipeg, "and if demonstrations, reasonings, talkings, speeches and mass meetings will do any good, we shall stand a good chance of getting it." Accordingly, the Grange organized a series of mass meetings on the railway question where speeches were heard, demands made, and petitions signed.<sup>22</sup>

The protest which began at High Bluff spread slowly. Although another new subordinate lodge was established at Headingley in 1878,<sup>23</sup> that was as far as the protest extended. No doubt many settlers in the province sympathized with the decision of the High Bluff residents to seek redress of grievances, but they did not organize to add the weight of their numbers to the protest. The diffused settlement pattern in the newer districts of the province where settlers were isolated from one another, and the promise of the newly formed provincial government of John Norquay to "encourage local effort in the direction of railway construction"<sup>24</sup> contributed to the failure of protest to spread. More important, when spring arrived in 1878, the whole of the western North American agricultural frontier was bustling in preparation for the next westward thrust of civilization.

For the first time in years, immigrants began to arrive on the North American frontier in large numbers and with their arrival, business conditions began to improve in the small prairie towns and cities, many of which had been languishing.<sup>25</sup> Once the rush to the agricultural frontier began, it gathered momentum. Reports by Dakota and Nebraska "boosters" of the rapid development of agriculture on the plains and good crops in 1878 and 1879 heightened the land fever that gripped North America in the spring of 1878. By the beginning of 1880, the fever was turning into a full-scale boom.<sup>26</sup>

Manitoba shared in this continental excitement. As many as 7,000 immigrants found their way to Manitoba during the spring and summer of 1878.<sup>27</sup> Most of these newcomers were from the eastern provinces and "were of a superior class, ...well provided with means, sufficient to stock and start upon their farms".<sup>28</sup> As the summer wore on, settlements were begun at Pembina River, Cypress River, Rock Lake and Turtle Mountain along the international boundary, and at Rapid City and Minnedosa along the Saskatchewan trail. In the older settled districts vacant lands were occupied and the original settlers were encouraged to make local improvements. J. E. Tetu, the immigration agent at Dufferin, reported that in the Pembina Mountain district "steam threshing machines, stores, blacksmith shops, a grist mill, saw mill, etc. etc. have been erected during the present year."<sup>29</sup> The towns benefited from the increased immigration as well. Emerson saw "churches, stores, grist mills, machine shops of all kinds, hotels and numerous private residences" built during the course of the year.<sup>30</sup> Winnipeg burgeoned to

7,000 souls, although much of the population was transient, and the tempo of business in the provincial capital increased.<sup>31</sup>

The period of rapid growth beginning in 1878 continued in the succeeding years. Immigration remained high in 1879 and 1880 with up to 20,000 persons arriving over the recently completed Pembina Branch line.<sup>32</sup> Settlers pushed the agricultural frontier as far west as Russell in the North West Territories and invaded the Souris plains to the south west. The population of Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie, Emerson and Selkirk swelled, while ambitious hamlets like Crystal City, Millford, Birtle, Dominion City and Pilot Mound were founded.<sup>33</sup> By the end of 1880, the Manitoba "fever" was gradually being transformed into the great Manitoba Boom.

(11)

The Boom was created by the start of large-scale railway construction in the West. In 1880, the Canadian government signed a contract with a new Syndicate headed by George Stephen of the Bank of Montreal to build the Canadian Pacific Railway. Within Manitoba, the Dominion had already commenced building a line west from Winnipeg; the Syndicate continued that project with renewed vigour. By the end of the year, the railway was open between Winnipeg and Portage la Prairie.<sup>34</sup> The Portage, Westbourne and Northwestern and the Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway contributed to the railway excitement by making plans to begin laying track in 1881. It was confidently expected that the Manitoba South Western would reach the Boyne River and that the Portage, Westbourne and Northwestern would reach Gladstone by the end of

that year.<sup>35</sup>

All this railway activity and the promise of more to come in the immediate future--if the charters passed by the Legislature during its 1881 spring sitting meant anything--<sup>36</sup> caused immigration to increase. Ten thousand immigrants arrived during 1880 and by March, 1881, Winnipeg and Emerson were jammed with prospective settlers and thousands more were waiting for the winter to end so they could begin their search for choice locations.<sup>37</sup> Not all the newcomers were looking for farm land; some took a more speculative approach. A shrewdly located homestead or the purchase of a quarter section from a resident anywhere along the projected railways could make a man very wealthy if a townsite and station were located on or near his holdings. Even in those towns and villages that had been founded in the 1870's, there was a feeling of excitement.<sup>38</sup>

The first stage of the Manitoba Boom began in December, 1880, when the Canadian Pacific lines on either side of the Red River were joined by the Louise Bridge connecting St. Boniface and Winnipeg.<sup>39</sup> Early in 1881, some lots were placed on sale near the newly completed Canadian Pacific station. They sold for unheard of prices,<sup>40</sup> and before long, Winnipeg property was selling at grossly inflated figures.

Initially, the Boom was confined to Winnipeg speculators. Throughout the spring, real estate rose in value, rents began to climb, and newspaper advertisements for auctions of lots became increasingly common.<sup>41</sup> The fever began to increase as more immigrants found their way to the city to purchase supplies before heading west to find land, and as the season's railway construction got underway.

In June the second phase of the Boom commenced. The founding of the "city" of Brandon was the stimulus for the expansion of the Boom from Winnipeg into other areas of the province. Within weeks of Brandon's founding, one traveller noted:

Brandon is one of those miracles of mushroom growth that springs up as if by magic in scarcely more than a single night at favourable points along a new railroad. ...In a few days the railroad company was \$120,000 richer and several hundred enterprising speculators had town lots on their hands which cost them from \$70 to \$400 apiece.<sup>42</sup>

Very few of those new landowners lost money on their original investment. The price of lots continued to rise in Brandon and before long, the instant "city" which had no permanent buildings was circled with "suburbs" for whose lots there were eager buyers.<sup>43</sup>

Throughout the summer with continued railway construction, increased immigration, and the examples of the new wealth accumulated by speculators in Winnipeg and Brandon to spur others on, the Boom increased in tempo. By the end of August, reports of fabulous sales were filling the columns of newspapers. One speculator cleared \$10,000 and a second cleared from \$30,000 to \$40,000 in a single day from the sale of land near the Canadian Pacific freight sheds in Winnipeg.<sup>44</sup> T. C. Mewburn, the inspector of customs for Canada, summed up the situation in Winnipeg: "there is a perfect land fever raging in the Province at the present time; and so great is the influx of people that the hotels cannot begin to supply accommodation."<sup>45</sup>

With the onset of autumn, the Boom began to gather momentum. No longer was the real estate mania confined to property in existing

centres. The towns of Niagara on the Assiniboine,<sup>46</sup> Walkerton, described as "becoming the county town of Dufferin county",<sup>47</sup> and Pomeroy, "a great railway centre" on Tobacco Creek<sup>48</sup> were all enthusiastically boomed and their lots sold at ever higher prices, although nothing was to become of these paper towns.

Strange visions clouded the minds of the citizens of established towns. Morris began to think of itself as the future railway centre for the North West.<sup>49</sup> The village had been established as a stage stop in the days before the railway,<sup>50</sup> and although it had grown into a small town, it really had no prospects. Located on a flood plain, and surrounded by marshes, it lacked a hinterland and railway connections. Yet, the village businessmen seriously spoke of its rivalling Winnipeg as the entrepot of the Canadian North West.<sup>51</sup>

The Boom was gradually entering its third and final phase. The real estate frenzy became a highly contagious disease that made sober men delirious and led them to act upon advice that they would normally have ignored. On January 13, 1883, for example, C. P. Brown, a Cabinet minister in the provincial government and general manager of the Portage Westbourne and Northwestern, cautioned the public against buying Woodside lots as the townsite was not located where the lots were being sold.<sup>52</sup> The following day it was announced that the townsite of Woodside had been sold for \$8,000 with the original owner clearing something like \$5,000.<sup>53</sup>

Railways were drawn on maps where none existed and where none were to exist. Rapid City, which was on none of the projected lines of companies holding charters, was described in a real estate

advertisement as the "Minneapolis of the North-West".<sup>54</sup> Not one of the six railways listed by the promoter was ever built, nor for that matter were any of the six ever to receive a charter! Similarly, an advertisement for Garfield--a station on the Canadian Pacific Railway 24 miles west of Winnipeg--announced that the Manitoba and Rapid City Railway and the Garfield, Woodland and Oak Point Railway would have their junction with the Canadian Pacific at the new townsite.<sup>55</sup> The response to the sale of Garfield lots was so heartening that the real estate dealer prepared a second sale of "Villa lots" in "North Garfield", a paper suburb of a paper town, for the capitalists and merchants who were to inhabit this new metropolis.<sup>56</sup>

Not all Manitobans were infected with the fever and some even tried to warn their fellow citizens of the perils that they faced. One enterprising gentleman investigated the claims of real estate promoters regarding Cartwright, a hamlet in southwestern Manitoba. After travelling to the village, he returned to Winnipeg to inform the Times that advertisements were fraudulent in claiming that "shops, mills, schoolhouse, churches, etc." were in existence. These claims were the "merest castles in the air."<sup>57</sup> Such warnings had no noticeable effect on the Boom.

Outside the province, there were those who watched the strange happenings in Manitoba with concern and attempted to dampen the mounting enthusiasm for western land that was beginning to affect all of Canada. The Monetary Times described what was taking place in the prairie province as:

Such a saturnalia of speculation as the operators have revelled in, the brilliant imagination of Dickens, sharpened by the sight of some American Edens, never conceived. Nothing like it ever occurred out of Bedlam.<sup>58</sup>

In the editors' opinion, anyone "with the least grain of sense" could see "how artificial it all was."<sup>59</sup> When this warning fell on deaf ears, The Monetary Times repeated its theme. This time the warning was even more explicit: "The North-West is not to be built up by speculation in village lots, though its progress may, in that way, be greatly retarded."<sup>60</sup>

The fever continued to spread: it reached Rapid City in mid-January, 1882;<sup>61</sup> Stonewall, Minnedosa and High Bluff in the first week of February;<sup>62</sup> and Crystal City, Norquay and Millford at the beginning of March.<sup>63</sup> In each instance, rumours of railway connection stimulated the Boom; local entrepreneurs laid out and sold subdivisions to accommodate the vastly increased population that was expected to arrive with the railway.<sup>64</sup>

In 1882, real estate promoters began to deal in farm lands. Agricultural land had not interested dealers previously, probably because of the vast tracts held for speculative purposes in the Half-Breed reserves, which if thrown on the market, would have depressed prices, and because of the still large quantities of free land available in the North West from the Crown. Encouraged by the Boom psychology that permeated the province, and by large sales of Hudson's Bay Company and Canadian Pacific Railway property, dealers gradually began to dabble in farm lands.<sup>65</sup> By the end of January, there was a full-scale boom in agricultural land. Some farms changed hands at fabulous prices. William Nimmons of Little Stoney Mountain

sold his farm for \$175 per acre;<sup>66</sup> George O'Brien sold three-quarters of a section at Plum Coulee for \$8,000;<sup>67</sup> and a Mr. Cowan of Minnedosa refused \$15,000 for 300 acres, holding out for \$18,000.<sup>68</sup>

Most of the farm land finding its way onto the market appears to have been owned by non-farmers. The majority of the province's agricultural settlers were skeptical of the real estate dealers and their talk of the sky being the limit. The farmers had come west to cultivate the land, and the natural caution of the yeomen for get-rich-quick schemes combined with the isolation of the rural areas, insulated them from the worst excesses of the Boom. As one correspondent reported from Norquay: "The whisper of the land boom has reached here, and agricultural lands, with improved farms, are now fetching up to twenty dollars an acre, farmers are showing no eagerness to part with them at that price,..."<sup>69</sup>

The fever finally broke in April, 1882, when Edmonton town lots placed on the market failed to find a buyer. Real estate speculators, sensing a change for the worse in the market, began to sell off their property.<sup>70</sup> Before long panic set in and the bottom fell out of the real estate trade. No buyers could be found except at such low prices that the speculators were ruined if they sold their holdings and ruined if they did not. Slowly the auctioneers and realtors closed their shops and halls.<sup>71</sup> By June there were only 16 firms dealing in real estate advertising in the Daily Times,<sup>72</sup> whereas in February there had been 54.<sup>73</sup> The Boom had ended.

The underlying weakness in the Boom was the availability of land. It made little sense to invest in land when there were millions of acres still available for homesteading in 1882, and millions more for sale by the Canadian Pacific Railway at far more reasonable prices than the Winnipeg realtors were asking.<sup>74</sup> As the railways were built across the plains--the Canadian Pacific line extended into the North West Territories and the Portage, Westbourne and Northwestern reached Minnedosa by 1882--<sup>75</sup> new areas were opened for settlement and the land values in already settled regions of the prairies were depressed.

Manitoba's towns and cities were commercial centres whose only purposes were to supply the rural residents' needs and provide them with market facilities for surplus farm production. But their citizens had unrealistic expectations of villages growing into large, important industrial cities which would export manufactured goods to Eastern Canada, the United States and Europe.<sup>76</sup> The rapid changes in industrial organization and technology which were effecting a revolution in manufacturing in older centres of population, excluded Western Canada from competing for markets and doomed the western towns to be commercial rather than industrial centres.

Moreover, the coming of the railway proved to be a mixed blessing to more than one town. The existence of a townsite was no guarantee that the railway company would establish a station at the site.<sup>77</sup> Nor did the opening of rail communication necessarily lead to an increase in a town's population. The railways established stations every six to ten miles with the

result that railway hamlets drained larger villages and towns of their population and businesses.

Neither the towns nor the agricultural areas had the economic foundation to support the Boom for long because the Manitoba agricultural frontier produced only one product which found a ready market. Beginning in 1880, wheat production surpassed the local needs of the province and large exports became necessary to sustain the economic well-being of the farmers and townspeople. The price received for wheat exported did not justify the wide-spread speculation that gripped Manitoba in 1881-1882. In the autumn of 1881--at the height of the Boom--the very best grades of wheat commanded from 75¢ to 90¢ per bushel with the bulk of the year's crop commanding considerably less.<sup>78</sup> Given the high freight rates and the heavy costs of farm supplies, the profit margin the farmer enjoyed was not very wide. The real estate dealers, under the circumstances, were hardly justified in predicting a glorious future for the province.

(iii)

The end of the Boom did not immediately lead to a general economic depression in the province. Although thousands of settlers left in the summer of 1882, immigration remained strong in both 1882 and 1883: an estimated 69,332 immigrants arrived in 1882,<sup>79</sup> and 44,223 arrived in 1883,<sup>80</sup> (as compared with 23,586 arrivals in 1881 at the height of the Boom).<sup>81</sup> While the number of cancellations of homestead applications increased, the number of homesteads and pre-emptions for which applications were made did not fall off until 1883,<sup>82</sup> and it was not until 1885, when a general economic depression

prevailed throughout Canada, that the number of applications for homesteads and pre-emptions dropped dramatically.<sup>83</sup> Wholesale and retail trade--an indicator of economic conditions--remained strong throughout 1882. Farm equipment dealers in Brandon reported sales totalling \$342,709 in 1882<sup>84</sup> and \$387,868 in 1883,<sup>85</sup> while The Commercial commented in November, 1882, "that trade in the Winnipeg merchants'7 different branches has been more prosperous and certainly has shown much greater indication of permanence and solidity since the collapse of the real estate fever than it did during its height."<sup>86</sup>

One economic consequence of the collapse of the Boom was that it caused the banks to suspend credit to Manitoba businessmen. Several of the major financial institutions in the country suffered sufficiently to look upon the prairie province's businessmen as very poor risks. The Imperial Bank of Canada with branches at Winnipeg and Brandon was especially hard hit. President H. S. Howland, at the Bank's annual meeting in 1883, informed the shareholders that the "commercial interests of the North-West Provinces had during the year suffered in consequence of excessive speculation in real estate and over-importation of goods."<sup>87</sup> Two years later, he revealed that what he really had meant to say was that the Bank was over-extended in its operations in Western Canada:

The depression in Manitoba became intensified during the year and a further depreciation in the value of all securities in the Province was the result, rendering it advisable...to apply a portion of the Reserve Fund to cover such depreciation and to provide for contingencies.<sup>88</sup>

It was a clear case of inadequate security and vanishing assets.

The Bank of Commerce had a similar experience, although

it did not have a single branch in the West before 1893.<sup>89</sup> In 1886, Senator William McMaster told his shareholders the bad news.

The parties were uniformly reported to be highly respectable, and to be possessed of large means,... It was, however, discovered that during the period of wild speculation in the North-West, they had become parties to large ventures in Winnipeg property and North-west land and land securities, and had used the Bank's means for these purposes. Upon the demand of the Bank the debtors furnished security principally on real estate in Manitoba and Ontario, which to all appearance at the time afforded reasonable margin over and above the Bank's claim. But the utter collapse of values in the North-west, and the depreciation that ensued in the price of property in the western part of Ontario, especially towns, rendered the process of liquidation tedious and very disappointing, and the ultimate result was that a considerable loss has been sustained.<sup>90</sup>

The Senator congratulated the bank's shareholders for declining to extend operations into the West, and noted that this policy had saved the bank from "direct losses in Manitoba", but he lamented "we have not entirely escaped the unfortunate results."<sup>91</sup> It is apparent that McMaster had little confidence in the Canadian prairies as a place to invest the Bank's money.

Because no banker, saddled with poor security, wanted to jeopardize his chances of recovering capital invested or minimizing his losses by pointing out that the assets held by his bank were worthless, Canadian banks refrained from commenting on the situation in Manitoba in 1882 and 1883.<sup>92</sup> The Canadian economy was still relatively strong throughout 1882 and there was some hope that the value of property in the West would rise and a market would develop where the banks could recoup their investments.<sup>93</sup> In the meantime, bankers were reluctant to see more capital invested in Manitoba.

The credit restrictions imposed on Manitoba by the banks

eventually took their toll. In April, 1883, The Commercial revealed that in the first three months of 1883 the aggregate liabilities of all insolvents in the North West amounted to 10% less than their assets. As far as the editors were concerned,

there has been a screw loose in financial affairs somewhere, and a closer inquiry into the facts confirms the suspicion that many of the most aggravated cases of unnecessary insolvency were due to uncalled for pressure from some financial source, or, to put it in plainer terms, the refusal of banks to render the expected financial aid when it was most needed.<sup>94</sup>

While capital was available to farmers through loan companies, the banks--"the financial props of commerce"--were "sadly deficient" in their obligations by restricting credit to the merchants of the province.<sup>95</sup>

Many of the Manitoba businessmen ruined by the collapse of the Boom were the newly rich. Arthur Wellington Ross, for one, had invested heavily in the Brandon townsite in June, 1881. He turned a handsome profit on that transaction and ploughed back his profits into more land. Throughout the autumn and winter, Ross engaged in every new speculative opportunity that presented itself and by the end of the year he was one of the wealthiest men in Canada--but only on paper.<sup>96</sup> Almost all his investments were tied up in real estate,<sup>97</sup> mostly purchased at inflated prices. When the Boom ended, he was burdened with property for which there were no buyers at any price and which he lost when he was unable to meet the property taxes imposed on his extensive holdings.<sup>98</sup>

The established businessmen of Winnipeg were more cautious in their real estate ventures and most of them escaped the worst consequences of the collapse in property values.<sup>99</sup>

Of Winnipeg's prominent merchants, only A. G. B. Bannatyne was completely ruined.<sup>100</sup> J. H. Ashdown and John Christian Schultz both speculated in real estate,<sup>101</sup> and while neither appears to have added greatly to his fortune, neither lost heavily.

Outside of Winnipeg, the citizens of the towns who indulged in extensive real estate speculation, counting on the future of their particular "metropolis", suffered severe reverses. James Broadfoot of Gladstone, after laying out an addition to the town, found himself over-extended and was eventually embarrassed by the depreciation in property values.<sup>102</sup> Colonel R. Z. Rodgers of Millford, the town's founder and principal landowner, absorbed such severe losses that he returned to Ontario, probably convinced that there was little future in investing in Manitoba.<sup>103</sup>

Yet, in the towns as in Winnipeg, those who lost money probably were in the minority. Some town promoters had not been taken in by the speculative madness that gripped Manitoba. Thomas Greenway, the owner of the townsite of Crystal City, had been very chary about booming the village's future, much to the displeasure of its citizens. At the height of the Boom, he was criticized for refusing to "enlist the help and energy of outsiders who have proferred to assist in building up the place."<sup>104</sup> In spite of this criticism, Greenway confined his speculative activity to the paper town of Cartwright,<sup>105</sup> a fact that indicates, perhaps, that he realized the underlying weaknesses in the Boom. Similarly, Rodmond Palen Roblin of Carman City did not boom his townsite, although Andrew Fournier sold a "suburb" of the town during the real estate frenzy.<sup>106</sup> Roblin's cautious course proved

wise and in later years, he was one of the few town promoters actually to make money on his investment.<sup>107</sup>

In the farming districts only a few of the settlers suffered evil consequences from engaging in the real estate mania. Those few--particularly in the Portage la Prairie and Gladstone districts--had succumbed to the blandishments offered by the realtors, sold their land, and purchased new farms at inflated prices. These settlers, like their unlucky brethren in the towns and Winnipeg, lost not only their profits when the Boom ended and the purchasers of their property could not pay off their mortgages, but their new farms as well.<sup>108</sup>

(iv)

If the end of the Boom did not immediately lead to an economic depression nor to widespread hardship among Manitobans, what was its impact upon the people of the province? The collapse created a crisis of confidence in the future of the Western Canadian agricultural frontier. The Boom had engendered the belief that Manitoba and the North West were on the threshold of rapid development and that the promise everyone assumed the West to hold would soon be fulfilled.

Even the skeptical farmers had been partially caught up in the new spirit which infused Manitoba after the heartbreaking years of the 1870's. During the Boom, a correspondent reported from Holland, a village at the edge of the Tiger Hills:

Railways are all the topic of conversation just now, and the farmers are in hopes that it will not all end in talk. They complain bitterly of the expense and time of taking their wheat to market, which takes all of the gilt off and a part of the gingerbread.<sup>109</sup>

With the coming of the branch railways, the farmer hoped to gain access to new markets, the townsman to see his future secure, and the citizen of Winnipeg to find his city in control of the transportation network of a rapidly advancing agricultural region. Along the recently completed lines, new immigrants would find their way into the rural areas where they would take up vacant lands and establish businesses and industries whose employees would furnish a growing domestic market for the farmers' produce. Starved of expected railways for a decade, Manitobans wanted to believe the promoters and they committed themselves to the most absurd fantasies.

Imagine then the deep disappointment that followed the collapse of the Boom. Only a handful of the towns and agricultural districts in the province had rail communication or were likely to acquire it in the near future. The towns remained isolated from their hinterlands, and the farmer was denied access to markets. After having been convinced that rapid development was at hand, Manitobans discovered that development was to be far slower than anyone had anticipated.

Disappointment was felt all the more keenly when Manitobans looked across the international boundary. The Dakota Territory had been developing rapidly since 1878, and from 1881 onwards the Territory had enjoyed a Boom similar to the one in Manitoba.<sup>110</sup> As in Manitoba, railway construction, heavy immigration and the rapid development of the wheat economy stimulated expansion. But the Dakota Boom was less speculative than the one in Manitoba.<sup>111</sup> The economic expansion in the Territory continued unabated until the summer of 1883, and only

then did it gradually begin to subside.<sup>112</sup> For Manitobans, it was difficult to reconcile the rapid growth of the adjacent American territory with the slower growth of the Canadian West.

The contrast between the pace of development in the territory of North Dakota and the province of Manitoba clearly demonstrates the special problems of Manitoba agriculture. The rapid industrialization and urbanization of the United States following the Civil War created a large urban market for agricultural produce which in turn stimulated the wheat economy in the newly settled western areas of the nation. American entrepreneurs, brash and confident, were well-supplied with capital and were willing to take the risks entailed in opening up the frontier districts. In Canada, on the other hand, there was a small domestic market and a restricted number of capitalists willing to invest heavily in developing the Canadian West. Dependent upon export markets for their surplus production and upon the Canadian government to provide capital for western development, Manitoba farmers and the townspeople who looked to agriculture for their livelihood, had chosen an inferior agricultural frontier.

Disappointment among Manitobans increased during the summer of 1882 when the Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway suspended construction after it became unable to raise enough capital to meet its commitments. This was a severe blow to the hopes of the citizens of Carman, Nelsonville, and Crystal City, all of which were on the projected line. Farmers in the Boyne, Pembina Mountain and Rock Lake settlements were left without

transportation for delivering their crops to market and were faced with several more years of long hauls to the nearest railhead.<sup>113</sup>

About the same time, it became apparent that work on the Southern Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway, running just north of the international boundary from the Red River to the North West Territories, was not being prosecuted with any vigour. The Syndicate, pre-occupied with completing a transcontinental line, had little interest in building a branch line network in Manitoba. By the end of 1882, the Southern Branch had only reached Pembina Mountain and it would be ten years before it was completed to the western boundary of Manitoba.<sup>114</sup>

The Canadian Pacific was determined to make as large a profit as possible from building the railway and from the outset, the company's policy was to lay out its own towns rather than to build to established centres.<sup>115</sup> On the Southern Branch, the Canadian Pacific Railway by-passed Nelsonville and founded the town of Morden two miles south of the county seat of South Dufferin. The citizens of Nelsonville were both outraged and discouraged by the Syndicate's decision.

Another blow fell in November when the Canadian government disallowed the provincial charter for the Emerson and North Western Railway. The Emerson and North Western had planned to build from Emerson across the province to Mountain City and from there to the North West Territories.<sup>116</sup> Although it was unlikely that the entrepreneurs promoting this enterprise could raise enough capital to complete the line, many Manitobans had pinned their hopes of future rail connection upon it. The citizens of Emerson, in

particular, were disappointed for in anticipation of its construction, they had built a bridge across the Red River at enormous cost, a bridge which was now entirely useless.<sup>117</sup>

Without railways, the towns and agricultural areas of the province were isolated from outside markets and business in Winnipeg and the towns suffered. There was plenty of grain in the country during the winter of 1882-1883;

which can be counted by the thousands of bushels, which cannot find a market this winter. Far removed from railway facilities, it takes nearly all the grain is worth to haul it to the nearest market--in many cases from sixty to one hundred miles.<sup>118</sup>

To relieve their distress Manitobans pressed for an end to the Canadian Pacific "monopoly" and to disallowance, and for government encouragement of those railways which were willing to build the branch lines whether American or Canadian owned.<sup>119</sup>

Rail communication in itself did not make wheat-growing profitable. High freight rates combined with a general drop in the price of wheat from up to 90¢ per bushel in the autumn of 1881<sup>120</sup> to a maximum of 63¢ per bushel in the winter of 1882,<sup>121</sup> absorbed what small profits the farmer expected. The sense of grievance that ensued was so strong that even the Brandon Mail, a staunch supporter of the Canadian Pacific's "monopoly" in the Canadian West, admitted that freight rates were too high.<sup>122</sup>

Nor did the coming of the railway make wheat marketing any easier. Time was needed to complete stations and sidings, but in the case of the Canadian Pacific Railway, time was of the essence, if the transcontinental line was to be completed within the period stipulated by the contract with the Canadian government.

When siding construction was postponed often a farmer living near a railroad line found himself at a great distance from the nearest station.<sup>123</sup> The Syndicate also required that the elevators and grain warehouses along its lines be of at least 25,000 bushels capacity.<sup>124</sup> Few companies had the capital resources to build such expensive facilities, and since the banks were unwilling to lend money for Western enterprises, small local companies were unable to raise the money necessary for them to undertake construction. Consequently, few elevators were built to handle the farmers' grain and those constructed were almost all established by the Ogilvie Milling Company of Montreal which enjoyed a virtual monopoly of the grainhandling business in Manitoba.<sup>125</sup>

Federal lands policy received the critical attention of Manitobans as well. Settlers in the province were unhappy about the amount of land that had been set aside for ethnic groups and railways in the Canadian West. Absentee ownership compounded the problems as John Wickes Taylor, the American Consul in Winnipeg, reported, "during the last ten years, besides occupation for homesteads and pre-emptions, the public lands have been largely purchased at \$1 per acre and held by non-resident proprietors without improvement." Because of this, Manitobans by 1882 had to go "200 miles west of Winnipeg to secure an eligible homestead", although the "country is very sparsely settled." Rather than do this, thousands of intending settlers who came to Manitoba in 1882 and 1883, travelled to North Dakota where they could locate near railways.<sup>126</sup>

To stem the outrushing tide of settlers, the Dominion Lands Branch decided to offer the even-numbered sections lying along the Canadian Pacific main line in Manitoba at public auctions to be held in May, 1882. The Manitoba Free Press led an agitation to stop the sale of these lands which it maintained should be retained for homesteads.<sup>127</sup> When the government, ignoring objections, proceeded to sell the homestead lands, the Free Press was so incensed with the Dominion government which "has clearly shown itself susceptible to neither reason nor supplication" that it supported settlers who resolved "on the adoption of some other means of bringing them to their senses."<sup>128</sup>

Despite the growing discontent in the West, Ottawa added insult to injury in the spring of 1883 by raising the tariff on agricultural implements from 25 to 35% ad valorem.<sup>129</sup> Unable to market his crop because of the lack of railways, the luckless farmer was now being asked to give greater support to the Canadian agricultural equipment industry. Manitobans had long since been disenchanted with the protective tariff, and while the Mail might argue that the tariff led to cheaper prices for farm machinery and had been the "direct cause" of Manitoba's "remarkable development and rapid advancement",<sup>130</sup> the farmer knew better.

The final source of discontent was the return of hard times in the summer of 1883. The economic expansion that began in 1878 ended in 1883 as banks began to restrict credit, business failures increased, and exports declined.<sup>131</sup> The depression that followed was general throughout Canada, although it hit Manitobans especially hard. A developing region was always in need of capital

and with the coming of the depression the capital inflow practically ceased. Not only the banks which had restricted investment in the West following the collapse of the Boom, but loan companies and private investors as well, curtailed their investments in light of the prevailing economic conditions. Many businessmen and farmers now found themselves increasingly hard-pressed.<sup>132</sup>

(v)

The government of Premier John Norquay attempted to forestall the growth of extra-parliamentary protest by appealing to the discontent of Manitobans in the provincial election called in December, 1882. Running on a platform of anti-disallowance and the return of Crown lands to provincial administration, the Premier pledged his government to charter new railways and to see that they were constructed in defiance of the federal government.<sup>133</sup>

Although he was safely re-elected, Norquay had not entirely succeeded in harnessing the new mood in the province for his political advantage. When he was first summoned to form a government, he had been a non-partisan leader who had done his best to form a non-partisan government. Between 1878 and 1882, he had ceased to be above party politics. Actively supported by the Conservative members in the House and by the Conservative press in the province, he had gradually identified himself with the Conservative party.<sup>134</sup> By 1882, all his supporters in the Assembly were Conservatives and the Opposition--while it called itself the Manitoba Rights League--was made up of Reformers. The injection of partisan politics into Manitoba put the Premier in a difficult

position. On the one hand he had to defend the actions of the federal government and on the other demand that Manitoba's rights be respected by that government. Norquay was a skillful politician, but there were limits on how far he could push the federal Tories. In the election campaign of 1882-1883, his stand on disallowance had outraged the federal Conservatives in Winnipeg, leading to a split in the party that cost the Premier both Winnipeg seats.<sup>135</sup> Once the votes were counted his first task was to heal the wounds within the party. To do this, he had to abandon his campaign rhetoric, with the consequence that he was bound to disappoint many Manitobans who expected him to do something about their increasingly desperate situation.

The Premier could not afford to offend Sir John A. Macdonald. Not only was Norquay a political client of the senior administration, but he was a mendicant with only one benefactor. Provincial finances were, as usual, inadequate in the spring of 1883 and the Premier began negotiations with the federal government for an increase in the subsidy.<sup>136</sup> To succeed in these talks, he would be forced to abandon his belligerent stand on provincial rights. Norquay was enough of a political realist to give way to political considerations, and in doing so he opened the way for an extra-parliamentary protest movement to come into being.

The first sign that trouble was brewing in Manitoba appeared in the Free Press in August, 1883. A letter to the editor signed "Secesh" advocated the dismemberment of Confederation to permit the western provinces to form a new Confederation.<sup>137</sup> While the Winnipeg Daily Times did its best to ignore the movement,<sup>138</sup> the Free Press responded by pointing out that the Liberal Opposition

in Ottawa should be given a chance to govern first, but if

they too shall have proven unfaithful to the high duty to be committed to their hands, then will be the time to talk of employing violent means for the restoration of our disregarded rights, and for the salvation of the future of the North-west.<sup>139</sup>

The suggestion that Manitoba secede from Confederation did not take hold for most Manitobans were too loyal to Canada to accept the draconian measure that "Secesh" advocated, but it was significant. The publication of a letter arguing that Manitoba might secede was an expression of the deep-seated discontent in the province, and the suggestion and the debate surrounding it were the first signs on the part of the public of their willingness to take action outside of the regular political process.

The event that finally spurred Manitobans into action came a few weeks later on the night of September 20. A sharp frost caught most of the wheat crop still standing in the fields. That year the crop had not been very promising in any case as seeding had been delayed in the spring by floods and the summer had been plagued with drought. When the frost struck, it capped what had already been a very discouraging season. A large part of the wheat crop was frozen, and much of what was saved was so badly damaged that it brought next to nothing on the open market, if it could be sold at all.<sup>140</sup>

The hardship wrought by the crop failure was severe. Few farmers had succeeded in saving money to carry them through poor years, for most received low prices for their wheat in previous seasons and lacked transportation to take their crops to market. What little extra cash remained at the end of each season was

probably needed to meet the exigencies of establishing a new home in Manitoba. Furthermore, the crop failure of 1883 was completely unexpected,<sup>141</sup> and many farmers convinced by the books and pamphlets written by men like John Macoun may not have taken into account the possibility of there ever being a crop failure. Whatever the reason for their lack of cash, many farmers were driven to the wall. Some gave up farming completely and left the province; some travelled to Winnipeg seeking work and when no work was available became public charges;<sup>142</sup> and some struggled to remain on the land often with the aid of a mortgage taken out on their property at an exorbitant rate of interest.<sup>143</sup>

The crop failure when added to the general feeling of discontent already current in Manitoba, was all that was needed. On October 19, a settler from Brandon Hills--probably Charles Stewart--<sup>144</sup> wrote a letter to the editor of the Brandon Sun. He enumerated the grievances that most Manitobans knew to exist and noted that

The strain upon the farming community has now become so severe, owing to the excessive cost of living, as compared with the very small profits to be derived from farming, that, unless something is immediately done to keep the farmers on their legs, complete stagnation of business and a financial collapse throughout the Province will be the inevitable result.

The causes of this state of affairs were clear-cut:

A powerful railway /monopoly/ has been established, with the avowed intention of depriving a number of our settlers from marketing their grain by railroad for many years. An excessive duty has been placed upon agricultural implements, which will render it next to impossible for poor men ever to obtain them. An immense amount of land has been locked up in the midst of existing settlements, which will have the tendency to isolate farms from one another for many years to come. Roads and bridges have been

made by settlers at their own expense. Our roads cannot be graded for want of funds, and are consequently an enormous burden upon the settlers.

As for the courts of justice, prisons, asylums, and other county buildings, these will have to be left unbuilt or erected by direct taxation, owing to the funds of the Province which should be available for the purpose, having become already exhausted.

In his opinion, the remedy for all these problems was simple:

"free trade and no monopoly." To achieve these goals, he called for

a Convention, say, at Brandon, to which representatives from all parts of Manitoba and the North West should be invited; to consider our position, and to determine which steps shall be taken to secure this country from the impending ruin, and to obtain for ourselves that independence which is the birthright of every British subject.<sup>145</sup>

The idea of holding a convention spread rapidly. Before long all Manitoba had taken up the cause. The first meeting was held in Portage la Prairie on November 20,<sup>146</sup> and it was followed by meetings in Brandon and Manitou on November 26 and December 5 respectively.<sup>147</sup> At the Brandon and Manitou meetings, those in attendance formed continuing organizations which were not to be dissolved until redress of grievances had been secured. With the formation of those organizations, a full-scale extra-parliamentary protest began.

(vi)

When on November 20, 1883, about two hundred and fifty persons met at the town hall in Portage la Prairie to discuss "matters pertaining to the welfare of the farmers",<sup>148</sup> the first speaker was Roderick McCuaig, a leading farmer from the Oaklands district to the north west of the town. In his opinion, the farmers were being victimized by the millers who, he claimed, were

combining to "decry frozen wheat". As a solution to this problem, he suggested that the farmers of the area form a joint stock company to market their wheat and thus by-pass the millers.

Other speakers supported McCuaig. Councillor Matthew Owens of High Bluff, a farmer, held "that the farmers must have relief or leave the country, as they cannot live as things are at present." The High Bluff settlers had already concluded that "the best plan was to ship their own grain" and that they were willing to support the construction of a farmers' elevator. A number of non-farmers, men such as Dr. Daniel Haggarty, a real estate dealer and Mayor E. McDonald of Portage la Prairie, a grain merchant, also endorsed McCuaig's proposal.<sup>149</sup>

Accordingly, the meeting approved two resolutions. First, the assembly accepted the argument that Manitoba's farmers were the victims of an "unjust combination" to depress wheat prices. Second, that since "every industry in America has formed combinations for mutual support", the farmers should do the same so as to "get fair prices for their produce and to prevent their being victimized by wheat rings and Millers' Associations." To accomplish this, a joint stock company was to be formed "exclusively of farmers". A committee was set up to discover the "best steps" to give effect to the resolutions.<sup>150</sup>

Some of those present thought that these decisions were not very far-reaching. They had attended in the hope that a "Grange system" would be established to redress grievances which they believed encompassed more than the low prices for farm

produce. The meeting, however, was opposed to dealing with political questions, though some speakers brought up the matters of the Canadian Pacific Railway "monopoly" and the heavy duties imposed by the federal government on building supplies and farm implements.<sup>151</sup>

The division between those who wished to form a co-operative grain marketing agency and those who wished to protest federal policies did not threaten the success of the meeting, but it did create tensions within the assembly. These went far deeper than the question of what were the proper matters for discussion. The delegates, influenced by the nature of their economic and social position in the community, were deeply divided on aims.

Non-farmer delegates who were motivated primarily by their personal economic reverses had less sympathy for the general plight of the Manitoba farming community than for their own precarious position.<sup>152</sup> Dr. Daniel M. Haggarty was one of those who had his own economic interests to promote. Although he spoke of "the necessity of organizing in self-defence" and "doing away with middlemen",<sup>153</sup> he had no connection with agriculture. Haggarty was a medical man, who, shortly after his arrival in Manitoba, had abandoned his practice to speculate in land. As one of the leading dealers in half-breed scrip and in town lots, he had been deeply involved in the Manitoba Boom.<sup>154</sup> When the Boom collapsed, many of his investments turned sour. Consequently, his interest in the farmers' meeting was, as he admitted, based upon the fear that the frost would discourage immigrants from coming to Manitoba and

TABLE X

INTEREST GROUPS REPRESENTED AT  
FARMERS' MEETINGS AT PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE  
BRANDON, AND MANITOU ON NOVEMBER 20,  
NOVEMBER 26, AND DECEMBER 5, 1883

	<u>PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE</u>	<u>BRANDON</u>	<u>MANITOU</u>
Disillusioned Promoters	1	5	
Politically Motivated Individuals	3	1	1
Inveterate Joiners	2	2	
Farmers			
Financially Troubled	5	2	3
Marginally Successful	8	7	6
Unknown	1	3	
Unidentified		2	
	—	—	—
Totals	20	22	10

lessen his chances at recouping his losses.<sup>155</sup>

Politicians attempting to further their careers made up a second element at the meeting. Mayor E. McDonald of Portage la Prairie, Isaiah Mawhinney, the Member of the Legislature for Burnside, and Robert Watson, the Member of Parliament for Marquette, were present to look after their own interests. While all sympathized with the farmers' plight, Watson going so far as to argue that "the whole province should unite to elect delegates and hold a convention" at which the farmers would predominate since they made up "seven eights of the people", not one of these politicians was to make a more positive contribution to the farmers' cause.<sup>156</sup>

The third element at the meeting can be characterized as the inveterate joiners. This group identified with every organization and every project that was popularly deemed to be in the public interest. Into this category fall the Warden of the County, Matthew Ferris, a farmer, and E. H. H. G. Hay, a foundry operator and miller. Both men were pillars of society, active in church and community affairs,<sup>157</sup> but neither was a man of vision who was willing to make sacrifices on behalf of the movement.

The largest group present were the farmers who had suffered difficulties in trying to establish themselves on the Manitoba agricultural frontier. Some, like Roderick McCuaig, were motivated by impending personal economic disaster. An early settler at Oaklands, he had taken up a homestead and pre-emption in 1874, and farmed successfully for eight years.<sup>158</sup> Then, at the height of the Manitoba Boom, he had expanded his farming operations. Borrowing

heavily on property he already owned, he purchased the adjoining 320 acres at an inflated price. By the autumn of 1883, he was in financial difficulties, brought on by the fact that the mortgages he had taken out were greater than the value of his land after the real estate collapse.<sup>159</sup>

Other farmers were successful in avoiding crushing debts, but because the margin between success and failure in the depressed economy of Manitoba in the autumn of 1883 was very narrow, their success was relative. A second crop disaster or a prolongation of depressed economic conditions might see them in the same desperate state as farmers like McCuaig. It was to safeguard their own interests--present and future--that they supported the emergent agitation.

While they made up the most important element at the meeting in terms of numbers, when it came to expressing their opinions, the marginally successful farmers deferred to the other groups present, possibly because they lacked both the powerful economic and political motivation of other groups. Only Thomas Sissons had the temerity to suggest that the plan for a joint-stock elevator company had one flaw: the "stock might afterwards be sold to other capitalists" with the farmers, in effect, financing a company that would ultimately benefit those to whom they were opposed. The objection was brushed aside.<sup>160</sup>

Given these underlying divisions, it is not surprising that the convention accomplished very little. To have struck out on a bolder course would have alienated some of those present and

would have weakened the resolve of the remainder. On the other hand, by allowing men with special interests to dominate the meeting and by agreeing not to offend anyone's sensibilities, the delegates effectively destroyed whatever chance they might have had of creating a powerful lobby to press for redress of grievances.

Such was not to be the case at the Brandon meeting held six days later. The Brandon assembly, tackling problems that those attending the Portage la Prairie assembly avoided, founded a permanent organization that was to have an important role in shaping early Western Canadian agrarian protest.

At the Brandon convention, the organizers were better prepared for action than those at Portage la Prairie. Long before the convention met in the Council Chamber of Brandon City Hall, a committee had been struck with the purpose of securing redress of grievances.<sup>161</sup> William Winter, the Mayor of Brandon and the owner of extensive farming interests beyond the city limits, was appointed chairman of the Executive Committee which drew up a programme, wrote a platform and developed a constitution to present on November 26.<sup>162</sup> The meeting itself was well-publicized throughout the western areas of the province and when it met, representatives were drawn from a large region to deal with a specific programme of action.<sup>163</sup>

It did not take the delegates at Brandon long to come to grips with matters that the Portage la Prairie meeting had avoided. With Thomas Lockhart occupying the chair and George Purvis acting as secretary, Charles Stewart moved quickly to denounce the

Dominion government. As far as he was concerned, the farmers had assembled "to make a solemn, united and vigorous protest against the high-handed policy of the Dominion" towards Manitoba. The province, deprived of her lands, received in return only a "paltry subsidy"; the increased duty on agricultural implements demonstrated Ottawa's desire to take "advantage of our necessity to oppress us with this iniquitous imposition"; and a "hideous railway monopoly which is to bind us hand and foot for twenty years" had been inflicted upon Manitobans. Stewart did not propose any solutions, but he warned that it was all very well to "talk of loyalty to the Dominion but we must be first loyal to ourselves", and "if the oppressive rule of Ottawa is to continue" it was apparent that "secession of this province from the Dominion will be inevitable."<sup>164</sup>

Following the blistering attack on federal policies by the former Cambridge don, other speakers rose to complain bitterly of their plight. Warden James A. Lang, a farmer and a Presbyterian minister from Riverside, saw the root of the problem in the party system. Parliament was supposedly answerable to the people, but in reality it was "controlled by a few party leaders or party wire-pullers." The answer to the West's problems lay in burying party differences so that all Manitobans would serve the ends of the province rather than those of party. Charles Pilling, a hotelier and a farmer attacked the "gigantic incubus"--the Canadian Pacific Railway--which provided poor access to markets. The construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway, in Pilling's opinion, would put an end to Manitobans being the "lawful prey" of the

Syndicate. As for federal lands policy, "it can only be characterized as abominable". The best lands in the province were "jobbed to political partizans and swindling land companies", while genuine settlers were "pushed back to the verge of civilization". In short, stated Pilling, "the railway and land policies are doing more to retard settlement than any other cause."<sup>165</sup>

The Brandon convention resolved itself into an association to be known as "The Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union". A platform, adopted unanimously, called for modifications in the customs tariff; demanded that Manitoba be given the right to charter railways free from federal interference; declared that the "public lands are the sacred heritage of the people" to be granted to actual settlers; condemned the Canadian Pacific for its high freight rates and for promoting an elevator monopoly; and demanded the immediate construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway. Finally, the convention resolved that circulars be distributed among "leading farmers in the several municipalities of Manitoba" suggesting that they organize local associations to draft resolutions which would be presented by local delegates "of both sides of politics" at "some central point" to formulate a "Provincial expression on Manitoba's necessities, with suggestions for their remedy."<sup>166</sup>

Unlike the Portage la Prairie assembly which had confined itself to one issue, the Brandon convention tackled all issues, thus making a broad appeal. As Warden Lang argued before the Brandon meeting:

People from different localities feel those evils under varying form and degrees, but they are felt

in some form everywhere. Some of us, for instance, will give the most prominence to the monopoly of railway construction granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, others to the Customs Department--the fiscal policy of the Dominion Government in its avowed discrimination against Manitoba's interests. Others will hold the Department of the Interior responsible and will see in the transfer to the Provincial Government of all our unappropriated lands a remedy for those evils. Doctors differ, and so may farmers be expected to differ both in their estimate of the character and magnitude of our disorders and the remedies to be applied.<sup>167</sup>

In his editorial comments in the Brandon Mail, a newspaper which was an open supporter of the Liberal-Conservative government at Ottawa although it was somewhat more independent in provincial politics,<sup>168</sup> Charles Cliffe disapproved of much of the "animosity associated with the movement", but decided that there "never was yet a bundle of chaff that did not contain a certain quantity of wheat,..." The Mail, therefore, gave support to the Farmers' Union despite the "extreme partisanship" expressed at the meeting and urged the federal authorities to pay attention to the "situation of the settler in Manitoba and the Northwest".<sup>169</sup> Cliffe himself accepted a position on the executive of the new organization,<sup>170</sup> overcoming whatever objections he had to such prominent Grits and leading Unionists as William Winter and A. L. Sifton.

The problem with such a broad appeal was that it glossed over structural weaknesses in the movement. These weaknesses were the same as those that existed at the Portage la Prairie meeting. As at Portage la Prairie, there were individuals present who put their own economic interests foremost--men like William Winter who had lost heavily in the collapse of the Manitoba Boom and was in dire financial straits, and Charles Stewart, a less than successful farmer who had his property well-mortgaged.<sup>172</sup>

A. L. Sifton, an aspiring young Liberal politician, was using the Farmers' Union as the first stepping stone in a political career, while James Elliott, one of the original settlers in the Brandon area, gave his support to every new organization that appeared to benefit the community as a whole.<sup>173</sup> The majority of delegates were relatively successful farmers, men who looked to the Union to improve their position on the agricultural frontier, but the presence of other elements not committed to the agricultural community boded ill for the success of the movement.

At first, the structural weaknesses of the Farmers' Union were of little moment. In the days following the founding convention at Brandon, meetings were called in other localities to discuss grievances and to organize local associations. The most important of these meetings was held at Manitou on December 5.

At Manitou, a rival organization--the Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Protective Union--was founded. The Protective Union borrowed from both the Portage la Prairie and Brandon meetings for its programme. Like the delegates to the Brandon assembly, the Manitou delegates saw the federal government as being responsible for many of their difficulties. The first objective of the organization was to secure the repeal of "laws that militate against [farmers'] interests." Of those laws the most important were the ones which prevented low freight rates, which placed "unjust restrictions upon trade", and which led to "railway and other monopolies." The second objective was co-operation among farmers. The "general feeling was that the farmers should combine and send their wheat to Ontario themselves", it being believed that market would be better than the Manitoba

market "owing to the lightness of the Ontario crop."<sup>174</sup>

The delegates to the Manitou convention were not given to the vivid denunciations of the federal government that had taken place at Brandon a week earlier. The resolutions were carefully phrased so as not to offend anyone's political sensibilities, particularly those sensibilities of the "great many...pronounced Conservatives" who were present. The language employed in the resolutions indicated that the delegates were prepared to accept any reasonable offer from the federal government that would relieve distress in the area.<sup>175</sup>

The delegates to the Manitou convention, perhaps, recognizing weaknesses in the programmes adopted by the earlier meeting at Brandon, set up their own provincial organization. This step was taken in defiance of the attempt at Brandon to centralize the protest movement under the leadership of the Farmers' Union. The Protective Union served notice that it intended to compete for members with the Farmers' Union when it was agreed to form "subordinate unions in every portion of the Province."<sup>176</sup>

Although both the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union agreed to a common provincial executive at Winnipeg on December 19, and formally united their rival platforms in the "Declaration of Rights", the differences between them were only submerged. Each in its own geographical sphere of influence pursued what it considered to be the legitimate goals of the agitation.

From the outset the Farmers' Union of Brandon drew its supporters from a much larger area of the province, embracing practically the whole of the region to the west of Portage la

Prairie. The Protective Union found its support exclusively in the municipalities lying along the United States border from Morden to Turtle Mountain.<sup>177</sup> Strengthening its position in the rural areas, the Farmers' Union quickly acquired the support of W. F. Luxton of the Free Press, the leader of the Liberal press in Manitoba, who was only too glad to have the federal government attacked in no uncertain terms. The Protective Union's more reasonable attitude to federal policies for the development of the Canadian West found less favour.<sup>178</sup>

Where the Protective Union had an advantage over the Farmers' Union was in its greater economic and social unity. Although a substantial number of persons attended the Manitou convention in the hope that they might find economic salvation, almost all who were in attendance were farmers.<sup>179</sup> Of the nine farmers who can be identified as being present, five were in debt; of those five, two were foreclosed and a third was forced to sell his land before 1890. Of the remaining four non-debted farmers, two were to take out mortgages within a year, and one was to lose his land to the mortgage company before 1890.<sup>180</sup>

The unity of the Protective Union rested on common hardships shared by farmers in southern Manitoba. The area along the international boundary lacked railway communication to markets, and although the Canadian Pacific Railway had made a beginning on construction, it seemed likely that the farmers would have to wait sometime yet before the needed line was completed. Inadequate transportation prevented the farmers from marketing their small surplus agricultural production and whatever the accumulated

savings of the settlers when they arrived in Manitoba, these were almost certainly expended by 1883.

No major centre dominated the region. The typical market town in the district was a straggling village of less than a hundred inhabitants. Only Nelsonville and its rival Morden were larger, and both these centres had limited hinterlands.<sup>181</sup> Because of the small size of the towns and because none had established a clear position of pre-eminence, the merchants, the professional men, and the promoters exercised a weak metropolitan authority. The towns were fundamentally extensions of the rural districts, and this fact was reflected in the structure of the Manitou Union.

In contrast, both Brandon and Portage la Prairie were important centres which dominated their surrounding areas. Brandon was the western regional metropolitan city of Manitoba, while Portage la Prairie's hinterland was limited to the district immediately adjacent to it. In both instances, their merchants acted as wholesalers to retailers in smaller centres,<sup>182</sup> both had two newspapers which played a significant role in disseminating ideas and determining the course of politics,<sup>183</sup> and both were important railway centres.<sup>184</sup> In exercising their city's metropolitan function, the leading citizens of both Brandon and Portage la Prairie enjoyed great influence in the outlying districts. When meetings were called to discuss grievances, the civic leaders of both centres attended, and because of their position, they exerted an important influence on the decisions taken. The problem was that their interests did not always coincide with those of the farmers.

Finally, southern Manitoba enjoyed a non-partisan political tradition. All three local Members of the Legislature--Thomas Greenway, Finlay M. Young and William Winram--were Liberals who owed their political success to their identification with local issues. Each was a farmer who understood the difficulties that other settlers faced,<sup>185</sup> and each put local development ahead of provincial questions. In their ridings, elections were fought not on issues, for all candidates espoused the same position, but on personalities.<sup>186</sup>

In the initial competition between the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union for the allegiance of Manitoba's farmers, the Brandon organization was the winner. Supported by the Manitoba Free Press,<sup>187</sup> the Brandon Sun,<sup>188</sup> Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate,<sup>189</sup> and less enthusiastically by the Brandon Mail,<sup>190</sup> it received the bulk of the publicity in the provincial press. The Protective Union could claim only one small local newspaper, the Nelsonville Mountaineer,<sup>191</sup> as its apologist. Within two weeks of its founding, the Farmers' Union, bolstered by its support in the press and firing audiences with its radical rhetoric, had achieved ascendancy in Manitoba.

There was an inevitability to the birth of agrarian protest in Manitoba during the autumn of 1883. In the 1870's when the expectations of immigrants to the province were not met, a short-lived agitation had emerged in the High Bluff district but was quickly snuffed out by the start of large-scale railway construction and the beginning of heavy immigration. Between 1878

and 1880, the hopes of the settlers were rekindled as Manitoba fever gripped the new Dominion. Those hopes became greatly exaggerated during the Manitoba Boom of 1881-1882. When the Boom collapsed, many Manitobans--townsmen and farmers alike--were deeply disappointed. In their despair, they identified federal programmes for the development of the Canadian West as being responsible for their poor prospects of future success. Stripped of the illusions to which they had clung for a decade, Manitobans turned to extra-parliamentary movements to seek redress of grievances.

Of the two organizations formed in the autumn of 1883, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union of Brandon found the greatest favour with Manitobans. Broadly based, including both farmers and non-farmers, it encouraged all Manitobans to join in supporting its platform which, because of its breadth, could appeal in some measure to almost anyone. The Manitoba and North West Farmers' Protective Union, the rival to the Farmers' Union, was a weaker organization, more directly concerned with the welfare of the farmers. It failed to generate the same excitement in the province as a whole. Consequently, within a few weeks of its founding convention, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union emerged as the standard-bearer of the province's citizens in their attempt to obtain modification of the federal programmes, which they saw as being responsible for the failure of the Canadian West to fulfil their own exaggerated expectations.

FOOTNOTES

1. See Table IX.
2. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1878, Vol. VIII, No. 9, Appendix, p. 77.
3. Ibid.
4. E. K. Francis, op. cit., p. 50.
5. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1892, Vol. IX, No. 13, Appendix, J. S. Dennis, "A Short History of the Surveys Performed Under the Dominion Lands System 1869 to 1889", p. 16; A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 57.
6. Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion-Provincial Relations, Book I, p. 53.
7. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume II, p. 262.
8. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1880-1881, Vol. VII, No. 12, Appendix, pp. 56-57.
9. /David Currie/, op. cit., pp. 43 and 45-46; /Anonymous/, Chronicles by the Way. A Series of Letters Addressed to the Montreal "Gazette", Descriptive of a Trip Through Manitoba and the North-West, (Montreal: The Gazette, 1879), pp. 7-8.
10. /Anonymous/, Chronicles by the Way, p. 12.
11. Winnipeg Daily Times, May 8, 1879, p. 4.
12. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1879, Vol. VII, No. 9, Appendix, p. 49.
13. /David Currie/, op. cit., p. 22 and p. 73; /Anonymous/, Chronicles By the Way, p. 10; A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 59.
14. Statutes of Canada, 35 Victoria, Cap. 23.
15. /David Currie/, op. cit., p. 69.
16. /Anonymous/, Chronicles By the Way, p. 35.
17. Louis Aubrey Wood, op. cit., pp. 29-61.
18. Ibid., pp. 73-105.

19. Ibid., p. 65.
20. Ibid., p. 44; H. Michell, "The Grange in Canada", Bulletin of the Departments of History and Political and Economic Science in Queen's University, (No. 13, October, 1914), p. 3.
21. Manitoba Free Press, January 9, 1878, p. 1.
22. Ibid.
23. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 210.
24. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume II, pp. 335-336.
25. Gilbert C. Fite, The Farmers' Frontier, 1865-1900, (New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966), pp. 100-101.
26. Ibid., pp. 102-103.
27. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1879, Vol. VII, No. 9, Appendix, p. 36.
28. Ibid., p. 49.
29. Ibid., p. 59.
30. Ibid., p. 61.
31. John Macoun, op. cit., p. 496; Charles R. Tuttle, A History of the Corporation of Winnipeg Giving an Account of the Recent Crisis, (Winnipeg: 1883), p. 27. According to the Census of 1880-1881, Winnipeg's population was 7,985, indicating that earlier estimates were exaggerated and probably included a large floating population of newcomers.
32. See Table IX. Also see Canada, Sessional Papers, 1880, Vol. VII, No. 10, Appendix, p. 54.
33. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, pp. 178-181
34. John Macoun, op. cit., p. 478.
35. Margaret Morton Fahrni and W. L. Morton, Third Crossing: A History of the First Quarter Century of the Town and District of Gladstone in the Province of Manitoba, (Winnipeg: Advocate Printers, 1946), pp. 52-55.
36. James A. Jackson, op. cit., pp. 22-23.
37. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1880-1881, Vol. VII, No. 12, Appendix, p. 57; Canada, Sessional Papers, 1882, Vol. VII, No. 11, Appendix, pp. 110-112.

38. John Macoun, op. cit., pp. 466-486.
39. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 194.
40. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume III, p. 69.
41. Ibid.
42. Frank Austin Cade, The British North-West, Pen and Sun Sketches in the Canadian Wheat Lands, (St. Paul: The Pioneer Publishing Company, 1882), p. 65.
43. Winnipeg Daily Times, August 18, 1881, p. 6.
44. Winnipeg Daily Times, August 26, 1881, p. 4.
45. Ibid.
46. Winnipeg Daily Times, September 7, 1881, p. 4.
47. Winnipeg Daily Times, September 20, 1881, p. 1.
48. Winnipeg Daily Times, November 14, 1881, p. 1.
49. Winnipeg Daily Times, September 3, 1881, p. 1.
50. Robert B. Hill, Manitoba: History of Its Early Settlement, Development and Resources, (Toronto: William Briggs, 1890), p. 641.
51. See George B. Fraser, Morris, Manitoba. Growth and Progress with Personal Sketches, (Morris: The Morris Herald, 1882), pp. 4-5.
52. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 13, 1882, p. 4.
53. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 14, 1882, p. 4.
54. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 27, 1882, p. 1.
55. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 21, 1882, p. 1.
56. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 14, 1882, p. 4.
57. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 20, 1882, p. 1.
58. The Monetary Times, January 20, 1882, p. 888.
59. Ibid.
60. The Monetary Times, February 10, 1882, p. 975.
61. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 18, 1882, p. 1.

62. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 4, 1882, p. 3; February 6, 1882, p. 1; February 3, 1882, p. 1.
63. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 8, 1882, p. 1; February 23, 1882, p. 1; February 28, 1882, p. 1.
64. See for example, Winnipeg Daily Times, February 3, 1882, p. 1; February 8, 1882, p. 1.
65. Winnipeg Daily Times, August 30, 1881, p. 4; James B. Hedges, op. cit., p. 67.
66. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 25, 1882, p. 4.
67. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 2, 1882, p. 1.
68. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 10, 1882, p. 1.
69. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 28, 1882, p. 2. See also February 7, 1882, p. 3; February 11, 1882, p. 1.
70. Alexander Begg, History of the North-West, Volume III, p. 70.
71. Pierre Berton, The Last Spike, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971), p. 79.
72. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 3, 1882.
73. Winnipeg Daily Times, June 2, 1882. The advertisements were very modest compared to those of February.
74. The Canadian Pacific Railway's prices varied, but generally were between \$2.50 and \$5.00 per acre. James B. Hedges, op. cit., p. 67.
75. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A. History, p. 209.
76. /David Currie/, op. cit., p. 58; Winnipeg Daily Times, May 6, 1879, p. 4; Brandon Daily Mail, April 30, 1883, p. 2; /Anonymous/, Brandon, Manitoba and Her Industries, (Winnipeg: Steen & Boyce, 1882), p. 8.
77. As, for example, Nelsonville, Crystal City, Pilot Mound, and Millford were to discover.
78. Winnipeg Daily Times, September 1, 1881, p. 1; October 13, 1881, p. 1.
79. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1882, Vol. X, No. 14, Appendix, p. 173.
80. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1884, Vol. VIII, No. 14, Appendix, p. 11.

81. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1882, Vol. VII, No. 11, Appendix, p. 110.
82. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1884, Vol. VII, No. 12, Appendix, pp. 18-19.
83. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1886, Vol. VI, No. 8. Appendix, pp. 6-9.
84. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1883, Vol. X, No. 14, Appendix, p. 170.
85. Canada, Sessional Papers, 1884, Vol. VIII, No. 14, Appendix, p. 108.
86. The Commercial, November 7, 1882, p. 109. Also see J. M. S. Careless, "The Development of the Winnipeg Business Community, 1870-1890", Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Series IV, Volume VIII, 1970, pp. 249-250.
87. Imperial Bank of Canada, Proceedings of Eighth Annual General Meeting of Shareholders, 4 July, 1883, n. p.
88. Imperial Bank of Canada, Proceedings of Tenth Annual General Meeting of Shareholders, 2 July, 1885, n. p.
89. Victor Ross, A History of the Canadian Bank of Commerce, Volume II, (Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1922), p. 558.
90. The Canadian Bank of Commerce, Charter and Annual Reports 1867-1907, Volume I, (Toronto: 1907), p. 167. See also Victor Ross, op. cit., p. 95.
91. The Canadian Bank of Commerce, op. cit., p. 167.
92. A number of other Canadian banks suffered from the collapse of the Manitoba Boom. Among them were the Federal Bank and the Merchants' Bank of Canada, although the latter institution would appear to have run into difficulties from loans made after the collapse. See The Monetary Times, June 20, 1884, pp. 1432 and 1485. Also see A. B. Jamieson, Chartered Banking in Canada, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1953), pp. 24-25.
93. The Monetary Times, June 8, 1883, p. 1381.
94. The Commercial, April 3, 1883, p. 528.
95. Ibid.
96. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 16, 1882, p. 1.

97. He did have some other business interests, among them a timber limit in the District of Keewatin.
98. Pierre Berton, op. cit., p. 79.
99. J. M. S. Careless, op. cit., p. 250.
100. James A. Jackson, The Centennial History of Manitoba, (Winnipeg: The Manitoba Historical Society in Association with McClelland and Stewart, 1970), p. 121.
101. Winnipeg Daily Times, November 25, 1881, p. 4; February 11, 1882, p. 4; January 14, 1882, p. 4.
102. Margaret Morton Fahrni and W. L. Morton, Third Crossing, p. 85.
103. Henry James Morgan, ed., The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Handbook of Canadian Biography, (Toronto: William Briggs, 1898), p. 878.
104. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 23, 1882, p. 1.
105. P.A.O., Sir Richard Cartwright Papers, Thomas Greenway to Cartwright, November 28, 1881; Thomas Greenway to Cartwright, July 6, 1882.
106. Winnipeg Daily Times, February 10, 1882, p. 3.
107. See Hugh R. Ross, Thirty-Five Years in the Limelight: Sir Rodmond P. Roblin and His Times, (Winnipeg: Farmers' Advocate, 1936), pp. 17-25.
108. Margaret Morton Fahrni and W. L. Morton, Third Crossing, p. 87; Robert B. Hill, op. cit., p. 446; Manitoba Colonist, October, 1889.
109. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 24, 1882, p. 3.
110. Gilbert C. Fite, op. cit., pp. 95-103; Elwyn B. Robinson, History of North Dakota, (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966), pp. 133-135.
111. Elwyn B. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 148-151; Winnipeg Daily Times, February 6, 1882, p. 4.
112. Elwyn B. Robinson, op. cit., pp. 151-152.
113. Not until the late 1880's was the railway completed to these districts.
114. H. A. Innis, op. cit., p. 141; P.A.M., Acton: Burrows Collection, W. C. Van Horne to Borrows, November 2, 1888.

115. James B. Hedges, op. cit., p. 86.
116. Statutes of Manitoba, 44 Victoria, Cap. 39.
117. Margaret McWilliams, Manitoba Milestones, (Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1928), pp. 152-153.
118. The Commercial, February 27, 1883, p. 428.
119. Ibid. See also James A. Jackson, "The Disallowance of Manitoba Railway Legislation in the 1880's", pp. 22-37, for the progress of the anti-disallowance agitation.
120. Winnipeg Daily Times, October 31, 1881, p. 1.
121. Brandon Daily Mail, January 6, 1883, p. 3.
122. Brandon Daily Mail, April 10, 1883, p. 2.
123. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 209.
124. Ibid., p. 210.
125. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, December, 1883, p. 292.
126. P.A.M., James Wickes Taylor Papers, (microfilm), Taylor to J. C. Bancroft Davis, June 2, 1882. See also The Commercial, June 12, 1883, p. 766.
127. Manitoba Free Press, April 25, 1883, p. 4.
128. Manitoba Free Press, May 19, 1883, p. 4.
129. W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, p. 210.
130. Brandon Daily Mail, April 30, 1883, p. 2.
131. The Monetary Times, June 22, 1883, p. 1437.
132. Ibid.; R. B. Hill, op. cit., pp. 444-445.
133. James A. Jackson, "The Disallowance of Manitoba Railway Legislation in the 1880's", pp. 38-39.
134. R. O. MacFarlane, "Manitoba Politics and Parties After Confederation", Canadian Historical Association Annual Report, 1940, p. 53.
135. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, MG. 26, A. 1(b), Vol. 246, Gilbert McMicken to Macdonald, July 13, 1882, 110932-110935; P.A.C., Mackenzie Bowell Papers, M.G. 26, E, 1(c), Vol. 79, Bowell to J. C. Aikins, October 26, 1882.

136. J. A. Maxwell, op. cit., p. 82.
137. Manitoba Free Press, August 28, 1883, p. 5.
138. Winnipeg Daily Times, August 29, 1883, p. 4; August 30, 1883, p. 4.
139. Manitoba Free Press, August 28, 1883, p. 4.
140. Robert B. Hill, op. cit., pp. 445-446.
141. Between 1876 and 1883, there had not been a single crop failure. Most settlers arrived during that time and learned little of the normal hazards of farming on the prairies in those exceptionally favourable years.
142. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 399, Amos Rowe and Stewart Mulvey to Macdonald, January 4, 1884, 192214; W. C. B. Grahame to W. B. Small, January 7, 1884, 192216-192217.
143. R. B. Hill, op. cit., pp. 445-446; P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, part 2, T. M. Daly to Macdonald, December 16, 1883, 191552-191572.
144. Brandon Mail, November 9, 1883, p. 1.
145. P.A.M., Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Scrapbook, Brandon Sun, October 19, 1883. I have used the Scrapbook only where I have not been able to locate the articles in question in the periodicals themselves.
146. Manitoba Free Press, November 21, 1883, p. 1.
147. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 1; December 6, 1883, p. 1.
148. Manitoba Free Press, November 21, 1883, p. 1.
149. Ibid.
150. Ibid.
151. Ibid.
152. See Table X. For the purposes of this table, the politically-motivated individuals include those who held local offices (if of a political nature) and those who were active in the political life of the province. The inveterate joiners were determined by examining the membership of local organizations. Those individuals who belonged to practically every organization but seemed to take only a minor part in most of them, I have put in this category. Disillusioned promoters were those who were land speculators or town

promoters, some of whom had encountered financial difficulties, others who were so situated that their particular metropolis had not developed according to their expectations. Under the heading farmers, I include all those delegates whose principal source of income was from agriculture. Financially embarrassed farmers were those who had mortgage debts of more than \$10.00 per acre. The figure chosen is artificial but it appears from an examination of the material on mortgage indebtedness that beyond \$10.00 per acre in debts, the individual farmer was very likely to be foreclosed. The figure is also useful since after the collapse of the Manitoba Boom, the price of "improved" that is cultivated land did not rise above \$10.00 per acre until the late 1890's. Financially embarrassed farmers also include any landowner who was foreclosed within five years of the convention which he attended. Marginally successful farmers were all farmers who were not in financial difficulties. The category includes both debted and non-debted farmers, but those individuals who had mortgaged their property possessed debts of less than \$10.00 per acre. The term "Marginally successful" is used to denote the difficult conditions under which Manitoba settlers laboured, not to indicate the type of agriculture in the province. Rather the situation in the 1880's and 1890's, because of low prices and high costs, was one in which profits were small and the risk of failure high.

153. Manitoba Free Press, November 21, 1883, p. 1.
154. J. H. Metcalfe, The Tread of the Pioneers, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1932), p. 132.
155. Manitoba Free Press, November 21, 1883, p. 1.
156. Ibid.
157. J. H. Metcalfe, op. cit., pp. 109-110; F. H. Schofield, The Story of Manitoba, Volume II, (Winnipeg: 1913), pp. 483-484.
158. J. H. Metcalfe, op. cit., p. 169; Abstract Book No. 9, Portage la Prairie Land Titles Office, Portage la Prairie, Manitoba.
159. Instruments 9202, 9049, 15121, 6139, Portage la Prairie, Land Titles Office, Portage la Prairie, Manitoba.
160. Manitoba Free Press, November 21, 1883, p. 1.
161. Brandon Mail, November 9, 1883, p. 1.
162. Ibid.; P.A.M., Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Scrapbook, handbill included in scrapbook summoning first convention.

163. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 1.
164. Ibid.
165. Ibid.
166. Ibid.
167. Ibid.
168. Brandon Daily Mail, September 17, 1883, p. 2.
169. Brandon Mail, December 6, 1883, p. 2.
170. P.A.M., Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Scrapbook, list of executive members jotted in the margin.
171. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, part 2, T. Mayne Daly to Macdonald, December 16, 1883, 191552-191572.
172. Ibid.; Instruments 2268 and 2324, Brandon Land Titles Office, Brandon, Manitoba.
173. J. A. D. Stuart, The Prairie W.A.S.P.; A History of the Rural Municipality of Oakland, Manitoba, (Winnipeg: The Prairie Publishing Company, 1969), pp. 61, 92 and 147.
174. Manitoba Free Press, December 6, 1883, p. 1.
175. Ibid.
176. Ibid.
177. Ibid.
178. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 2; December 6, 1883, p. 2.
179. Only E. A. Bailey of the identifiable delegates to the Manitou meeting was not a farmer.
180. Derived from the land records at the Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.
181. Nelsonville was probably not much more than 1,000 inhabitants at its height. The Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886 gives the population of Pilot Mound as 54. In 1891, Morden had grown to 1,176 persons.
182. Henderson's Directory of Manitoba and the North West, 1881.

183. The newspapers were: the Brandon Sun, the Brandon Mail, the Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, and the Manitoba Liberal.
184. Brandon was a divisional point on the Canadian Pacific Railway, while Portage la Prairie was the eastern terminus of the Portage, Westbourne and Northwestern.
185. Both Greenway and Young had many business interests, but both always remained connected with agriculture.
186. For example, Ferris Bolton, the Conservative candidate in 1883 in South Dufferin, ran on a platform of railway construction arguing that the Norquay government was more likely to accomplish it than a new Liberal government.
187. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 2; December 6, 1883, p. 2; December 14, 1883, p. 2.
188. Early copies of the Brandon Sun do not appear to have survived. It almost certainly was a supporter of the Farmers' Union as many of its principal shareholders were active in the new organization.
189. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, November 30, 1883, p. 2.
190. Brandon Mail, December 6, 1883, p. 4.
191. No copies of the Nelsonville Mountaineer survive, but as E. A. Bailey was a member of the executive of the Protective Union and the editor of the Mountaineer, it can be surmised his newspaper supported the Protective Union.

#### CHAPTER IV

##### "A SOLEMN, VIGOROUS AND UNITED PROTEST"

The extent of the support accorded to the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union in the autumn of 1883 was remarkable. At the movement's first provincial convention held in Winnipeg in December, 1883, delegates represented practically every agricultural district and every town and city of importance in the English-speaking areas of the province. Within two months, the movement had evolved from an idea suggested by Charles Stewart into the means accepted by many English-speaking Manitobans to obtain redress of grievances.

Less than eight months later, the Union drastically declined in influence. Far from being a forum where all Manitobans were welcome and which represented the hopes and aspirations of the majority of the English-speaking population, it had disintegrated into factions. Following the Union's second Winnipeg convention, held in March, 1884, dissension was rife. The Union was accused of contributing to Manitoba's economic problems and its leaders of fomenting treason. Newspapers once friendly to the Union became ambivalent in their support, and members began to desert the organization. Little more than a month later, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union collapsed.

The explanation for the spectacular rise of the Farmers' Union and for its equally spectacular collapse is to be found in its economic and social structure. The Union acted as an umbrella sheltering diverse organizations, interest groups and individuals,

all holding distinctive opinions as to what was wrong in Manitoba and what was the best way to correct perceived problems. At first such diversity was a strength for it allowed practically anyone to identify with the Union, but later as it became apparent that satisfying one faction among the membership involved offending another, diversity became a source of weakness.

(i)

Following its founding convention in Brandon, in 1883, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union extended its influence throughout the province. Meetings were held at school houses, town halls and churches to organize local associations. At these meetings, the programme of the Farmers' Union was enthusiastically endorsed by those present. But as the Union expanded its base of support, the divisions in its structure, apparent at the founding convention, were exacerbated.

At Carberry, a "large gathering" on December 4, 1883, rapidly divided into two camps. One group, led by the Warden of North Cypress, John McDonnell, proposed that the "farmers organize to build mills and elevators," that "they petition the Government to open the H. B. route" and "to appoint a grain inspector for the proper grading of wheat", and that freight rates on grain be placed "at the lowest possible paying rates." This platform was supported by the farmers of the Big Plain north of Carberry, but it did not find favour with the townsmen who were present. They moved an amendment to the platform which condemned the "excessive tariff" and the railway "monopoly". This development provoked a "heated

discussion", with the proponents of the original platform, led by W. E. Spence, a farmer, lining up against those supporting the amendment led by E. N. Dickie, a real estate speculator. In the end, the amendment was withdrawn and dealt with separately by the meeting. When the votes finally were taken, it was obvious where the sympathies of the meeting lay: the townspeople's resolution carried "almost unanimously".<sup>1</sup>

At the Rapid City meeting held the following evening, the businessmen of the town monopolized the discussions. This was to be expected. Once boomed as the future great city of western Manitoba--David Currie thought it would even rival Winnipeg--<sup>2</sup> Rapid City had been deeply disappointed at the collapse of the Manitoba Boom. Lacking railway connection, the town's existence was threatened and its citizens were ready to accept the wildest of proposals.

The Mayor of Rapid City, Dr. Crawford, was prepared to take the lead in directing the Union into dangerous waters. With several executive members of the Farmers' Union from Brandon, including William Winter and A. L. Sifton, willing to give tacit approval, Crawford launched into a bitter attack on the railway "monopoly", the high freight rates charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway, the tariff, and the federal government for not granting the province its public lands. As solutions to these grievances, he demanded changes in federal policies, and he urged the immediate construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway "even if the Province had to be taxed for so doing." He presented one last solution--one which did the movement no good and ultimately did it much harm--

If they could not obtain their rights constitutionally he was in favour of secession, and if secession could not be obtained, then he for one, much as he loved the British Flag, would emigrate across the line and seek there what could not be obtained in this country--fair play.<sup>3</sup>

This was not the first time that secession had been advocated at a Farmers' Union meeting, but it was the first time that secession had been linked to union with the United States. Charles Stewart had raised the secession issue at the founding convention in Brandon, although he preferred the formation of a new Confederation of the western provinces firmly tied to the British crown.<sup>4</sup> Crawford's statement, when it is noted that the Union agitation was known locally as the "Secession Movement",<sup>5</sup> hinted at the spectre of annexation. At least that was the interpretation of the Free Press which quoted the Mayor as saying that if "there was not a change in the administration of our affairs soon we would have to go over to Dakota in a body."<sup>6</sup>

In the heat of the discussion, no one at Rapid City seemed to realize the potential damage to the movement in what Crawford was saying. Indeed, William Winter, who was given a chance to address the meeting on behalf of the Brandon Union, did not disassociate the parent body from Crawford's sentiments. In a rambling speech, Winter contrasted the happy state of the farmers of North Dakota with that of their less fortunate brethren in Manitoba, and concluded by saying that "if we remained a part of the Dominion we must have special legislation". Should such legislation not be forthcoming, he implied that he favoured secession.<sup>7</sup>

While the townsmen made speeches prophesying dire consequences if grievances were not remedied quickly, the majority

at the meeting were farmers and their support was necessary for any programme adopted. After it was recommended that the meeting resolve itself into the "Rapid City Branch of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union", the Brandon resolutions, without any additions or emendations, were presented to the delegates. Following a brief discussion, they were adopted.<sup>8</sup>

The more moderate position of the farmers at the meeting was not paralleled by plans for co-operative action in the marketplace. Undoubtedly part of the explanation for this failure was the influence exercised by the townsmen, at least one of whom, S. L. Head, was a prominent grain dealer. Another reason was the utter desperation of many of the farmers of the region. A few weeks later, Arthur Lakeman, a merchant, in reply to a letter from a friend in Ontario who was very critical of the Farmers' Union, drew a picture of a rural community so demoralized and indebted that co-operative action no longer provided a solution. He pointed out that "over 60 per cent of the farms around here are already mortgaged and the rate rising every day." The only person who was benefitting from the hardship was a "little old 4 per cent a month Ontario man, who is driving around the country lending money to those in difficulty." To charges that the hardship was the result of extravagant expenditures, Lakeman replied that most of the settlers were anything but extravagant. They lived in log houses, they wore homespun clothing, and they built their own furniture. What had driven them into debt was expensive farm machinery which was "an absolute necessity to the farmer cultivating any considerable amount of land", for "farm labourers are exceedingly scarce and a

high priced luxury."<sup>9</sup>

On December 15, an assembly of "farmers" was held at Emerson, and two days later another was convened at Dominion City. At both meetings self-interested citizens of the towns, led by disappointed land speculators and railway promoters, took up the rural population's cause, ostensibly because they were concerned with the plight of the farmer, but in reality because they needed a forum to air their own grievances. They were joined in their attack on the railway monopoly, high tariffs and freight rates by the virtually bankrupt members of the farming community and by aspiring young politicians. As for the more successful farmers, who were in the majority at both meetings, they silently listened as those who had the most to gain convinced the delegates to support their selfish interests.<sup>10</sup>

The Emerson and Dominion City meetings were more politically inclined than any of the earlier meetings in other centres. Instead of attempting to maintain a non-partisan balance between Liberals and Conservatives transcending party allegiances, each meeting was marked by a bare-faced effort on the part of those present from both political parties to capture the new movement. At Emerson the Liberals were successful, in spite of an able defence by C. S. Douglas, the Conservative Member of the Legislature for the area, of federal programmes affecting the West. Two days later it was the Tories' turn. When Hugh Carmichael, the chairman of the Dominion City convention, attempted to ensure that only Liberals were elected to the local executive, he was hooted until he left the platform, whereupon the Conservatives took over and elected a slate of their own choosing.<sup>11</sup>

The emergence of partisan politics within the Farmers' Union seriously diminished its effectiveness by creating the impression that it was another political movement. Liberals were alienated from the Dominion City Union and Conservatives were alienated from the Emerson Union with the result that neither of these Unions really represented their communities politically.

(ii)

By the time the first provincial convention met at Winnipeg on December 19, 1883, the character of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union had been established. Settlers from different regions of the province rallied to the cause of protest for diverse personal, political or economic reasons so that expectations of what the agitation might accomplish varied from one individual or region to another. Lacking in unity of purpose, the delegates to the Winnipeg assembly had the task of giving the movement the cohesion it needed.

Great strains were placed upon the fragile unity of the Farmers' Union agitation at the Winnipeg convention. As the delegates assembled, the Free Press did its best to associate the movement with the Liberal party. According to an editorial welcoming the delegates, the meeting of the convention was the most "momentous event" that had "occurred in the history of the Dominion." The delegates' purpose was to remove the "oppressive customs tariff" and to "overthrow" the "monopoly", objectives which were in the opinion of the Free Press the view of every "intelligent man in the Northwest" but which were, in point of fact, the Liberal party's position.<sup>12</sup>

The Times was outwardly cool, if not hostile towards the movement. The Farmers' Union agitation was simply the outcome of a body of men who had been ruined by the collapse of the Manitoba Boom forming a league with farmers who had been temporarily embarrassed by the crop failure of the autumn. The delegates had, unfortunately, fallen under the influence of "Grit wire-pullers" who were seeking to use the movement for their own advantage.<sup>13</sup> Not that Amos Rowe, the Times' editor, was impervious to the intensity of the discontent, for he recognized that there was a "great deal of grumbling...heard in this Province and all through the North West", although unlike the editor of the Free Press, he could not blame the "Government, the CP Rway nor Ogilvie" for what he claimed was the fault of the early frosts.<sup>14</sup>

With the two leading provincial newspapers already pre-judging the convention, the delegates would have been advised to proceed cautiously. But as soon as the convention opened, it was apparent that the politically militant members of the Farmers' Union were in the ascendant. Pressure for co-operative action in the marketplace was not exerted by any of the delegates although representatives from Portage la Prairie and from the Protective Union were present.<sup>15</sup>

Since meeting on November 20, farmers from the Portage la Prairie district had splintered into a number of factions. At the Winnipeg convention, the Oaklands district farmers were represented by Roderick McCuaig who clearly favoured co-operative action; the farmers of High Bluff sent the Rev. Nelson Brown, a fiery Methodist preacher and a known Liberal who favoured political action although he also advocated farmers' co-operation. The two

Burnside delegates were probably under the influence of Kenneth McKenzie, an influential farmer and one of the most popular men in the province. The town of Portage la Prairie sent five delegates, one of whom was Joseph Martin, the newly elected Liberal Member of the Legislature for Portage la Prairie. Martin's presence clearly strengthened the political orientation of the meeting. He took a major part in every debate of the convention, was a moving force behind the adoption of the platform, and was finally appointed as one of the Union's delegates to Ottawa.

Having found such an unexpected ally in Martin, the leaders of the Farmers' Union of Brandon also had good cause to be delighted with the representatives of the Protective Union. While the Manitou organization had formed at least twenty local branches in southern Manitoba,<sup>16</sup> only seven branches sent delegates to the provincial meeting.<sup>17</sup> Of these representatives, only one played an important role in the proceedings of the convention. He was E. A. Bailey, the partisan editor of the Nelsonville Mountaineer, who was unrepresentative of the Protective Union and whose Liberalism was well-known throughout the province.<sup>18</sup>

With the majority of the delegates prepared to seek political solutions to problems and with no effective opposition from the Portage la Prairie and southern Manitoba delegates, the Winnipeg convention formed a provincial organization to be called the "Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union", adopted a constitution and accepted a platform that sought a purely political solution to Manitoba's grievances. By far the most interesting section of the platform is the preamble stating the reasoning underlying the demands of the delegates. The members of the Union, recognizing that the

prosperity of the province rested "upon the successful prosecution of agriculture", were concerned with the "present depression in agriculture and commercial industries, in the Province of Manitoba."<sup>19</sup> This statement was a recognition of the alliance that existed between farmers and non-farmers in the Farmers' Union and reflected the occupations of the delegates to the Winnipeg convention.<sup>20</sup> The preamble also claimed that restrictions were placed "upon every effort made by the settlers to extend their operations and improve their condition", a reference to the disappointment and resulting frustration that existed on the Manitoba agricultural frontier. Some of these restrictions were the "oppressive duty" on agricultural implements, "the monopoly of the carrying trade" granted to the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the "vexatious methods employed in the administration of public lands." Finally, it was argued that the citizens of the province were "practically denied the privilege of securing the redress of their grievances through the representatives in the Provincial or Dominion Parliaments."<sup>21</sup> This assertion was a scarcely veiled criticism of the Conservative governments at Winnipeg and Ottawa.

The main planks of the platform confirmed the agitation's partisan stance. The first plank stated that the provincial government had the right to charter railways "anywhere in Manitoba free from any interference." The second plank demanded for the province the "absolute control" of all public lands. The third plank requested that the tariff on "agricultural implements and building materials be removed" and that the duty on goods "entering into daily consumption be greatly modified". This was a clever way of introducing the Liberal policy of a tariff for revenue only.

The fourth plank asked the provincial government to amend the Municipal Act so that local councils could "build or assist in building elevators, grain warehouses and mills." The fifth plank requested the same government to "appoint grain inspectors, whose duty it shall be to grade all grain", and the final plank endorsed the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway. Later one other resolution was added to the platform: a demand that the federal government appoint a westerner as a Cabinet minister to look after the region's interests.<sup>22</sup>

Given the blatantly political nature of the platform--especially its first three planks--not surprisingly, it was attacked by the leading Conservatives present. Charles Cliffe, the editor of the Brandon Mail, emerged as the spokesman of this group. Cliffe proposed an amendment to the platform which, if accepted, would have substantially changed the demands that the Union was making. His amendment asked that the province receive an increased subsidy; that Manitoba be given the right to charter railways "for local purposes"--he did not think that any province had the right to charter a line to a provincial or international boundary without federal consent--that freight rates be reduced; that a 25% rebate be "allowed all importers of agricultural implements"; that the Province enable municipalities to "impose a wild-land tax on all unimproved land" held by speculators; and that the Hudson's Bay Railway be built without further delay.<sup>23</sup>

Cliffe explained the reasoning behind the amendment in a letter to Sir John A. Macdonald. He thought that while the "Grit portion of the country will be satisfied with nothing less than anarchy or annexation", there were genuine grievances. Some

of those grievances were the "case of hardship when the C.P.R. refuse to allow private parties to load grain cars from sleighs requiring all /farmers/ to pass thru elevators owned by Ogilvie"; the high rates charged by the same company for carrying wheat short distances; the rates charged for carrying coal from Medicine Hat to Brandon which were "pure extortion"; and the high cost of farm equipment. The "most grievous" drawback to the country was the "want of means to support rural schools." He amplified this point:

In many districts there are not more than 12 to 15 families on farms that are improved and productive of any considerable school rate, and for these to put up a building and pay a teacher is a tax of no small moment, and there are nearly 200 Districts in the Province in this position. It is now while the people are comparatively poor aid is required.

Despite the grievances, however, he added that "the settlers of this country are many times better off than were the settlers of Ontario", but this status was "not enough" since expectations were high and few settlers were doing as well as they hoped.<sup>24</sup>

If Cliffe had succeeded in having his amendment accepted, the result would have been a greatly modified platform and a more moderate approach to the redress of grievances, an approach which the Conservative party in Manitoba would have been able to support. Instead, partly because Martin and Bailey fully controlled the discussions on the platform, the convention was not receptive. No one seconded Cliffe's amendment, although some delegates said "they would support certain sections of it moved separately." Cliffe insisted that the amendment be put as a whole, and was subsequently forced to withdraw it.<sup>25</sup>

The Conservative failure to influence the platform of the new organization was not the only feature of the Winnipeg convention which indicated the political nature of the provincial

Union. The presence of delegates from the Manitoba Rights League, a Liberal body, was not calculated to put an end to Conservative suspicions.<sup>26</sup> While the League's representatives were not given voting privileges, they did take an active part in the debates and leading members of the League and the Union expressed their desire to co-operate together in achieving their mutual objectives.<sup>27</sup> Such an alliance was, in effect, notice that the Union intended to behave as an arm of the Liberal party.

Charles Stewart helped to drive a wedge between the Liberals and Conservatives at the convention. He presented a resolution calling for Manitoba's secession from Canada and the formation of a new Confederation of the North West "provinces" and British Columbia. The resolution failed to find a seconder, but other speakers at the convention, when they proclaimed the bankruptcy of Confederation and the imminent collapse of the Canadian nation,<sup>28</sup> gave credence to the belief that secession lurked just below the surface in the Union. By skirting what the Conservative press in Canada would regard as treason, the Union gave its enemies an issue on which they could effectively attack the new organization.

Further evidence that the Union was associating itself with disloyal sentiments was provided by a letter from James Taylor, president of the Manitoba Old Settlers' Association. In it, Taylor gave an outline of the Resistance of 1869-1870 at Red River and concluded by stating that "if we would have fair play in this country we must begin with our appeals from the year 1870..." When the letter was read to the delegates, W. T. Lonsdale took the floor, identifying himself as one of the elected representatives to Louis Riel's second convention where the original "Bill of Rights" for the province had been adopted. In his opinion, "the farmers

were taking their present stand in reference to grievances almost as great as those of that time."<sup>29</sup>

Taylor's letter and Lonsdale's ill-judged reply were bound to inflame feelings against the Union in some quarters. While most Manitobans had long since ceased to cry out for Riel's blood-- he had visited the province in 1883 and been treated as something of a celebrity--<sup>30</sup> there were those who had not forgotten the events of the Resistance culminating in Thomas Scott's execution. By tying the Farmers' Union, no matter how tenuously, to the earlier agitation, the delegates were courting condemnation by the Conservative press and by a substantial portion of the public.

The split between the Liberals and Conservatives within the Farmers' Union was not long in coming. Within twenty-four hours of the close of the convention, Charles Cliffe, Dr. D. M. Haggarty, Roderick McCuaig, and Dr. J. P. Pennefather, all of whom were prominent Conservatives and members of the Union's provincial executive, resigned their positions in protest over the Liberal stance of the Union. In separate letters to the Winnipeg Daily Times, each criticized the Union leadership for its Liberal bias.<sup>31</sup> Each argued that he understood that the Union was formed to aid farmers, but by taking a political position corresponding to that of the Liberal party, the farmers in their desperation were being used as pawns by unscrupulous politicians for political advantage.

No sooner had the delegates started their journey home, than the Times added its voice to the chorus condemning the Farmers' Union. The Union had been captured by the likes of Bailey and Martin, neither of whom was a farmer, and both of whom were in the movement to advance their own personal interests. As to be

expected at any "Grit" function, there was an undercurrent of secession and before too long it would be only too apparent what the Union was really about--separation from Canada.<sup>32</sup>

The Conservative press in the province followed the Times' lead. According to the Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, the "true inwardness of the Brandon agitation which has been falsely called the 'Farmers Movement' by way of a kind of cloak" was secession. Secession, in turn, was the solution proposed by "dyed in the wool aspiring Grit politicians, as are all the leaders in this agitation."<sup>33</sup> Charles Cliffe's Brandon Mail was just as vigorous in condemning the Union. It had been captured by "professional agitators" who were not farmers, while most of its leaders were simply Grits who wished to see the destruction of Confederation and desired to "secure nothing but capital for the Grit party at the next election."<sup>34</sup>

Conservative politicians were usually more circumspect in assailing the Farmers' Union. Joseph Royal, Member of Parliament for Provencher, might publicly describe the Union members as "parties who wanted to look to Washington" and Hugh John Macdonald, the Prime Minister's son, might characterize the Union's leaders as "briefless attorneys",<sup>35</sup> but both John Norquay and Sir John A. Macdonald kept whatever reservations they had about the Union to themselves,<sup>36</sup> and publicly promised redress except for those grievances that affected the policies for national development of which the construction of the Canadian Pacific Railway was the keystone.

Norquay, when interviewed by a delegation from the Winnipeg convention in December, stated that his government was "in entire sympathy with the views expressed in the resolutions"

passed by the convention.<sup>37</sup> Unfortunately, many of the demands for redress of grievances were beyond the legal jurisdiction of the provincial government. The only thing it could do was to amend the Municipal Act so that the municipal councils could build or assist in building elevators and grain warehouses.<sup>38</sup>

Sir John A. Macdonald behaved in much the same way towards the Farmers' Union. When the delegation from the Union, consisting of Joseph Martin, E. A. Bailey, Alexander Mutchmor and George Purvis presented the "Declaration of Rights" to the federal government in February, 1884, the Prime Minister was firm in granting would could be granted and no more. Dealing first with the question of representation in the federal Cabinet, he pointed out a fundamental feature of Canadian politics.

In forming a cabinet the first minister's duty was to find men possessed of ability and capable in other respects to fill the position with credit to the country. Secondly, men who could bring the largest following. In the United States ministers were chosen indiscriminately without reference to the claims of any particular state.

With regard to the Hudson's Bay Railway, he noted that the government had already made large concessions to the railways chartered to build that line. Those concessions were "double that given any road except the C.P.R. at the nominal price of 50¢ per acre."

While the federal government was aware of the importance of the Hudson's Bay Railway, it "would take time to accomplish it and the country as yet did not need two exits for their products." As for the "monopoly clause", he chastized the delegates. There was "nothing to prevent branch lines from being built to connect with the C.P.R. even parallel lines might be built." On the other hand, the government was "bound in honour to protect and see that the trade of this country

was not carried to the south connecting with the American system." The government would grant but two concessions on this issue. First, as soon as the Canadian Pacific Railway was completed "from ocean to ocean" the Company would cease to enforce the "monopoly clause". Second, once the railroad was placed on "a paying footing the Government would see that excessive rates were not imposed." Until that time, the "Government felt that it would be a hardship to the company to insist on low freight rates." Finally, Macdonald, in answer to the delegates' request for rebates on the duty on agricultural machinery and building supplies, replied that the government could not reasonably be "expected to make an exceptional tariff".<sup>39</sup>

With the Conservative administrations in both Ottawa and Winnipeg publicly uncommitted to anything more than partial redress of grievances, with the Conservative press attacking the Union, and with the defections from its executive, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union should have been conciliatory towards the Conservative element in the province. That it was not is another indication of the degree to which it had been captured by the Liberal party. When Cliffe, Haggarty, McCuaig and Pennefather left the Union, there was still a remote possibility that the rupture could have been repaired. Instead, E. A. Bailey wrote a lengthy letter to the Free Press condemning the four men and attacking their character.<sup>40</sup> Furthermore, in a pamphlet published by the Union in January, 1884, setting out the Union's goals, one of the sections was highly critical of the Norquay government.<sup>41</sup> Although George Purvis, the provincial secretary of the Union, apologized in March for its inclusion and tried to explain that it was a mistake, the damage was done.<sup>42</sup>

TABLE XI

POLITICAL AFFILIATION OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Liberal	3	14	40
Conservative	2	9	19
Independent	2	1	9
Unknown	13	16	39
Unidentified	2	5	1
	—	—	—
Totals	22	45	108

(iii)

By the time the second provincial convention of the Union assembled in Winnipeg on March 5, 1884, the farmers' movement had become closely identified with the Liberal party. The Farmers' Union's emphasis upon political means to achieve redress of grievances gave the Liberals the opening they needed to take over the organization. This victory was reflected in the political composition of the second convention. Although there was still a large number of Conservatives present, as Table XI illustrates, they were on the whole relatively unimportant figures. With the exception of Charles Cliffe whose presence can be accounted for by his desire to correct the injury done by the Union in the "old countries, whence our immigration is expected",<sup>43</sup> all of the prominent political figures present were Liberals. Indeed, the convention was practically a roll of the aspiring Liberal politicians in the province. Among the delegates were a future Minister of the Interior,<sup>44</sup> a future Canadian senator,<sup>45</sup> a future Premier of Manitoba,<sup>46</sup> a future Premier of British Columbia,<sup>47</sup> two future Cabinet ministers in the government of Thomas Greenway,<sup>48</sup> and a clutch of future Liberal Members of the Legislature.<sup>49</sup> As the captive of the Liberal party, the great convention which was called to chart the future action of the movement in response to the rebuff of the delegates to Ottawa, represented the views of only a portion of the Manitoba public. Redress of grievances may have been generally desired, but many Manitobans were not interested in furthering Liberal ends.

Besides the development of a political bias, there were other weaknesses that had been accented by developments in the agitation between December, 1883, and March, 1884. The most

important of these was the growing diversity of elements which were rallying to the Farmers' Union. Because of the Union's broad platform, individuals supported the Union's cause for a wide variety of reasons. What many of these individuals wanted was redress of local grievances rather than the redress of grievances common to the whole province. Consequently, all that many members shared in common was the belief that the Farmers' Union offered the means to rectify their own pressing local problems.

At Deloraine the problem was depopulation. At a meeting held on February 1 to discuss the possibility of forming a local Union, speakers bewailed the fact that "hundreds have left this section" in the past year to locate across the line in the Dakota Territory. Those who had stayed had done so only because they had "invested their all in the cultivation of their lands, and have not the means to begin again." If economic conditions did not improve, desperate action could be expected. As one speaker argued, "Loyalty is a beautiful sentiment, but the farmers are beginning to realize that it would not provide bread for the family." The only solution that could avert secession was the development of "cheap transportation to the grain markets of the world, without which grain raising which had to contend against other disadvantages would never pay in Manitoba."<sup>50</sup>

When meetings were held at Millford and Wakopa to establish local Unions, the issue was railways. The Wakopa meeting, attended only by farmers, was concerned with the desperate condition of the rural population and saw the reason for the farmers' situation in the "want of railway facilities through South Western Manitoba, which deprive /sic/ the farmers of one of the best agricultural districts in the Northwest of a market for their produce."<sup>51</sup> At Millford, similar feelings were expressed, but as there was a large

delegation from the town present, it was not only the farmers' welfare which was threatened. Millford needed the railway to survive and the agitation conducted by the Farmers' Union could prove useful in obtaining it.<sup>52</sup>

Similar sentiments were argued at a meeting at Carman. The Carman assembly was composed almost exclusively of townsmen, led by the redoubtable R. P. Roblin.<sup>53</sup> Assured by the backers of the Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway that their line would cross the Boyne River where Roblin had established himself, he had invested everything he had in the townsite of Carman. When the Manitoba South Western went bankrupt, the end of the track was still six miles from the townsite.<sup>54</sup> Roblin and the other citizens of the hamlet were desperately trying to convince the Canadian Pacific Railway which had taken over the Manitoba South Western to build the remaining six miles and so ensure the survival of the village and the preservation of Roblin's investment.<sup>55</sup>

Railways were the issue at Virden as well. Here the problem was not the need for a railway--the town had been laid out by the Canadian Pacific Railway--but the cost of transportation. Townsmen and farmers were agreed that the chief factor working against their prospering was the high freight rate schedule. The farmers were convinced that with lower freight rates they could grow wheat profitably; the townsmen believed that a prosperous farming community would improve the depressed business conditions that were severely affecting the fortunes of the merchants.<sup>56</sup>

The formation of a branch at Oak Lake in January was in response to a different desire. The farmers of the district saw

little point in arguing about tariffs and railway "monopolies". What they needed was immediate aid and not the will-o-the-wisp promises of a political agitation. The whole purpose behind the formation of the Oak Lake local Union was the construction of a farmers' elevator which Robert Lang, a prominent farmer, informed the Free Press would hopefully increase the farmers' share of the profits to be made from wheat growing.<sup>57</sup>

Three groups in Winnipeg also interested themselves in the Farmers' Union. The first of these was composed of businessmen who wished to establish an "Empire of the Red River" in competition with the Empire of the St. Lawrence.<sup>58</sup> The key to this dream was the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway, which would not only provide competition to the Canadian Pacific Railway, resulting in lower freight rates in Manitoba, but would also provide a shorter route to Europe for exports from the American Mid-West. Winnipeg, because of its strategic location on this route, would control the trade and would rival Chicago and New York as a commercial centre.<sup>59</sup>

In pursuit of the "Empire of the Red River", two Winnipeg businessmen, James E. Steen and William Clark, established the only contacts between American and Western Canadian agrarian protest movements in the 1880's.<sup>60</sup> They attended a Farmers' Convention in Grand Forks, Dakota Territory, where they presented their argument for the Hudson's Bay Railway. The 1,000 delegates to the convention "enthusiastically applauded" their presentation, adopting a resolution in favour of an immediate start on construction.<sup>61</sup>

A second Winnipeg group, the Board of Trade, evinced an interest in the Farmers' Union, in part because of the Union's

support of the Hudson's Bay Railway--James Steen was a member of the Board--and in part because the Board wanted lower tariffs and freight rates.<sup>62</sup> Following the first provincial convention of the Farmers' Union in December, the Board passed a "vote of sympathy in support of the movement of the farmers," and when George Purvis invited the Board to send delegates to the second convention in March, the members agreed, although not without some opposition being expressed.<sup>63</sup>

The final Winnipeg group which was interested in the Farmers' Union was the banking fraternity. At the March convention all of the managers of the chartered banks in the city attended as observers. While none of them made the purpose of their presence clear, except to say that they had been invited by the Union executive,<sup>64</sup> their interest in the meeting is self-evident. The banks had underwritten the Manitoba Boom and when the Boom collapsed, they were burdened with loans on property, which if judgment were secured against the owners would still entail considerable losses.<sup>65</sup> The only hope the banks had of covering the losses they had already sustained and avoiding future losses was for an improvement in Manitoba's economic climate. If the Farmers' Union could secure sufficient changes in federal policies so that better times would return, the banks had much to gain.

All the individuals who rallied to the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union--whether Winnipeg businessmen or farmers hoping to establish their own elevators--expanded the base on which the movement rested. This was both a source of strength and a weakness. The broader the base of the Union, the more able the Union was to claim that it represented all Manitobans in its negotiations with

TABLE XII

PRINCIPAL OCCUPATIONS OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Architects			1
Bankers			9
Blacksmiths	1		3
Brewers			1
Clergymen	1	1	3
Contractors	1	1	2
Doctors		3	2
Editors	1	2	4
Farmers	12	20	48
Financial Agents		1	
Furniture Merchants	1		
General Merchants	1	1	5
Grain Dealers			1
Hardware Merchants			1
Hoteliers	1		1
Lawyers	1	5	12
Lumber Merchants			2
Livery and Stable Owners			1
Managers			1
Millers			3
Quarry Owners			1
Real Estate Dealers		6	6
Unknown	none	none	none
Unidentified	2	5	1
Totals	22	45	108
Non-farmers with farming interests	5	5	11
Farmers with non-farming interests	3	3	12

the Norquay and Macdonald governments. On the other side of the coin, the broader the base, the less real unity there was in the organization. With so many individual interests involved, it was almost impossible to meet the expectations of all the movement's supporters.

(iv)

The growing diversity of the membership of the Farmers' Union is reflected in the economic and social structure of its conventions. Table XII showing the occupations of the delegates to the conventions affords the best example. Where 54.5% of the identifiable delegates to the Brandon assembly were farmers, only 50% of the first provincial convention and 44.9% of the second provincial convention made their living from agriculture. The proportional decline in the number of farmers present is directly related to the expansion of the movement into the political arena and to the appeal of the Union to individuals who saw the movement as a means of achieving ends that were not necessarily those desired by the farming population.

Normally the farmers had little in common with the merchants, professional men and agents who lived in the towns. It was the local merchant or implement dealer who, when the farmer could not pay his debts, placed a chattel mortgage on the farmer's property. It was the lawyer who served as agent for a mortgage company. It was the grain merchant who determined that wheat should receive a lower grade and a correspondingly lower price. It was the local banker who charged interest rate of up to 24% per annum on loans. And it was the local newspaper editor who criticized the farmer for being lazy and unintelligent when he was doing his

best to make a living.<sup>66</sup>

What united the townspeople and the farmers was the economic situation. Very few Manitobans were not feeling the pinch of hard times. Farmers throughout the province, whether or not their crop had suffered from the frost of September, 1883, were receiving such low prices for their grain that often the costs of production outran their meagre returns.<sup>67</sup> In the towns, the rural depression so affected business that debts could no longer be collected. Sales of supplies and new farm equipment practically ceased.<sup>68</sup> In Winnipeg, the wholesale trade declined, forcing some of the leading merchants, among them the pioneer hardware merchant, J. H. Ashdown, to retrench.<sup>69</sup>

Under the existing economic conditions, survival for many Manitoba farmers meant taking out a mortgage. By 1883, rural indebtedness was common in Manitoba as it was throughout the rural districts of the whole of North America.<sup>70</sup> In Manitoba, as in other regions, debt took two forms: chattel mortgages and land mortgages. Chattel mortgages on crops and farm implements were taken out by settlers who had not yet acquired title to their property or by those individuals who had patented their land, but who had placed such heavy land mortgages on it that they could not acquire further financial assistance by using their real property as security. Although T. M. Daly noted that large numbers of farmers in the Brandon area were taking out chattel mortgages in the autumn of 1883,<sup>71</sup> little can be determined about the extent of that type of debt either among the general population or among delegates to the Farmers' Union conventions.<sup>72</sup>

Some intimation of the extent of land indebtedness

TABLE XIII

MORTGAGE DEBT  
IN  
TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE FIVE WEST, 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR</u> <sup>o</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>LANDOWNERS</u> <sup>+</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>MORTGAGED</u> <u>LANDOWNERS</u> <sup>+</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>FIRST</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u> <sup>+</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>SECOND</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u> <sup>+</sup>
1881	26	10	11	2
1891	52	25	30	3
1901	55	28	35	9

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any land company until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

<sup>+</sup>Excluding token mortgages of \$1.00. The discrepancy between the number of landowners who were mortgaged and the number of primary mortgages is explained by the fact that some landowners owned several parcels of land and mortgaged different parcels of land with different legal instruments.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XIV

MORTGAGE DEBT  
IN  
TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE SIX WEST, 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR</u> <sup>o</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>LANDOWNERS</u> <sup>+</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>MORTGAGED</u> <u>LANDOWNERS</u> <sup>+</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>FIRST</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u> <sup>+</sup>	<u>NO. OF</u> <u>SECOND</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u> <sup>+</sup>
1881	11	4	4	none
1891	39	20	20	3
1901	56	37	45	10

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands belonging to the Hudson's Bay Company, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or any land company until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

<sup>+</sup>Excluding token mortgages of \$1.00. The discrepancy between the number of landowners who were mortgaged and the number of primary mortgages is explained by the fact that some landowners owned several parcels of land and mortgaged different parcels of land with different legal instruments.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XV

PATENTED AGRICULTURAL LANDS MORTGAGED  
IN TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE FIVE WEST: 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR<sup>o</sup></u>	<u>PATENTED LANDS (IN ACRES)</u>	<u>LANDS MORTGAGED (IN ACRES)</u>	<u>% MORTGAGED</u>
1880	7,680	960	12.50
1885	14,400	8,240	57.22
1890	14,720	6,320	42.93
1895	15,200	7,040	46.32
1900	15,520	7,200	46.39

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Canadian Pacific Railway until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XVI

PATENTED AGRICULTURAL LAND MORTGAGED  
IN TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE SIX WEST: 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR<sup>o</sup></u>	<u>PATENTED LANDS (IN ACRES)</u>	<u>LANDS MORTGAGED (IN ACRES)</u>	<u>% MORTGAGED</u>
1880	2,560	800	31.25
1885	7,840	4,800	61.22
1890	10,400	5,120	49.23
1895	13,440	7,840	58.33
1900	18,080	12,160	67.26

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company, and the Canadian Pacific Railway until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XVII

LAND PURCHASES AND MORTGAGE INDEBTEDNESS  
IN TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE FIVE WEST: 1881-1891\*

<u>YEAR<sup>o</sup></u>	<u>NUMBER OF MORTGAGED LANDOWNERS</u>	<u>NUMBER OF LANDOWNERS MORTGAGED BECAUSE OF LAND PURCHASES</u>	<u>% OF LANDOWNERS MORTGAGED BECAUSE OF LAND PURCHASES</u>
1881	10	2	20.00
1891	25	9	36.00
1901	28	17	60.71

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XVIII

LAND PURCHASES AND MORTGAGE INDEBTEDNESS  
IN TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE SIX WEST: 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR<sup>o</sup></u>	<u>NUMBER OF MORTGAGED LANDOWNERS</u>	<u>NUMBER OF LANDOWNERS MORTGAGED BECAUSE OF LAND PURCHASES</u>	<u>% OF LANDOWNERS MORTGAGED BECAUSE OF LAND PURCHASES</u>
1881	4	1	25.00
1891	20	7	35.00
1901	37	18	48.65

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

among Manitoba farmers can be determined from an examination of the indebtedness of the landowners<sup>73</sup> in two townships in the Red River Valley. In township six range five west, 38.5% of the landowners were mortgaged in 1881. This proportion of debted landowners increased to 48.6% in 1891 and to 50.9% in 1901. In township six range six west, the percentage of landowners who had mortgaged their property increased from 36.4% in 1881 to 51.3% in 1891 to 66.1% in 1901.<sup>74</sup>

Tables XV and XVI indicate that there is a correlation between the agricultural depression of the mid-1880's and the acquisition of mortgage debts. The first peak in the percentage of patented agricultural land<sup>75</sup> mortgaged in both townships occurs in 1885 following a series of poor harvests. It declines in 1890, but rises again in 1895 following a slump in world wheat prices.

But by the 1890's, much of the landed debt in both townships was the result of land purchases as Tables XVII and XVIII illustrate.<sup>76</sup> By 1901, 60.7% of mortgaged landowners in township six range five west and 48.7% of mortgaged landowners in township six range six west had acquired mortgages because of land purchases. Since debt acquired in the purchase of land can be considered as an investment rather than a liability, the level of mortgage indebtedness resulting from economic difficulties encountered by farmers in both townships was actually considerably lower by 1901 than it had been a decade and a half earlier.

The most significant feature of mortgage indebtedness in townships six ranges five and six west are the differences between the two townships in the level of indebtedness and in the average amount of debt shouldered by the landowners.<sup>77</sup> Both

TABLE XIX

VALUE OF MORTGAGE DEBT  
IN TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE FIVE WEST: 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR</u> <sup>o</sup>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>VALUE</u> <u>FIRST</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u> <u>VALUE</u> <u>FIRST</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u>	<u>TOTAL</u> <u>VALUE</u> <u>SECOND</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u> <u>VALUE</u> <u>SECOND</u> <u>MORTGAGES</u>	<u>AVERAGE</u> <u>DEBT PER</u> <u>MORTGAGED</u> <u>LANDOWNER</u>
1881	\$ 9,010.00	\$ 819.09	\$ 2,300.00	\$1,150.00	\$1,028.18
1891	\$43,859.00	\$1,461.97	\$ 3,800.00	\$1,266.67	\$2,106.36
1901	\$62,498.33	\$1,785.67	\$15,299.95	\$1,699.99	\$2,778.51

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company until they are alienated to and individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XX

VALUE OF MORTGAGE DEBT  
IN TOWNSHIP SIX RANGE SIX WEST: 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR<sup>o</sup></u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE FIRST MORTGAGES</u>	<u>AVERAGE VALUE FIRST MORTGAGES</u>	<u>TOTAL VALUE SECOND MORTGAGES</u>	<u>AVERAGE VALUE SECOND MORTGAGES</u>	<u>AVERAGE DEBT PER MORTGAGED LANDOWNER</u>
1881	\$ 2,650.00	\$ 662.50	none	none	\$ 662.50
1891	\$18,970.00	\$ 903.33	\$ 4,500.00	\$1,500.00	\$1,117.62
1901	\$37,930.00	\$ 842.88	\$14,844.50	\$1,484.45	\$1,426.34

---

\*Excluding those lands under the Real Property Act and those lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company until they are alienated to an individual.

<sup>o</sup>As of December 31st.

---

Source: Data derived from Abstract Book 6-5, 6-6, Morden Land Titles Office, Morden, Manitoba.

TABLE XXI

MORTGAGE INDEBTEDNESS AND RATE OF FORECLOSURE  
AMONG LANDOWNING DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.\*

	Brandon 1883	Winnipeg 1883	1884
Landowners	12	22	55
Average Size Farm	314.5A	341.1A	460.4A
Number in Debt	2	11	25
% in Debt	16.7%	50.0%	45.5%
Average Debt Per Debted Farmer	\$2,250.00	\$3,373.64	\$2,948.96
Average Debt Per Acre of Debted Farmers	\$ 4.33	\$ 4.34	\$ 4.32
Number Foreclosed by 1890	3	10	12
% Foreclosed by 1890	25%	45.5%	21.8%
Number Foreclosed 1891-1900		1	1
% Foreclosed 1891-1900		4.5%	1.8%
Number of Sales by 1890		2	4
% Sales by 1890		9.1%	7.3%
Number of Sales 1891-1900	1	2	7
% Sales 1891-1900	8.3%	9.1%	12.7%
Under Real Property Act	2	1	6

---

\* As of December 31, 1883 and December 31, 1884.

---

TABLE XXII

DATE OF ARRIVAL IN MANITOBA OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Before 1870		1	5
1870			3
1871			
1872		2	4
1873	2		1
1874		3	3
1875	1		2
1876		1	1
1877	1		5
1878		1	8
1879		5	12
1880	4	4	8
1881	9	5	18
1882	1	4	11
1883		2	3
1884			
Native Manitobans		1	1
Unknown	2	11	22
Unidentified	2	5	1
Totals	<u>22</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>108</u>

townships were settled at about the same time by Scots-Irish Canadians from Ontario,<sup>78</sup> both enjoyed equally good access to transportation,<sup>79</sup> and in both the soil types were similar.<sup>80</sup> Yet, landowners in township six range six west were more heavily burdened with land mortgages than those in township six range five west. Since there were major differences in the level and extent of land indebtedness in these two adjacent townships, it is possible that throughout Manitoba there were local and regional differences in mortgage indebtedness.

At the conventions of the Farmers' Union regional differences are evident in the extent of indebtedness among land-owning delegates. Whereas almost half the farmers attending the Winnipeg provincial conventions had mortgaged their land, under 20% of the farmers at the Brandon meeting, the vast majority of whom were from the Brandon district, had sought loans with their property as security.<sup>81</sup>

The Brandon statistics reflect local circumstances. Before land could be mortgaged, title had to be obtained from either the Crown or the Canadian Pacific Railway's lands department. In both instances, the patent was not issued until the conditions of the grant or purchase were fulfilled. Since the Brandon region was settled later than districts in the Red River Valley or on the Portage Plains, fewer farmers had been able to complete the requisite three years residence for a patent to be issued by the Crown.<sup>82</sup> Similarly, the Canadian Pacific Railway normally required that payment for purchases of its land be made over five years' time.<sup>83</sup> When the landowning delegates to the Brandon

convention did acquire legal possession of their property, they were not long in mortgaging their newly acquired asset. By the end of 1885, 50% of those who were present at the 1883 convention had mortgaged their land.<sup>84</sup>

Throughout the province, but especially in those districts adjacent to the Old Red River parishes, the Manitoba Boom had encouraged many farmers to take out heavy land mortgages. On the whole these debts were not the result of land speculation. Optimism and increased property values for farm lands--up to \$175 per acre was paid for farms during the Boom--<sup>85</sup> encouraged farmers to borrow against the future in order to acquire working capital. As land values increased so did the mortgage value of property, and farmers were not slow to take advantage of the greater availability of capital that inflated land values brought. When the Boom ended, property values collapsed. According to the Manitoba government the value of improved land ranged from \$8.55 per acre in 1885 to \$7.37 per acre in 1887,<sup>86</sup> and value of unimproved land ranged from \$4.51 per acre in 1885 to \$4.18 per acre in 1887.<sup>87</sup> Many farmers in 1885 found themselves saddled with debts that were greater than the value of their property if sold on the open market.<sup>88</sup>

The fact that many of the landowners found themselves badly over-extended as a result of the heavier burden of debt they assumed during the Manitoba Boom is demonstrated by the high rate of foreclosure among delegates to the Farmers' Union conventions.<sup>89</sup> Because the movement offered some hope for those caught in the morass of debt, the premonition of disaster appears to have played an important part in convincing many of the farmer-delegates to

rally behind the Farmers' Union. For others not so self-interested as those on the verge of bankruptcy, their deeply mortgaged neighbours became object lessons of the misfortune which could befall themselves if economic conditions did not improve.

Economic hardship affected all farmers, although it did make a difference whether one owned 160 acres or 1,000 acres. As Seymour Martin Lipset noted about the farmers who belonged to the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan during the Great Depression of the 1930's, farmers with large holdings enjoyed greater profits in good years than farmers with small holdings, but they also suffered more heavily in lean years.<sup>90</sup> Among landowning delegates to the Farmers' Union conventions, the average size of landholdings was over 300 acres, while the average-sized farm in the province was only 262.7 acres in 1881<sup>91</sup> and 237.4 acres in 1886.<sup>92</sup> Of the landowners who were delegates, those with large holdings were more likely to have mortgaged their property and were more likely to have been foreclosed than those with small holdings. But the small landowners who had mortgaged their property were more likely to be foreclosed than mortgaged large landowners.<sup>93</sup>

The indebtedness of the farmer-delegates to the Farmers' Union conventions related less to the means by which a landowner acquired his property than to the rate at which he expanded his farming operations. Those farmers who purchased land--from the government, the Canadian Pacific Railway, or from a previous owner--were only slightly more likely to be in debt than those who had taken out a homestead or a homestead and pre-emption; but those farmers who attempted to expand their landholdings by purchase,

TABLE XXIII  
INDEBTEDNESS AND FORECLOSURE RELATED  
TO SIZE OF LAND HOLDINGS AT  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number in Debt</u>	<u>Number Eventually Foreclosed</u>
Under 100 Acres			
101-200 Acres	46	11	13
201-300 Acres			
301-400 Acres	25	13	7
401-500 Acres	3	3	1
501-600 Acres	1	1	
601 Acres Plus	13	9	6
Unknown	1	1	

TABLE XXIV

MEANS BY WHICH PROPERTY WAS ACQUIRED  
BY LANDOWNING DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon 1883	Winnipeg 1883	1884
Landowners	12	22	55
Homestead	6	3	19
Homestead & Pre-emption	3	2	12
Homestead, Pre-emption, and Private Purchase		2	1
Homestead & C.P.R. Sale	2	1	1
Homestead, Pre-emption and Government Sale			1
Homestead, Special Grant, and Private Purchase			1
Homestead and Government Sale		2	
Government Sale		1	5
C.P.R. Sale	1	5	7
Hudson's Bay Company Sale		1	
Manitoba Act Grant		1	2
Private Purchase		2	4
Military Bounty Grant and Manitoba Act Grant			1
Military Bounty Grant and Common Grant		1	
Special Grant and Private Purchase			1
Unknown		1	

TABLE XXV

INDEBTEDNESS AND FORECLOSURE BY  
MEANS OF ACQUIRING PROPERTY AT  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number in Debt</u>	<u>Number Eventually Foreclosed</u>
Homestead	28	6	5
Homestead & Pre-emption	17	8	4
Homestead, Pre-emption, and Private purchase	3	3	2
Homestead & C.P.R. Sale	44	4	4
Homestead, Pre-emption and Government Sale	1	1	
Homestead, Special Grant, and Private Purchase	1	1	
Homestead and Government Sale	2	1	1
Government Sale	6	3	2
C.P.R. Sale	13	4	7
Hudson's Bay Company Sale	1		
Manitoba Act Grant	3	3	3
Private Purchase	6	2	
Military Bounty Grant and Manitoba Act Grant	1		
Military Bounty Grant and Common Grant	1	1	
Special Grant and Private Purchase	1	1	
Unknown	1		

especially during the Manitoba Boom, found themselves in greater financial difficulty than their less ambitious neighbours.<sup>94</sup>

Furthermore, the depth of the agricultural depression and the hardship it wrought obscured some very real differences in the rural community. The farmer who had so heavily mortgaged his land that foreclosure was imminent was far more desperate than the one who could still manage to meet the interest payments on a mortgage, while the farmer who was free of debt was less desperate than the one who had to meet payment on his mortgage. The consequences of these differences in experience was that self-interest determined attitudes. The more self-interested the farmer, the more likely he was to accept radical solutions to his problems. Since a high proportion of the farmers who were delegates to the Union's conventions were in a poor financial position, the resolutions adopted by the conventions demanded radical changes in federal policies. There was the possibility that this approach would alienate the more successful farmers, but in the winter of 1883-1884, destitution and hardship were so widespread that the rural community acted in concert.

Unity was given to the Farmers' Union by the common cultural background shared by members of the movement. The Union was primarily a Canadian organization.<sup>95</sup> The majority of the delegates, like the majority of settlers in most districts of the province, had arrived in Manitoba from Ontario, while a handful had immigrated from the other provinces. Some of the Canadians were originally from Great Britain;<sup>96</sup> other British newcomers came directly from the United Kingdom. The British element, although

TABLE XXVI

LAST PLACE OF RESIDENCE BEFORE IMMIGRATING  
TO MANITOBA OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Canada			
Ontario	9	14	45
Quebec		1	5
Nova Scotia			2
New Brunswick		1	1
Prince Edward Island			1
British Columbia			
North West Territories			
United Kingdom			
England & Wales	1	3	3
Ireland	1	1	1
Scotland		1	7
Other British Possessions			
United States		1	3
Native Manitobans		1	1
Unknown	9	17	38
Unidentified	2	5	1
Totals	<u>22</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>108</u>

TABLE XXVII

BIRTHPLACE OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Canada			
Ontario	5	4	17
Quebec			3
Nova Scotia			3
New Brunswick			
Prince Edward Island			2
British Columbia			
North West Territories			
Manitoba		1	1
United Kingdom			
England & Wales	2	3	5
Ireland	1	1	4
Scotland		4	14
Other British Possessions		1	
United States			
Unknown	12	26	58
Unidentified	2	5	1
Totals	<u>22</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>108</u>

it made up only a small portion of the total number of participants in the movement, played a key role in the formation of the Farmers' Union. If it had not been for Charles Stewart, the idea of an agitation to redress Manitoba's grievances might never have been formulated. The few delegates who had immigrated from the United States, were for the most part Canadians by origin who had left Ontario for the American agricultural frontier and were now simply returning home. Only in the Emerson district, where there was a large American settlement, is there any indication that Americans exercised any influence.<sup>97</sup>

Other ethnic groups within Manitoba did not participate in the Farmers' Union agitation. In spite of the hardships that non-English-speaking Manitobans shared in common with their anglophone neighbours, language and culture proved to be effective barriers to entry into the movement. The Mennonites enjoyed "almost complete economic and social self-sufficiency" and the leaders of the sect enforced the group's religious determination to avoid contact with the "world" outside the colonies.<sup>98</sup> The Icelanders protested not through agrarian action, but by emigrating in large numbers to North Dakota where it was expected they would be better off than in Manitoba.<sup>99</sup>

French-speaking Manitobans, like the non-English-speaking immigrants, also were isolated from the English-speaking majority. As many francophone Manitobans were Metis, their isolation was not only cultural and linguistic but also racial. A threatened minority within Western Canada by 1880, both French-Canadians and Metis were more concerned with preserving their cultural identity through support of the federal government than

in protesting conditions on the Manitoba agricultural frontier.<sup>100</sup>

In religion, the supporters of the movement were Protestant. Most of the delegates belonged to the Presbyterian and Methodist churches. Only a few adherents of the Church of England and the Baptist Church were attracted to the movement,<sup>101</sup> and both the Baptists and Anglicans tended to come from the towns and not from the rural districts.<sup>102</sup>

The pre-eminence of the Presbyterians and the Methodists in the Union was related to the religious development of the agricultural frontier. Neither the Baptists nor the Anglicans had had the resources or organization to reach newly arrived immigrants in the rural areas.<sup>103</sup> In practically every district of the province the first Sabbath schools and churches were established by circuit riders sent out by the Methodist and Presbyterian home missions boards.<sup>104</sup> Since few rural communities were able to support more than one or two churches at most, members of other denominations adjusted to the local situation and attended Presbyterian or Methodist services. When the other churches eventually tried to establish their own congregations, they discovered that their potential membership had dwindled.<sup>105</sup> Even when these churches were successful in establishing and maintaining a congregation there were unforeseen problems. At Miami, for example, an attempt on the part of the Anglican priest to open a Sunday School was a total failure when the children refused to abandon the Union Sabbath School of the Presbyterian and Methodist churches.<sup>106</sup>

In some areas, other churches enjoyed the usual Presbyterian and Methodist monopoly. South of Minnedosa, the Anglican community was the first denomination to open a church--

TABLE XXVIII

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Presbyterian	2	9	25
Methodist	3	2	8
Congregational			1
Church of England	1	6	10
Roman Catholic			1
Baptist			3
Unknown	14	23	59
Unidentified	2	5	1
	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>	<u>      </u>
Totals	22	45	108

St. Saviour's--with the result that members of other denominations were gradually assimilated into the Church of England.<sup>107</sup> In another instance, at Dand in the south west, a Quaker missionary, Amelia Hall, organized the first church in the district, and although there were no Quakers in the community, almost everyone attended. In keeping with its non-denominational heritage, this church eventually joined the United Church of Canada in 1925.<sup>108</sup>

Adherents of the dominant religious group in the rural communities transferred their positions of leadership in the church to the Farmers' Union. Since social life in rural districts revolved around the church and the school, it was only natural that recognized local leaders should be called upon to express the district's frustrations at provincial conventions of the Farmers' Union. Because the Church of England and the Baptist church were poorly organized outside of the larger towns in the early 1880's, few of their adherents assumed positions of local leadership. Consequently, they were under-represented among the delegates to the Farmers' Union conventions.<sup>109</sup>

The pre-eminence of the Presbyterians and Methodists in the Farmers' Union also sprang from the close connection of some of their ministers with the farming community. Both the Rev. Nelson Brown, a Methodist, and Rev. James Lang, a Presbyterian, were farmers. Since neither of their congregations was able to provide a living for their pastors, both men eked out a living from agriculture and whatever their churches could pay them.<sup>110</sup> When depression and crop failure were visited upon the farming population, both Lang and Brown shared the experiences of their parishioners. As natural leaders in the community, both men became active in their local associations and later in the provincial

TABLE XXIX

MARITAL STATUS OF DELEGATES TO  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883,  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon <u>1883</u>	Winnipeg <u>1883</u>	<u>1884</u>
Married	9	19	51
Single	1	5	4
Unknown	10	16	52
Unidentified	2	5	1
Totals	<u>22</u>	<u>45</u>	<u>108</u>

Most members of the Farmers' Union were married men.<sup>111</sup>

Those attracted to the agitation were not the adventurous young bachelors from Ontario or Great Britain who came West to seek their fortunes. Rather they were the solid, substantial citizens of whom the federal immigration agents held such high opinions. They were the settlers who came West with their wives and families to establish homes, and when the Manitoba agricultural frontier did not fulfill their expectations, they were also the men who were least able to start anew, encumbered as they were with domestic responsibilities.

But whatever the features of the economic and social structure of the Farmers' Union that united the delegates at its conventions, the factors that divided the delegates were of greater importance. Divisions made the movement unable to withstand the shocks that would come when the delegates found themselves in conflict about what the Union ought to accomplish. Since conflicts were inevitable in such a broadly based organization, the test of the movement's resilience would not be long in coming.

(v)

The second provincial assembly of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union was called to re-affirm the platform adopted at the first provincial convention in December and to demonstrate to both the provincial and federal governments the widespread support that the Union enjoyed in the province. It was believed that if the Union could show that most Manitobans supported the organization and that if they were united in their resolve to see the platform put into effect, then neither the provincial nor federal governments would be able to refuse the "just" demands of

TABLE XXX

INTEREST GROUPS REPRESENTED AT  
CONVENTIONS OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST  
FARMERS' UNION HELD AT BRANDON AND WINNIPEG ON  
NOVEMBER 26, 1883, DECEMBER 19, 1883  
AND MARCH 5, 1884.

	Brandon 1883	Winnipeg 1883	1884
Disillusioned Promoters	5	12	32
Politically Motivated Individuals	1	7	18
Inveterate Joiners	2	3	3
Farmers			
Financially Troubled	2	10	14
Marginally Successful	7	7	27
Unknown	3	1	13
Unidentified	2	5	1
Totals	22	45	108

the Union for the redress of grievances.<sup>112</sup> The key to the success of this plan was the maintenance of a united front.

Unity among the delegates was in woefully short supply. A large number of the delegates and observers were present to serve their own interests.<sup>113</sup> Some, like R. P. Roblin came to salvage an investment in a townsite; others like Robert Wemyss had been ruined financially by the collapse of the Manitoba Boom; still others like A. J. Baskerville hoped to avoid imminent foreclosure on their mortgages. A second large group of delegates were politically motivated. Men like E. A. Bailey, Joseph Martin and Clifford Sifton were intent upon promoting the interests of the Liberal party and embarrassing the Conservative governments of Manitoba and Canada. The movement also attracted its share of inveterate joiners. As the Union broadened its base, men such as Kenneth McKenzie of Burnside, who lent his name to all good works in his community, and Stewart Mulvey of Winnipeg, a brewer and a prominent official in the provincial Orange Lodge, gave their support to the movement. As for the relatively successful farmers, the backbone of the organization and the group in whose name the agitation was being carried on, they enjoyed a smaller representation and less influence than at any other convention since the movement began.

The convention began to disintegrate into its constituent parts during the second day's morning session. A resolution was passed stating that "agricultural operations cannot be made to yield a fair profit" and that the convention "cannot advise emigrants to settle in the Province till full redress of the grievances."<sup>114</sup> This was not the type of resolution that was

likely to appeal to real estate speculators. Robert Wemyss and Charles Stewart then presented a resolution calling for Manitoba's secession from Confederation. The reading of this resolution was "received with oppressive silence", and Wemyss' and Stewart's speeches to the resolution were interrupted with both cheers and catcalls. After "considerable confusion", the assembly adjourned without the matter on the floor coming to a vote.<sup>115</sup> Although the resolution was not revived at a later session, much damage was done by its introduction. The Times' headline reporting the day's proceedings of the convention read "Secession",<sup>116</sup> while several of the Conservative delegates expressed their displeasure with the turn of events.<sup>117</sup>

The secession resolution was only a foretaste of the division to come. In the second evening session, E. W. Thomson of Winnipeg, a real estate agent, and James Shillinglaw of Brandon, an architect, presented a resolution which would have authorized the convention to advertise both at home and abroad that "this convention cannot advise immigrants to enter the province till full redress of grievances complained of by the Convention shall have been obtained." As soon as there was redress of grievances, the advertisements were to be withdrawn and new advertisements placed. The initial outcry from those opposed to the resolution--mainly non-farmers who needed immigration if their towns were to grow into important centres and their speculative land investments were to pay off--caused its sponsors to withdraw it. But the following morning at the final session of the convention, after many of the delegates had returned to their homes, the motion was re-introduced by Thomson and the Rev. Nelson Brown.<sup>118</sup> This time it carried,<sup>119</sup> with as Thomson later recalled, but one dissenting vote.<sup>120</sup>

The impact of the "anti-immigration" resolution on the movement was disastrous. The precarious coalition of farmers and non-farmers rapidly came unstuck. For the businessmen of Winnipeg and the towns, the resolution could only spell ruin. Within days the Board of Trade had disassociated itself from the Farmers' Union. As Joseph Mulholland, a member of the Board stated, the resolution was both "false and suicidal".<sup>121</sup> The editors of The Commercial were no less blunt in their condemnation.

The Northwest has many active enemies, and these will not fail to make the most of this damaging and unnecessary resolution of Manitoba farmers in convention. Such a course of recklessness may be commendable in a game of poker, but on the part of a convention, met for calm deliberation, the most generous construction that can be placed upon it is, that it betrays petulancy [sic] and childish overbearing.<sup>122</sup>

The Winnipeg press took much the same position as The Commercial. The Times simply regarded the resolution as inevitable given the nature of the Union's leadership,<sup>123</sup> while the Winnipeg Sun frankly stated that the resolution "is now generally admitted to have been a mistake".<sup>124</sup> Even the Free Press, that staunch defender of Manitoba's rights, was shocked. When E. W. Thomson told W. F. Luxton of the convention's action, the Free Press editor was "surprised to the point of dismay."<sup>125</sup> Although Luxton's newspaper did not attack the resolution, it let magisterial silence on the subject convey its disapproval.<sup>126</sup>

Outside of Winnipeg, the reaction to the "anti-immigration" resolution was mixed. The Brandon Sun defended the action of the convention,<sup>127</sup> but that is hardly surprising as nine of the newspaper's owners were delegates.<sup>128</sup> Similarly profuse support came from the Manitoba Liberal,<sup>129</sup> the Stonewall News,<sup>130</sup> and presumably

the Nelsonville Mountaineer.<sup>131</sup> The Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, whose editor, S. L. Head, was a particularly vociferous supporter of the Union,<sup>132</sup> simply ignored the issue until June when he allowed that it would be better to support Premier Norquay in his attempts to seek redress of grievances rather than support the farmers' movement.<sup>133</sup> Among Conservative newspapers, the Minnedosa Tribune described the "anti-immigration" resolution as a "traitorous manifesto",<sup>134</sup> while the Neepawa Canadian thought that "the vicious resolution should have died in the morbid mind of the mover."<sup>135</sup> In the opinion of the Brandon Mail, the resolution was a Grit plot which would destroy the good name of the province and discourage development,<sup>136</sup> an argument with which the Selkirk Herald agreed.<sup>137</sup>

Conservative politicians who had either publicly or privately opposed the movement were delighted with the Union's behaviour. Gilbert McMicken telegraphed Macdonald within hours of the resolution's passage: "Be firm Farmers Convention overreached themselves reaction set in look for satisfactory development in a few days."<sup>138</sup> T. M. Daly, the new Mayor of Brandon, was just as cheerful when he informed the Prime Minister: "The last escapade of the Farmers' Union had destroyed its usefulness if it ever had any."<sup>139</sup>

Daly's assessment was correct. The Farmers' Union of Brandon went into a steep decline after the provincial convention of March, 1884. Most of the provincial press was opposed to the movement, and even its own supporters were by and large unhappy with the "anti-immigration" resolution. Attempts were made to

secure public support through holding meetings, but these were not successful. What support there was for the resolution was in the rural areas of the province where farmers who knew the conditions on the Manitoba agricultural frontier saw little point in asking others to share their hardships.<sup>140</sup> In the towns and Winnipeg, there was little enthusiasm for such demonstrations of popular support except at Rapid City where it was led by the Liberal party.<sup>141</sup>

As the base of support of the Farmers' Union narrowed, the premise upon which the Union had been built began to crumble. From the outset at Brandon in November, 1883, the Farmers' Union had been a political agitation founded upon co-operation between rural residents and the townsmen of the province. The premise underlying this co-operation was that common grievances outweighed local, personal, and occupational grievances. The outcome of the Winnipeg convention stripped this assumption naked and left the movement vulnerable and exposed.

When at the spring sitting of the Legislature the Premier launched a major attack on the federal government, the agitation led by the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union was effectively over. For almost a year the Manitoba government had been conducting desultory negotiations with Ottawa on the question of the provincial subsidy.<sup>142</sup> In March, the federal government made a transparently unsatisfactory offer of terms to the provincial government.<sup>143</sup> The Premier rejected the offer and invited the House to prepare a "Bill of Rights" which could form the basis of future negotiations with Ottawa.<sup>144</sup> The House responded by drafting a document which in its essentials was the same as the "Declaration

of Rights" adopted by the Farmers' Union at its December convention in Winnipeg.<sup>145</sup> This "Bill of Rights" was unanimously approved by the Legislature in April, and among those voting for its acceptance was that erstwhile foe of Conservative governments and leading member of the Farmers' Union, Joseph Martin.<sup>146</sup> The political agitation would go on, but in the future it would be conducted within the framework of a regular political process. Since the Farmers' Union had turned to political means to solve the farmers' problems, the reason for its existence disappeared.

What accounted both for the success and for the failure of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union was its diverse economic and social structure. Individuals supported the Union for a wide variety of local or personal reasons, each finding something in the Union's platform with which they could agree. The Union itself encouraged the inclusion of varied and often divergent interests by accepting a broad platform, by seeking a political solution to Manitoba's problems, and by trying to induce new groups to join in the movement. These policies led to the Union's rapid and sustained growth from November, 1883, to March 1884, making it the most powerful protest organization in the province's history until the rise of the United Farmers of Manitoba as a political force in the early 1920's. At the same time, by making an appeal to so many different interests, internal divisions were created in the Farmers' Union. These led to its eventual downfall. In March, 1883, the "anti-immigration" resolution opened conflicts within the movement. When these conflicts were exacerbated by the interference of provincial politicians, by that time already

a serious source of division within the movement by itself, the Farmers' Union disintegrated.

The end of the political agitation of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union did not mean an end to agrarian protest. The grievances that led to the beginning of protest in the autumn of 1883 still remained to be redressed. Conditions on the agricultural frontier were no more tolerable in the spring of 1884 than they had been six months earlier. Low prices for wheat continued to prevail; the costs of production remained high; the Ogilvie elevator monopoly still existed; and no farmer was any more satisfied with the system of grading grain than before.

The Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union--it had been renamed in January--stepped into the breach left undefended by the collapse of the Farmers' Union of Brandon. The Protective Union had been submerged, but not absorbed, by the Farmers' Union in December, 1883. Throughout the district lying along the international boundary, it had continued to preach its gospel of co-operative action coupled with a moderate agitation for the redress of grievances. Now with the end of the political agitation, the Protective Union emerged from the shadow of its once powerful rival. The new call to the farmers was to be for co-operation in grain marketing.

FOOTNOTES

1. Manitoba Free Press, December 8, 1883, p. 4.
2. David Currie, op. cit., p. 59.
3. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, December 7, 1883, p. 1.
4. Manitoba Free Press, November 27, 1883, p. 1; December 20, 1883, p. 4.
5. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, November 30, 1883, p. 2.
6. Manitoba Free Press, December 7, 1883, p. 1.
7. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, December 7, 1883, p. 1.
8. Ibid.
9. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, January, 11, 1884, p. 2.
10. Manitoba Free Press, December 18, 1883, p. 4;  
Emerson International, December 20, 1883, pp. 2 and 3.
11. Emerson International, December 20, 1883, p. 2.
12. Manitoba Free Press, December 19, 1883, p. 2.
13. Winnipeg Daily Times, December 18, 1883, p. 4; December 19, 1883, p. 4.
14. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, Part 2, Amos Rowe to Macdonald, December 13, 1883, 191503-191506.
15. Of the 66 delegates to the provincial convention, 8 were supporters of the Protective Union, 14 were from the Portage la Prairie district, 5 were representatives of the Manitoba Rights League, 27 were from the Brandon Union and its allied organizations, and the remainder were drawn from scattered points across the province. Of these delegates, the names of only 45 were printed in the newspapers of the day.
16. Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1883, p. 1.
17. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(a), Volume 113, Alexander Fleming and George Purvis to Macdonald, January 21, 1884, 46166-46169.

18. Emerson International, December 20, 1883, p. 2.
19. Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1883, p. 1.
20. See Table XII, p. 151 below.
21. Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1883, p. 1.
22. Ibid.
23. Ibid.
24. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, Part 2, Charles Cliffe to Macdonald, December 31, 1883, 191776-191779.
25. Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1883, p. 1.
26. The Manitoba Rights League delegates were: Lt. Col. P. H. Attwood, J. D. Cameron, James Fisher, W. E. Perdue and Robert Wemyss.
27. Manitoba Free Press, December 21, 1883, p. 4.
28. Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1883, p. 4.
29. Manitoba Free Press, December 21, 1883, p. 1.
30. G. F. G. Stanley, Louis Riel, (Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1964), p. 240.
31. Winnipeg Daily Times, December 21, 1883, p. 4; December 22, 1883, p. 4; January 2, 1884, p. 4; January 4, 1884, p. 4; and January 8, 1884, p. 4.
32. Winnipeg Daily Times, December 21, 1883, p. 4.
33. The Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, February 22, 1884, p. 4.
34. Brandon Mail, December 27, 1883, p. 4.
35. Manitoba Free Press, December 29, 1883, p. 2.
36. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 399, Norquay to Macdonald, January 8, 1884, 48489-48492; Macdonald to Lord Lorne, March 26, 1884, as quoted in Donald Creighton, Sir John A. Macdonald: The Old Chieftain, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1955), p. 380.
37. Manitoba Free Press, December 22, 1883, p. 1.
38. Manitoba Free Press, December 29, 1883, p. 1.

39. Brandon Sun, February 28, 1884, p. 1.
40. Manitoba Free Press, January 3, 1884, p. 3.
41. The Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Union, Resolutions Adopted at the Farmers' Convention Held in the City of Winnipeg 19th and 20th Dec., 1883. Instructions As to the Formation of Branch Unions, etc., (Brandon: Brandon Sun, 1884), p. 12.
42. Manitoba Free Press, March 6, 1884, p. 1.
43. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d) Vol. 400, Charles Cliffe to Macdonald, February 4, 1884, 192689-192695.
44. Clifford Sifton.
45. Finlay McNaughton Young.
46. Rodmond Palen Roblin--still a Liberal.
47. Joseph Martin.
48. James A. Smart and J. D. Cameron.
49. Included were Thomas Duncan, A. C. Fraser, Duncan MacArthur, James Riddell and Dr. S. J. Thompson.
50. Brandon Sun, February 5, 1884, p. 1.
51. Brandon Sun, February 18, 1884, p. 1.
52. Brandon Sun, March 4, 1884, p. 1.
53. Winnipeg Daily Times, January 4, 1884, p. 4.
54. Thomas Kernighan, Dufferin and Carman, Manitoba, (Vancouver: 1923), p. 16.
55. H. R. Ross, op. cit., pp. 23-24.
56. Manitoba Free Press, January 14, 1884, p. 4; Brandon Sun, March 6, 1884, p. 1.
57. Manitoba Free Press, January 14, 1884, p. 4; January 15, 1884, p. 2.
58. The phrase "Empire of the Red River" may appear to be a bit grandiose, but the backers of this idea were thinking in continental rather than western regional terms.
59. The Commercial, February 5, 1884, p. 368.

60. It is interesting that it was the businessmen of Winnipeg who made these contacts and not the farmers of Manitoba. Moreover, it appears that the Farmers' Union in the Dakota Territory was formed at the meeting in February, 1884, modelled on the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, instead of the Manitoba Union using an American model.
61. Manitoba Free Press, January 31, 1884, p. 1; Winnipeg Daily Times, January 30, 1884, p. 1; January 31, 1884, p. 1; The Commercial, February 19, 1884, p. 408.
62. Winnipeg Daily Sun, March 5, 1884, p. 1.
63. Ibid.; Winnipeg Daily Times, March 5, 1884, p. 2.
64. Manitoba Free Press, March 6, 1884, p. 1.
65. The Commercial, September 8, 1885, p. 989.
66. See for example, The Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, April 4, 1884, p. 4.
67. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, November 30, 1883, p. 2; The Commercial, November 20, 1883, p. 154; Manitoba Free Press, October 26, 1883, p. 2; Brandon Mail, November 1, 1883, p. 4.
68. The Commercial, October 9, 1883, p. 34; Manitoba Free Press, January 1, 1884, p. 2.
69. The Commercial, October 9, 1883, p. 34.
70. John D. Hicks, op. cit., pp. 87-90.
71. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d), Vol. 397, Part 2, T. M. Daly to Macdonald, December 16, 1883, 191552-191572.
72. Chattel mortgages did not have to be registered in Manitoba. Consequently, documentation does not exist as it does for land mortgages.
73. I use the designation "landowners" to describe the heads of households in townships six ranges five and six west, because some of the property holders may not have been farmers but rather non-resident land speculators. I suspect, in one or two cases, that landowners were speculators, but without the census records for the townships one cannot readily ascertain who they were. On the whole, most of the landowners were actual farmers. Some slight distortion in the figures, however, is inevitable.

74. See Tables XIII and XIV.
75. Tables XV and XVI are modeled upon similar tables in AllanAG. Bogue, Money at Interest: The Farm Mortgage on the Middle Border, (New York: Russell & Russell, 1968), pp. 223 and 248. Bogue does not, unfortunately, define what he means by "patented agricultural land". I have defined it as that land fit for agricultural purposes which had been patented by an individual landowner. I have excluded lands patented by the Hudson's Bay Company and the Canadian Pacific Railway Company until they are sold to individual landowners. I have also excluded the two sections nearest to the town of Carman as they may have been held for speculative purposes.
- As with all tables regarding townships six ranges five and six west, I have used only those figures available from the abstract books. In township six range five west, 18.1% of the land was under the Real Property Act; and in township six range six west, 12.5% of the land was under the Real Property Act. There is no reason to suspect that the exclusion of property under the Torrens system would significantly alter the statistics that have been obtained from the abstract books. What few titles under the Real Property Act that I checked would indicate a similar trend as the material from the abstract books provided.
76. I have assumed that any mortgage taken out thirty days before or thirty days after a sale was applied to the purchase of the land.
77. See Tables XIV, XV, XIX and XX.
78. Thomas Kernighan, op. cit., pp. 5, 14-15.
79. Both townships were served by the Manitoba South Western Colonization Railway.
80. J. H. Ellis and Wm. H. Shafer, Report of the Reconnaissance Soil Survey of South-Central Manitoba, (Manitoba Department of Agriculture, 1943), pp. 40-41 and 88-89.
81. See Table XXI.
82. At least three years had to pass before a patent was issued, but often farmers waited as long as six and occasionally up to 15 years before making application.
83. The Canadian Pacific Railway did make outright sales to individuals, but most contracts of sale I examined in land titles offices were for payment over five years.
84. Derived from material at the Brandon Land Titles Office, Brandon, Manitoba.

85. See above, p. 83.
86. Manitoba Crop Bulletin, June 1885; June, 1887.
87. Ibid.
88. Another indication of property values is the price for which land sold in township six range five west. Taking the two years of 1885 and 1886, 960 acres were sold at an average value of \$6.46 per acre.
89. See Table XXI.
90. Seymour Martin Lipset, "The Rural Community and Political Leadership in Saskatchewan", The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, Vol. XIII, No. 3, (August, 1947), p. 414.
91. Census of Canada, 1880-1881.
92. Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886.
93. See Table XXIII.
94. See Table XXIV and XV.
95. See Table XXVII.
96. Compare Tables XXVI and XXVII.
97. The first settlers in the Emerson district in 1873 were mostly Americans, but very little can be determined about the background of the Emerson district members of the Farmers' Union. What can be established is that the Emerson district members played only a very small role in the provincial agitation.
98. E. K. Francis, op. cit., p. 75.
99. W. J. Lindal, op. cit., pp. 169-170.
100. For a discussion of the position of French-speaking Manitobans in the early 1880's, see Alexander Allan Roscoe, "The Manitoba Act in Transition, 1870-1896: The Transformation of Manitoba's French-Canadian Politico-Cultural Institutions", (An unpublished M.A. in history for the University of Manitoba, 1968), especially Chapter II.
101. See Table XXVIII.
102. Of the seventeen delegates to Farmers' Union conventions who were adherents of the Church of England, eleven were from towns.
103. See Robert Machray, Life of Robert Machray, (Toronto:

The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1909), especially Chapters XIII and XIV. As for the Baptists, despite valiant attempts to establish congregations, most were failures and many of those that were established soon collapsed.

104. A reading of Manitoba's local histories would confirm that in practically every district in the province, the first church services were held by circuit riders from the Methodist and Presbyterian churches.
105. For example, the Baptists at Wellwood and Oakburn and the Church of England at Norquay found that by the time they were able to establish local congregations that many of their members had deserted to the Presbyterian and Methodist churches.
106. History Committee, The Hills of Home, A History of the Municipality of Thompson, (Miami: 1967), p. 35.
107. 75th Anniversary Section, A History of Minnedosa and Surrounding Districts, (Minnedosa: 1958), n.p.
108. Dand Women's Institute, Golden Memories: A History of the Dand Community, (Dand: 1967), p. 20.
109. Compare Table XXVIII and Table III, p.10 above.
110. See Mrs. Donald A. Stewart, The Story of High Bluff Church, (High Bluff: 1971), pp. 19-20.
111. See Table XXIX.
112. Manitoba Free Press, March 6, 1884, pp. 1 and 4.
113. See Table XXX.
114. Manitoba Free Press, March 6, 1884, p. 4.
115. P.A.M., Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Scrapbook, Winnipeg Sun, March 12, 1884.
116. Winnipeg Daily Times, March 6, 1884, p. 1.
117. P.A.M., Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Scrapbook, Winnipeg Sun, March 12, 1884.
118. The Manitoba Free Press identified Thomson's partner as the Rev. Robert Brown, but Thomson in a later letter to the Free Press identified his companion as the Rev. Nelson Brown.
119. Manitoba Free Press, March 8, 1884, pp. 1 and 4.

120. Manitoba Free Press, March 8, 1886, p. 2.
121. Manitoba Free Press, March 11, 1884, p. 4.
122. The Commercial, March 11, 1884, p. 468; see also, March 18, 1884, p. 488.
123. Winnipeg Daily Times, March 7, 1884, p. 4.
124. P.A.M., Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Scrapbook, Winnipeg Sun, March 12, 1884.
125. Manitoba Free Press, March 8, 1886, p. 2.
126. The Free Press published a single half-hearted defense of the "anti-immigration" resolution on March 10, 1882, p. 2.
127. Brandon Sun, March 13, 1884, p. 2.
128. There were nineteen shareholders in the Sun and nine controlling roughly one third of the stock were delegates. The nine were: John W. Brock, John A. Christie, A. C. Fraser, James A. Johnston, A. M. Peterson, Clifford Sifton, John W. Sifton, James A. Smart, and William Winter.
129. Manitoba Liberal, March 15, 1884, p. 4.
130. Stonewall News, March 15, 1884, p. 4.
131. The assumption can be made as E. A. Bailey defended the resolution at meetings throughout the province.
132. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, February 22, 1884, p. 2.
133. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, June 6, 1884, p. 2.
134. Minnedosa Tribune, March 14, 1884, p. 2.
135. Neepawa Canadian, March 20, 1884, p. 3
136. Brandon Mail, March 13, 1884, p. 4.
137. Selkirk Herald, March 14, 1884, p. 2.
138. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(b), Vol. 246, Gilbert McMicken to Macdonald, March 8, 1884, 110949.
139. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1(d) Vol. 401, T. M. Daly to Macdonald, March, 1884, 193409-193410.

140. The resolution was endorsed by local Unions at Ruttanville, Shoal Lake, High Bluff, Birtle and Rounthwaite. See Manitoba Free Press, April 2, 1884, p. 1; April 14, 1884, p. 2; April 18, 1884, p. 4; May 3, 1884, p. 1; and May 12, 1884, p. 3. At all of these meetings the overwhelming majority of those in attendance were farmers.
141. Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate, March 28, 1884, p. 2.
142. Norquay was in Ottawa at the same time as the Farmers' Union delegates in February, 1884.
143. Alexander Begg, History of the North West, Volume III, pp. 91-92.
144. Ibid., p. 93.
145. The "Bill of Rights" included the demand that the province be allowed to charter railways anywhere within its boundaries, the demand for control over the public lands, and the demand for a reduction in the tariff.
146. Alexander Begg, History of the North West, Volume III, pp. 94-95.

## CHAPTER V

### "FARMERS RALLY TO YOUR POSTS"

The Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union was only slightly more successful than the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union in attempting to improve the farmers' condition. Achieving ascendancy in the spring of 1884 under inauspicious circumstances following the collapse of the Farmers' Union of Brandon, the Protective Union was relatively successful in mobilizing the support of the farmers of the province so long as it confined its activities to co-operative action in the marketplace. When it gradually began to turn to political action in the autumn of 1884, divisions also appeared in this movement and its support began to wither away. The outbreak of the Saskatchewan Rebellion in March, 1885, irreparably damaged the Union's reputation, and when its co-operative grain marketing programme encountered serious financial problems in the autumn of 1885, the future of the organization became very bleak. By March, 1886, wracked with internal divisions and beset by enemies from without, the Protective Union collapsed.

Part of the explanation for the failure of the Protective Union lies in its social and economic structure. It was a more cohesive movement than its predecessor, yet there were divisions within its membership. Personal and local grievances, reflecting the different ways in which the deficiencies of Manitoba's agricultural frontier affected different localities, were less pronounced than in the Farmers' Union, but they existed. These divisions within the movement were exacerbated by the merger of the remnants

of the Farmers' Union with the Protective Union and by the continuation of low prices paid for farm produce which led to the rebirth of a political agitation that accomplished little and did much to discredit the Protective Union.

Contributing to the failure of the Protective Union was the type of organization chosen to accomplish farmers' co-operation. The Protective Union was a benevolent society and as such it was restricted in its ability to raise capital. Ultimately the lack of capital left the union in financial difficulties from which it could extricate itself only by the most unfortunate expedients. When these expedients were adopted, its opponents were given the means to attack it successfully.

(1)

Many of the difficulties encountered by the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union during its brief existence can be attributed to the decision of the Union at its first annual convention in January, 1884, to seek incorporation as a benevolent society.<sup>1</sup> Up until that time, the Protective Union was a relatively small, regionally based organization that sought to alleviate the effects of the economic depression and the crop failure of 1883 by local co-operation and by a moderate political agitation. By incorporation the organization hoped to expand the scope of its grain marketing programme and to broaden its base. But the attempt to broaden the base of the Protective Union led to the inclusion of new elements that undermined the relative economic and social unity that characterized the Manitou organization.

What led the Protective Union to look into the matter of incorporation was the success of its grain marketing programme. Beginning in December, 1883, the Union began to buy members' wheat to ship to Ontario.<sup>2</sup> This was necessarily a small operation because of the lack of capital, but the results of the experiment were very encouraging. Members who participated in the programme received from 10¢ to 15¢ more per bushel for their wheat than they would have obtained from a local graindealer. With this success came requests from other farmers who wished to participate. Greater participation in the marketing of wheat entailed taking greater risks which the members of the Union's executive who had given their personal notes were not willing to run. To avert the ever-present danger of personal ruin for the executive whenever the Union entered the market, an application for a charter was presented to the provincial legislature during its spring sitting in 1884.<sup>3</sup>

The Act of incorporation, given Royal Assent on April 29, stated as the Union's objectives:

the sale and disposal of farm products, the purchase of farm implements and machinery, livestock and building materials, the building and operation of grain warehouses, elevators and grist mills and generally the protection of farmers' interests.

To accomplish these ends, the Union was empowered to acquire and to hold personal property and real estate not exceeding \$100,000 in value, to borrow money and to issue "negotiable instruments or mortgages, or pledges of the real or personal property of the Union, as may be required." Operating capital was to be raised by subscriptions, dues and assessments to be determined under the constitution and by-laws adopted by the Union.<sup>4</sup>

At a meeting held in Winnipeg at the Roblin House on

June 5, 1884, the Protective Union was re-organized as a benevolent society in accordance with the provisions of the Act.<sup>5</sup> The basic unit of the Union was to be the local association or Branch Union. The Branch Unions were grouped together into eight Division Unions--six in Manitoba and two in the North West Territories--each of which reported to the Central Union, the movement's governing body. Membership in the organization was open to any person over 18 years of age and of "good moral character" upon payment of a one dollar entrance fee. Membership was continuous as long as one dollar in annual dues was paid. Monies collected were to be divided between the Central, Division and Branch Unions with 50% of all fees going to the Central treasury, the remainder to be divided equally between the Branch and Division Unions.<sup>6</sup>

The funds that could be raised under the provisions of the constitution were insufficient for the purposes of the organization. The Central Union which was to undertake the co-operative activities of the Protective Union, received only enough cash to pay printing costs, travel allowances for the executive, and office expenses. Nor were the Division and Branch Unions able to make contributions to the Central treasury for, as the provincial secretary complained in 1885, "the expenses of branches and the cost of sending delegates to conventions had prevented their contributing to the general treasury to any material extent..."<sup>7</sup> Without proper funding, the Protective Union was likely to be hardpressed to implement its ambitious programme of co-operative action.

The lack of capital was a function of incorporation as a non-profit benevolent society. By attempting to finance a

province-wide programme of co-operative grain marketing from the funds raised by membership fees, the Protective Union ensured that it would be perpetually short of working capital. It would have been better to separate the political and educational aspects of the organization from the grain marketing programme and incorporate a joint stock company to handle the grain business, as E. A. Partridge recognized when, in 1906, he founded the Grain Growers' Grain Company as a separate entity from the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association.<sup>8</sup> The Protective Union tried to combine all its activities within one organizational framework, utilizing a structure that was poorly adapted to achieving its objectives.

Few Manitobans, including the leaders of the practically defunct Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, however, recognized the weakness in the structure of the re-organized Protective Union. The executive of the Farmers' Union approached the Protective Union in April, 1884 with a proposal for a merger of the two organizations under the Act of incorporation. The leaders of the Protective Union responded by inviting the Farmers' Union to send delegates to the Winnipeg meeting in June. At that meeting, the two organizations merged, with the Farmers' Union submerging its identity in the Protective Union.<sup>9</sup>

The merger with the Farmers' Union of Brandon did little to strengthen the Protective Union. Former members of the Farmers' Union were over-represented in the executive of the re-organized Protective Union because of the provisions in the constitution. Two members from each of the eight Division Unions were to be chosen annually as Directors of the Central Union.<sup>10</sup> Although by June, 1884, the overwhelming majority of farmers who still supported

the agitation resided in southern Manitoba,<sup>11</sup> the Winnipeg meeting decided that geographical considerations rather than the number of supporters would determine the location of Division Unions.<sup>12</sup> Since of the six Manitoba Division Unions only two were located in the southern Manitoba heartland of the old Protective Union and the remaining four were organized in the former strongholds of the Farmers' Union, the founders of the new movement were outnumbered in the executive.<sup>13</sup> The re-organized Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union had, consequently, a tendency to gravitate towards a political agitation to the detriment of its co-operative programme.

By merging with the Farmers' Union the Protective Union jeopardized the economic and social unity which was one factor in its survival when the provincial agitation conducted by the Farmers' Union failed. The increased diversity in the economic and social structure of the Protective Union is especially evident in the interest groups represented at the annual meetings of the movement. At the 1884 annual meeting, before the merger, the marginally successful farmers were the most important element present. Two years later at the third annual meeting, the marginally successful farmers were still the largest element among the delegates, but the financially embarrassed farmers and the disillusioned promoters together made up a substantial minority of those present.<sup>14</sup> Furthermore, only 11.1% of the representatives at the January, 1884, meeting were non-farmers, but at the January, 1886, annual meeting 21.1% of the delegates were non-farmers.<sup>15</sup>

While the non-farmers were never more than a minority at all of the annual meetings their small number belies their influence.

TABLE XXXI

INTEREST GROUPS REPRESENTED AT  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Disillusioned Promoters		2	8		6	8
Politically Motivated Individuals	3	2	3	1	3	2
Inveterate Joiners		1	1		1	3
Farmers						
Financially Troubled	3	4	12	3	21	6
Marginally Successful	11	9	24	6	50	25
Unknown	1	2	6		12	9
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885 AND JANUARY 20, 1886  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885 AND DECEMBER 16, 1885  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Blacksmiths						1
Clergymen			1		1	2
Collectors					1	
Doctors		1	1			1
Editors	1	1	1	1	1	3
Farmers	16	16	42	9	80	32
General Merchants		1	3		1	3
Grain Dealers					1	
Horse Dealers					1	
Hoteliers						1
Land Agents						1
Land Surveyors					1	
Lawyers		1	1		1	1
Lumber Merchants					1	
Millers			2		1	1
Post Office Clerks						1
Quarry Owners			1			
Railway Firemen			1			1
Real Estate Dealers			1		2	1
Saddlers	1					
Station Masters						1
Teachers						1
Teamsters					1	1
Unknown	none	none	none	none	none	1
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	18	21	57	10	104	55
Non-farmers with farming interests	2	1	2		1	5
Farmers with non-farming interests	5	1	3	4	9	5

The leadership of the Protective Union after the merger with the Farmers' Union was not entirely representative of the general membership. E. A. Bailey, the editor of the Nelsonville Mountaineer, was elected as travelling agent for the re-organized Union, while Dr. Alexander Fleming, a Brandon physician, druggist and farmer, secured the presidency. Robert Wemyss, a Winnipeg real estate agent, was elected to the office of treasurer, and J. D. Cameron, an ambitious young Winnipeg lawyer, was chosen as one of the auditors. Among the directors elected were Clifford Sifton of Brandon, a lawyer, and A. O. Graham of Rapid City, a real estate promoter. All were Liberals and, with the exception of E. A. Bailey, all were former members of the Farmers' Union.<sup>16</sup>

Not all members of the Old Protective Union were prepared to acquiesce in the leadership of the re-organized Union. The members of the Branch Union at Thornhill, at the first regular Branch meeting after the Winnipeg assembly, on June 23 accepted a resolution that withdrew the local association from the Protective Union because the Union as "now constituted appears to be more of a political nature than the farmers desire", because "it can in no sense be termed a Farmers' Union as there are lawyers, doctors, brokers, etc., as its principal officers", and because there was "no proper method of transacting business". The reasoning behind the withdrawal was remarkably clear-sighted in pinpointing weaknesses in the re-organized Protective Union. But if the members of the Thornhill Branch hoped to stimulate a general exodus from the parent organization--and this was the purpose of their action--they were disappointed.<sup>17</sup>

The farmers of Thornhill were especially concerned with

TABLE XXXIII

POLITICAL AFFILIATION OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886;  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Liberal	11	10	17	8	28	15
Conservative	1	2	4		6	10
Independent			2			
Unknown	6	8	31	2	59	28
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

the political complexion of the Protective Union after the Winnipeg meeting. As Table XXXIII illustrates, the organization's members were largely supporters of the Liberal party. Although the political composition of the organization does not appear to have changed after the merger, the actual number of Conservatives who supported the Protective Union is not fully reflected in the statistics of the early conventions of the movement. Newspaper reports of both the December, 1883, and January, 1884, meetings state that a large number of the delegates present at both meetings were Conservatives. This is probably true--only a few of the names of the over two hundred individuals at both meetings were printed in the newspapers.<sup>18</sup> At both the January, 1885, and January, 1886, meetings, complete lists of those in attendance were printed.<sup>19</sup> At both these annual meetings the Liberals greatly outnumbered the Conservatives present.

The capture of the Protective Union by the Liberals was not entirely the result of the merger of the Farmers' Union with the Manitou organization. The Protective Union had been too closely identified with the Farmers' Union agitation in 1883-1884 to escape being identified as a Liberal organization by the Conservative press and by the leading Conservative politicians in the province. Furthermore, the impression that the Protective Union was Liberal in its sympathies was encouraged by E. A. Bailey's editorials in the Nelsonville Mountaineer, the only provincial newspaper to advocate the cause of the southern Manitoba farmers. Bailey may not have been representative of the general membership of the Protective Union, but he was the leading public figure in the Manitou movement and he claimed to speak for its executive and membership.

By the early summer of 1884, few Conservative farmers were likely to join the Protective Union. Noting that the Conservative press had pilloried the movement as a Liberal front, aware that the Premier and his government were now actively engaged in obtaining redress of agrarian grievances, and warned off by the number of Liberal politicians associated with the re-organized Protective Union, the Conservative farmers were understandably reluctant to give their support to the movement. Not that they were opposed to the co-operative grain marketing scheme devised by the Manitou organization. Three farmers<sup>20</sup> who were Conservatives, and each of whom gave damaging testimony about the Union to the House of Commons' Select Committee on Colonization and Immigration in 1885,<sup>21</sup> marketed their wheat with the Union, although only one of them had ever been a member and that was only for a short time in 1883.<sup>22</sup>

The close connection between the Protective Union and the Liberal party in the public consciousness and the resulting unwillingness of Conservative farmers to support the movement openly had unfortunate consequences. For any attempt at co-operative purchasing and marketing to succeed, the Union needed the support of the vast majority of farmers in the province. This was not possible if the movement was too closely associated with a political party. Liberal politicians, most of whom were from the towns or Winnipeg, supported the movement for whatever political advantage could be derived from that support rather than from any strong commitment to co-operative action by the farmers.

Added to the political and occupational differences among the members were economic divisions. A high proportion of the landowning delegates to the annual meetings and conventions of the

## TABLE XXXIV

DATE OF ARRIVAL IN MANITOBA OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885 AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885 AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Before 1870		1	5		2	2
1870			2		2	
1871			4			1
1872			2		3	2
1873					2	2
1874	2			1	4	2
1875		1	1	1	1	
1876	1		1		5	1
1877	3	1	5	1	5	
1878	3	4	3	2	10	1
1879	4	2	4	1	14	2
1880	2	2	7	1	14	4
1881	1	3	7		7	6
1882		3	2		6	4
1883	1	1	1	1	3	3
1884						
1885						
1886						
Native Manitobans			2		1	
Unknown	1	2	8	2	15	23
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

MEANS BY WHICH PROPERTY WAS ACQUIRED BY LANDOWNING DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Landowners	17	16	41	9	74	34
Homestead	3	4	10	2	22	11
Homestead & Pre-emption	9	8	10	6	24	7
Homestead & Private Purchase	1		1		2	
Homestead & Military Bounty Grant					1	
Homestead, Pre-emption & Private Purchase		1			1	1
Homestead & North West Mounted Police Grant			1			
Homestead & Hudson's Bay Company Sale					1	
Homestead, Pre-emption & Government Sale			1	1	2	
Homestead, Special Grant & Private Purchase			1		1	
Homestead & Government Sale					1	1
Government Sale	3		1		4	
Government Sale & Private Purchase					1	
C.P.R. Sale		2	3		3	5
Hudson's Bay Company Sale			1		2	
Manitoba Act Grant		1	5		3	1
Manitoba Act Grant & Private Purchase			1			
Private Purchase			2		4	6
Military Bounty Grant & Manitoba Act Grant			1		1	1
Military Bounty Grant & Private Purchase			1			
Military Bounty Grant & Government Sale	1		1			1
Military Bounty Grant, Private Purchase & Government Sale					1	
Inherited Land			1			

TABLE XXXVI

INDEBTEDNESS AND FORECLOSURE RELATED TO SIZE OF LAND HOLDINGS AT  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number in Debt</u>	<u>Number Eventually Foreclosed</u>
Under 100 Acres			
101-200 Acres	76	23	17
201-300 Acres	2		
301-400 Acres	83	60	11
401-500 Acres	9	9	3
501-600 Acres			
600 Acres Plus	18	15	6
Unknown	3		

## TABLE XXXVII

INDEBTEDNESS AND FORECLOSURE BY MEANS OF ACQUIRING PROPERTY AT  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1888, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number in Debt</u>	<u>Number Eventually Foreclosed</u>
Homestead	52	15	9
Homestead & Pre-emption	64	50	8
Homestead & Private Purchase	4		1
Homestead & Military Bounty Grant	1	1	1
Homestead, Pre-emption & Private Purchase	3	3	1
Homestead & North West Mounted Police Grant	1	1	
Homestead & Hudson's Bay Company Sale	1		
Homestead, Pre-emption & Government Sale	4	4	4
Homestead, Special Grant, & Private Purchase	2	2	
Homestead & Government Sale	2	1	
Government Sale	8	6	2
Government Sale & Private Purchase	1	1	
C.P.R. Sale	13	3	4
Hudson's Bay Company Sale	3		2
Manitoba Act Grant	10	8	5
Manitoba Act Grant & Private Purchase	1	1	
Private Purchase	12	5	
Military Bounty Grant & Manitoba Act Grant	3	2	
Military Bounty Grant & Private Purchase	1	1	
Military Bounty Grant & Government Sale	3	2	
Military Bounty Grant, Private Purchase & Government Sale	1		
Inherited Land	1	1	

TABLE XXXVIII

MORTGAGE INDEBTEDNESS AND RATE OF FORECLOSURE AMONG LANDOWNING DELEGATES TO ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886, AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885, OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Landowners	17	16	41	9	74	34
Average Size Farm	461.2A	331.9A	403.1A	300.9A	337.4A	357.1A
Number in Debt	11	10	22	5	43	16
% in Debt	64.7%	62.5%	53.7%	55.6%	58.1%	47.1%
Average Debt Per Debted Farmer	\$2,218.18	\$2,200.00	\$1,992.36	\$1,160.00	\$1,696.51	\$3,140.25
Average Debt Per Acre of Debted Farmer	\$2.64	\$5.25	\$4.63	\$3.66	\$4.42	\$8.90
Number Foreclosed by 1890	1	2	6	3	6	6
% Foreclosed by 1890	5.9%	12.5%	14.6%	33.3%	8.1%	17.6%
Number Foreclosed 1891- 1900	none	1	2	none	10	none
% Foreclosed 1891-1900		6.3%	4.9%		13.5%	
Number of Sales by 1890	5	1	4	1	6	5
% Sales by 1890	29.4%	6.3%	9.8%	11.1%	8.1%	14.7%
Number of Sales 1891-1900	none	2	5	none	13	5
% Sales 1891-1900		12.5%	12.2%		17.6%	14.7%
Under Real Property Act	1	1	2		4	1

Protective Union were in financial difficulties and many were eventually foreclosed by their creditors.<sup>23</sup> As in the case of the Farmers' Union, the economic position of the members of the movement (as determined from an examination of the land records of those delegates who owned property) was related to the amount of land that they held. Holders of large tracts of land were the most likely to have mortgaged their property and to be foreclosed. But smaller landowners who had taken out loans were more likely to be foreclosed than mortgaged large property owners.<sup>24</sup> Also, as in the case of the Farmers' Union, the means by which a landowner acquired his property was less important in relationship to his landed indebtedness than the extent of his holdings.<sup>25</sup>

Under the right circumstances, personal grievances stemming from a member's economic position were likely to outweigh common grievances. Debted landowners were more prone than non-debted landowners to accept radical means for the redress of grievances, and those individuals who were on the verge of foreclosure or forced sale were more likely to accept radical solutions than those who were debted but were still able to bear the burden.

One factor uniting all the disparate interests within the Protective Union, as in the case of the Farmers' Union, was a common cultural background. The re-organized Protective Union was a Protestant,<sup>26</sup> British and Canadian<sup>27</sup> movement, holding a greater attraction for married men than for single men.<sup>28</sup> Unhappily for the Protective Union, the common cultural heritage was not enough to overcome the diversity of personal interests.

As long as the Protective Union was united by the common experience of pioneering in southern Manitoba, by the problems

TABLE XXXIX

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885 AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885 AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Presbyterian	8	4	17	4	29	14
Methodist	6	5	10	1	11	5
Congregational			1		1	
Church of England			4	1	8	4
Roman Catholic			1		1	
Baptist					1	
Unknown	4	11	21	4	42	30
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

TABLE XL

LAST PLACE OF RESIDENCE BEFORE IMMIGRATING TO MANITOBA OF DELEGATES TO ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886, AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885, OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Canada						
Ontario	11	8	23	2	36	22
Quebec			2		2	
Nova Scotia						
New Brunswick		1	1			1
Prince Edward Island						
British Columbia						
North West Territories						
United Kingdom						
England & Wales			1		2	1
Ireland						
Scotland	1		1		3	1
Other British Possessions						1
Native Manitobans			2		1	
Unknown	6	11	24	8	49	27
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

TABLE XLI

BIRTHPLACE OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Canada						
Ontario	1	3	6		15	6
Quebec			2		1	1
Nova Scotia			1			
New Brunswick						
Prince Edward Island						
British Columbia						
North West Territories						
Manitoba			2		1	
United Kingdom						
England & Wales	3		5		6	1
Ireland						
Scotland	4	1	7	1	9	8
Other British Possessions						
United States		1				1
Unknown	10	16	31	9	61	36
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

TABLE XLII

MARITAL STATUS OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL MEETINGS OF JANUARY 16, 1884, JANUARY 21, 1885, AND JANUARY 20, 1886,  
AND AT CONVENTIONS OF DECEMBER 5, 1883, MARCH 4, 1885, AND DECEMBER 16, 1885,  
OF THE MANITOBA AND NORTH WEST FARMERS' CO-OPERATIVE AND PROTECTIVE UNION.

	Annual Meetings			Conventions		
	Jan. 1884	Jan. 1885	Jan. 1886	Dec. 1883	March 1885	Dec. 1885
Married	12	9	33	5	47	26
Single	2	1	2		6	1
Unknown	4	10	19	5	40	26
Unidentified		1	3		11	2
Totals	<u>18</u>	<u>21</u>	<u>57</u>	<u>10</u>	<u>104</u>	<u>55</u>

unique to that region, by a similar social background and by a non-partisan outlook, economic divisions within the membership could be overlooked. When members from other regions joined the movement, when the movement became politically oriented, and when non-farmers took out memberships and began to play a leading role in the organization's deliberations, the unity of the movement was shattered.

(ii)

The pressures within the Manitou movement for radical political solutions were not as strong as they had been within the Farmers' Union. Those politically-motivated individuals who maintained their connection with the re-organized Protective Union were chary about renewing the political agitation. Dr. Fleming, the president of the Union, was the most active Liberal within the movement, but he was a cautious man not given to making inflammatory public statements. He was unlikely to take the lead in pushing the Union into political action. E. A. Bailey, normally politically belligerent, confined his activities to re-organizing the Branch Unions in accordance with the provisions of the new constitution. The directors who were Liberals also avoided controversy.<sup>28A</sup> Undoubtedly the reason for the responsible attitude of the Liberal members of the executive was the disaster that had overtaken the Farmers' Union. Having effectively destroyed one farmers' movement without gaining any significant political advantage, the Liberals were attempting to avoid the mistakes they made in the recent past.

The hiatus in political activity allowed the provincial secretary of the re-organized Union, George Purvis--who more than any other individual deserves the title of the father of Western

Canadian agrarian protest--to emerge as the spokesman for Manitoba's farmers. Alone among the leading members of the old Farmers' Union, Purvis was a farmer and a Conservative. Other members of the Brandon executive were villified in the Conservative press for their lack of agricultural experience and for their support of the Liberal party, but Purvis was always treated with respect.<sup>29</sup> Even T. M. Daly who described the leading members of the Brandon Union as "political vagrants"<sup>30</sup> referred to Purvis as a "very decent, businesslike man" who was "very intelligent" and "well posted".<sup>31</sup>

From the commencement of the farmers' agitation in November, 1883, Purvis supported the movement for practical considerations. He was interested in realistic political reform and in co-operative action. This fact was especially evident in the meeting of the farmers' delegates with the Prime Minister in February, 1884. Where the other delegates spoke to the intensely political "Declaration of Rights", Purvis told of the practical difficulties that a settler faced in Manitoba: the lack of railways, the differences in standards for grading wheat among grain buyers, the high freight rates, the lack of equal access to timber by all settlers, and the heavy school taxes. Although he believed that by accepting the "Declaration of Rights" the federal government could remedy many of the settlers' grievances, he was prepared to support any federal initiative that would lead to relief for the farmers.<sup>32</sup>

In June, 1884, Purvis was elected to the most important post in the re-organized Protective Union, the office of provincial secretary, with responsibility for the day to day operation of the Union's affairs. In this position, he used his enormous energy to

promote co-operative action among Manitoba's farmers. Throughout July and August he travelled about the province speaking to local branches, impressing upon the members the advantages that would accrue to them if they marketed their wheat through the Union's co-operative marketing programme. Even in old Farmers' Union strongholds, such as East Brandon, he was remarkably successful in convincing the members of the advantages of farmers' co-operation.<sup>33</sup>

The grain marketing programme that Purvis presented to the various Branch Unions did not directly involve the Union in the marketplace. An agreement was concluded--probably sometime in June--with the firm of Mitchell & Mitchell of Montreal, grain merchants. Under the agreement's terms, Mitchell & Mitchell became the exclusive agents for the marketing of members' wheat. It was then believed, as it was later believed in the 1920's during the organization of the Wheat Pool, that by creating one monopolistic agency for the buying and selling of farmers' grain, a higher return to the farmer could be secured.<sup>34</sup>

What the farmers did not know at the time was that Mitchell & Mitchell were also agents for the Canadian Pacific Railway which provided the agency's capital. This arrangement appears to have been an experiment on the part of the Syndicate to integrate the sale and transportation of the Western Canadian crop, which if successful, would give the Canadian Pacific Railway an additional source of revenue and enhance its economic position as the West reached its full agricultural development.<sup>35</sup>

As well as the hidden dangers in the agreement made with Mitchell & Mitchell, neither Purvis nor the general membership were sufficiently aware of the hostility of the Winnipeg businessmen,

many of whom were deeply involved in the grain trade, to the Union's grain marketing programme. The first salvo from the Winnipeg interests was fired by The Commercial in June, which declared that the farmers had "exhausted the field of politics and secured no glory". The "agitating portion of our Manitoba farmers" was condemned for "blackguarding the miller and his associate the grain buyer". While admitting that the limited co-operative grain marketing scheme of the previous winter had been a success, The Commercial saw in the new proposal an attempt to establish a monopoly which would be burdensome. The grain marketing proposal was bound to fail because it was impractical, and if the Union persisted in its course of action, it would only succeed in arraying "the agricultural and trading classes against each other" with no visible benefit being gained for the farmer or businessman, and to the destruction of whatever chances Manitobans had of securing redress of grievances. The Union, if it persisted with its plan, would sow "the first seeds of discord among the hitherto united people of the province."<sup>36</sup>

For some time the leaders of the Protective Union ignored the criticism of the Winnipeg business community, but by October, 1884, it was no longer possible to avoid a confrontation. The federal government had decided to give the Winnipeg Board of Trade the right to determine grain standards for all wheat marketed in the Canadian West, and this important concession on the part of the Macdonald administration ensured that Winnipeg would become the principal grain marketing centre of Canada. The Winnipeg merchants were unquestionably delighted with the decision, but the farmers were disappointed. Throughout the summer the Union's executive had

been conducting negotiations with the Canadian Pacific Railway for the establishment of a satisfactory system of grain inspection.<sup>37</sup> An agreement had almost been reached when the federal announcement made it clear that instead of the farmers having some say in determining standards for wheat grades, the Winnipeg Board of Trade would have exclusive jurisdiction in the matter. At a meeting held at Nelsonville on October 17, many of the farmers bitterly complained of the "injustice about to be perpetrated by the Winnipeg Board of Trade upon the farmers of the country." The agricultural population aware from "past experience of the tender mercies of Winnipeg grain men, ...knew enough to trust them no farther than they could see them."<sup>38</sup>

The Commercial responded with a counter-attack on the "Kicking Unionists", condemning the Protective Union for having in its ranks "an individual whose duty seems to be to travel from point to point in the country and foment by fair means or foul discontent among those who have no better way of passing their time." Such activity was most destructive to the province's interests, for "we are yet too weak to accomplish anything in a divided state". The real question was whether Manitobans would "secure notoriety for Protective Union people or secure provincial unity."<sup>39</sup> This appeal for unity fell on deaf ears. Divisions were growing in intensity between the Winnipeg business community and the farmers.

A second issue had arisen to divide the farmers and the businessmen by the autumn of 1884: the Protective Union's decision to purchase binder twine co-operatively for its members. The executive of the Central Union was to determine how much binder twine the members needed and then call for tenders from various

manufacturers specifying both the quality and the quantity desired. The Watson Manufacturing Company submitted the lowest tender and agreed to ship the twine from its factories in Ontario to Winnipeg where the Central Union arranged distribution to the Branch Unions.<sup>40</sup>

The Winnipeg merchants, and in particular the wholesale merchants, were very unhappy about the development of this new "monopoly" which effectively precluded their competing in an important market. They argued that the Union was creating a monopoly, thereby depriving them of present and future business by encouraging Eastern domination of the Western Canadian market. In addition, the Union was accused of supplying inferior twine at higher prices than those prevailing in the market. This was an indirect accusation that the Union's leaders were personally dishonest.<sup>41</sup>

George Purvis, speaking for the executive of the Protective Union, refuted the charges in a letter to the Free Press. The Union, he wrote, had carefully examined all tenders and had tested all the twine submitted by every company before choosing the Watson Manufacturing Company as supplier. Certainly there had been a scarcity of twine in the province during the harvest and high prices had prevailed--but not for Union members. They had received their twine at greatly reduced prices. Any complaints from Winnipeg merchants directed at the Union were simply an attempt on their part to avoid the consequences for their failure to order enough twine to meet the expected demand. The Union could not be held responsible for lack of foresight on the part of the province's businessmen.<sup>42</sup>

While the Protective Union and the Winnipeg merchants

engaged in their war of words, the Union was also haggling with the Canadian Pacific Railway. From the beginning of the farmers' agitation in Manitoba in October, 1883, one of the avowed ends of the movement had been the elimination of the Ogilvie elevator "monopoly". One way to promote co-operation and to provide the farmers with the services which they desired was for the farmers to build their own elevators. The Branch Unions at Portage la Prairie and Brandon had incorporated their own elevator companies which had constructed the desired facilities.<sup>43</sup> For a farmers' elevator to be successful, large numbers of farmers had to patronize the new facility and in many districts, the construction of an elevator was impractical because there were few settlers. A more reasonable way to end the "monopoly", as far as the Protective Union was concerned, was for the Canadian Pacific Railway, which at the time served only upright elevators of 25,000 bushels capacity, to change its regulations so that farmers could load grain into box cars directly from loading platforms, or failing that, for the Railway to allow the construction of flat warehouses which were less expensive to build than upright elevators.<sup>44</sup>

The Canadian Pacific Railway was reluctant to change its regulations. W. C. Van Horne, the general manager of the Railway, explained the company's position in a letter to George Purvis. Van Horne stated that from many years experience in providing transportation for grain in the American West, and after seeing grain "handled in all ways and under all conditions", he had become aware of

the disastrous results both to the farmers  
and to the grain trade of the flat warehouse

system under exactly the same conditions as those existing on the Company's lines in Manitoba and , as he is a fool who will not profit by the mistakes of others, I have been exceedingly anxious that our grain trade should start right.

Elevators under 25,000 bushels capacity could not provide the necessary facilities to keep separate the various grades of grain, nor could they provide grain cleaning equipment. There were already enough problems with "very dirty, badly mixed and generally disgraceful" grain at the Port Arthur terminal elevator operated by the Railway, and two or three years shipment of that kind of wheat on a large scale would "effectually ruin the reputation of Manitoba wheat and...enormously reduce its value in the eastern market."<sup>45</sup>

The executive of the Protective Union was not impressed by the Canadian Pacific Railway's argument. At a meeting of the Council of the Central Union held at the end of July, it was pointed out that most of the Ontario wheat crop was handled at flat warehouses or at loading platforms with no deleterious effects on wheat exports. No doubt there was too much dirty wheat being sold at the present time, but that was partly the consequence of the great confusion in grain standards. Once universal standards were established and an adequate system of grain inspection set up, the cleaning of grain would regulate itself. Since dirty grain would be subject to a reduced price, self interest would lead the farmer to have it cleaned at his farm or at an elevator before it was offered for sale.<sup>46</sup>

The Canadian Pacific Railway declined to modify its position and the Protective Union refused to change its own stand. An impasse was reached in the negotiations between the Railway and the Union by the late autumn of 1884. Unable to budge the Railway from its position, the leaders and members of the Protective Union

were deeply frustrated in their attempt to break the elevator "monopoly".<sup>47</sup>

Despite the impasse with the Canadian Pacific Railway, the disappointment with regard to the federal government's decision to allow the Winnipeg Board of Trade to set grain standards, and the conflicts with the Winnipeg business community, by the autumn of 1884, the Protective Union had accomplished a great deal in furthering farmers' co-operation. The first province-wide scheme designed to market the farmers' crops co-operatively was established; a central buying plan was instituted for the purchase of binder twine; and two Branch Unions had constructed farmers' elevators. The only danger was that the Protective Union might forget its accomplishments and dwell on its failures. If it did that, political solutions to the frustrations stemming from its failure to accomplish all its goals might become too attractive to resist.

(iii)

Opposition to, and checks on, the ambitious plans for farmers' co-operative action were powerful stimuli to political action. The only way in which changes could be secured in the means of establishing grain standards and the system of inspection was by direct political pressure on the federal government which had the authority to determine grain standards itself or to delegate that power. Similarly, if the Canadian Pacific Railway could not find its way clear to change its regulations regarding the construction of elevators along its line, the federal government might intervene, passing legislation to regulate the handling of grain in Western Canada.

Another stimulus to political action was the continuing agricultural depression. The opponents of the Union believed that

the crop failure of the autumn of 1883 had been solely responsible for the rise of the agitation in Manitoba and that a good crop in 1884 would, as J. C. Aikins, the Lieutenant-Governor of Manitoba, informed Sir John A. Macdonald, "do more to allay the petulant feeling that exists than any concessions you could make to the Province however important."<sup>48</sup> This feeling was shared by the Conservative press in Manitoba.

The economic depression which held the province firmly in its grip throughout 1883, seemed to be nearing an end. The Minnedosa Tribune reported in May, that "prospects...were never brighter than they are today, and we anticipate the very best results from the operation of the present year."<sup>49</sup> The prognostications of the Tribune proved inaccurate. Although Manitoba's farmers harvested quite a good crop in 1884,<sup>50</sup> very low prices for grain continued to prevail. In October, after enough wheat had been marketed at Brandon to establish a market, the Mail, a Conservative newspaper, was deeply perplexed by the low prices being quoted to the farmers. Concluding that supply greatly exceeded demand, all the Mail could do was to advise the farmers to sell their crop immediately as prices were likely to decline even further.<sup>51</sup> By December, the price of wheat at Brandon had slipped to below 37¢ per bushel--most wheat selling at 27¢--a price at which the farmer could not meet his costs of production.<sup>52</sup>

Any optimism that the farmer might have experienced during the spring and summer as his crops germinated, developed and matured was rapidly transformed into pessimism after he drew his first load of wheat to market. The grain buyers were offering only slightly more for good quality wheat than they had offered for

frozen wheat a year earlier. Given the prevailing market conditions, co-operative action could not provide a solution to the farmer's problems. Only political action offered hope.

No matter how strong the temptation to undertake political action, most members of the Protective Union agreed with George Purvis when he argued that until the results of Norquay's negotiations with the federal government were known, there was little point in renewing a separate political agitation under the auspices of the Protective Union.<sup>53</sup> If the settlement with the provincial government was unsatisfactory, then the Union would enter the political arena.

In January, 1885, Norquay finally reached an agreement with the Dominion. In return for an increase in the provincial subsidy, the Manitoba government gave up its claims to the Crown lands in the province and its demand for an end to the Canadian Pacific Railway "monopoly".<sup>54</sup> For a government that was chronically short of revenue, the settlement must have appeared exceedingly generous, but for the farmers who had attached such importance to more railway construction and lower freight rates, the Premier appeared to have sold the province's birthright for a mess of potage.

Norquay's settlement with the federal government was the signal for a renewal of the political agitation. On February 4, 1885, a manifesto was issued over the signatures of Alexander Fleming and George Purvis, calling upon the citizens of Manitoba to "make preparations for another united movement" and "to meet in convention" in Winnipeg on March 4, 1885. The manifesto concluded:

Farmers rally to your posts. No Tory, no Grit, no party politics, united Manitoba in the Majesty and vigor of her strength and in the rectitude of her purpose will demand, and if necessary will compel by constitutional means, the recognition of her just rights.<sup>55</sup>

The revival of the political movement was not met with enthusiasm in the Liberal press of the province. As early as January 23, 1885, the Manitoba Free Press, probably aware of the intentions of the executive of the Protective Union to enter the political arena again, ran an editorial evaluating the past performance of the Union and its future prospects. While the province owed much to the farmers' agitation and while much still remained to be done, the members of the Protective Union could only succeed if they "unitedly kept themselves free from any taint of suspicion". Unfortunately for the farmers' cause "disreputable and designing demagogues" who were "seeking to ally themselves with the Union... in search of an opportunity to use it for their own purposes" were threatening the usefulness of the movement.<sup>56</sup>

Although the Free Press did not care to name those who were undermining the Union from within, it is obvious that the editorial referred to the secessionists who had been attracted to the movement and to the firm of Mitchell & Mitchell which marketed the members' wheat. Secessionist sympathies among the general membership could only be regretted and disavowed by the executive of the Protective Union; the connection with Mitchell & Mitchell was a more ticklish problem. In December, 1884, the arrangement between the Montreal graindealing firm and the Canadian Pacific Railway became public knowledge.<sup>57</sup>

The executive of the Union chose to resolve the obvious conflict of interest by ignoring it. At a meeting in Manitou, one of the partners in the Montreal firm shared the same platform as George Purvis, and both gentlemen were extremely laudatory in their remarks regarding one another and the interests they represented.<sup>58</sup>

When Purvis returned to Winnipeg from Manitou, he informed a Free Press reporter that if the farmers "could exercise a little more faith in those they have to deal with much of the existing dissatisfaction would disappear."<sup>59</sup>

The connection between the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Protective Union left the Liberal press in Manitoba in a serious quandary. One of the cardinal planks in the provincial Liberal party's platform was an end to the Canadian Pacific Railway "monopoly" of the carrying trade within Manitoba.<sup>60</sup> Accordingly the Syndicate was treated as the province's greatest enemy which had to be overthrown by whatever constitutional means were at hand. With the leaders of the Protective Union simultaneously praising the grain marketing scheme indirectly worked out with the Canadian Pacific Railway and attacking the Syndicate for its "monopoly", the Liberal press can be forgiven for not thinking the Union sincere.

The guarded support of the Protective Union by the Liberal newspapers at the time of its entry into politics had unfortunate consequences for the movement. Given the hostility of the Conservative press,<sup>61</sup> and not possessing its own press to disseminate information, the Protective Union was completely dependent upon the goodwill of the Liberal press to further its cause. When the Liberal newspapers began to question the sincerity of the Union's motives in renewing the political agitation, the farmers' cause was greatly weakened.

Undaunted, the Protective Union's leaders continued to make preparations for the March, 1885, convention summoned to meet in Winnipeg. As in the case of the Farmers' Union a year earlier,

preliminary meetings were held by local associations to discuss the problems of the farmers and to draft resolutions to be presented at Winnipeg. During the course of this series of meetings, the united front that the movement had presented in its struggle to implement farmers' co-operative action was broken.

Local grievances were emphasized at all of the Branch assemblies. At Portage la Prairie, the members complained of the lack of capital in the province, most of which was invested in real estate, compelling the farmers to place themselves "at the mercy of avaricious traders, who, in order to hold a monopoly, belittled in every possible way not only the country but also its products."<sup>62</sup> The delegates to the Green Ridge meeting were primarily concerned with the grain trade, hoping that the Protective Union's co-operative marketing programme would break the "monopoly" enjoyed by Ogilvie.<sup>63</sup> The farmers of Langvale to the south of Brandon were principally interested in protesting federal lands policy. Too much land had been sold by the Crown or given away to the Canadian Pacific Railway as a subsidy with consequent hardship being wreaked on those settlers who were too scattered to provide community institutions.<sup>64</sup> At Emerson, the issue was railways. Nearing bankruptcy, the city of Emerson saw its only hope of salvation in putting an end to disallowance of railway charters and promoting the speedy construction of the Emerson and North Western Railway.<sup>65</sup>

Divisions based upon local grievances were also apparent at the Winnipeg convention. The delegates from Pilot Mound, Rapid City and Sourisford, all of which places were without railway connections, urged the convention to adopt a strong resolution in favour of the immediate construction of branch lines. The delegates

from Griswold and High Bluff, both of which centres had railways, were less enthusiastic about the need for railways, but were very much in favour of the province acquiring control of its Crown lands, a step which they believed would lead to a rapid influx of settlers and put an end to the economic depression that hung like a pall over Manitoba.<sup>66</sup> The Springfield delegates thought that changes in the Municipal Act would be of great practical benefit if such changes relieved the local governments of the heavy financial responsibilities incurred in recent years. The Morris and Emerson delegations pressed the convention to adopt a resolution favouring an immediate start on the Hudson's Bay Railway which they believed would give their towns control of the trade of the American Mid-West. And Kenneth McKenzie of Burnside, true to his Scottish heritage, argued that what the country needed was more efficient and less costly government to remedy its problems.<sup>67</sup>

The presence of a large number of Liberal delegates helped to distract the convention from its purpose of securing redress of farmers' grievances. E. A. Bailey and W. F. Luxton, the editor of the Free Press, successfully sought acceptance of a resolution condemning the National Policy and putting the Union on record as favouring free trade.<sup>68</sup> Other Liberals introduced a resolution demanding redistribution of the seats in the Legislative Assembly of Manitoba according to population.<sup>69</sup> When this resolution passed, the convention had committed itself to an important plank in the provincial Liberal platform, which that party believed, if implemented, would lead to the overthrow of the Norquay administration.<sup>70</sup>

Added to the local and political divisions that developed

in the movement either before or during the Winnipeg convention of March, 1885, were the divisions based upon personal grievances. As Table XXXI illustrates, a large number of farmers who attended the March, 1885, assembly were financially embarrassed. Fully 23% of all landowning delegates were eventually foreclosed and a further 8.1% of those delegates were forced to sell their land by 1890. In addition, there were a number of disillusioned promoters who attended the convention, and while not so important a force at this meeting as at the meetings of December, 1883, and March, 1884, their special interests were not ignored in the debates.<sup>71</sup>

Among the farmers who made up the vast majority of delegates to the Winnipeg convention in 1885, however, there was more social and economic unity than at earlier provincial conventions of the Farmers' Union. In the first place, the vast majority of the delegates to the March, 1885, assembly were farmers.<sup>72</sup> Consequently, the conflicts in interests between the farmers and non-farmers which had been such an important feature at earlier provincial assemblies were of lesser significance, although they continued to exist as long as non-farmers played a role within the movement. Cohesion was given to the agitation by the farmer-delegates' British and Canadian background,<sup>73</sup> by their family commitments,<sup>74</sup> and by their Protestantism.<sup>75</sup> Differences based upon the length of residence in Manitoba,<sup>76</sup> and the means by which landowning delegates acquired property<sup>77</sup> indicated only the diversity of regions within the province represented at the assembly and not the diversity in economic and social background among the delegates.

Although he exerted a negligible influence at the March, 1885, convention, A. F. Martin, a Rouge from Quebec who had

emigrated to the West in 1872, was elected as a delegate from Morris, representing the French-Canadian and Metis minorities within the province. Economic hardship and the Protective Union's emphasis upon co-operative self-help had broken down to a very limited extent the cultural and linguistic barriers that separated the non-English-speaking minorities from the anglophone majority in Manitoba.

Yet, the greater cohesion in the economic and social structure of the convention, as compared with the Farmers' Union provincial conventions, was outweighed by the local and personal grievances of the delegates from the various regions represented. The reasons why the farmers of Rapid City and Langvale sent delegates were not the same, any more than were the reasons motivating townsmen of Emerson and Brandon. Until the residents of rural Manitoba saw that they all shared the same problems, until they excluded non-farmers from farmers' organizations, and until they were agreed on common solutions, centrifugal forces would disrupt the movement.

Rent with divisions based upon local and personal grievances, the convention of March, 1885, accomplished very little. The "Declaration of Rights" was re-affirmed and a number of special resolutions, most of which simply gave added emphasis to planks in the "Declaration of Rights", were passed. But no departures from past policy nor imaginative solutions to the farmers' problems were initiated. As the delegates adjourned to return to their homes, the provincial press was quick to criticize the Protective Union for what it regarded as the convention's failure.

The Conservative press was, naturally enough, hostile. Despite the fact that through the two days of debate, not a hint

of secession was broached by any of the speakers, the Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review felt itself called upon to condemn the movement as a "political dodge" whose purpose was to "publicly advocate secession."<sup>78</sup> The Brandon Mail was content to describe the Protective Union as a Grit organization which was not interested in solving the very real problems of the Manitoba settlers and farmers.<sup>79</sup>

While the reaction of the Conservative press was to be expected, the members of the Protective Union were not entirely prepared for the criticisms of the normally friendly Liberal press, even though the Liberal newspapers had been ambivalent in their support in recent months. The greatest shock came from the Manitoba News of Morden, the successor to the Nelsonville Mountaineer.<sup>80</sup> E. A. Bailey was no longer connected with the paper,<sup>81</sup> but it had supported the Union following his departure.<sup>82</sup> After stating that the Winnipeg convention was "on the whole a satisfactory affair", the News went on to point out that much "time was taken up in the discussion of trivial matters, indicating, perhaps, that the real grievances which the Union was formed to combat have ceased to exist."<sup>83</sup> The Manitoba Free Press, although its editor attended the convention, ignored the Protective Union in its editorial pages, a sign of disinterest or displeasure with the movement. Only the Brandon Sun complimented the Union on the position it had taken at the convention regarding Manitoba's grievances.<sup>84</sup>

(iv)

The March, 1885, provincial convention marked the turning point in the fortunes of the Protective Union. By renewing a political agitation, all the divisions within the Union which had

lain dormant while the farmers sought solutions to their problems through co-operative action were exposed. Lacking in the unity that was so necessary to achieving redress of grievances, the Protective Union had subjected co-operative action to the imperatives of politics with little likelihood that the farmers' lot would be improved by the new direction of the movement.

Moreover, the timing of the renewal of a political agitation was most inauspicious for its success. On the banks of the Saskatchewan River, an unrelated agitation was being conducted by the Metis residents of the North West Territories to secure what they regarded as their just rights. Shortly after the Protective Union's Winnipeg convention, news was flashed across the country that armed rebellion had broken out with the massacres at Duck Lake and Fort Pitt. The troubles of the Canadian West that had been festering for a decade had finally led to uprising.<sup>85</sup>

The Protective Union was, unhappily for it, indirectly connected with the outbreak of the Saskatchewan Rebellion. In its initial stages, the British and Canadian residents of Prince Albert had been associated with the North West agitation. They had formed the Prince Albert Settlers' Protective Union in 1884 under the leadership of William Henry Jackson,<sup>86</sup> an Ontario settler and a farmer, and had acted in concert with the Metis farmers and buffalo hunters in summoning Louis Riel to lead the movement. While most of the English-speaking residents of the district quickly broke with Riel when he began to advocate the creation of a Provisional Government, Jackson continued to support Riel and served as his private secretary.<sup>87</sup> Since the Prince Albert Settlers' Protective Union was apparently patterned on the organizations founded by the

farmers of Manitoba, the Canadian public could be excused for confusing the Manitoba and Territorial movements.

There was a more ominous connection between the two agitations. Under the re-organized Protective Union's constitution, adopted in June, 1884, provision had been made for the formation of a Division Union in the Prince Albert district.<sup>88</sup> While the Prince Albert settlers never availed themselves of the opportunity to merge their organization with the Protective Union, leaders of the Manitoba organization had not publicly disassociated themselves or the Manitoba movement from events in the District of Saskatchewan.

Furthermore, the public in Manitoba was prepared to believe that the Protective Union was engaged in treasonous plots. The Conservative newspapers had attacked the farmers' movement practically from its inception, claiming that it was a front for secessionist Liberal politicians who desired nothing more than to see the break-up of Confederation. There was some substance to the claims, for Charles Stewart, the founder of the movement, had constantly advocated secession and the formation of a new Confederation of the Western Canadian provinces.

More serious were the rumours spread that the farmers planned an armed uprising in March, 1884. Upon the basis of evidence given to the authorities by an unknown informer, Charles Stewart was arrested in Winnipeg and the militia commanders were warned of an attempt to take the armoury and Lower Fort Garry. The whole affair turned out to be a practical joke; Stewart was released, indignantly claiming that he was being persecuted by the authorities for his beliefs.<sup>89</sup>

In June, 1884, there was a second scare. A letter from

Joseph "Mack" Howes, the owner of the Brunswick House in Winnipeg, to George Purvis was intercepted by the police. In the letter, Howes argued that "since the commencement of the agitation" there had not been "a better time to strike than the present." There was no force to resist an armed uprising; "the military here is nothing more than a pack of boys and we have easy access to the Store rooms." If Purvis gave his consent, Howes and his friends would move at once.<sup>90</sup>

The Norquay government acted promptly. Detectives were detailed to keep track of the movements of Purvis and Howes, and the Prime Minister was informed of the situation.<sup>91</sup> Macdonald replied by telegram asking Norquay to alert the military authorities to the situation and to take the proper precautions.<sup>92</sup> The same day, Macdonald wrote advising the Premier to arrest Howes if the letter was in his handwriting, although the Prime Minister conceded, it might be better "to await further developments."<sup>93</sup> There were no new developments in the case, and as it turned out that was the end of the affair.

The business concerning the intercepted letter appears to have been another hoax. While Purvis and Howes were good friends-- Purvis later made a trip from his self-imposed exile in the United States in 1890 to testify in a civil action in Howes' favour--<sup>94</sup> there is no reason to suppose that they were planning treason. Little is known of Howes, but Purvis' behaviour throughout the entire course of the farmers' agitation in the 1880's was exemplary. He was not one of those seeking radical solutions to Manitoba's problems, rather he was a moderating influence on the movement and his greatest commitment was to co-operative action. Given Purvis' character and

given the earlier practical joke played on Stewart, there is sufficient reason to believe that a second hoax had been perpetrated.

Fact or fiction, rumours that a leader of the Protective Union and a prominent figure from the Farmers' Union were plotting an armed uprising were very damaging to the movement. They gave credence to the wildest accusations. In an editorial in April, 1885 discussing the causes of the Rebellion, the Brandon Mail argued that the farmers' agitation in Manitoba indirectly led to the Saskatchewan uprising by creating a false sense of grievance in the people of the Canadian West so great that only armed force could secure redress.<sup>95</sup> An anonymous correspondent from Brandon made the point more clearly in a letter to J. B. Plumb. He stated that the "foundation of the rebellion" could be attributed to "utterances of the Farmers' Union a year ago." The Union's agitation "led Riel and his co-adjutors to believe the whole country was one pile of tinder and that it required but a single match to set it all in flame."<sup>96</sup>

Compounding the problems facing the Protective Union following the outbreak of the Saskatchewan Rebellion were the effects of an ill-timed secession meeting called by Charles Stewart following the March, 1885, convention. The meeting itself was a complete fiasco. The opponents of secession as a solution to the province's difficulties took over the platform and bodily "seceded" Charles Stewart from the hall into a snowbank.<sup>97</sup> But the Union was saddled with the problem of disassociating itself from the sentiments Stewart expressed, for although he was no longer a member, he was prominently identified with the movement.

The Protective Union failed to take sufficient notice of

the danger that Stewart's meeting and the events in the North West posed to the survival of the agitation. Instead, while the fires of rebellion burned in the North West, the Protective Union continued its agitation in Manitoba, holding meetings at Morden,<sup>98</sup> Crystal City,<sup>99</sup> Ruttanville,<sup>100</sup> and Turtle Mountain.<sup>101</sup> At each meeting, the provincial and federal governments were denounced, the inflammatory language used demonstrating how oblivious the Union was to the peril in which it found itself. And at no meeting was any attempt made to disassociate the movement from the utterances of Charles Stewart or from the actions of the Saskatchewan rebels.

The disillusioned Liberal press was aware of the curious ambivalence displayed by the Protective Union, and gradually it began to attack the movement. On March 19, a letter appeared in the Manitoba Free Press highly critical of the Union's leadership and especially of George Purvis. According to the letter, Purvis had few fixed principles, was a secret secessionist, and was responsible for the "anti-immigration" resolution. The Union's provincial secretary and his friends would do well to confine themselves to their proper duties, for there was no one "who is more calculated sooner to alienate its true friends and sympathizers, and sooner to run it to earth than Purvis if left to his own warped judgment and personal feelings."<sup>102</sup>

The Manitou Mercury, another Liberal newspaper which had been a staunch supporter of the Protective Union--there had once been a plan afoot for the Mercury to publish a newspaper for the Union's membership--<sup>103</sup> attacked the movement. In its columns, an account of a local meeting held in Manitou to discuss the farmers' grievances was unflattering in its references. Purvis' speech was

described as a "rambling, illogical and unconnected piece of spouting"; the resolutions presented for debate were ridiculed; and the meeting, the proceedings of which were painted as "general confusion", was described as a "fiasco".<sup>104</sup>

Even as support in the provincial press withered away, the Protective Union continued to agitate for the ends it desired. A new convention was summoned to meet in Winnipeg on March 31, 1885 to "protest against acceptance of the federal government's terms" by the Norquay government and to "defend the rights of the Province." As the Mercury observed: with "Riel kicking up a row in the North-west, and Purvis and the army of Unionists in Winnipeg, a lively time may be expected."<sup>105</sup>

Very little is known of the second Winnipeg convention of March, 1885, but wiser heads than those of the leaders of the movement seem to have prevailed. The convention passed only one resolution of importance: to postpone any further political action until the Saskatchewan Rebellion had been suppressed.<sup>106</sup> This move came too late to check further dwindling of public support for the Union.

What little good the March 31 convention accomplished was dissipated a few weeks later with the publication of an appeal by the Protective Union to Queen Victoria. Dated May 25, 1885, the appeal to the "foot of the throne" which was printed and given general circulation in Manitoba, had much to recommend it. By far the greatest part of the document which ran to over one hundred pages was a moderate, thoughtful, and well-argued analysis of the farmers' situation in Manitoba. In the conclusion, however, the authors betrayed the movement completely. Not only did the appeal defend the Metis in the North West, claiming that grievances which

Ottawa ignored far too long had led them to take up arms,<sup>107</sup> but if Manitoba and the North West

are doomed much longer to their present anomalous position--a colony in name only, the colony of a colony, denied all the rights that belong to the other colonies in the Confederation, under the "British North America Act"--then, indeed, it will only be a question of time as to when the people will become tired of their equivocal position and slip the yoke of servitude.<sup>108</sup>

The scarcely veiled threat of another armed uprising when the last embers of the Saskatchewan Rebellion had yet to be extinguished, was the final act in the political agitation of the Protective Union. The movement had condemned itself. The public standing of the Protective Union was such by the time of the publication of the appeal, that no provincial newspaper saw fit to comment on the latest indiscretion. Although in July there was a last flurry of political meetings sponsored by the Union in an attempt to rekindle the flames of political action,<sup>109</sup> most Manitobans were unprepared to support the discredited movement with its political solutions to the province's difficulties.

(v)

The failure of political action did not lead to an immediate collapse of the Protective Union as it had for the Farmers' Union of Brandon. The real strength of the Protective Union lay in its programme of farmers' co-operation. As long as co-operation in the marketplace was actively pursued by the Union and as long as it appeared to benefit the farmers, the Protective Union would retain some support in the rural areas of the province.

Throughout the political agitation, the Protective Union continued to emphasize its programme of farmers' co-operation. At the local level, indeed, some farmers concentrated on co-operative

action to the exclusion of the political questions that the leaders of the Union wished to see resolved. In the Manitou district, members were directing their energy towards setting up a farmers' elevator company.<sup>110</sup> To the east of Morden, the Mennonite settlers were expressing an interest in the activities of the Protective Union, not because of political commitments--at this point they still left worldly matters to their Anglo-Saxon neighbours--but because of the co-operative grain marketing scheme of the Union, in the hope that it might improve their lot, for they, like other Manitobans, had suffered from the effects of the agricultural depression.

George Purvis, at the invitation of A. E. Shantz, a Mennonite from Ontario, addressed a meeting at Shanzenfeld in the Western Reserve on March 19. Despite a patronizing speech in which the Protective Union's president declared that Mennonite social organization "retarded rather than encouraged individual effort and independence", resulting in the Mennonites being "left behind in the race of intelligence and progress", the meeting was moved to action by the testimony of individual Mennonite farmers who had marketed their grain with the Union and had received a far better price than that offered by the private grain buyers. The Mennonite farmers organized themselves as the Shanzenfeld Branch of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, and the political agitation notwithstanding, the new Branch Union sent a delegate to the December, 1885, provincial convention.<sup>111</sup>

Even before the political agitation reached its denouement, however, the usefulness of the Protective Union's grain marketing programme was being questioned. In testimony presented to the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Immigration

and Colonization, the Union was attacked for not fulfilling conditions under which farmers sold their wheat to the Union's agents. Under the system of grain marketing devised by the Union, two payments were made to the farmers: one when Mitchell & Mitchell took delivery of the wheat, and one when the Montreal firm disposed of its purchases. According to the testimony of the three farmers before the Committee, the Union had made a first payment, but failed to make a second. With some justification, all three individuals believed that they had been defrauded by the Protective Union.<sup>112</sup>

Partly accounting for the failure to make second payments was the poor business sense displayed by the Union's leaders and especially by George Purvis who had charge of the grain marketing programme. In January, 1886, when the accounting procedures used by the Union were carefully scrutinized by the auditors after Purvis' resignation from the executive, the grain marketing records were found to be confused, with some invoices being misplaced and others lost.<sup>113</sup>

A second reason accounting for the failure to pay out monies that farmers believed to be due to them was the lack of capital reserves. Mitchell & Mitchell acted as the purchasing agent for the Union, but actual payment to the individual farmers was made by the Protective Union after receiving the cash from the disposal of the grain from their agents. Until payment was made to individual farmers, the Union deposited the money with McEwen and Dunsford, private bankers in Morden. Difficulties arose when McEwen and Dunsford disagreed with the Union about the amount deposited on account. A considerable sum was involved--\$5,800--without which the Union would have difficulty in meeting its

commitments.<sup>114</sup> When McEwen and Dunsford refused to honour the Union's bank drafts, the Manitou organization had no reserves on which to fall back. Total dues collected by the Central Union in 1884 had amounted to only \$401, and these had been expended by the officers almost as soon as they were collected.<sup>115</sup>

The farmers who marketed their wheat through the grain marketing programme of the Protective Union used the "tickets" issued by Mitchell & Mitchell's buyers, covering the difference between the first and second payments, as cash at the stores of local merchants. When it became apparent that the "tickets" might not be redeemed by the Union, the merchants took action to recover what was owed them. In July, Francis and Fowler, general merchants of Manitou, launched a civil suit against the Protective Union.<sup>116</sup> They were soon joined by the Manitou Farmers' Elevator Company which had also accepted the Union's "tickets" as cash for seed grain, and while most of the directors of the Elevator Company were members of the Union, they did not wish to see their co-operative enterprise suffer severe financial losses because of its connection with the Union.<sup>117</sup>

The litigation begun in July, 1885, continued through to October, 1886. Faced with the lawsuits, the Union attempted to recover the money it believed was owing to it from McEwen and Dunsford. The banking house, in turn, filed a suit against the Union, claiming that rather than owing anything to the Union, the Union had a substantial overdraft at the bank. The first case came to trial in October, 1885, with the Union being ordered to pay the Manitou Farmers' Elevator Company what was due that organization.<sup>118</sup> A year later, the remaining cases were settled to the

disadvantage of the farmers' movement. The courts accepted McEwen and Dunsford's argument and the Protective Union was ordered to deposit \$343 to cover the deficit in its account.<sup>119</sup> By that time, the grain marketing plan had been suspended, and the Union had all but disappeared.

The actual cause of the collapse of the Protective Union's co-operative grain marketing programme was not the litigation, although it probably contributed to the end, but the decision of the Canadian Pacific Railway to abandon its venture into grain purchasing. In the summer of 1885, faced with the cancellation of the agreement with the Montreal firm and without the capital to establish its own company, the leaders of the Protective Union hit upon an ingenious plan. George Purvis was engaged as the Union's grain buyer. In return for a modest capital outlay provided by the Union, Purvis was expected to turn a profit from the business, out of which he would take a salary and build up capital reserves.<sup>120</sup> The problem with this arrangement was that it left Purvis and indirectly the Union, open to the charge of speculation.

The Conservative newspapers of Manitoba had already charged the Union's executive with dishonesty in their marketing of members' grain. In April, 1884, the Neepawa Canadian warned its readers that, while "the farmers are busy putting in their grain the hungry-would-be-agitation-leaders are calculating how much they will get out of the crops."<sup>121</sup> A little more than a year later, the Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review accused George Purvis of "riding the Farmers' Union horse to his own pecuniary advantage with a vengeance."<sup>122</sup>

With the new grain marketing agreement establishing Purvis

as the Union's agent, trouble should have been anticipated, but when it came, it was from an unexpected quarter. At a provincial convention that met in December, 1885, to discuss the Canadian Pacific Railway's "monopoly" and improvements in the grain marketing system, Joseph Martin who had been so prominent in the Farmers' Union, but who had maintained very loose ties with the Protective Union, charged that Purvis had a secret agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway under which he would receive a preferential freight rate on all grain that he shipped. Martin revealed that it was Purvis' intention to charge the Union the regular rate and pocket the difference. The accusation was serious coming from a prominent Liberal politician and a known supporter of the farmers' agitation.<sup>123</sup>

The charge was sufficient in itself to convict the Protective Union in the public's estimation of wrong-doing. No matter how Purvis chose to answer it, he would only draw more adverse publicity to himself and to the Union. At first, the provincial secretary fought back. He explained his conduct to the convention, and was exonerated by the delegates, thereby forcing Martin's resignation from the Union.<sup>124</sup> But the provincial press did not believe his explanation. The Manitoba Free Press, in refraining from commenting on the charges, condemned him by implication; the Manitou Mercury sharply criticized the Union's grain marketing plan.<sup>125</sup> Confronted with the subtle insinuations in the newspapers, Purvis attempted to justify himself in a letter to the Free Press, in which he explained the details of the grain marketing arrangement which he had made with the Union, and denying any dishonesty.<sup>126</sup> Martin replied the following day, repeating hearsay evidence from what he termed "reliable parties" that "Purvis intended

to make a large profit out of the grain trade through his connection with the Union."<sup>127</sup> Finally recognizing that he could not shake off the attacks and that he was damaging the Union's cause by attempting to defend himself, Purvis resigned his office of provincial secretary on January 2, 1886.<sup>128</sup>

The resignation did not clear the Protective Union of suspicion. Martin and other Liberal politicians, it rapidly became apparent, were intent upon destroying the farmers' movement. Not one shred of evidence was ever produced showing that Purvis had been guilty of misusing Union funds. Indeed, the auditors' report prepared in January, 1886, while critical of his accounting procedures, found that no monies had been misappropriated nor had the provincial secretary made undue profits from the grain marketing programme.<sup>129</sup> The attack on Purvis was simply a preliminary action the purpose of which was to discredit the most prominent public figure in the movement.

At the January, 1886, annual meeting of the Protective Union, Martin was again present, having renewed his membership after Purvis' departure. Along with E. A. Bailey, he managed to persuade the now leaderless delegates that the grain marketing programme had been a mistake. All grain buying by the Union was suspended until the courts disposed of the pending suits initiated by the Union or its creditors. To make sure that there would be no renewal of the programme once the court cases were finally disposed of, Martin and J. D. Cameron gave legal opinions that the grain marketing scheme as devised by the Union was beyond the powers conferred in the provincial charter.<sup>130</sup> Although both men prefaced their remarks by stating that they were acting in the Union's best interests in proffering their opinions, the motivation behind their

action was transparent. If either man had been genuinely interested in the Union's welfare, he would have given his advice on the Union's powers eighteen months earlier when the Protective Union re-organized itself under the provisions of the charter.

The reason behind the attacks on the Protective Union by Joseph Martin and other Liberals within the movement actually had little to do with the co-operative grain marketing programme of the Union. Most of the Liberals were non-farmers who were not especially interested in the problems of the Manitoba farmers. They had joined the movement for the political advantage that might be obtained by embarrassing the Conservative governments at Ottawa and Winnipeg. When the Saskatchewan Rebellion began in the North West Territories, it was the Liberals through their connection with the Protective Union who had been embarrassed. Once the Union became a liability to the Manitoba Liberals, it had outlived its usefulness to them. Consequently, Martin had taken the lead in destroying a movement which he had so actively promoted less than two years before.

Ultimately, what allowed the Liberals to undermine the Union from within was the economic and social structure of the movement. At both the December, 1885, convention and at the January, 1886, annual meeting, it was the non-farmers who had taken the lead in discrediting the Protective Union. If the Union had restricted its membership to farmers, men like Bailey and Martin would have been excluded from its deliberations. But lacking in social and economic unity, the Union was beset by internal divisions which in time of crisis divided the organization against itself.<sup>131</sup>

Like the Farmers' Union before it, the Protective Union did not long survive the disaster which had befallen it. Within

three months the Union had split in two. The farmers of Brandon established their own organization called the "Farmers Alliance" in March, 1886, with the objective of achieving redress of grievances through political action. While this new movement had the blessing of the Manitoba Free Press,<sup>132</sup> it was not accepted by the province's farmers. Both the Farmers' Alliance and the Protective Union disappeared by the end of 1886; the only remnant of the great farmers' agitation that had convulsed Manitoba for three years was the Farmers' Club of Manitou, the successor to the Manitou Branch Union. The Club's following was purely local, the members meeting twice a month to discuss problems related to the situation of the farming population.<sup>133</sup>

There were many explanations at the time for the collapse of the Protective Union. The Commercial argued that it was the grain marketing programme of the Union that destroyed the movement.<sup>134</sup> Charles Stewart, the founder of the agitation in 1883, who had embarrassed the membership of the Union by advocating secession, thought that declarations of the low profits that could be expected from farming in Manitoba had been the prime cause as they had alienated a large part of the population which had a vested interest in continued immigration.<sup>135</sup> But it was the Manitoba Free Press which came closest to revealing the most important weakness in the Protective Union when it attacked the enemies within the movement which had used the Union for their advantage and had undermined it. Although the Free Press was referring to George Purvis rather than the Liberals and the non-farmers who were an alien element in a farmers' agitation, the Winnipeg newspaper had touched on the essential problem that plagued farmers' movements in Manitoba in

the 1880's.<sup>136</sup>

Like the Farmers' Union before it, the Protective Union failed because of basic weaknesses in its economic and social structure. Too many individuals were motivated to support the Protective Union out of a sense of local or personal grievance; too many individuals were uninterested in the improvement of the farmers' condition; and too many individuals were politically motivated for the agitation to survive the stresses that were imposed by the failure of the political agitation and the grain marketing programme in 1885.

Despite its extinction, however, the Protective Union accomplished a great deal. It founded the first province-wide programme of co-operation in the sale of farm produce and the purchase of farm supplies. It inspired farmers to build their own elevators and flat warehouses. It conducted an agitation for the improvement of the grain marketing system in the Canadian West. And perhaps of greatest significance, it opened the eyes of many rural Manitobans to the advantages of producers' co-operation.

FOOTNOTES

1. Manitoba Free Press, January 24, 1884, p. 4.
2. Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1884, p. 1.
3. Manitoba Free Press, June 6, 1884, p. 4.
4. Statutes of Manitoba, 47 Victoria, Cap. 79.
5. Manitoba Free Press, June 6, 1884, p. 4.
6. /Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union/, Constitution of the Manitoba and North-West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, (Winnipeg: Manitoba Daily Free Press, 1884), pp. 5-9.
7. Manitoba Free Press, December 21, 1885, p. 4.
8. Partridge, of course, had the advantage of hindsight as a result of the failure of the Protective Union and later of the Patrons of Industry to combine the activities of a benevolent society with those of farmers' co-operation in the marketplace.
9. Manitoba Free Press, June 6, 1884, p. 4.
10. /Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union/, Constitution of the Manitoba and North-West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, p. 5.
11. Calculated on the basis of Branch Unions remaining active after the collapse of the Farmers' Union of Brandon.
12. Manitoba Free Press, June 6, 1884, p. 4.
13. /Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union/, Constitution of the Manitoba and North-West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, pp. 9-10.
14. See Table XXXI.
15. See Table XXXII.
16. Manitoba Free Press, June 6, 1884, p. 4.
17. Brandon Mail, July 10, 1884, p. 8.
18. Manitoba Free Press, December 6, 1883, p. 1; January 24, 1884, p. 4.

19. Manitoba Free Press, January 26, 1885, p. 4; January 21, 1886, p. 4.
20. They were Robert McKay, Francis Clegg and John Dobbryn.
21. Canada, Journals of the House of Commons, Appendix No. 3, pp. 24, 33-34 and 43.
22. He was Francis Clegg.
23. See Table XXXVIII.
24. See Table XXXVI.
25. See Table XXXVII.
26. See Table XXXIX.
27. See Tables XL and XLI.
28. See Table XLII.
- 28A. Manitoba Free Press, July 25, 1884, p. 4.
29. See for example, Minnedosa Tribune, March 14, 1884, p. 2; Brandon Mail, January 17, 1884.
30. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (d), Vol. 397, Part 2, T. M. Daly to Macdonald, December 16, 1883, 191552-191572.
31. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (d), Vol. 397, Part 2, T. M. Daly to Macdonald, December 31, 1883, 191785-191796.
32. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (a), Vol. 113, clipping from the Ottawa Citizen, 46176.
33. Manitoba Free Press, July 23, 1884, p. 3.
34. The Commercial, June 17, 1884, p. 748; Manitoba Free Press, December 5, 1884, p. 1; December 18, 1884, p. 1.
35. The Commercial, November 24, 1885, p. 168.
36. The Commercial, June 17, 1884, p. 748.
37. Manitoba Free Press, July 25, 1884, p. 4; August 28, 1884, p. 4; September 1, 1884, p. 3; The Commercial, October 7, 1884, p. 28.
38. Manitoba Free Press, October 20, 1884, p. 3.
39. The Commercial, October 21, 1884, p. 69.

40. Manitoba Free Press, August 28, 1884, p. 4; October 13, 1884, p. 2.
41. Manitoba Free Press, October 13, 1884, p. 2.
42. Ibid.
43. Brandon Mail, June 5, 1884, p. 1; Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, July 17, 1885, p. 4.
44. Manitoba Free Press, June 27, 1884, p. 4.
45. Manitoba Free Press, July 24, 1884, p. 4.
46. Manitoba Free Press, July 25, 1884, p. 4.
47. Manitoba Free Press, October 20, 1884, p. 3; November 28, 1884, p. 1.
48. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (a), Vol. 119, J. C. Aikins to Macdonald, July 13, 1884, 48560-48562.
49. Minnedosa Tribune, May 2, 1884, p. 2.
50. Manitoba Free Press, September 2, 1884, p. 2; Neepawa Canadian, September 18, 1884, p. 2.
51. Brandon Mail, October 2, 1884, p. 4.
52. Brandon Mail, December 11, 1884, p. 4.
53. Manitoba Free Press, September 6, 1884, p. 2.
54. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (e), Vol. 526, Part 1, Macdonald to A. A. C. LaRiviere, April 9, 1885.
55. Manitoba Free Press, February 4, 1885, p. 2.
56. Manitoba Free Press, December 5, 1884, p. 1.
57. Manitoba Free Press, December 5, 1884, p. 1.
58. Ibid.
59. Manitoba Free Press, December 18, 1884, p. 1.
60. Manitoba Free Press, February 6, 1885, p. 2.
61. See Brandon Mail, January 15, 1884, p. 4; Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, January 23, 1885, p. 4; January 30, 1885, p. 4.
62. Manitoba Free Press, February 7, 1885, p. 1.
63. Manitoba Free Press, February 14, 1885, p. 1.

64. Manitoba Free Press, February 20, 1885, p. 2.
65. Manitoba Free Press, March 2, 1885, p. 1.
66. Manitoba Free Press, March 5, 1885, p. 1.
67. Manitoba Free Press, March 5, 1885, p. 4.
68. Manitoba Free Press, March 5, 1885, p. 1.
69. Manitoba Free Press, March 6, 1885, p. 2.
70. Manitoba Free Press, February 6, 1885, p. 2.
71. See also Table XXXVIII.
72. See Table XXXII.
73. See Tables XL and XLI.
74. See Table XLIII.
75. See Table XXXIX.
76. See Table XXXIV. Brandon district delegates tended, for example, to arrive later than Portage la Prairie district farmers.
77. See Table XXXV. Canadian Pacific Railway Grants tended to be in the western part of the province, while Manitoba Act Grants tended to be in the Red River parishes.
78. Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, March 6, 1885, p. 4.
79. Brandon Mail, March 12, 1885, p. 4; March 19, 1885, p. 4.
80. The Mountaineer followed the town of Nelsonville as it was moved on skids to the railway at Morden in the summer of 1884.
81. He appears to have left some time in the summer of 1884.
82. Manitoba News, December 26, 1884, p. 1.
83. Manitoba News, March 13, 1885, p. 2.
84. Brandon Sun, March 12, 1885, p. 5.
85. On the causes of the Saskatchewan Rebellion, see G. F. G. Stanley, The Birth of Western Canada, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963).
86. On William Henry Jackson see, W. J. C. Cherwinski, "Honore Joseph Jaxon, Agitator, Disturber, Producer of plans to make men think, and Chronic Objector",

Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XLVI, No. 2, (June, 1965).

87. G. F. G. Stanley, The Birth of Western Canada, Chapters XII and XIV.
88. Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union<sup>7</sup>, Constitution of the Manitoba and North-West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, p. 10.
89. Brandon Sun, March 8, 1884, p. 1; April 22, 1884, p. 1.
90. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (a), Vol. 105, Mack Howes to George Purvis, June 18, 1884, 42274-42275.
91. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (a), Vol. 105, Norquay to Macdonald, July 1, 1884, 42273.
92. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (a), Vol. 119, Macdonald to Norquay, July 1, 1884, 48558.
93. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (e), Vol. 525, Part 2, Macdonald to Norquay, July 1, 1884.
94. Manitoba Free Press, February 28, 1890, p. 1.
95. Brandon Mail, April 23, 1885, p. 4.
96. P.A.C., Sir John A. Macdonald Papers, M.G. 26, A, 1 (a), Vol. 106, extract of a letter from J. B. Plumb to Macdonald, undated, 42394-42395.
97. George H. Ham, Reminiscences of a Raconteur, (Toronto: The Musson Book Company Limited, 1921), pp. 49-50; Manitoba News, March 13, 1885, p. 2.
98. Manitoba Free Press, March 20, 1885, p. 1.
99. Ibid.
100. Manitoba Free Press, March 25, 1885, p. 1.
101. Manitoba Free Press, April 2, 1885, p. 2.
102. Manitoba Free Press, March 19, 1885, p. 2.
103. The Commercial, January 13, 1885, p. 305.
104. Manitou Mercury, March 27, 1885, p. 2.
105. Ibid.

106. Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union<sup>7</sup>, Statement of the Claims of the Province of Manitoba and the North West Territories; To the Constitutional Rights of a Province Under the British North America Act, 1867, (Winnipeg: 1885), p. xx.
107. Ibid., p. 80.
108. Ibid., p. 81.
109. Manitoba Free Press, July 1, 1885, p. 1; July 8, 1885, p. 4.
110. Manitou Mercury, March 6, 1885, p. 2.
111. Manitoba Free Press, March 25, 1885, p. 4.
112. Canada, Journals of the House of Commons, 1885, Appendix, No. 3, pp. 24, 33-34, and 43.
113. Manitoba Free Press, January 20, 1886, p. 1.
114. Manitoba News, October 29, 1886, p. 4.
115. Manitoba Free Press, July 4, 1885, p. 1.
116. Manitoba Free Press, July 15, 1885, p. 2.
117. Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, October 9, 1885, p. 4.
118. Ibid.; Manitou Mercury, October 2, 1885, p. 2.
119. Manitoba News, October 29, 1886, p. 4. I have been unable to discover the outcome of the suit launched by Francis & Fowler.
120. Manitoba Free Press, December 21, 1885, p. 4.
121. Neepawa Canadian, April 17, 1884, p. 2.
122. Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review, June 5, 1885, p. 4.
123. Manitoba Free Press, December 18, 1885, p. 4.
124. Ibid.
125. Manitou Mercury, December 25, 1885, p. 2; see also Stonewall News, December 12, 1885, p. 4.
126. Manitoba Free Press, December 21, 1885, p. 4.
127. Manitoba Free Press, December 23, 1885, p. 3.
128. Manitoba Free Press, January 5, 1886, p. 3.

129. Manitoba Free Press, January 20, 1886, p. 1.
130. Manitoba Free Press, January 21, 1886, p. 4.
131. On the economic and social structure of the December, 1885, convention, see above Tables XXXI to XLII.
132. Manitoba Free Press, February 5, 1886, p. 4; March 15, 1886, p. 4.
133. Manitou Mercury, December 21, 1889, p. 2.
134. The Commercial, December 29, 1885, pp. 268-269.
135. Manitoba Free Press, July 14, 1886, p. 2.
136. Manitoba Free Press, January 25, 1886, p. 2.

## CHAPTER VI

### "MANITOBA FOR MANITOBANS"

The failure of the Protective Union effectively precluded the rebirth of an extra-parliamentary farmers' agitation for four years. Disheartened by the scandal over the grain marketing programme of the Union, and shocked by the extreme statements of the Union's leaders at the time of the Metis uprising in the North West Territories, the membership did not have the will to continue the movement. Instead, farmers in Manitoba turned to regular political channels to achieve redress of grievances. Only when politics proved less than satisfactory as a solution to Manitoba's problems was there a revival, beginning in 1889, of agrarian protest in Manitoba.

The most important of the new farmers' organizations to emerge was the Grand Order of the Patrons of Industry which achieved pre-eminence in the province by 1892. Better organized and more circumspect in its programme to solve farmers' difficulties than either the Farmers' Union or the Protective Union, it appealed to the agrarian community because of its moderation. The programme espoused by the Patrons, however, was firmly rooted in the Manitoba agrarian experience.

(1)

Conditions on the Manitoba agricultural frontier did not improve appreciably during the late 1880's. In 1885, the last year when the Protective Union was active, the wheat crop was again struck by a late summer frost.<sup>1</sup> Although not so severe as the frost

of 1883, the 1885 frost caused widespread hardship. It proved difficult to find a market for the frozen grain and even when farmers found a market, the prevailing prices were so low that the costs of production could not be met.<sup>2</sup> In 1886, there was no frost but because of drought the harvest was not so bountiful as it had been in previous years. Prices also remained low--the price of wheat at Morden fluctuated between 41¢ and 60¢ per bushel.<sup>3</sup> The Commercial, nonetheless, saw some signs that the agricultural depression was easing its grip on the province. The short crop of 1886, which coincided with reduced yields in most of the major wheat-exporting countries, promised to bring supply and demand into balance so that farmers could hope for better prices before the spring of 1887.<sup>4</sup> In 1887, the price of wheat rose in June and July. Then, when a bumper harvest was threshed during the autumn, the Canadian Pacific Railway, lacking in rolling stock, was unable to handle the huge crop and the first of the great grain blockades developed. The Manitoba market rapidly became glutted and prices dropped to a level just slightly above those offered during the previous season.<sup>5</sup> In 1888, there was a good crop and prices improved.<sup>6</sup> The following year, drought reduced yields and the quality of the crop; prices slipped with much of the wheat in the province selling for 60¢ per bushel or less. In 1890, the crop was frozen again.<sup>7</sup>

The continuing failure of the Manitoba farmers to realize their expectations led to an increasing sense of frustration. Manitoba's hard spring wheat had been generally praised as being the finest milling wheat in the world, and bountiful harvests had been reaped in those years in which frost and drought did not cause

crop failures. But prices for farm produce remained low and the farmer was hardly better off in 1890 than he had been during the depths of the depression of the mid-1880's. Mrs. W. D. Paynter, whose husband had arrived in the Beulah district in 1879, lamented in 1890:

There had always been sufficient food for the farmer, but many have been compelled to go into debt to obtain necessary clothing which, in this country, must be sufficient during the winter months at least, but we are obliged to pay such high prices for clothing that I am forced to get just as little as I can get along with. We had 800 bushels of wheat and only had time to sell two loads and a half when the price began to fall and is now down to 35 cents per bushel in Birtle and one load the day before yesterday /sold/ for 25 cents /per bushel/. We cannot afford to sell at that price as we are greatly in need of a new house, having lived in the same we first built all these last years. Some of the logs are much decayed and the mud from the thatched roof keeps falling continually so that we have a great deal of washing and cleaning to do which might be avoided if we could only afford a new house.<sup>8</sup>

Despite the hardships, W. D. Paynter avoided--with the exception of a mortgage for \$800 taken out in 1883--encumbering his land with debts.<sup>9</sup> Other farmers were not so fortunate. In a sympathetic editorial, The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller pointed out that debt acquired as a result of "over expenditure in the raising of crops, whose market value turned out far below the cost of production, ill health, hail storms, frosts" could not be condemned, for although "some degree of imprudence" often lay behind these misfortunes, "no moral blame is attachable for the mortgages that burden" such a farmer's existence. At the same time

Indebtedness, often above any present power of repayment, is a far too familiar feature in the social condition of all new countries, and Manitoba has not been behind in shouldering her own share of those unpleasant liabilities.<sup>10</sup>

Diversification of agriculture was advocated as a means

by which farmers might improve their economic position. At the annual meeting of the Board of Agriculture for Manitoba in 1886, speakers urged farmers to undertake stock raising on a larger scale, to improve their herds through the introduction of purebred animals, to grow more oats and barley, and to begin the cultivation of flax.<sup>11</sup> At a meeting of the Brandon Farmers' Institute in 1892, D. F. Wilson, a farmer argued that "the present low price of wheat was caused by the craze of farmers to go into wheat growing to the exclusion of other branches of farming." Other speakers emphasized the necessity of turning to mixed farming if Manitoba agriculture was to develop a base that would make the farmer secure from the fluctuations in the price of wheat and the possibility of crop failure.<sup>12</sup>

Diversification was also advocated by the provincial press. In the opinion of the Manitoba Free Press, mixed farming renewed rather than exhausted the land. And as the "experience of farmers in every country shows", it is "not wise to depend upon one kind of crop or produce, which may fail in any season." To the Free Press, the farmer "who varies his resources to the utmost is surer of success in the long run than he who confines himself to the raising of grain."<sup>13</sup> The Neepawa Register agreed with this opinion, arguing that mixed farming "greatly lessens the risk of total loss through an unfavourable season." Furthermore, mixed farming brought in "money at all seasons of the year, largely doing away with the borrowing of money at high rates of interest."<sup>14</sup> Other editors wrote in the same vein, expressing the hope that Manitoba farmers would take their advice and diversify their farming operations.<sup>15</sup>

But diversification of agriculture was only partially

successful in Manitoba. Some special crops such as rye and corn were poorly adapted to the Manitoba climate and the farmer had to await the development of improved varieties before these crops could be grown successfully north of the 49th parallel. For other crops such as potatoes and flax, there was a limited market. The farmer could increase production of those crops if he wished, but without markets his effort was wasted.<sup>16</sup> Though there were large export markets for oats and barley,<sup>17</sup> high overhead costs, arising from the distance to markets, and low prices<sup>18</sup> precluded competition in those markets.

Livestock offered a more profitable means of diversification. All types of livestock increased in number between 1881 and 1901, but only cattle and poultry show a continuous increase in the number per occupier during the same time-span.<sup>19</sup> As Tables XLVIII and XLIX illustrate, the number of cattle sold or slaughtered increased throughout the period 1880-1900, as did the number of pounds of butter and cheese manufactured on the farm. By 1900, the value of all livestock and livestock products sold during the course of the year was \$7,610,279 or \$234.20 per farm occupier.<sup>20</sup> The largest portion of this income was obtained from the sale of cattle, dairy products, poultry, and poultry products with a lesser amount derived from the sale of swine, sheep and wool.<sup>21</sup>

In the late 1880's, while progress in agricultural diversification was made, the progress was not rapid enough to overcome the difficulties in which farmers found themselves.<sup>22</sup> More immediate relief for the agrarian population was needed. In the opinion of the editor of the Morden Monitor, despite his allegiance to the Conservative party, the Manitoba farmer would never be prosperous as long as he was victimized by the grain

TABLE XLIII

PRODUCTION IN BUSHELS OF SPECIAL CROPS IN MANITOBA, 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>RYE</u>	<u>CORN</u>	<u>PEAS &amp; BEANS</u>	<u>POTATOES</u>	<u>TURNIPS &amp; OTHER ROOTS</u>	<u>BUCK- WHEAT</u>	<u>FLAX</u>
1880	1,203	2,516	8,991	555,193	198,121	320	
1885	2,574		13,030	1,203,575	231,111		62,203
1890	12,952	3,429	11,306	1,757,231	547,559	178	
1900	7,085	1,932	5,635	1,892,803	230,644	1,274	81,898

---

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Canada, 1901; Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886.

TABLE XLIV  
LIVESTOCK IN MANITOBA, 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>CATTLE</u>	<u>SWINE</u>	<u>SHEEP</u>
1881	48,012	17,358	6,073
1886	130,883	101,490	16,053
1891	211,497	54,117	35,838
1901	349,886	126,459	29,464

---

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Canada, 1901; Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886.

TABLE XLV  
LIVESTOCK PER OCCUPIER IN MANITOBA, 1881-1901\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>OCCUPIERS</u>	<u>CATTLE</u>	<u>SWINE</u>	<u>SHEEP</u>
1881	9,077	5.29	1.91	.67
1886	17,571	7.45	5.78	.91
1891	22,571	9.37	2.40	1.59
1901	32,495	10.77	3.89	.91

---

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Canada, 1901; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886.

TABLE XLVI

NUMBER OF ANIMALS KILLED OR SOLD  
IN MANITOBA, 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>CATTLE</u>	<u>SHEEP</u>	<u>SWINE</u>	<u>POULTRY</u>
1880	4,936	1,382	18,674	
1890	37,797	13,373	39,076	
1900	84,266	13,567	122,158	359,063

---

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Canada, 1901.

TABLE XLVII

NUMBER OF ANIMALS KILLED OR SOLD PER OCCUPIER  
IN MANITOBA, 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>CATTLE</u>	<u>SHEEP</u>	<u>SWINE</u>	<u>POULTRY</u>
1880	.54	.15	2.06	
1890	1.67	.59	1.73	
1900	2.59	.42	3.76	11.05

---

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Canada, 1901.

TABLE XLVIII

ANIMAL PRODUCTS IN MANITOBA, 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>HOME-MADE BUTTER (LBS.)</u>	<u>HOME-MADE CHEESE (LBS.)</u>	<u>WOOL (LBS.)</u>	<u>HONEY (LBS.)</u>	<u>EGGS (DOZ.)</u>
1880	957,152	19,613	16,452	1,080	
1885	3,469,524	74,825			
1890	4,830,368	116,002	162,866	4,791	
1900	8,676,661		137,469	16,242	5,038,062

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Canada, 1901.

TABLE XLIX

ANIMAL PRODUCTS PER OCCUPIER  
IN MANITOBA, 1880-1900\*

<u>YEAR</u>	<u>HOME-MADE BUTTER (LBS.)</u>	<u>HOME-MADE CHEESE (LBS.)</u>	<u>WOOL (LBS.)</u>	<u>HONEY (LBS.)</u>	<u>EGGS (DOZ.)</u>
1880	105.45	2.16	1.81	.12	
1885	197.46	4.26			
1890	214.01	5.14	7.22	.21	
1900	267.02		4.23	.50	155.04

\*Derived from data in the Census of Canada, 1880-1881; Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886; Census of Canada, 1891; Census of Canada, 1901.

dealers, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the steamship companies. The price of wheat at Liverpool, the principal port of entry for Canadian grain into the United Kingdom, was double that paid the Manitoba farmer. To the Monitor it seemed incongruous that the middlemen in the grain trade should take such a large percentage of the potential profits from the sale of wheat unless they were unduly exploiting their position. Reduced railway freight rates, elevator charges, grain dealers' commissions and oceanic shipping rates would do more to improve the farmers' position in the province than any other proposals that could be offered.<sup>23</sup>

The Monitor's solutions to the farmers' difficulties bore a striking resemblance to those advocated by the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union from 1883 to 1886, proposals which the Conservative press at the time denounced. It was a sign of the deepening gloom that was settling over Manitoba that the enemies of the farmers' movement of the 1880's should accept the analysis of the province's problems offered by those they had earlier branded as "secessionists". It was also a sign that agrarian protest was reviving in Manitoba.

(ii)

Protest had not actually ended with the collapse of the Protective Union in 1886--it had simply taken on a new guise. The political agitation begun by the Farmers' Union and revived by the Protective Union was taken over by the provincial Liberal party whose members had played a large role in the agitation conducted by the farmers' organizations. From 1886 to 1888, the Liberal opposition mounted assaults upon the Canadian Pacific Railway "monopoly" as the chief cause of Manitoba's problems. The Norquay

government, unwillingly cast as the defender of the federal government's railway policy, was forced to adopt increasingly radical positions in order to survive.<sup>24</sup> In 1885 the provincial government announced its support for the project of a railway to Hudson's Bay.<sup>25</sup> Before construction began on the rail outlet to the north, the government realized that Manitobans wanted more immediate relief from their transportation difficulties than would be provided by a long-term construction project. In 1887, the Norquay administration took a step it had rejected in the past: the building of a government railway to the United States from Winnipeg over which any company might run its trains.<sup>26</sup>

Unhappily for the Premier, the limited resources of the province were inadequate to support the construction of both the Hudson's Bay Railway and the Red River Valley Railway, as the government line to the United States was named, without encountering serious financial problems. In the autumn of 1887, faced with mounting expenditures for railway construction and lacking in capital resources to meet them, Norquay and A. A. C. LaRiviere, Provincial Treasurer, authorized the transfer of monies raised for the construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway to Mann & Holt, the contractors for the line, without demanding the transfer of Hudson's Bay Railway lands required by statute as security, and in contravention of Norquay's pledge to consult with the Legislature if financial difficulties in the railway programme of the government were encountered.<sup>27</sup> When the public became aware of the government's dealings, the Premier and his Provincial Treasurer were forced to resign their offices.<sup>28</sup> The new Conservative government led by Dr. David Howard Harrison of Minnedosa, was weakened by defections

from the government's ranks. Following two disastrous by-elections in January, 1888, in which safe government seats were won by the Liberals, Harrison resigned and Thomas Greenway formed a Liberal government.<sup>29</sup>

While negotiating with the federal government for an agreement under which Ottawa would cease to enforce the "monopoly" clause of the Canadian Pacific Railway contract, the Greenway government defiantly proceeded with the construction of the Red River Valley Railway, ignoring a federal disallowance order. Confronted with the intransigence of the Manitoba government, the Macdonald administration, already convinced that the "monopoly" ought to be ended, prevailed upon the Canadian Pacific Railway to abrogate the offensive section of the contract with the Dominion. With Greenway's victory, one of the principal goals of the farmers' agitation of the 1880's was achieved.<sup>30</sup>

Many of the members elected as Liberal supporters in the provincial elections of 1886 and 1888 had been associated either with the Farmers' Union or with the Protective Union. For this reason, the Liberal triumph of 1888 was very much the triumph of the political wing of the farmers' movement. Joseph Martin obtained the office of Attorney-General in the Greenway government and James Smart, a member of the Farmers' Union from Brandon, was appointed Minister of Public Works. Among the Liberal backbenchers were men such as R. P. Roblin of Carman, S. J. Thompson of Carberry, Finlay M. Young of Killarney, Thomas Duncan of Morden and Kenneth McKenzie of Burnside, all of whom had been associated with the farmers' agitation.

While the Liberal party was continuing the political agitation begun by the Farmers' Union, farmers' co-operative

enterprises were keeping alive the idea of co-operative action favoured by the Protective Union. At Brandon, Portage la Prairie and Manitou, locally-owned elevator companies remained in business after the failure of the Protective Union which had been responsible for their incorporation. The spirit of agrarian co-operation was also maintained by the Portage la Prairie Mutual Fire Insurance Company and the Miniota Mutual Fire Insurance Company, both founded by farmers in 1885 before the collapse of the Protective Union.<sup>31</sup> The continued existence of the elevator and insurance companies demonstrated that the agrarian community could successfully operate its own co-operative enterprises.

But there was no extension of farmers' co-operative action. For greater co-operation among the province's rural residents in purchasing farm supplies and selling farm products, a central organizing and governing body was needed. No such regulating agency existed after the disappearance of the Central Union in 1886. Co-operative action now had to be initiated at the local level for the scandals that ripped apart the Protective Union had destroyed enthusiasm for province-wide farmers' co-operation.

Meanwhile, new movements, which eventually would play an important role in a renewed agrarian agitation, were gradually gaining footholds in the province. The most important of these movements was Prohibition. Organizations urging a ban on the sale of intoxicating beverages were not new in Manitoba, the first having been established before Confederation,<sup>32</sup> but in the middle 1880's the proponents of Prohibition were becoming more militant. J. W. H. Wilson, a Winnipeg lawyer who had been a delegate to the March, 1884, Farmers' Union convention, was selected as a candidate in North

Winnipeg in the provincial election of 1886 by the "Temperance Electoral Union". This Union had been formed with the explicit purpose of electing a prohibitionist to the Legislature to introduce a private members' bill to "ban the bottle".<sup>33</sup> Although Wilson was unsuccessful in his electoral bid, a precedent for political action in the cause of temperance had been established.

At the time of Wilson's candidature, Manitoba newspapermen were speculating about the prospects of success of a group of men in Toronto who had formed a "Third Party" to promote moral reforms. This new political organization does not appear to have made any headway in Manitoba, but the provincial newspapers, by giving it publicity, sowed the idea of an alternative political party to the Liberals and Conservatives.<sup>34</sup>

In addition to advocating Prohibition, the "Third Party" supported the women's suffrage movement. While this movement was still in its infancy in the Canadian West--the Women's Christian Temperance Union did not advocate women's suffrage until the early 1890's--<sup>35</sup> the agitation for female suffrage received some publicity in the Free Press in 1886. Surprisingly, the Free Press approved of the idea of women being granted the vote, perhaps hypocritically, because there was little possibility that the Legislature would act in the matter. The editors expected no great moral reformation of society resulting from female suffrage; in their opinion the argument that women would support Prohibition was fallacious since they were persuaded that women would vote the same way as their husbands.<sup>36</sup>

Neither the women's suffrage movement nor the Prohibition movement was very strong in the 1880's and neither was responsible

for the renewal of the agrarian agitation in 1889. The farmers of Manitoba were still preoccupied with economic conditions on the agricultural frontier. When it became obvious that the aggressive railway policy of the Greenway government was unlikely to improve the farmers' economic position, extra-parliamentary movements advocating farmers' co-operation revived.

For a decade Manitobans had believed that with the completion of a railway network and with the provision of competition for the Canadian Pacific Railway, the cost of marketing grain would be lowered, and they would be able to profit from wheat-growing. By 1889, construction of branch lines was proceeding at a rapid pace; and by the end of that year only the extreme southwestern corner of the province was still without a railway or without the immediate prospect of one being completed.<sup>37</sup> But with the completion of the railway network, farmers in areas newly served by rail lines made the discovery that farmers in the Portage la Prairie and Brandon districts had made in the early 1880's; the benefits that were gained by the acquisition of rail connections were obliterated by high freight rates.<sup>38</sup>

The completion of the Red River Valley Railway failed to benefit the farmers. The Greenway government, which was either unwilling or unable to operate the railway as a government company, turned the completed line over to the Northern Pacific Railway in 1889 in return for a pledge of further railway construction to points which were serviced only by the Canadian Pacific Railway. To the consternation of the farmers, the Canadian Pacific and the Northern Pacific railways, realizing that a railway freight rate struggle would have ruinous effects, came to an agreement on rates that was mutually advantageous. The Manitoba farmer was the loser;

the freight rate reductions which he had expected failed to materialize.<sup>39</sup>

The first sign of renewed militancy on the part of Manitoba farmers came in December, 1889, at Manitou. The general merchants of that town proposed, in view of the hard times and the expected need of the farmers for credit, a system of credit in advance of need. Books of credit coupons would be issued to an individual farmer in the autumn for use throughout the winter in return for a chattel mortgage on his crop. The members of the Manitou Farmers' Club, the last remnant of the Protective Union, were deeply distressed by this proposal. At a special meeting, they argued that what the merchants had in mind was the creation of a captive market for their goods. If farmers accepted the credit scheme they would rapidly discover that all prices would suddenly rise leaving them so heavily in debt to the Manitou businessmen that they would never escape from the burden. The Manitou merchants, realizing that there was little to be gained from pressing such an unpopular scheme, agreed not to introduce the plan.<sup>40</sup>

A second sign of the renewal of the farmers' agitation was the revival by the farmers of co-operative action in the marketplace. In 1890, the farmers of the Carman district under the leadership of Alexander Morrison, a prominent farmer and municipal politician, organized a farmers' elevator company.<sup>41</sup> Within a year, similar companies were established at Carberry,<sup>42</sup> Neepawa,<sup>43</sup> Crystal City,<sup>44</sup> and Morden.<sup>45</sup> With the exception of the Carman farmers' elevator company, all of the new attempts at farmers' co-operative action were organized by former members of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union.

The first new farmers' organization to emerge with the avowed purpose of agitating for redress of grievances was the Rockwood Farmers' Alliance founded at Stonewall in December, 1890. Apparently it was modelled upon the Northern Farmers' Alliance of the United States and quickly reached an approximate membership of 500 persons. Little is known about its platform or about its leading members. What is known is that the Farmers' Alliance remained a purely local organization having no appeal beyond the boundaries of Rockwood municipality. Its importance lies simply in the fact that its creation marked the rebirth of organized agrarian protest within Manitoba.<sup>46</sup>

Another local agitation began in the Cartwright district in January, 1891. At a "mass meeting", the farmers of the area considered "means to further our interests and protect ourselves from combines and monopolies, and put ourselves on record as a body ready to stand up for our rights." It was decided to form an "alliance or League", whose officers would "correspond with all those they could in order to ascertain which was the best form under which to organize."<sup>47</sup> Within two weeks a second meeting was called to receive a report. At this meeting it was decided to seek a charter from the National Farmers' League of Springfield, Massachusetts. On January 31, the Cartwright farmers formed themselves into the Farmers' League of Manitoba.<sup>48</sup>

The platform of the Manitoba Farmers' League reflected the disabilities under which the province's farmers laboured at the beginning of the 1890's. The organization desired better prices for grain and lower freight rates; the end of the pre-eminence of the Winnipeg Board of Trade in establishing grain

standards; rapid construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway; improved trade relations with "our Southern neighbours"; "better and cheaper outlets for our produce"; and "suppression of combines and trusts".<sup>49</sup> Much of the platform was reminiscent of the "Declaration of Rights" passed by the great Winnipeg convention of the Farmers' Union in December, 1883, but in its last plank there was an important added element. From experience the farmers of Manitoba had learned that powerful corporations--the Northern Pacific's agreement with the Canadian Pacific Railway forcibly drove the point home--could make private arrangements which circumvented government policies that had been designed to lead to greater competition and increased benefits to primary producers and consumers alike. Farmers could successfully challenge the great corporations only by organizing themselves into a powerful pressure group that would force governments to take the farmers' interests into consideration when drafting legislation to regulate industrial concerns.

The Farmers' League also differed from earlier farmers' movements in Manitoba by barring all "professional men" from membership in the new organization and by adhering to "non party principles." The leaders of the new movement were only too aware of the problems that had accompanied the admission of non-farmers and politicians into the councils of the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union. If the League failed, it would not be because non-farmers used the movement for their own advantage.<sup>50</sup>

At first, the Farmers' League enjoyed some success in convincing the rural residents of southwestern Manitoba of the advantages of a new farmers' agitation. A full-time organizer was appointed by the executive,<sup>51</sup> and several local associations were

formed in the neighbourhood of Cartwright.<sup>52</sup> But by the end of June, 1891, the Farmers' League ceased to expand; like the Farmers' Alliance of Stonewall it became confined to a small geographic area.

The Farmers' League was the smallest and least important of all the agrarian organizations that proliferated on the continent in the 1880's and 1890's, and it is unlikely that many farmers in Manitoba were aware of its existence.<sup>53</sup> Furthermore, it would be difficult for any movement originating at Cartwright to gain acceptance throughout the province, as the village was an unimportant centre lacking even a newspaper to promote local organizations. By May, 1891, a competing organization with far greater appeal to most Manitoba farmers--the Patrons of Industry--had appeared upon the scene and within a few months it had rapidly outstripped all other farmers' organizations in the province.

(111) -

The Grand Order of the Patrons of Industry of North America was founded in 1887 in Port Huron, Michigan, as a lodge with a secret ritual. It was the creation of Rev. F. W. Vertican, a retired Presbyterian minister, Dr. David Campbell, a physician, and F. W. Krause, a printer. Originally conceived as an organization whose purpose was to give its members the opportunity of discussing matters of scientific and economic concern, the movement quickly evolved into an agrarian protest organization. The hope of the founders of the Patrons of Industry was that the movement would appeal to both farmers and workingmen. But while farmers flocked to the Order in Michigan, the workingmen kept their distance. Once the farmers captured the organization, they transformed it into a

vehicle for the redress of grievances and co-operative self-help, merging the movement into the general Populist agitation that engulfed the United States at the end of the 1880's.<sup>54</sup>

Although 75,000 Michigan farmers joined the Patrons of Industry within a few years, the organization which was overshadowed by the much larger and more powerful Southern Farmers' Alliance and Northern Farmers' Alliance, was of no more than peripheral importance in the United States as a whole.<sup>55</sup> In Canada, the Patrons became the pre-eminent agrarian protest organization. In 1889, the Order was introduced to Lambton County, Ontario, and by February, 1892, it had a membership in that province of 30,000 farmers.<sup>56</sup>

In 1891, A. L. MacLachlan, an American organizer of the Order, came to Manitoba from Michigan and began the work of establishing the Patrons in the Canadian West.<sup>57</sup> Going from school district to school district, he held public meetings at which he urged the farmers to organize to defend their interests. MacLachlan enjoyed his greatest success in the Portage la Prairie district where six local associations were founded by the end of the first week in May.<sup>58</sup> A month later, the first lodge was established at Wellwood near Neepawa.<sup>59</sup> By autumn sufficient headway had been made in the western parts of the province<sup>60</sup> to warrant the summoning of the first provincial convention of the new movement to be held at Portage la Prairie in November, 1891.

Although not averse to borrowing ideas from the American parent organization, the Manitoba Patrons shaped their policies to fit local conditions. The first clause in their policy statement,

"Manitoba for Manitobans", contained a strong plea for recognition of provincial rights. Emphasis was placed on such grievances as the public lands question, the Canadian Pacific Railway's privileged position in the West, and tariff discrimination, all of which had been complaints leading to the foundation, eight years earlier, of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union.<sup>61</sup>

The second clause stated that the Patrons of Industry was non-sectarian and non-political.<sup>62</sup> In Manitoba the Patrons' desire to avoid religious controversy was more evident than elsewhere. In 1890, the Greenway government had introduced a new Manitoba Schools Act abolishing the Protestant and Roman Catholic school systems established under the Manitoba Act, replacing them with a single public school system. Since the controversy engendered by the Schools Act was creating both religious and political turmoil within the young Dominion,<sup>63</sup> any entanglement with this issue would inevitably divide the movement.

The third clause of the policy statement indicated a departure from the purposes of the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union. Members were encouraged to improve themselves "intellectually and socially" so as to place themselves "on a level with the privileged classes."<sup>64</sup> The Patrons promised self-help through self-education rather than fanciful schemes of province-wide farmers' co-operative action and demagoguery.

Delegates to the convention agreed

as farmers and employees to band ourselves together for self-protection and for the purpose of obtaining the advantages that are now almost exclusively enjoyed by the financial, commercial and manufacturing classes, who by a system of combines and monopolies are exacting from us an undue proportion of the fruits of our toil...<sup>65</sup>

The idea of the agricultural class allying with the working class

to fight the moneyed interests of Canada was probably borrowed from the American parent organization. The rhetoric appealed to Manitoba farmers who believed that they were being victimized by the industrial interests of Central Canada. But while these farmers might accept the rhetoric, they did not accept the substance of the resolution. Not until 1895 were industrial workers invited to join the organization.<sup>66</sup> Furthermore, it is unlikely that the delegates to the convention saw farmers as belonging to a distinct economic class. Rather they saw class in terms of occupation in the manner that the Dominion Bureau of Statistics grouped Canadians according to their occupation. What concerned Patrons was not an abstract analysis of the structure of society, but the concrete means by which the farmers' condition might be improved.

The delegates agreed that one means by which the farmers might help themselves was by advising and aiding each other "in acquiring business and commercial habits", and by placing their "trade on a cash basis".<sup>67</sup> Years of depressed prices for wheat and other agricultural products had forced many farmers to rely heavily upon local merchants for credit, and farmers who had given chattel mortgages on their crops were in virtual bondage to the merchants. Even if a chattel mortgage had not been drawn up, the cost that a farmer had to bear in meeting interest charges and paying off the principal often absorbed a large part of the value of his crop. As for the merchants, when the farmers defaulted in their payments, they were often unable to obtain the value of the credit extended through seizure of the farmer's assets--especially since there were usually other creditors to be satisfied as well--and they frequently found themselves financially embarrassed. The

Patrons' proposed a solution to what, by the 1890's, was a widespread problem in the province and their solution was welcomed by farmers and merchants alike.<sup>68</sup>

The Manitoba Patrons' emphasis upon developing better business and commercial habits was borrowed directly from the American parent organization. In Michigan, the Patrons had attempted, with some success, to have their members deal with merchants on a strictly cash basis.<sup>69</sup> In Manitoba, the local merchants applauded the Order's attempts to regularize the business dealings of farmers, but criticism developed within a few months of the founding convention when it became apparent that the Order's dicta were being honoured by only a portion of the membership.<sup>70</sup> Many farmers probably did not have the cash resources to purchase their supplies outright after marketing their crops at a less than satisfactory price. Neither the Patrons nor the merchants realized that necessity underlay much of rural indebtedness.

The merchants' criticism did the Patrons' public image in Manitoba little good, but it was less damaging to the Order than it might have been. By the time the merchants began to voice their opinions about the efficacy of the Patrons' programme, the programme itself had changed. In its initial stages the Patrons borrowed heavily from the American parent organization in developing policies, although they later gave these policies a distinctly Manitoban emphasis. By March, 1892, the Manitoba movement was principally concerned with the problems of the province's agricultural frontier and its programme bore greater similarity to the platform of the Protective Union than to that of the Michigan Patrons of Industry.

At the first annual convention of the Order in Manitoba,

held during the last week of February, 1892, at Brandon, almost seventy delegates from Manitoba and the North West Territories discussed problems affecting agriculture in the Canadian West. Charles Braithwaite, a farmer from Portage la Prairie who had been elected Grand President of the Patrons in November, 1891, expressed the mood of the meeting in his address. He attacked the "binding twine and implement combines", suggesting that freer trade, particularly with the United States, would lead to reductions in the cost of farming in Manitoba. Until the federal government saw fit to abandon the "National Policy", the farmers might help themselves as the members of the Protective Union had done earlier by co-operatively purchasing their binder twine through the Patrons of Industry. The Grand President also believed that it was imperative that the farmers have their own representatives on the board which fixed grain standards and that officers be appointed at country elevators who would "superintend the arrival and departure of grain shipped by individual farmers to Port Arthur." Some of the inequities that every farmer knew to exist in the grain trade could be removed by "grain growers possessing mills and elevators of their own." As for the problem of rural indebtedness, the Grand President, recognizing the failure of the "cash only" philosophy adopted at the November convention, proposed that the provincial government establish at all the principal centres "banks where upon sufficient security, loans might be obtained by farmers at five per cent interest;..."<sup>71</sup>

Except for the proposal for a system of provincial farmers' banks, all of the demands of the Patrons of Industry at their first annual convention could have been those of the Protective Union.

Given the conditions on the Manitoba agricultural frontier and the tradition of protest established in the 1880's, it was only natural that the farmers of Manitoba should turn to the Protective Union for inspiration. As long as the Western Canadian farmer was dependent upon wheat-growing for the bulk of his income and as long as he remained relatively isolated from the major markets of the world, the most logical way he could improve his economic position was to reduce the costs of growing and marketing his crop. The Protective Union had seen that the most obvious ways of reducing costs were for the farmer to be allowed to buy what he needed in the cheapest market--the United States--and for governments to take action against the middlemen who handled and transported the crop to market. It was all very well for the founders of the Patrons of Industry to suggest discussion of the agrarian problems and to emphasize frugality, but the Manitoba farmer knew from experience and from the agitation conducted by the Protective Union the causes of his difficulties and the solutions to them.

In departing from the purposes of the movement as conceived by its American founders, the Patrons in Manitoba did not follow in the footsteps of the Michigan Patrons who had also turned the movement into a vehicle to express general agrarian unrest. While the Patrons in Michigan joined in the Populist agitation that was sweeping the United States, and while both the Patrons in Manitoba and the Populists desired a general reduction in freight rates, freer trade, control of industrial combinations, and cheaper credit, the Manitobans did not adopt the more radical measures advocated by the Populists such as the unlimited coinage of silver, the issuing of paper currency by the federal government, a

graduated income tax, and political reforms such as the referendum and the recall.<sup>72</sup>

One reason the monetary solutions to the farmers' difficulties advocated by the Populists found little support in Manitoba was because of the difference in American and Canadian historical experience. Not since the Ancien Regime had a Canadian government issued paper money; banknotes were issued by the chartered banks of the country. In the United States there was a long tradition of the government printing currency. During the American Revolution, the Continental Congress issued its own notes and during the Civil War both the Confederate States of America and the Union government found it expedient to print paper money to pay for the enormous cost of the conflict. After the Civil War, the American government attempted to redeem the currency it had issued, but ran into opposition ~~from~~ the "Greenbackers" who saw the return to the gold standard as deflationary and responsible for the economic depression that followed on the heels of the end of hostilities. Allied with other reformers, the Greenbackers entered politics in the 1870's, their agitation proving to be a direct forerunner of the Populist monetary agitation of the late 1880's and the 1890's.<sup>73</sup> In Canada, there was no comparable historical experience.

As for the unlimited coinage of silver and the use of silver along with gold to secure the paper currency issued by the American government, Canadian conditions made such solutions to the West's economic problems irrelevant. The attraction that silver held for the Populists was based upon the premise that by monetizing silver, the money supply would be increased, leading to greater buying power on the part of the consumer. If the consumer's

purchasing power were increased, the farmer would be able to sell more of his produce, and because of the inflationary effects of a larger money supply, he would receive a better price for what he sold.<sup>74</sup> In Manitoba, it was generally recognized that the reason for the prevailing low prices for farm produce was tied directly to the low prices for farm exports in overseas markets in which world-wide surpluses of agricultural commodities were responsible for depressed market conditions. Although the farmer might argue that the middlemen received too large a portion of the value of farm produce, no one could seriously contend that by increasing the purchasing power of the Canadian consumer, a larger domestic market could be developed. Manitobans knew that they had to export foodstuffs at better prices and at a lower cost to the producer if economic conditions were to improve.

Most Canadians viewed the silver agitation as a typical American phenomenon. In Manitoba, the provincial press, although it printed news items regarding the Populist movement and occasionally an editorial on some matter raised by the American farmers' organizations, generally refrained from discussing the silver question. When the issue was discussed the purpose was to illustrate the shortsighted and false economic policy being pursued by the Populists.<sup>75</sup> Only the Canadian bankers seem to have regarded the Populist policy of free silver as capable of infecting Canadians. In the mid-1890's when it appeared as though the Populist-Democratic alliance had a chance of capturing the American presidency, the Journal of the Canadian Bankers' Association published articles condemning Populist monetary policy.<sup>76</sup>

The graduated income tax also found little favour with the Manitoba Patrons of Industry. Direct taxation as it was called in

Canada, was looked upon as an unwelcome expedient to which governments might be driven if all other sources of revenue failed to meet government needs. In 1884, the Norquay government had introduced an Act providing for direct taxation in the provincial Legislature as a means of covering an expected shortfall in revenue.<sup>77</sup> Manitobans were generally thankful that an increase in the federal subsidy led to the Act being allowed to die before receiving Royal assent.

Nor did the Patrons accept the argument that a graduated income tax was necessary to control the power of the new type of industrial leaders known as "Robber Barons". While the Patrons condemned the "binding twine and implement combines", they did not identify specific Canadian business leaders with specific enterprises. When members of the Order did attack wealthy individuals they chose American and British examples such as Jay Gould, J. D. Rockefeller, and the "Marquis" of Westminster who "could not spend their incomes if they ever tried to,..."<sup>78</sup>

At the beginning of the 1890's, political reforms held little attraction for Manitobans. Politics had been one of the causes of the failure of the farmers' agitation in the 1880's and there was little desire to make the same mistake again. After 1894, when the Patrons entered politics for economic reasons, political reform was one of the principal concerns of the Order, but even then, Manitoba Patrons borrowed most of their political platform from the Ontario Patrons and rejected the more radical reforms of the American Populists. Not until 1899, when the Patrons were a spent political force within the province, did they adopt the referendum and the recall as planks in their programme.<sup>79</sup>

The principal contribution of American agrarian protest to Manitoba protest by February, 1892, was not in policy but in organization. The constitution of the Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba and the North West Territories was borrowed directly from the American parent organization. The basic unit of the Order was the Subordinate Association organized in school districts. Subordinate Associations were grouped together in County Associations--in Manitoba there were no counties so provincial constituencies were substituted -provided that there were six local associations within the constituency. Both local and county associations reported directly to the Manitoba Grand Association whose headquarters were at Portage la Prairie. Local matters were left to the Subordinate and County Associations, while provincial policy and the direction of province-wide co-operative activities were left to the provincial organization.<sup>80</sup>

The Order of the Patrons of Industry was a lodge, possessing the social aspects of most brotherhoods. Members were encouraged to wear badges and other insignia to meetings; officers of Subordinate, County and Grand Associations were dignified with splendid-sounding titles; and a secret ritual was set down for use at all gatherings of members. Active members were asked to do what they could to support the widows and children of departed brethren, and while the Order was non-sectarian, provision was made for members to attend funerals as a group.<sup>81</sup>

Initially, the Ontario Patrons also made only a small contribution to the programme adopted by the Manitoba Order. Given the background of most Western farmers, the Patron members in Manitoba were probably aware of developments in the rural districts of Ontario. Even if, as seems likely, connections were soon

established between the Grand Associations of Ontario and Manitoba, Manitobans were in no hurry to adopt the 1891 London platform of the Ontario Order. Political reforms such as the abolition of the Canadian Senate, changes in constituency boundaries, simplification of the laws, and reduction in the machinery of government, formed a major part of the Ontario Patrons' programme.<sup>82</sup> Manitobans welcomed the Patrons of Industry because the Order promised to seek solutions to the farmers' economic problems and not because they saw the movement as the vehicle by which the moral reformation of Canadian politics might be accomplished. Only in 1894 when the Manitoba Patrons decided to enter politics, did they adopt most of the Ontario Order's political positions.

With regard to the most important issues, the Ontario Patrons could not contribute anything new to the Manitoba movement. The London platform demanded a tariff "for revenue only", "reciprocal trade on fair and equable terms between Canada and the rest of the world", "reservation of public lands for actual settlers" and the end of public aid for railway construction.<sup>83</sup> The Farmers' Union and the Protective Union had already advocated all those planks as solutions to the farmers' difficulties. The Patrons in Manitoba, when they adopted similar planks at the February, 1892 annual convention, were not turning to Ontario for inspiration, but were looking backward to the tradition of agrarian protest in the Canadian West.

The Western Canadian orientation of the Patrons of Industry in Manitoba was responsible for the success of the movement in mobilizing farmers. Between the Order's founding convention in November, 1891, and the first annual convention in 1892, dozens of Subordinate Associations were formed throughout the province. County

Associations were organized in Birtle<sup>84</sup> and Beautiful Plains constituencies.<sup>85</sup> Other farm movements were swept aside by the Patrons' tide. The Farmers' Alliance of Stonewall, recognizing the potent appeal of the rival organization, undertook negotiations for a fusion with the Patrons in March, 1892, but before the merger was completed, the Farmers' Alliance disappeared and the Patrons absorbed its supporters individually.<sup>86</sup> The Farmers' League survived as a separate entity, at least until July, 1892.<sup>87</sup> The Farmers' Club of Manitou acted in concert with the Patrons.<sup>88</sup> But its leaders managed to keep the order at arm's length so that when the Patrons encountered serious problems in 1895 and 1896 after entering the political arena, the Club was able to sever all connections with the Order and to survive after the Patrons disappeared. In the spring of 1892, however, the Patrons of Industry was the pre-eminent farmers' organization in Manitoba.

Founded in the continuing difficulties facing the Manitoba farmer living on the agricultural frontier and in the failure of the Greenway government to solve the persistent economic problems of Manitoba agriculture, agrarian protest was reborn in 1889. By 1892, a province-wide agitation was being conducted by the Grand Order of the Patrons of Industry.

Although it was an American organization which was transplanted to Manitoba, the Patrons of Industry was transformed into a Manitoba organization within a few months of its appearance in the province. By reviving many of the demands of earlier Manitoba agrarian protest movements and by rejecting policies adopted by American Populists and the Ontario Patrons, the Manitoba Order maintained a distinct Western Canadian approach to agrarian problems.

The success of the new movement was dependent upon the lessons learned from the failures of the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union. The principal appeal of the Patrons of Industry was that it was an agrarian movement, belonging exclusively to farmers, which promised self-education and local co-operation as an alternative to political action and province-wide co-operative ventures. If for any reason the Patrons should find it expedient to abandon this moderate programme or to change its membership requirements, it was likely to lose its support among the members of the Manitoba agricultural community.

FOOTNOTES

1. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 83.
2. Minnedosa Tribune, October 16, 1885, p. 1.
3. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 84; Manitoba News, September 6, 1886, p. 4; October 8, 1886, p. 4.
4. The Commercial, November 18, 1886, p. 146.
5. The Commercial, October 5, 1887, p. 128; November 7, 1887, p. 128; Morden Monitor, September 15, 1887.
6. A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 85.
7. Morden Monitor, September 26, 1889, p. 1; Neepawa Register, November 29, 1889, p. 8; A. S. Morton, op. cit., p. 85.
8. Mrs. W. D. Paynter to Phebe [?], November 23, 1890, as printed in Beulah Women's Institute, Minnewashta Memories, 1879-1970, (Beulah: 1970), pp. 106-107.
9. Abstract Book No. 27A, Neepawa Land Titles Office, Neepawa, Manitoba.
10. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, December, 1887, p. 867.
11. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, March, 1886, pp. 411-417.
12. The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, January, 1893, p. 18.
13. Manitoba Free Press, September 20, 1883, p. 4.
14. Neepawa Register, August 25, 1893, p. 4.
15. See for example, Selkirk Herald, May 30, 1884, p. 2; The Commercial, February 16, 1886, p. 432, and January 25, 1887, p. 346.
16. W. W. Swanson and P. C. Armstrong, Wheat, (Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1930), p. 9.
17. From 1881 to 1891 inclusive, Canada exported 29,288,691 bushels of wheat, 98,251,764 bushels of barley and 19,923,756 bushels of oats, (domestic produce only). Figures are from Canada, The Statistical Year-Book of Canada, 1902, (Ottawa: Government Printing Bureau, 1903), p. 108.

18. From 1881 to 1891 inclusive, the value of Canadian grain exports (domestic produce only) was: wheat, \$.97 per bushel; barley, \$.66 per bushel; and oats \$.38 per bushel. Derived from statistical information in Canada, The Statistical Year-Book of Canada, 1902, pp. 108-110.
19. See Tables XLIV and XLV. The category "occupiers" includes both owners of lots and farms. The distinction was made for the Census of 1901 but not for 1881, 1886 and 1891. Accordingly, I have included owners of both lots and farms in the category "occupiers" in 1901. There is, as a result, some slight distortion.
20. Census of Canada, 1901.
21. See Tables XLVI and XLVII for approximate ratios.
22. See Tables XLVIII to XLIX for the trend towards agricultural diversification. One interesting feature of the attempts to diversify farming operations as revealed in the Census statistics is that after 1890, there was less diversification than in the late 1880's.
23. Morden Monitor, October 17, 1889, p. 4.
24. On the railway struggle between Manitoba and the Dominion see W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, Chapter IX; also, P. B. Waite, op. cit., Chapters VIII and IX.
25. Alexander Begg, History of the North West, Volume III, pp. 126-128.
26. Ibid., pp. 143-146.
27. Ibid., p. 154.
28. Ibid., pp. 155-156.
29. Ibid., p. 156.
30. P. B. Waite, op. cit., pp. 196-199.
31. J. H. Metcalfe, op. cit., p. 294; Miniota Women's Institute, Bridging the Years, 1879-1967, (Miniota: 1967), p. 40. Of the original seven directors of the Portage la Prairie Mutual Fire Insurance Company, five were members of either the Protective Union or the Farmers' Union. The founder of the Miniota Mutual Fire Insurance Company, W. A. Doyle, was prominent in the Patrons of Industry.
32. R. E. Spence, Prohibition in Canada, (Toronto: Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, 1919), p. 190.
33. Manitoba Free Press, January 21, 1886, p. 2; January 22, 1886, p. 2; September 2, 1886, p. 4.

34. Neepawa Register, August 28, 1885, p. 2.
35. Catherine Lyle Cleverdon, The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950), pp. 49-50.
36. Manitoba Free Press, August 5, 1886, p. 2.
37. Norman E. Wright, In View of the Turtle Hill, (Deloraine: Deloraine Times, 1951), Chapter IX.
38. Ibid., Chapter XI.
39. P. B. Waite, op. cit., p. 198.
40. Manitou Mercury, December 21, 1889, p. 2.
41. Carman Weekly Standard, December 11, 1890, p. 2.
42. Neepawa Register, January 9, 1891, p. 1.
43. Neepawa Register, January 16, 1891, p. 8; February 26, 1891, p. 8; May 8, 1891, p. 8; May 22, 1891, p. 8.
44. Pilot Mound Sentinel, September 17, 1891.
45. Morden Monitor, September 24, 1891. p. 1.
46. R. A. Quickfall, ed., Rockwood Echoes: A History of the Men and Women Who Pioneered the Rockwood Municipality, (Steinbach: Derksen Printers, 1960), p. 263; L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 124.
47. Manitou Mercury, January 31, 1891, p. 2.
48. Manitou Mercury, February, 7, 1891, p. 2.
49. Ibid.,
50. Ibid.
51. Manitou Mercury, February 21, 1891, p. 2.
52. Manitou Mercury, February 21, 1891, p. 2; April 18, 1891, p. 3.
53. Manitou Mercury, February 7, 1891, p. 2.
54. L. A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 110-111.
55. Ibid., p. 111.
56. Ibid., pp. 111-115.
57. Ibid., pp. 124-125.
58. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, May 6, 1891.

59. Neepawa Register, July 10, 1891, p. 8.
60. Delegates to the founding convention came from Brandon, Carberry, Rapid City, and Minnedosa in western Manitoba.
61. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, November 11, 1891.
62. Ibid.
63. On the Manitoba Schools Question see W. L. Morton, Manitoba A History, Chapters X and XI.
64. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, November 11, 1891.
65. Ibid.
66. Patrons' Advocate, March 13, 1895.
67. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, November 11, 1891.
68. Morden Monitor, November 26, 1891, p. 2; Manitous Mercury, March 5, 1892, p. 2; Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller, November, 1892, pp. 276-277.
69. Sidney Glazer, "Patrons of Industry in Michigan" Mississippi Valley Historical Review, Vol. XXIX, No. 2, (1937), pp. 186-187.
70. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, November 2, 1892, November 9, 1892, November 16, 1892; December 7, 1892; December 14, 1892.
71. Brandon Sun, February 25, 1892, p. 1.
72. For the platforms of the various Populist organizations in the United States see John D. Hicks, op. cit., pp. 427-444.
73. On the influence of the Greenbackers on Populism see Charles McArthur Destler, American Radicalism, 1865-1901; Essays and Documents, (New London: Connecticut College, 1948), Chapter I.
74. Harold U. Faulkner, Politics, Reform and Expansion, 1890-1900, (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1959), pp. 57-58.
75. Russell Chronicles and Free Trade Advocate, August 17, 1893, p. 1; Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, May 13, 1891.
76. Vere C. Brown, "The Crisis in the United States", Journal of the Canadian Bankers Association, Vol. I, No. 4, (June, 1894), pp 237-264; A. A. Taillon, "The Monetary Question and Kindred Topics", Journal of the Canadian Bankers Association, Vol. IV, No. 3 (April, 1897), pp. 268-293.
77. Alexander Begg, History of the North West, Volume III, p. 97.

78. Patrons' Advocate, June 27, 1894.
79. The Western Canadian, March 11, 1899.
80. Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba and the North West Territories<sup>7</sup>, Grand Constitution of the Patrons of Industry Manitoba and N.W.T., (Brandon: Times Job Printing House, 1894).
81. Ibid.
82. L. A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 114-115.
83. Ibid.
84. Birtle Eyewitness, February 11, 1892, as quoted in Beulah Women's Institute, Minnewashta Memories, 1879-1970, p. 65.
85. Neepawa Register, January 15, 1892.
86. L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 124.
87. The last reference I have been able to find regarding the Farmers' League is a report of a picnic held at Cypress River in 1892. Morden Herald, July 8, 1892, p. 3.
88. By 1894, provincial leaders of the Patrons of Industry were frequent speakers at Farmers' Club meetings. Connections between the Club and the Order were severed sometime in 1897.

## CHAPTER VII

### DOORKEEPERS IN THE HOUSE OF THE PATRONS

The Grand Order of the Patrons of Industry was a much longer-lived movement than its predecessors in the 1880's, surviving until 1900. Despite the length of time that the new movement flourished, however, it was no more successful in solving the farmers' problems than the Farmers' Union or the Protective Union had been. Beginning in 1894, the Patrons of Industry sought political solutions to the persistent difficulties facing the farmers on the Manitoba agricultural frontier. Politics proved to be disastrous for the agrarian cause; by 1897, the Patrons were a largely irrelevant movement in the rural areas of Manitoba. Although the Order struggled on for another three years, it was unable to regain the support of the agricultural community.

The fundamental weakness which prevented the Order from accomplishing its goals was the type of organization it chose to seek improvements in the farmers' economic condition in the first prairie province. Like the Protective Union before it, the Patrons of Industry was a benevolent society, equally unable to raise sufficient capital to undertake the co-operative activities envisioned by the membership after 1893. Eventually, the same financial problems that caused such havoc with the Protective Union's grain marketing programme appeared, undermining the co-operative activities of the Patrons and embarrassing the movement. Nor was a lodge a particularly suitable form of organization to transform into a political party as the Patrons attempted in 1894. The appeal of a benevolent society, founded upon principles of mutual co-operation

and self-improvement, was not political; consequently, the Patrons' entry into politics divided the movement against itself.

(1)

The Patrons of Industry in Manitoba enjoyed greater economic and social unity than any other major farmers' organization in Manitoba in the nineteenth century.<sup>1</sup> By restricting membership in the Order to farmers, the politically-motivated individuals and the economically distressed businessmen who had been attracted to the Farmers' Union were not attracted to the new movement.

As Table L illustrates, only a tiny percentage of the delegates to the Patrons' conventions were non-farmers, and of the non-farmers who did attend almost half of them had agricultural interests in addition to their principal business interest. The largest occupational group among the non-farmers were men associated with the grain trade. Usually the business activities of these men were confined to a small geographic area and did not embrace the province as a whole. Since their business was circumscribed by local conditions, they had a vested interest in improved prices for agricultural commodities. The more extensive operations of the Winnipeg grain dealers were less affected by the agricultural depression as the Winnipeg grain merchants could pass on their costs to the farmers more easily. Even if a Winnipeg grain dealer was inclined to seek membership in the movement--and none did--his application would have been rejected as the Patrons believed him guilty of monopolistic practices, a charge that was never levelled against local grain merchants. Similarly, local lumber merchants, usually with farming interests, were admitted to membership in the

TABLE L

PRINCIPAL OCCUPATION OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Blacksmiths			2		
Editors	1	1	1		2
Farmers	49	60	88	43	33
Grain Dealers		3	3	2	1
Handyman				1	
Insurance Agent			1		
Lumber Merchants		1	3	1	1
Millers	1				
Saddlers			1		
Teachers		2	1		
Veterinary Surgeons	1	1	1	1	
Unknown					
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	1	9	8	3	1
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>47</u>
Non-farmers with farming interests	1	4	9	3	2
Farmers with non-farming interests	3	3	1		1

TABLE LI

INTEREST GROUPS REPRESENTED AT  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Disillusioned Promoters		2	2	1	1
Politically Motivated Individuals	1	1	1	1	1
Inveterate Joiners	1	2	2	2	
Farmers					
Financially Troubled	7	2	12	6	
Marginally Successful	31	44	70	27	26
Unknown	12	17	14	11	9
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	1	9	8	3	1
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>47</u>

Order, since they could not be accused of monopolistic business methods. As for the remainder of the non-farmers at the conventions, H. C. Clay, a newspaper editor, was given a place because he published the Order's newspaper, the Patrons' Advocate; one or two others substituted for farming relatives who had been elected as delegates but were unable to attend; and still others were sons of farmers who had embarked upon non-agricultural careers but still maintained an interest in farming.

The most significant feature of the occupational complexion of the Patrons' conventions was the absence of the professional men and the land speculators who had played such an important role in the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union. Their absence ensured that the new movement would not be diverted from its purpose of bettering the farmers' economic position in order to serve the interests of aspiring politicians and disappointed town promoters. Professional men were anathema to the Patrons for they realized the impact upon earlier movements of admitting non-farmers into what was ostensibly a farmers' agitation. Those few non-farmers--with the exception of H. C. Clay--who were admitted to membership were denied provincial offices until 1898; before that the leadership of the Order remained in the hands of bonafide farmers.<sup>2</sup>

Most delegates to the Patrons' annual conventions between 1892 and 1897 inclusive were immigrants from Ontario. Even if born elsewhere, the delegates usually had located in Ontario first before emigrating to Manitoba. At all conventions there was a leavening of British immigrants, but this element was less signif-

TABLE LII  
LAST PLACE OF RESIDENCE BEFORE IMMIGRATING  
TO MANITOBA OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Canada					
Ontario	22	27	36	21	19
Quebec		1	2	1	
Nova Scotia					
New Brunswick			1		
Prince Edward Island		1			
British Columbia					
North West Territories					
United Kingdom					
England & Wales	2	3	3	1	2
Ireland			1		
Scotland		3	1		1
Other British Possessions					
Other Countries			1		
Native Manitobans		1	1		
Unknown	28	31	55	24	15
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	1	9	38	3	1
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>47</u>

TABLE LIII

BIRTHPLACE OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Canada					
Ontario	14	18	23	14	7
Quebec					
Nova Scotia					
New Brunswick			1		
Prince Edward Island	1	2	1	1	1
British Columbia					
North West Territories					
Manitoba		1	1		
United Kingdom					
England & Wales	2	3	5	3	3
Ireland	1		1		1
Scotland	1	4	2		2
Other British Possessions		1	1		
Unknown	33	39	66	30	23
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	1	9	8	3	1
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>47</u>

icant with the Patrons than it had been in the farmers' movements of the 1880's. Although a handful of the English immigrants played an important role in the provincial organization,<sup>3</sup> they did not exert the same influence in the Patrons' agitation as they had during the previous decade in Manitoba farmers' organizations. The vast majority of local and provincial office-holders appear to have been native-born Canadians from Ontario who now identified their interests with the future of the first prairie province.<sup>4</sup>

The declining influence of the British element in Manitoba agrarian protest can be explained by the changing position of the British immigrant in Western Canada. In the 1880's many immigrants from the United Kingdom had been attracted to the Canadian prairies by the investment possibilities that immigration agents had convinced them existed. On the whole, the more prominent British members of the Protective Union and the Farmers' Union could be described as gentlemen-investors. After sinking large amounts of capital into farm land or real estate, most of these men discovered, if they were not ruined by the collapse of real estate values that accompanied the end of the Manitoba Boom, that only a small return on their investment could be realized. By the 1890's, the gentlemen-investors had given up on the Canadian prairies and were risking their capital in other areas of the country or of the world. The new type of British immigrant to Manitoba generally possessed less capital and had come to Canada to work on railway construction or as a farm labourer. While these immigrants tended to gravitate to the towns and cities of the Canadian West,<sup>5</sup> some saved their earnings and invested in land.<sup>6</sup> As latecomers who often faced a cultural barrier in assimilating with the predominately transplanted Ontario society

TABLE LIV

DATE OF ARRIVAL IN MANITOBA OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Before 1870			1		
1870					
1871	1	1	2	1	
1872			1		
1873		2	1		2
1874	4	2	3	3	2
1875		1	1		
1876	1			1	1
1877	1	2	4	3	2
1878	6	5	11	5	3
1879	1	8	12	5	3
1880	2	3	3	3	4
1881	5	4	4	3	2
1882	4	11	14	5	4
1883	1	1	3		
1884	1	2	2	2	1
1885	1			1	
1886	1	2	1		
1887	2	1	2	3	1
1888	4	1	1		
1889	1				1
1890	2	4	4		1
1891	3				
1892	1				
1893					
1894					
1895					
1896					
1897					
Native Manitobans		1	1		
Unknown	10	7	30	13	10
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	<u>1</u>	<u>9</u>	<u>8</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>1</u>
Totals	68	95	135	60	47

of Manitoba, they were unlikely to be elected to important positions within the Patrons of Industry.

Similarly late arrivals from other parts of Canada were rarely elected as delegates to Patrons' conventions. The majority of delegates at all of the Patrons' annual assemblies had arrived in Manitoba before 1883. By the 1890's, Manitobans were beginning to look back nostalgically to the early settlement of the province in the 1870's, and early residents, many of whom had contributed to the growth of community institutions, were being accorded status as pioneers.<sup>7</sup> Early arrivals had the advantage, typical in rural communities, of family, business and community connections that could lead to political success in local elections or to recognition within local organizations such as the Patrons of Industry.

An examination of Table LIV also indicates that most of the early arrivals came in the years between 1877 and 1883 and that a substantial proportion of them arrived during the Manitoba Boom of 1881-1882. They were the immigrants whose expectation of future success was founded upon the generally optimistic view of the province's prospects that most Canadians shared in the halcyon days before the economic collapse of 1883. For a decade after their initial hopes were dashed, they struggled for economic survival in the face of crop failures and depressed prices for agricultural commodities. By the 1890's they were becoming weary of the constant struggle they were waging. There appeared to be no end to the burdens that they were asked to bear. Many were growing older and were making plans to retire from farming--approximately half of the delegates for whom land records are available sold their land to their sons and daughters or to newer arrivals between 1890 and

1910--<sup>8</sup> and for them the Patrons of Industry represented a slender hope that their original expectations of the Canadian West would finally be fulfilled.

Few of the Patrons had been involved in the agitation conducted by the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union. Although the delegates to the Patrons' conventions and the delegates to the conventions of the earlier provincial farmers' movements tended to arrive in Manitoba at about the same time, the earlier agitation appealed to those farmers who were deeply in debt. In contrast, few delegates to the Patrons' conventions were financially embarrassed.<sup>9</sup> By the 1890's, a large number of the farmer-delegates to the Farmers' Union and Protective Union conventions had been foreclosed by their creditors; others, while retaining their land in some instances, had moved to towns to embark on new careers. Since the original generation of local leaders of agrarian protest in Manitoba had for the most part abandoned agricultural pursuits, new leaders at the local level emerged to be elected as delegates to provincial farmers' conventions.<sup>10</sup>

The farmers' movements of the 1880's had been leavened with a sprinkling of native Manitobans and pre-Confederation Ontario immigrants, the Patrons of Industry, on the other hand, appear to have made little appeal to the older settlers in the province.<sup>11</sup> The parishes along the Red and the Assiniboine Rivers which had sent old settlers as delegates to the farmers' conventions of the 1880's were now represented at the Patrons' conventions by new arrivals. By the 1890's, immigrants from Ontario and Great Britain were in the majority in the parish settlements and had

displaced the Red River settlers in community organizations. As John Gunn, a former member of the provincial legislature lamented in 1891:

I think I will stay at home and quietly allow ignorance, selfishness, whiskey and debauchery to accomplish for this part, what Jock McDougal says God intended for it viz. the displacement of the present population of these parishes by the incoming or dominant race, and do what little I can at my age to hold my own in the prophesied wreckage.<sup>12</sup>

The composition of the Patrons' Conventions reflected the increase in the number of Ontario settlers in Manitoba.

Minority ethnic groups in Manitoba which had enjoyed representation in the Protective Union, did not participate in the Patrons of Industry. French-speaking Manitobans were struggling for survival as a distinct cultural group within the province in the 1890's, and because of the hostility shown by the majority of Manitobans as evidenced by the Manitoba Schools Act of 1890, were not inclined to support a British-Canadian farmers' movement. The militance of the English-speaking majority also alienated Mennonites and Icelanders from the Patrons. The linguistic and cultural barriers which had been briefly broken down in 1885 could not be breached in the face of the racial difficulties of the 1890's.

Social changes on the Manitoba agricultural frontier were further reflected in the religious affiliation of the delegates.<sup>13</sup> At the conventions of the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union the majority of delegates were either Presbyterians or Methodists, while adherents of the Church of England in attendance were principally from the towns. At the Patrons' conventions, it appears that there was a much stronger Anglican presence, and that the Church of England delegates were almost all farmers. Where the

TABLE LV

RELIGIOUS AFFILIATION OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Presbyterian	8	20	18	9	9
Methodist	12	9	17	9	9
Congregational					1
Church of England	3	5	9	2	2
Baptist		1	3	1	
Quaker			1	1	
Unknown	29	34	53	26	16
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	1	9	8	3	1
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>47</u>

TABLE LVI

MARITAL STATUS OF DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Married	32	39	54	30	21
Single	2	4	4		7
Unknown	18	25	43	18	9
Unidentified	15	28	26	9	9
N.W.T. Delegates	1	9	8	3	1
Totals	<u>68</u>	<u>95</u>	<u>135</u>	<u>60</u>	<u>47</u>

Anglican church had been hard-pressed to compete with the Methodists and Presbyterians in the early settlement period in Manitoba, by the 1890's as the railway network spread and new hamlets and villages were established, and as the Church of England's finances permitted, Anglican churches had been founded at most points where supporters of that denomination were relatively numerous.<sup>14</sup>

Both the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union had attracted a number of Presbyterian and Methodist farmer-ministers who had taken a leading role in the agrarian agitation. The scandal surrounding the failure of protest in the 1880's, probably convinced these clergy that it was impolitic for them to become involved in future protests. And as settlement progressed and congregations became able to pay salaries, fewer individual pastors were inclined to combine their clerical duties with farming. In the course of time, clergymen were removed from direct involvement in the economic difficulties confronting farmers.

As in the case of the farmers' organizations of the 1880's, delegates to the Patrons' conventions were mostly married men. Agrarian protest continued to attract those individuals who were encumbered with the greatest responsibilities and who were possessed of the least mobility. Because they had tied their prospects and those of their families to Manitoba's future they made up the bulk of the Patrons' membership.<sup>15</sup>

Though members of the Patrons of Industry tended to own more land than other Manitoba farmers, they owned on the average less than the delegates to the provincial conventions of the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union. At all conventions of the Patrons of Industry, except the 1897 convention, the average

TABLE LVII

MORTGAGE INDEBTEDNESS AND RATE OF FORECLOSURE  
AMONG LANDOWNING DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Landowners	44	57	89	42	33
Average Size Farm	260.9A	328.9A	304.4A	284.7A	383.0A
Number in Debt	24	27	52	23	21
% in Debt	54.5%	47.4%	58.4%	54.8%	63.6%
Average Debt Per Debted Farmer	\$2,310.58	\$2,029.15	\$1,982.27	\$1,819.13	\$1,829.19
Average Debt Per Acre of Debted Farmers	\$5.66	\$6.17	\$6.80	\$6.26	\$5.46
Number Foreclosed by 1900	2	2	4	1	
% Foreclosed by 1900	4.5%	3.5%	4.5%	2.4%	
Number Foreclosed 1901-1910			1		
% Foreclosed 1901-1910			1.1%		
Number of Sales by 1900	9	14	15	12	7
% Sales by 1900	20.5%	24.6%	16.9%	28.6%	21.2%
Number of Sales 1901-1910	10	13	23	11	6
% Sales 1901-1910	22.7%	22.8%	25.8%	26.2%	18.2%
Under Real Property Act	3	7	7	6	3

TABLE LVIII

INDEBTEDNESS AND FORECLOSURE RELATED  
TO SIZE OF LAND HOLDINGS AT  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 25, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number in Debt</u>	<u>Number Eventually Foreclosed</u>
Under 100 Acres	1	1	1
101-200 Acres	103	48	2
201-300 Acres	1		
301-400 Acres	114	72	6
401-500 Acres	25	16	
501-600 Acres	2	2	
600 Acres Plus	14	6	
Land Unknown	5	2	1

holdings of delegates were substantially less than at conventions of the earlier protest organizations.<sup>16</sup> It should, however, be noted that from 1881 to 1891 the average land holdings of all Manitoba farmers decreased.<sup>17</sup> Most of the land speculators of the 1880's had been forced to divest themselves of their holdings by the beginning of the 1890's and those who retained their property found little to appeal to them in the Patrons' programme. This programme which emphasized self-education found its greatest support among many of the smaller farmers who needed practical assistance to improve their livestock or farming methods. Undoubtedly, the social activities of the Patrons also appealed to many smaller farmers who otherwise would not have associated themselves with an agrarian protest organization. The regular bimonthly meeting of the Subordinate Association, held at the local schoolhouse, usually consisted of a brief business meeting, a short paper on some agricultural subject presented by a local farmer, and then a box social, dance or entertainment.<sup>18</sup>

Farmers with large land holdings who attended Patrons' conventions, however, were more likely than the smaller landholders to have mortgaged their property. The continuing agricultural depression severely affected the large landholders by increasing their expenses relative to the profits to be made from agriculture. The principal difference between the movements of the 1880's and the Patrons was the absence of a relatively large number of land-owners with extensive holdings.<sup>19</sup>

Patrons' delegates who had purchased their land were no more likely to have mortgaged their property than those who had obtained it by other means.<sup>20</sup> The continuing agricultural

TABLE LIX

INDEBTEDNESS AND FORECLOSURE BY  
MEANS OF ACQUIRING PROPERTY AT  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>Number</u>	<u>Number in Debt</u>	<u>Number Eventually Foreclosed</u>
Homestead	78	36	2
Homestead & Private Purchase	14	6	
Homestead & Pre-emption	69	45	4
Homestead, Pre-emption, & Private Purchase	5	2	
Homestead & Military Bounty Grant	2	2	1
Homestead & H.B.C. Sale	1	1	
Homestead & C.P.R. Sale	2	2	
Homestead, Pre-emption & Government Sale	3	3	
Homestead, Special Grant & Private Purchase	2	2	
Homestead & Government Sale	2		
Homestead, Government Sale & C.P.R. Sale	1		
Government Sale	5	3	
Government Sale & Private Purchase	1	1	
Government Sale & C.P.R. Sale	1	1	
C.P.R. Sale	14	2	1
C.P.R. Sale & Private Purchase	3	2	
C.P.R. Sale, H.B.C. Sale & Private Purchase	1		
H.B.C. Sale	4	1	
Manitoba South Western Colonization R'wy Sale	1	1	
Manitoba Act Grant & Private Purchase	1	1	
Private Purchase	52	34	2
Inherited Land	1	1	
Inherited Land & Private Purchase	2	1	

TABLE LX

MEANS BY WHICH PROPERTY WAS ACQUIRED  
BY LANDOWNING DELEGATES TO  
ANNUAL CONVENTIONS OF THE PATRONS OF INDUSTRY  
FEBRUARY 25, 1892, JANUARY 18, 1894, JANUARY 16, 1895,  
JANUARY 29, 1896, AND JANUARY 19, 1897.

	<u>1892</u>	<u>1894</u>	<u>1895</u>	<u>1896</u>	<u>1897</u>
Landowners	44	57	89	42	33
Homestead	15	16	28	10	9
Homestead & Private Purchase	1	2	6	2	3
Homestead & Pre-emption	11	9	27	14	8
Homestead, Pre-emption & Private Purchase		1	2		2
Homestead & Military Bounty Grant			2		
Homestead & H.B.C. Sale					1
Homestead & C.P.R. Sale				1	1
Homestead, Pre-emption & Government Sale			2		1
Homestead, Special Grant, and Private Purchase	1	1			
Homestead & Government Sale		2			
Homestead, Government Sale & C.P.R. Sale					1
Government Sale	1	2	1	1	
Government Sale & Private Purchase				1	
Government Sale & C.P.R. Sale	1				
C.P.R. Sale	2	3	5	3	1
C.P.R. Sale & Private Purchase		1			2
C.P.R. Sale, H.B.C. Sale, & Private Purchase					1
H.B.C. Sale	1	2	1		
Manitoba Southwestern Colonization R'wy Sale			1		
Manitoba Act Grant and Private Purchase			1		
Private Purchase	11	17	11	10	3
Inherited Land			1		
Inherited Land & Private Purchase		1	1		

depression removed whatever initial advantage farmers who received grants from the Crown enjoyed. Over a ten year period, capital reserves that a homesteader brought with him would be exhausted, and he would be forced to take out a mortgage to meet his expenses which in so many years in the 1880's and 1890's outran receipts in the autumn.

The value of mortgage indebtedness per acre among Patrons' delegates did not increase as rapidly as did land values in the 1890's, although the average value per acre of improved agricultural land increased from \$7.37 in 1887 to \$11.25 in 1892 and the value of unimproved agricultural land from \$4.18 in 1887 to \$8.80 in 1892.<sup>21</sup> The number of Patrons' delegates who were eventually foreclosed by mortgage and loan companies, by private lenders and by banks was only a small fraction of the number of delegates foreclosed among those individuals who attended the Farmers' Union and Protective Union conventions.<sup>22</sup>

Furthermore, there was no powerful motivation on the part of the financially embarrassed members of the farming community to turn to the Patrons who promised little in the way of political or economic solutions that would solve the difficulties of nearly bankrupt farmers.<sup>23</sup> Many Patrons' delegates may have mortgaged their property, but few were hard-pressed to meet their obligations. The economic tensions, consequently, which had been one factor in driving the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union to increasingly radical solutions to agrarian problems, were largely absent within the Patrons' movement.

Not that there was no potential for economic division within the Order. As long as Manitoba agriculture remained subject

to occasional crop failures, as long as there was a long-haul to markets, and as long as the continued existence of surplus world food stocks narrowed the profit margin, then there was the possibility of economic disaster overtaking the farmers. As the effects would not fall evenly among all Manitoba farmers, economic divisions within the movement could be expected to emerge to divide it bitterly.

Only politics could affect the course of the farmers' agitation as powerfully as economic disaster might. The Patrons' organization was ill-adapted to political action.<sup>24=</sup> In contrast to earlier agrarian agitations in Manitoba, the Patrons did not support either the Liberals or Conservatives. Instead, they launched their own political party in 1894. A lodge might be an adequate vehicle for self-education and local co-operation among the farmers, but it was poorly suited to act as a political party. The fact that meetings of the Order were secret gave the new party a conspiratorial atmosphere. Local editors were excluded from the deliberations of the Order and only given summaries of the meetings after the members had dispersed. This practice was hardly conducive to good relations with the press. Many members had joined the Order on the understanding that politics would be avoided; now they were being asked to abandon their traditional political allegiances to support an organization whose appeal had been based on social and economic purposes. If the Patrons had been political from the outset, and if the Order had been more open to the public in its deliberations, it would have had a better chance of political success. As it was, the Patrons in Manitoba courted disaster the moment they entered the political arena.

What motivated the Patrons of Industry in Manitoba to enter politics and to expand their programme of co-operative action was the marked deterioration in economic conditions in 1893. The depression that hung over North America throughout the 1880's and early 1890's deepened;<sup>25</sup> credit was restricted, the money supply contracted and many businessmen in both Canada and the United States were forced into receivership.<sup>26</sup> At the same time, large world surpluses of grain led to a dramatic drop in the price of wheat.<sup>27</sup> When low prices were coupled with short crops in both 1893 and 1894,<sup>28</sup> hardship resulted in Western Canada. President George A. Cox of the Bank of Commerce noted: "there is no use disguising the fact that in actual power to pay debts out of the current season's products, the farmers of the North-West were worse off during the past year than ever before."<sup>29</sup>

Many solutions to the Manitoba farmers' problems were offered, but no one solution or combination of solutions appeared to be entirely adequate. Cox told the shareholders of the Bank of Commerce:

In the course of their progress to material wealth our North-West provinces must expect the recurrence at intervals of such vicissitudes, and the question is, what are they to learn from the present experience? That they must raise everything for which there is a market other than wheat is clear,... That they must farm more within their own means, both as to capital and the employment of labour seems clear, but they have in the past only displayed the same expansive tendencies as their fellow merchants, and as all people in new countries who have not yet got their financial bearings. Hereafter, both from lessened ability and greater dread of debt, there will be improvement. But while the experiments in mixed farming are being made and the dreary lessons of enforced economy are being learned, the fact remains that for years to come wheat must be the main item

in what they have to sell, and, if they have to face the opening up of an indefinite area of new wheat lands in the Argentine and elsewhere, they may have a hard time of it for a while.<sup>30</sup>

To alleviate the farmers' immediate difficulties, Cox suggested:

The Canadian Pacific Railway claim to carry as cheaply as is possible, and in the present condition of railroad earnings this is probably true. But it is also true that railroads will year after year be forced to lower rates, and must somehow carry wheat to Europe at prices which will leave a living profit to the farmer over a series of years.<sup>31</sup>

Adam Shortt, a professor of political economy at Queen's University, reached similar conclusions after a journey to the Canadian West in 1893. Although his observations were based upon the time he spent in Alberta, they applied equally to Manitoba. The root of the problem was the isolation of the Canadian North West, which was aggravated by the freight rate policy of the Canadian Pacific Railway. It was obvious that if "Sir Wm. Van Horne had any real confidence in the future of the North West, he is too shrewd a Yankee not to see that his present policy is a penny-wise and pound-foolish one, in trying to extract paying rates from settlements in their infancy, thus preventing their development."<sup>32</sup> But reductions in freight rates would not overcome those difficulties the farmers made for themselves. Too many Western farmers were "content to live a half-civilized life of the narrowest economic kind, they cannot continue to raise wheat from the day they have a surplus to sell." The country had to "give up the idea of becoming a regular wheat-exporting country", either finding new uses for the surplus wheat produced or ceasing to grow so much of it. It would be better if Canada left "wheat growing to the more undeveloped races" and for herself "find a

higher destiny for her people in producing those things which require for their production, intelligence rather than muscle,..."<sup>33</sup>

Suggestions that the farmers should strive for diversification in agricultural production found little favour with the Patrons, for wheat-growing, despite the small profits and, in 1893, probably substantial losses, was still more profitable than any other agricultural endeavour. Charles Braithwaite, the Grand President of the Patrons of Industry, summarized the Manitoba farmers' position in a letter to W. C. Van Horne:

Let me give you a sample of the farmers' lot at present. Take a man with a quarter section--160 acres--take 60 acres off for pasture, feed, etc., leaving 100 acres for wheat. Now the crop won't average over 14 bushels per acre giving him 1,400 bushels at 30¢ per bushel, \$532 all told. Now he must pay \$100 for help and binding twine, \$100 for threshing and \$50 for breakages, etc. Then he needs an outfit worth at least \$600 which will require an outlay of at least \$150 to keep up, that is averaging the life of the outfit at 6 years, which I think is fair; thus leaving the man the princely sum of \$132 on which to feed himself and family, that is if he is out of debt and his land clear. But suppose he owes a mortgage of \$1,000 payable in ten years at eight per cent., that is a yearly payment of \$180, which is \$150 any of his rent /sic/. Then his outfit is seized and sold at 25 to 50¢ on the dollar, and his family is on the road. But you say what has he done with his beef and his pork: well thousands of them have none, and those who have are selling their beef at 1¼¢ per lb. live weight, and 5 per cent off for shrinkage; or by the carcass 4¢ per pound. Pork is a little better, it is worth about 65 per hundred.<sup>34</sup>

The answer to the farmers' problems according to the Patrons lay in a greatly reduced tariff so that farmers could buy in the cheapest market, and in much lower freight rates.<sup>35</sup> Both were political solutions and the only way to achieve them was through a revival of political action.

The exact moment when the Patrons decided to enter politics in Manitoba cannot be determined. Possibly it was sometime in 1893, but because the Order maintained secrecy about local meetings and because there were no convention minutes printed in any Manitoba newspapers for 1893,<sup>36</sup> there is no certainty about the timing of the decision. What is certain is that the Grand Executive, if not the membership, had made the decision to enter politics before the 1894 convention. At that assembly, while there was some discussion of the advisability of entering candidates in the expected federal elections, the Grand Executive acted as though the decision had already been taken. By the time the convention adjourned, plans had been laid for the forthcoming campaign and a platform had been adopted.<sup>37</sup>

In entering politics, the Manitoba Patrons were following on the heels of their Ontario brethren. The Ontario Order had always been more politically inclined than the Manitoba organization, although the decision of whether or not to enter a candidate at any election had been left to the county associations before 1893. At their annual meeting in London of that year, the Ontario Patrons decided to contest the imminent provincial elections.<sup>38</sup> While it might be argued that the Ontario Order's decision influenced the Manitoba Patrons to enter politics, it is important to note that the 1894 convention which met at Brandon did not discuss proposals to enter the provincial field.<sup>39</sup> If the Manitoba Patrons had been influenced by their Ontario counterparts it is likely that they would have chosen the same strategy as the Central Canadians.

The leaders of agrarian protest in Manitoba had precedents for not becoming involved in provincial politics. The failure of both the Protective Union and the Farmers' Union had been tied closely to the political agitation conducted by both organizations. Nor was there much to be gained from contesting provincial ridings. The impotence of successive provincial governments in dealing with Ottawa demonstrated that even if the Patrons captured the majority of seats in the provincial legislature they would be frustrated in their attempt to redress grievances. A strong demonstration of Western Canadian solidarity behind Patron representatives in the federal parliament might convince federal politicians of the justice of the claims of the West. The fact that the Ontario Patrons were already involved in federal politics would give the Western Patrons allies in their struggle, but it was highly unlikely that the Order would secure enough seats to form a government since there was minimal support for the Patrons east of Ontario. Political action on the part of the Ontario Order was important to the Manitoba Patrons only in that it was possible for the Patrons from all parts of Canada to capture enough seats "to hold the balance of power between the two old parties."<sup>40</sup>

Nor were the Manitoba Patrons inspired to enter politics by the Populists in the United States. Despite the initial American connections of the Manitoba organization, the Manitoba Patrons had resolutely avoided politics for almost three years after their foundation. It is improbable that after that length of time the Manitoba Order would turn to the American example which it had rejected earlier. Only the severe economic dislocations occasioned

by the deepening economic depression were sufficient to motivate the Manitoba Patrons to renew the political agitation begun in the 1880's.

One way in which both the Ontario Patrons and the American Populists did influence the Manitoba movement was in the decision to establish a third political party. In the 1880's the farmers of the province had conducted their political agitation largely through the Liberal party, but that had proved unsatisfactory when it became apparent that the Liberals were using the farmers for their own ends. The idea of a separate political party dominated by the farmers and excluding the professional men who had done so much harm to the farmers' cause in the previous decade was appealing to Patrons in Manitoba.

The Ontario Patrons also influenced the Manitoba Order when it came to adopting a platform. The Western Patrons' platform in its wording was almost entirely borrowed from the Ontario Order. But there were significant differences between the two organizations' interpretation of the various common planks. For both movements, the first plank was "Maintenance of the British connection." The second plank demanded that public land "be reserved for actual settlers." Manitoba and Ontario Patrons were agreed on this clause in 1894, but within a year, faced with a rising demand for the construction of new railways in the North West Territories, the Manitoba Order was forced to modify its stand to exclude railway land grants whenever they were "found necessary to extend settlement or to accommodate settlements already established." Similarly, both associations were in agreement in 1894 that "the representatives of agricultural constituencies shall be farmers"; by 1895, in their

attempt to broaden the political appeal of the Order, the Ontario Patrons deleted the clause from their platform. Manitoba Patrons did not follow suit; the experience of the 1880's convinced them that the admission of non-farmers into the movement would eventually lead to conflicts in interest. In those planks that demanded "rigid economy in every department of the public service", "simplification of the laws", reductions in the tariff, legislation that would effectively protect the "farmer and labourers from monopolies and combines", preparation of Dominion and provincial voters' lists by municipal officials, the redrawing of constituency boundaries to conform with municipal boundaries, and one man one vote in provincial and federal elections, there were no differences between the Ontario and Manitoba Patrons.<sup>41</sup>

For the most part, it was not a radical platform. Much of what both the Ontario and Manitoba Patrons demanded had been advocated by the Clear Grits half a century before, and some planks, for example those regarding economical administration and tariff reform, were still in the platform of the federal Liberal party. What distinguished the Patron platform from the Liberal platform was the fear of the agricultural community in Canada that it was being displaced in influence by the industrial classes--both managers and workers. The farmers demanded political reforms that would guarantee them not only a higher standard of living but increased influence in the councils of government. Within Manitoba there was no imminent threat of urbanization and industrialization leading to rural depopulation and the consequent loss of influence in political decision-making. Yet because of the growth of manufacturing in Eastern Canada and the power believed to be wielded by

industrialists in determining federal government decisions, and because the government decisions that most affected the farmer were within the jurisdiction of the federal authorities, Manitoba Patrons were alarmed. Their demand that power be restored to the agricultural population was an attempt to turn the clock back to a time when it was believed that the agricultural classes had actually influenced policy-making within the Dominion.

In one of the planks adopted at their 1894 convention, the implementation of women's suffrage, the Manitoba Patrons put themselves in the forefront of reform opinion. Though the delegates were divided on whether or not to accept the plank, after a lengthy debate they finally agreed to its inclusion in the platform.<sup>42</sup> This addition to their platform was not a very popular decision among the voters in the province.

In March, 1895, at a convention in Manitou, an arrangement was made between the provincial prohibition organizations and the Patrons of Industry to support each other in elections, and the Patrons added prohibition to their platform. In conjunction with the 1892 provincial election in Manitoba, the Greenway government had conducted a plebiscite to determine how strong the feeling was for banning the bottle in the province. Although the prohibitionists easily carried the day, the government after it had been safely returned to office refused to act on the results. The high hopes that the Greenway administration had created in holding the plebiscite were dashed and many temperance supporters became disillusioned with the government. Hence, they turned to the Patrons as the vehicle to end the liquor traffic in the province.<sup>43</sup>

For their part, what the Patrons were trying to accomplish by including women's suffrage and prohibition in their political platform was to build a reform coalition that would appeal to individuals who were dissatisfied with the Liberals and Conservatives. Twenty years later a similar coalition of farmers, temperance workers labour organizations, supporters of women's suffrage and advocates of the Social Gospel under the leadership of T. C. Norris was successful in driving the provincial government of Rodmond P. Roblin from office.<sup>44</sup>

Instead of creating a broader base for the movement, the adoption of women's suffrage and prohibition lost the Patrons as much, if not more, support than was gained. Men who were attracted to the Order because of what it promised to do for the farmer, men who whatever their private misgivings about the renewal of a political agitation were willing to do their best to further the cause of the Patrons, were not necessarily convinced of the merits of planks which did not promise to improve the farmers' condition. Indeed, some members did not believe that rum was a demon nor that women should be emancipated. In attempting to build a reform coalition, the Patrons created divisions within the movement. At least one Patron in later years, A. T. Hunter of the North West Territories, speculated on the possible effect that advocating women's suffrage had in the electoral battles the Order fought. All he could conclude was that the Patrons were the "first political body possessed of the courage of their convictions."<sup>45</sup>

The plank demanding a tariff for revenue only--some Patrons' candidates in the West substituted "Free Trade as in Great Britain"--<sup>46</sup> was bound to create differences between former Liberals

and Conservatives in this new political party. While many Manitoba Conservatives were probably of the same opinion as Senator Charles A. Boulton, a Conservative, that the National Policy had failed,<sup>47</sup> others while wishing modifications in the tariff were not prepared to accept complete free trade. The original phrasing of the plank-- "Tariff for Revenue Only"--allowed for some interpretation by members, but attempts to convey the impression that total free trade was the Patrons' policy destroyed what good the ambiguity in phrasing accomplished.

In the spring of 1894, the potential divisions within the Patrons were not easily recognized and several Liberal organizers were uneasy over the emergence of a new and unknown political force in the province. By the end of June, the Patrons had nominated candidates in the five rural federal constituencies to the West of the Red River.<sup>48</sup> After the nomination of Thomas Young in Marquette, C. J. Mickle, the Liberal member of the provincial House for Birtle, was thoroughly disheartened. No matter what the Liberals did, the fact that a Patron would contest the federal constituency would almost certainly result in a Conservative being elected. Mickle informed Premier Greenway in July:

One thing we must constantly have in mind is that if we permit the Patron candidate to go unopposed by Liberals and receive the Liberal support and they are half successful then at the next general local elections there will not be a constituency from Dauphin to Emerson that won't have a Patron in the field and many Liberals asked to give way to them.<sup>49</sup>

Mickle's fears were given substance by the end of the summer.

In July, 1894, the Greenway government called a by-election to fill the vacancy in Beautiful Plains provincial constituency. The local Patrons without consulting the Grand Executive for the province decided to nominate a candidate of their own. The

Liberals were now faced with the hard choice of engaging in a three-cornered race with the prospect of a Conservative victory, or withdrawing in favour of the Patron. A Conservative win could signal the revival of the provincial party, moribund since the death of John Norquay in 1889, and a Patron win could give the Order not only an increased incentive to contest the federal elections, but also the incentive to enter provincial politics on a much larger scale. The Liberals eventually decided to chance the unknown Patron menace. On August 24, 1894, John Forsyth, a local farmer and lay minister, became the first Patron in Manitoba to hold a seat in the provincial Legislature.<sup>50</sup>

The Beautiful Plains by-election victory was the result of local conditions. Not only had the Liberals not contested the election, thereby releasing Liberal votes for the Patrons, especially in the town of Neepawa, but the Patron nominee was a very strong candidate. Active in the community and in the local agricultural society, and a popular lay minister, Forsyth had many friends.<sup>51</sup> Even in a three-cornered race he would have done very well. Furthermore, the editor of the Neepawa Register, normally a fervent backer of the Conservatives, had maintained a benevolent neutrality throughout the campaign. Possibly because he believed that the election of a Patron would be as much of a blow to the prestige of the Greenway administration as the election of a Conservative, the Register's editor, praised Forsyth as being an able, honest and potentially worthy member for the constituency.<sup>52</sup>

The feeling of euphoria among Patrons that accompanied Forsyth's victory gradually wore off. By November, 1894, an embarrassing split had occurred between the editor of the Patrons'

Advocate, H. C. Clay, and the Grand Executive. Clay claimed the right to criticize the Patrons' executive officers in the columns of his newspaper.<sup>53</sup> The Grand Executive attempted to have him temper his views regarding the privileges of the official organ of the movement. Clay refused, and for four months, he and the Grand Executive engaged in the not very dignified sport of sniping at each other. The lack of harmony in the house of the Patrons became public knowledge when the Patrons' Advocate printed Grand President Braithwaite's letters, spelling errors and all, and H. C. Clay's replies.<sup>54</sup> Clay was finally forced to resign as editor of the Advocate.<sup>55</sup> After this incident, Wm. G. King, who succeeded Clay, was more pliable to the wishes of the executive. Although the Order resolved its internal conflict, its reputation had been damaged.

The Advocate also embarrassed the movement by being more militant in its columns than any leader of the movement considered wise. In July, 1894, for example, it had printed a series of articles entitled "Home Rule in Manitoba", ostensibly a fictional account of what might happen if grievances were not redressed. The articles were, in actuality, a call to armed revolt.

A grizzled old warrior in these articles was hounded in 1899 by his young son into telling once again the story of the "fight at Thunder Bay". The trouble began when some farmers decided to resist foreclosure on their mortgages. An underground organization was established. When the time was ripe, the farmers staged a successful armed uprising in Winnipeg, seizing the banks, the railways, the telephone and telegraph offices and the government buildings. After forming a new farmers' government, the "restorationists" were forced to deal with military expeditions to Manitoba sent by the federal government to restore the

"colonial" regime. The North West Mounted Police were defeated in a pitched battle at Brandon, while two militia regiments from Eastern Canada were captured after a Manitoba "ironclad" successfully attacked the troop ships in Port Arthur harbour. The federal government rapidly came to terms in the wake of the military disaster and granted Manitoba virtual independence. Given their freedom, Manitobans made their province into a paradise: banks were closely controlled by the state; mortgages were declared illegal; free trade was adopted; the government took over the operation of the railways; land taxes were abolished; all schools were made free; and lawyers were deported to whence they came.<sup>56</sup>

These preposterous fantasies damaged the Patrons' cause. The memory of two armed uprisings in the prairie west was still fresh in the people's mind, and the destructive influence of secessionist sympathizers on earlier farmers' movements still remembered. In "Home Rule in Manitoba", the Advocate undermined the determination of the Order, as expressed in its platform, to maintain the British connection and to avoid any taint of treason.

By the autumn of 1894, the co-operative activities of the Order which had been greatly expanded during the past year were also creating hostility towards the Order. At the beginning of 1893, the principal province-wide co-operative venture of the Order had been the sale of binder twine to the members. For the most part the binder twine business aroused little comment from the business community as it was limited in scope.<sup>57</sup> But as the agricultural depression deepened more farmers rallied to the Patrons' cause, some to take advantage of the low price for twine offered for sale by Subordinate Associations. Winnipeg wholesalers, now feeling

the pinch of declining trade, became aware of the Patrons inroads into their business. In September, 1894, The Commercial attacked the Order, declaring that the "Patrons' twine has been about the dearest in the market". There was a veiled implication that the officers of the Order were profiting from the business and that they were unpatriotic since they sold twine manufactured in the United States.<sup>58</sup> Charles Braithwaite charged that the claims of The Commercial were "unjust, unfair and untrue", arguing that any reduction in the price of twine on the part of regular dealers was the result of vigorous Patrons' competition. The Commercial replied that the Patrons' twine was inferior in quality to other brands and that it was "folly for the Patrons to claim credit" for any decrease in prices.<sup>59</sup>

Merchandizing was another area where the businessmen and the Patrons came into conflict. Beginning in 1892, some local associations of the Order decided to buy goods other than binder twine in bulk to sell to their members at reduced prices.<sup>60</sup> Hagyard Subordinate Association offered dried apples and peaches, raisins, brown sugar, coal oil and other staple goods for sale to its members.<sup>61</sup> To lower prices still further, the Order incorporated the Patrons' Commercial Union at Portage la Prairie early in 1894.<sup>62</sup> Some local associations believed that even this step was insufficient. At Manitou, the Farmers' Club in association with the Patrons decided to open its own store.

Townsmen launched a vigorous campaign to stop the farmers in this new venture. In a letter to the Manitou Mercury, one of the local merchants argued that there were already five general stores in the village, more than enough to serve the district's

needs and that there was every likelihood that the farmers would fail since 97 out of 100 merchants did not succeed in business. Why should "farmers and rusty businessmen...do better than the hundreds and thousands of sinewed, trained business men who have gone to the wall." The whole scheme smelled of rank ingratitude since present establishments had "carried...accounts when the farmers<sup>7</sup> were unable to pay them."<sup>63</sup> The editor of the Mercury supported the merchants' claims. In two editorials he pointed out that should the Patrons succeed in their business ventures, they would grow so powerful that "we should have a nobility of moneyed barons, lords and masters more potent, tyrannical and unfeeling than their hereditary forerunners."<sup>64</sup> When the farmers' store opened in spite of this opposition, the Board of Directors discovered that the local merchants had sent a circular letter to Winnipeg wholesalers advising them that they would not buy goods from those houses which sold goods to the farmers' store at Manitou.<sup>65</sup> That tactic failed. The store survived and the merchants learned to live with the competition.

The Patrons' plan to market members' wheat, originally developed in the autumn of 1892 but not put into effect until the autumn of 1893,<sup>66</sup> was equally harmful to the movement. Like the Protective Union, the Patrons had insufficient capital to launch a large-scale co-operative marketing agency. The Order decided to pay Braithwaite a salary and have him market the grain, and to allow him to build up reserves, it gave him permission to take one cent a bushel on all transactions.<sup>67</sup> In this way the Patrons hoped to avoid the charges that had been levelled

against George Purvis in 1885. But Braithwaite who had been forced to give up farming after a fire destroyed his crop in the fields and he was unable to meet his obligations to his creditors,<sup>68</sup> had no funds of his own to start the business. Consequently, he made arrangements with grain brokers to buy Patrons' wheat while he acted as the brokers' agent.

The scheme was unworkable. Braithwaite and the Order took the responsibility if any problem over the marketing of a member's wheat arose, but they had no control over the grain dealers who alone had the power to remedy any injustice. In the autumn of 1894, Peter Cram, a farmer from Pilot Mound, demanded that the Patrons pay him an additional sum of \$144.82 which he claimed was owed him from the sale of two carloads of wheat the previous autumn. Cavanagh and Spink, the graindealers who acted for the Patrons in this transaction, had sold his wheat in November, 1893, but claimed that they had held it until March, 1894. Cram was docked for storage charges, insurance premiums and four times the freight rates usually charged by the Canadian Pacific Railway. By the time the grain dealers had deducted their inflated costs, he received only \$34.37 and \$8.10 for the two carloads as opposed to \$75.81 and \$69.01 which he ought to have received. Understandably he was angry.<sup>69</sup>

Confronted with the evidence, Charles Braithwaite alternatively tried to bully and to mollify Cram. The reason the grain was held until March--which it was not, as Cram could prove--Braithwaite said was because Cram had instructed that it be held. Neither the Patrons nor Cavanagh and Spink could be blamed for Cram's mistake. Braithwaite went on

You threaten to take proceedings against Cavanagh and Spink for the balance you think you should have got. Now I think this is a mistake. I know myself

personaley /sic/ I have been ruined financaley /sic/ by handleing /sic/ Patrons wheat, and I know that the Executive of the Patrons have lost money, and I know that Cavanagh & Spink lost over \$2,000 last year on Patrons wheat. However, I suppose this does not satisfy you. ...I don't wish to dictate to you in any way. But I cannot see where you will make anything by threatening them, you are only playing right into the hands of the enemy. These grain men will use your action to cover their own unjust actions. Hoping you will think better of fighting a losing game.<sup>70</sup>

As far as Cram was concerned it "was a case of beat, and I am going to have my money, or it will be because I can't get /It/." Either Braithwaite or the graindealers, he charged, had utilized the proceeds from the sale of his wheat to cover other losses and then asked him to shoulder the consequences of their financial mismanagement. The Patrons would pay or he would get in touch with his attorney.<sup>71</sup>

It was a deeply discouraged Braithwaite who concluded the correspondence. In his reply to the "dark threatening /sic/ epistle", Braithwaite wrote

I also told you that I had ruined myself financially making up losses to farmers for wheat. Now sir if it will be any satisfaction to you or any one else to sue me, do so. I have been keeping my family on \$15.00 per month...and the rest of my salary when I got it was gone on old accounts. Now Sir if you need this and can get it by all means get it. ...I may just say that I have reason to believe there is an election on the tapis at Ottawa, and this is your chance to kill Patronism dead, however, never mind that go ahead.<sup>72</sup>

Cram took the Grand President's advice and contacted G. T. Watson of Pilot Mound, a political friend of Premier Greenway. Watson made copies of all the correspondence to send to the Premier with the suggestion that it be used to discredit the Patrons.<sup>73</sup> Greenway shrewdly filed it away for future reference.

Hoping to avoid a political confrontation, Braithwaite

made the material public at the Patrons' annual convention in January, 1895.<sup>74</sup> Despite a spirited defense of his actions, his explanations were not entirely convincing. The very fact that he considered it necessary to defend his actions raised suspicions that the Order's grain marketing scheme was not entirely above-board. Furthermore, the revelations of the financial status of Braithwaite, Cavanagh & Spink, and of the remaining members of the Grand Executive, would cause farmers to market their wheat through the private firms of Winnipeg.

(iii)

Despite the setbacks of the preceding year, the annual convention of the Order in February, 1895, was the largest assembly convened by the movement during its brief history in Manitoba. The delegates were in a confident mood. Grand President Braithwaite, even though he believed himself called upon to defend the grain marketing programme, dwelt upon the accomplishments and future prospects of the Patrons. The fact that the Canadian Pacific Railway had announced a freight rate reduction in the previous twelve months was, he claimed, the direct result of the Patrons' agitation, so were the changes made in the grading of wheat--changes "whereby the bulk of our grain has been made No. 1 hard, and the reputation of our country saved." Reductions in the tariff and in the cost of necessities such as binder twine and fence wire, along with rumoured reductions in government "expenditures on figureheads etc., thereby lessening our taxation" had resulted from the Patrons' demands.<sup>75</sup>

The Legislative and Platform Committees at the convention extended the scope of the Patrons' programme to include an end to

pauper emigration, abolition of bailiff's poundage fees, reduction of county clerk's fees, registration of lien notes in county offices, the abolition of elevator privileges "by permitting the loading of grain into cars direct", a stop to landlords' warrants taking precedence over lien notes, and a declaration that no Member of Parliament or Member of the Legislature should accept a railway pass. Only one recommendation generated any controversy: the abolition of the Senate. Senator Boulton, a Grand Trustee of the Order, spent some time defending the usefulness of the Upper House, but his speech was to no avail for the convention accepted the committee proposal.<sup>76</sup>

The Committee on Political Attitude and Action stated in its report that it favoured "allowing mechanics and industrial workers admission to our Association", although it also advised against "our uniting with any organization other than farmers' institutions or clubs."<sup>77</sup> Their experience during their first year in politics had convinced the Patrons that they ought to have a broader base of support. Although no non-farmer seems to have taken immediate advantage of the change in membership regulations and although both the 1895 and 1896 conventions possessed as much social and economic unity as any of the other Patrons' assemblies, the very fact that the Order was prepared to open membership to non-farmers divided the movement.

Manitoba farmers, however, were not yet ready to turn against the Patrons. Although Manitoba farmers harvested "altogether about thirty-two million bushels of wheat, oats and barley" in 1894, "prices were so low that but for the exercise of economy" they were little better off. There was even less credit available. Whole-

salers and manufacturers were pressing local merchants for payment of debts and the local merchants were pressing the farmers for immediate repayment of the credit that had been extended.<sup>78</sup> Economic conditions helped to maintain support for the Patrons' programme in the rural areas.

Farmers' political action also received encouragement from the results of the 1894 Ontario provincial election. In that province the Patrons of Industry, a movement only four years old, managed to elect 17 of 30 candidates to the Legislature.<sup>79</sup> The Patrons in Manitoba expected to do even better in the upcoming provincial election. But by the time the Greenway government called a provincial election in December, 1895, the movement was weak and divided.

It had been the practice of Canadian railroads to issue passes to the legislators of the country. This practice was extended to the Patron Member of the Legislature in Manitoba, John Forsyth. After Herbert D. Cartin of Neepawa wrote to the Patrons' Advocate accusing Forsyth of having used a pass,<sup>80</sup> the Grand President Charles Braithwaite ordered an investigation. When it was discovered that Forsyth had indeed used a pass,<sup>81</sup> the Executive ordered him to resign all his offices. He was expelled from the Order,<sup>82</sup> since the acceptance of railway passes had been one of the abuses that the Patrons had been elected to prevent. Forsyth, and the Patrons by implication, had been found as corruptible as members of other political parties.

In December the Ontario Patron Members of the Legislature were discovered to have used railway passes as well.<sup>83</sup> Until then, it could have been argued that the Forsyth scandal had been an

isolated instance. Although all the Patron members in both Ontario and Manitoba promptly surrendered their passes, it seemed to the public that the Order preached one form of morality and practised another.

Further complications developed in January, 1896, when Forsyth presented his side of the case in a letter to the editor of the Neepawa Register. He had consulted Charles Braithwaite, he wrote, before accepting the pass and had been given permission to use it. In August he had informed the County Association of Beautiful Plains that he possessed a pass. All things considered, Forsyth thought that "I have been badly used, both by the executive and the county association."<sup>84</sup> This letter severely damaged the credibility of the Patrons' leaders, for it appeared as though their righteous indignation over Forsyth's action was nothing more than an attempt to protect themselves from the full wrath of the Manitoba public.

In December, 1895, problems arose again over the management of the Patrons' Advocate. In its December 4 issue, Wm. G. King, the editor, in the opinion of the Grand Executive, "advocated the claims of one old party over the other and laid the whole order open to the construction, ... of being in sympathy with and working for the Liberal party, thus having lost our independence and substituting instead a partisan bias."<sup>85</sup> King disagreed with the Patrons' policy of placing candidates in the forthcoming provincial elections since he believed that the Greenway government was essentially a farmers' government.<sup>86</sup> A statement prepared by the Executive and published under the authority of W. C. Graham, the Grand Secretary, appeared in the Manitoba Liberal declaring that

"Patrons do not and cannot consistently recognize either of the old parties...such an utterance being contrary to our principles of independence". The Patrons' official policy was to "place candidates in all the local constituencies where a fair chance of success be possible."<sup>87</sup>

Underlying the quarrel between King and the Grand Executive was the Manitoba Schools Question. In 1895, the Conservative government in Ottawa had finally exhausted all the legal alternatives available to settle the Schools Question in Manitoba in favour of the minority Catholic population. The cabinet of Sir Mackenzie Bowell then issued a Remedial Order with which Manitoba refused to comply. The federal government decided to summon, in January, 1896, one last session of Parliament before dissolution to pass Remedial Legislation. King, like many other Manitobans, was loathe to oppose the Greenway administration when such opposition might be construed as opposition to the province's rights to determine educational policy.

The Schools Question was a particularly thorny problem for the Patrons. If the Order supported the Greenway government, it had no schools policy of its own to differentiate itself from the incumbent administration; if it opposed the government in any particular of its policy, it could be accused of being in favour of Manitoba's "coercion" by Ottawa. Charles Braithwaite attempted to strike out on an independent course in April, 1895, by stating that he "favoured the maintenance of the principle" of the Manitoba School Act of 1890, but "if some minor concessions would satisfy the Catholics he was in favour of making them."<sup>88</sup> As an example of concessions he was prepared to make,

he cited the history texts used in the public schools which he thought were not always "thoroughly" non-sectarian in their interpretation of the past.<sup>89</sup> The Neepawa Register spoke for the majority of Protestant Manitobans when it described the Grand President's proposal as "incomprehensible".<sup>90</sup> In the face of public hostility to his stand, Braithwaite accepted the Liberal position on Manitoba schools.

At the local level, County Associations debated the advisability of fielding Patrons' candidates in the provincial elections as three-cornered races might lead to the election of Conservatives. The more Conservatives elected, the weaker the Manitoba government would be in its dealings with Ottawa. The Russell County Association decided not to nominate a candidate after lengthy debate.<sup>91</sup> In southwestern Manitoba where the Patrons were exceptionally strong and where there were almost as many local associations as school districts, not a single candidate was nominated.<sup>92</sup> Even in the Portage la Prairie district, the home of the Grand President and the Grand Secretary, no local nominees entered the race because of an arrangement between the Grand President and the Greenway Liberals.<sup>93</sup> When nominations finally closed early in January, only nine Patron candidates had thrown their hats into the ring.<sup>94</sup> Of these nine Patron nominees, two discovered old political loyalties during the campaign and withdrew before election day.<sup>95</sup> Only two members were elected.<sup>96</sup>

It would have been better if the Order had not contested any constituencies. The Patrons revealed themselves in the provincial election as just another political party--indeed as a weak and disorganized one. The attempts to broaden the appeal of

the Order to groups other than farmers had not succeeded; the promises of moral reform in government appeared hollow in the light of the scandal over the railway pass held by Forsyth; the claim that they embodied a new political honesty was mocked by their deals with Liberal and Conservative candidates; and the internal bickering demonstrated that their leaders were hardly worthy of the trust and support of Manitoba farmers.

In the months following the provincial election, the Patrons found their future tied more and more to political action. Where political action had once been only one facet of the Patrons' overall programme, it now was given the main emphasis. With Braithwaite all but bankrupt and with the Grand Executive unable to provide new capital to restart the scheme as membership in the Order declined,<sup>97</sup> the Patrons abandoned grain marketing.<sup>98</sup> The Patrons' Commercial Union continued to function, as did the farmers' stores and elevator companies established by local associations, but there was a noticeable slackening in co-operative action.<sup>99</sup> Since one of the major attractions of the Order was farmer's co-operation, fewer new recruits joined the organization and older members drifted away. When the results of the provincial election were added to the problems of a contracting base of support, the Patrons' prospects were poor.

As economic conditions improved in the spring of 1896, the Patrons began a struggle for survival. Credit was gradually becoming easier to obtain as Western Canada began to emerge from the economic depression which had gripped the prairies since 1883 and tightened its grip in 1893.<sup>100</sup> Optimism began to infect

Manitobans. The Patrons, who thrived on pessimism, were unable to generate as much fervour.

Accompanying the Manitoba farmers' loss of confidence in the Patrons, some of the Order's candidates who had been nominated in the spring of 1894 to contest the federal seats of the province, began to waver in their support of the movement. Before and during the federal campaign, three of the five Patron nominees withdrew from the contest. James Morrow, a Conservative Patron in Lisgar, charged that the local associations in his riding which were dominated by Liberals were accusing him of partisan loyalties. Under the circumstances he could no longer carry on.<sup>101</sup> The Lisgar Patrons, bitterly dividing into Liberal and Conservative factions, were unable to bring a new candidate forward.<sup>102</sup> In Marquette, Thomas Young succumbed to the blandishments of his Liberal friends and withdrew in favour of J. H. Ashdown, the Liberal candidate.<sup>103</sup> The Marquette Patrons scrambled to find a new candidate. G. A. J. A. Marshall was selected and though he made a gallant effort on behalf of the Order, he was unable to repair the damage done by Young's defection.<sup>104</sup> Robert Fisher, the Patron candidate in Selkirk, also decided not to go to the polls.

In Brandon constituency, divisions within the Patrons' ranks destroyed whatever chance of success William Postlethwaite might have possessed. When Dalton McCarthy, the leader of the Protestant Protective Association, chose Brandon as his constituency, the local Liberals and many of the Patron lodges in the southern part of the riding quickly endorsed his candidacy. Postlethwaite was placed in the impossible position of campaigning against Patron colleagues who stumped the constituency as vigorously for McCarthy as they had for him a few weeks earlier.<sup>105</sup>

In Macdonald electoral division, Charles Braithwaite was the Patron nominee. The Order was stronger in Macdonald than in any other federal riding in the province, but the area was also a Liberal bastion. Braithwaite faced an uphill fight. When Patron candidates withdrew in other areas of the province his chances of success diminished. The Liberals ensured his defeat by pointing out that by actively co-operating with them during the provincial election campaign, he had completely discredited his appeal as an honest man who, if elected, would aid in the reformation of Canadian politics.<sup>106</sup>

When the votes were counted in June, 1896, Braithwaite, Postlethwaite and Marshall, although they attracted a respectable percentage of the vote, were defeated.<sup>107</sup> But for the Patrons a good showing was not enough. The disaster in the federal election confirmed the weakness they had shown in the provincial election in January, 1896, and effectively destroyed the movement's political ambitions.<sup>108</sup>

If further confirmation of the Patrons' political impotence was needed, it was provided in two provincial by-elections called in the autumn of 1896 to fill vacancies in the Legislature. On November 19, 1896, the voters of Lakeside went to the polls, electing the Liberal candidate, James Mackenzie, over D. W. McCuaig, the Patron standard-bearer.<sup>109</sup> A month later, the voters of Brandon North resoundingly rejected William Postlethwaite, the Patron, and elected A. C. Fraser, a Liberal.<sup>110</sup> In both constituencies the Patrons had a clear field against the Liberal nominees and in both they enjoyed the active support of the Conservatives. These favourable circumstances made little difference, for the electorate,

thoroughly disillusioned with the new political movement, was not prepared to support it.

(iv)

By the beginning of 1897, it was apparent to most Patrons that the political disasters of the preceding year necessitated a major re-organization of the movement. The weak and divided leadership had to be remedied; revisions made in the platform; changes in organization instituted; and the future of co-operative action discussed.

The leadership problem resolved itself. Charles Braithwaite, the Grand President, severed his connections with the movement and took a position with the provincial government as noxious weeds inspector.<sup>111</sup> W. C. Graham, the Grand Secretary and general manager of the Patrons' Commercial Union, resigned at the same time to look after his own business interests.<sup>112</sup> At the 1896 provincial convention, the Patrons elected C. J. Green, a Portage la Prairie farmer, to the presidency, and G. A. J. A. Marshall, the editor of the Patrons' Sentinel, as secretary.<sup>113</sup> Neither individual was particularly attuned to the needs of the Manitoba agrarian community and neither possessed a commanding public presence, but both enjoyed the advantage of not having been publicly and prominently associated with the planning and execution of the electoral disasters of the previous year.<sup>114</sup>

At the 1897 convention the Manitoba Patrons also finally recognized that the type of organization chosen by the Order was inadequate for successful co-operative and political action. The constitution was amended to abolish the ritual, titles of officers, and the use of the word "Grand" in the names of local, county and

provincial associations. In the future the movement was to be an association of Manitobans interested in furthering reform.<sup>115</sup>

The issue of co-operative action in the marketplace was not squarely faced at the convention, but by deciding to continue the political agitation and by not finding a solution to the problem of capitalization of co-operative activities, the Patrons rejected further economic co-operation sponsored by farmers. By 1897, most of the local associations which had established Patrons' stores or elevators were convinced that continued association with what had become a political movement was neither desirable nor expedient since a political party was not a suitable vehicle for establishing consumers' and producers' co-operative companies. While the Patrons maintained a tenuous connection with local co-operative enterprises through the Patrons' Commercial Union, the Commercial Union itself was gradually growing away from the provincial organization.<sup>116</sup>

It was probably impossible for the Patrons to involve themselves in widespread co-operative and educational activities by 1897. Many supporters who had been attracted to the movement because of the emphasis on co-operative action and self-education had now deserted the organization. Those who remained saw the problems of the farmer in political terms. A return to policies pursued by the Patrons before their entry into politics would lose the movement many of its present supporters without ensuring the re-entry of those who had left the fold.

The delegates to the 1897 provincial convention also saw a solution to the Patrons' difficulties in making a broader appeal. Accordingly, the delegates amended the platform to provide for the establishment of a Railway Commission with the power to

regulate freight rates, the nationalization of the telegraph system in the Canadian West, the government ownership and operation of the Crow's Nest Pass line of the Canadian Pacific Railway, and the repurchase by the federal government of all unsold lands belonging to the Canadian Pacific Railway.<sup>117</sup>

To encourage greater participation by reformers throughout the province, membership in the organization was thrown open to lawyers, doctors, merchants and other professional men who did not have connections with combines and trusts.<sup>118</sup> With that decision, the Patrons served notice to the public that they were no longer a strictly agrarian agitation. They had become a reform movement which was open to men and women of all occupational backgrounds within the province. To emphasize this point and to strengthen the reform coalition, the association discontinued publication of the Patrons' Sentinel which had been established in January, 1896, after the break with the Patrons' Advocate, and made arrangements with The Voice, the organ of Winnipeg labour, to publish a new newspaper, The Western Canadian.<sup>119</sup>

The connection with Winnipeg labour organizations radicalized the Patrons. The columns of The Western Canadian in 1897 were filled with articles promoting the public ownership of elevators, the eventual nationalization of all railways in the Dominion, direct taxation, and with demands that the provincial government "perform services now carried on by lumber dealers, grain dealers, money lenders to farmers, etc.", and that "unearned increment" be taxed.<sup>120</sup> Patrons, it was suggested, ought to read books on political economy: John Stuart Mill representing the "Manchester School", Richard T. Ely representing the "modern

school" and Fabian essays representing the "Socialist school".<sup>121</sup>

The educational campaign of The Western Canadian bore fruit at the annual convention of February, 1898. The platform of the Independent Industrial Association--as the Patrons renamed their organization--was amended to include a plank recommending "co-operation in all cases where the work to be done cannot be better performed by individual action." Co-operation was defined as the "co-operation of the community by means of state action." The convention balked at naming specific enterprises other than the railways and elevator companies that ought to be nationalized,<sup>122</sup> but the new stance of the movement put the Industrial Independents in the forefront of organizations advocating radical change in Canada.

Caution dictated that the Independent Industrial Association show some moderation in its demands. As The Western Canadian warned:

In constructing the platform two dangers have to be guarded against; it may be so over-cautious as to amount to nothing, or it may be so revolutionary as to be visionary and unpractical.<sup>123</sup>

According to the Morden Chronicle

Judging from the platform /the Industrial Independents/ have adopted, a clearer and more expressive title would have been "Ultra Radicals". The weak feature of all these organizations is the lack of prudent leaders to check the crude aspirations of the rank and file. In their platforms, they regularly bite off more than they can masticate, and regularly end their labours by strangulation. If they would be content to deal with desirable reforms within fair reach, they would stand to accomplish something, but apparently nothing will do them but they must soar beyond reach.<sup>124</sup>

Despite the necessity of caution, The Western Canadian advocated more radical measures throughout 1898. The referendum

and the recall were suggested as possible means of attaining the political power to undertake needed reforms which were being cloaked by the corrupt machine politics of the Liberals and Conservatives.<sup>125</sup> Co-operative group settlements were supported. The one at Tantallon, North West Territories, was painted as prosperous and populated by "comfortable and contented" farmers.<sup>126</sup> Millionaires who were regarded as coarse, immoral, vulgar and overbearing, were charged with "debasing" the "national life". Because they possessed such enormous wealth, ordinary men and governments endured them in "meek submission". A graduated income tax and inheritance taxes would restore the ordinary people to their rightful place in determining the future of their society.<sup>127</sup>

The radical ideas injected into agrarian protest through its connection with organized labour were one of the factors underlying the Patrons' decline. The movement gradually became irrelevant to the farmers who were primarily concerned with the economics of wheat-growing. It was patently obvious to them that tariff cuts would lower costs, and reductions in freight rates would improve their economic position. While the Independent Industrial Association promoted proposals for the nationalization of the railways, the banks and the grain trade, the rural local associations debated the merits of "Free Trade vs. Protection".<sup>128</sup> The innate conservatism of the farmer made him reject solutions which were to him "visionary" and "unpractical".

Improved economic conditions within Manitoba also undermined the agitation's appeal. The economic recovery which began in the spring of 1896 gathered momentum in 1897 and 1898. By the autumn of 1898, the price of wheat had risen to 75¢ per bushel, almost double what it had been four years earlier.<sup>128A</sup> Better

yields in 1897 and 1898 contributed to the general belief that conditions were improving. And with the beginning of large-scale immigration again the price of land increased. As his principal asset appreciated in value, the farmer was inclined to believe that after all he had made the right choice in coming to Manitoba.<sup>129</sup>

The new Liberal government in Ottawa went some distance towards meeting the farmers' principal demands. Imperial preference was a step in the right direction, while the agreement concluded with the Canadian Pacific Railway--the famous Crow's Nest Pass agreement--provided for a general reduction of 3¢ per 100 pounds in freight rates on all grain shipped from Western Canada. The Laurier administration also took an interest in the problems surrounding grain handling. In 1898, the government announced that new legislation would be forthcoming to make it possible for farmers to load their grain directly onto railway cars without having to pass through an elevator. With that decision, the infamous "elevator monopoly" first attacked by the Farmers' Union in 1883, appeared to be broken.<sup>130</sup>

Speakers for the Independent Industrial Association attempted to point out at public meetings that the farmers' lot really had not improved. The individual farmer's feeling of confidence in his future was founded not on his actual gains, they claimed, but on the belief that the future promised him a prosperity that he had not enjoyed in the past.<sup>131</sup> There was considerable truth in this argument. The Laurier Boom of 1897-1913 was founded more upon the ease with which credit could be obtained, increased land values, and the promise of work on railway construction than upon the actual profits that could be derived from agriculture.<sup>132</sup>

Compared to his position in 1893, nonetheless, the Manitoba farmer was prospering as he had never prospered before. The arguments of the Independent Industrial Association thus fell on deaf ears and its leaders appeared Cassandra-like in their perpetual litany of the woes of the agricultural community.

Despite harangues by speakers and editorials by The Western Canadian regarding the future of "Independent" political action,<sup>133</sup> the movement was so weak by the end of 1897 that at a by-election in Turtle Mountain constituency, no Independent candidate was brought forward.<sup>134</sup> The local Patrons consoled themselves by endorsing the Conservative candidate, James Johnston, a former Patron. Later, they claimed that they had been responsible for Johnston's election. This claim was given some credence by the Liberal argument that the Prohibition vote lost them the riding.<sup>135</sup> In reality, the tide was beginning to turn against the Greenway Liberals who had become moribund after almost a decade in office. Two years later, the rejuvenated Tories turned the Liberal government out of office. By that time the Industrial Independents as the Patrons then called themselves, had all but disappeared.

Although the farmers' movement became progressively weaker throughout 1898, the Independent Industrial Association was still hopeful of political success as late as the beginning of 1899. Spencer Percival, a farmer, who had emerged as one of the leading agrarian figures in the movement, thundered against the iniquity of the political system. Using phrases that demonstrated a familiarity with the Social Gospel teachings in the United States and Canada, Percival argued that the purpose of government was to "enact laws based on the divine laws" which "if obeyed, will preserve to each individual the fruits of his industry". The

Independent Industrial Association invited "all would-be Christians to take an active and intelligent interest in politics not only for their own sakes but for the honour and welfare of their country." As far as Percival was concerned, "any politician who professes Christianity is guilty of gross hypocrisy who does not attempt to carry Christianity into politics."<sup>136</sup>

In March, 1899, the largest and best-publicized annual convention in three years met in Winnipeg. In composition, the convention represented the primary impulse of the Patrons' reform agitation in its final years. By opening membership to professional men in 1897, the movement attracted not only the interest of organized labour but also the attention of assorted urban reformers. Wm. Scott, president of the local Labour Party, became first vice-president; T. W. Knowles of Emerson, representing temperance organizations, second vice-president; and A. B. Bethune, representing "independent businessmen", third vice-president. W. G. Rogers of Carberry who had been active in agrarian protest since 1883, was elected President, while W. C. Graham, now of Winnipeg, became Secretary-Treasurer. Of the representatives from the federal constituencies in the province who made up the remaining members of the executive, all but one was a farmer.<sup>137</sup>

Public ownership of utilities, public libraries to "supplement and continue the work of public schools", "free trade and direct taxation", "land for the actual settler", women's suffrage, prohibition, "free exercise to erect flat warehouses or small elevators at the various railway stations or sidings in Northwestern Canada", an end to subsidies, land grants and tax exemptions for large corporations, a non-partisan civil service commission, and

the implementation of legislation to give effect to the principles of Direct Legislation were all adopted in the platform. It was further resolved that the heavy "Galician" immigration, then in full tide, was unwise and should be discouraged since these immigrants lacked understanding of self-government. Finally, the delegates urged all Manitobans to respect the union label on products since unions were the most effective means for "stamping out the iniquitous sweating system".<sup>138</sup>

But while the future belonged to the cause of reform, the reform coalition of 1898-1900 had been formed ten years ahead of its time. Despite its brave talk of contesting the provincial election,<sup>139</sup> the Association declined rapidly in 1899. In July, The Western Canadian ceased to publish. When provincial elections were held in December, 1899, only Spencer Percival stood for the Independent cause: he received a mere 89 votes in Mountain constituency where Thomas Greenway won easily.<sup>140</sup>

The electoral debacle effectively destroyed the Independent Industrial Association. Sometime early in the new century, the last local association of the Industrial Independents ceased to function. With its disappearance, the last remnant of nineteenth century agrarian protest, so bravely begun at Portage la Prairie in November, 1883, disappeared, and all the high hopes of so many farmers in Manitoba were temporarily left in wreckage.

The fundamental weakness of the Patrons of Industry was the type of organization adopted by the movement to agitate for redress of grievances and to further farmers' co-operation in the marketplace. Circumstances and weak leadership aggravated the problems the Order encountered, but the problems were inherent

in the structure of the movement. As a lodge the Patrons were unable to raise the capital necessary for their ambitious programme of co-operative action. They were equally unable to transform a lodge into a successful political party.

Political action which earlier had destroyed the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union played a part in the Patrons' demise. The political and social reforms advocated by the Order were of secondary importance to farmers who were struggling to make a living on the Manitoba agricultural frontier. In reaching out to non-farmers to support a political reform coalition, the Patrons were reaching out to the very individuals who had been alienated by the movement after local associations established farmers' co-operative companies.

The Patrons did avoid, until 1899, the internal economic and social divisions that had plagued other farmers' organizations in Manitoba in the nineteenth century. The Patrons themselves, however, delivered their organization into the hands of men who were not primarily interested in the farmers' welfare. In the end, the Order became as divorced from the farming community, which they supposedly represented, as the Farmers' Union had been.

Although a largely irrelevant force among Manitoba farmers after 1897, the Independent Industrial Association--the final guise of the Patrons--was significant in that it pioneered the way for twentieth century agrarian organizations. The Manitoba Grain Growers' Association drew many of its radical proposals from the Independent Industrial Association, and when the Grain Growers joined in the Reform Movement in Manitoba after 1910, they were completing a task begun by the Patrons of Industry fifteen years earlier.

#### FOOTNOTES

1. With regard to Tables L to LX, there are a larger number of unidentified delegates than for earlier organizations. Delegates to Patrons of Industry conventions represented local associations which were named after school districts or given some other name chosen by the association. Since the delegates did not give their addresses, it has, in many instances, proved impossible to determine from which part of the province they came.  
A convention was held in 1893, but I have not been able to locate any press reports of its proceedings. At all other conventions the delegates' list was published in the newspapers.
22. See Tables L and LI.
3. Both G. A. J. A. Marshall and Wm. Postlethwaite who were British immigrants were nominated as Patrons' candidates in the federal election of 1896.
4. See Tables LII and LIII.
5. Proportionately, by 1900, the number of British-born immigrants in Winnipeg was greater than those in the rural areas. Census of Canada, 1901.
66. A. G. Bradley, op. cit., pp. 188-208; Alfred O. Legge, op. cit., pp. 274-280.
77. See for example, Morden Herald, April 7, 1893, p. 1; April 14, 1893, p. 1; April 21, 1893, p. 1; April 28, 1893, p. 1; May 5, 1893, p. 1; May 12, 1893, p. 1.
8. See Table LVII.
9. Ibid.
10. No more than a dozen delegates to the Patrons of Industry conventions had been delegates to conventions of earlier farmers' organizations. Of the provincial leaders of the Patrons only one--C. J. Green--served on the executive of earlier organizations.
11. See Tables LI and LIII.
12. P.A.M., George H. Gunn Collection, John Gunn to Donald H. Gunn, March 17, 1891.
13. See Table LV

14. For the development of the Church of England in Manitoba see T. C. B. Boon, The Anglican Church from the Bay to the Rockies, (Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962), especially pp. 115-119.
15. See Table LVI.
16. See Table LVII; see above Tables XXI and XXXVIII.
17. The average size of a Manitoba farm declined from 262.7 acres in 1881 to 237.4 acres in 1886 to 231.6 acres in 1891.
18. Manitoba Liberal, July 25, 1894, p. 4; Morden Herald, June 4, 1892, p. 1; Neepawa Register, July 15, 1892, p. 4 and March 17, 1893, p. 1.
19. See Table LVIII. There is one anomaly: those delegates who owned more than 600 acres were no less likely than those who owned 101-200 acres to have mortgaged their land. But the total number of delegates to all Patrons' conventions who owned more than 600 acres was only a small fraction of all delegates to the conventions.
20. See Tables LIX and LX.
21. Manitoba Crop Bulletin, June, 1887 and June, 1892.
22. See Table LVII; see above Tables XXI and XXXVIII.
23. See Table LI. Financially troubled farmer-delegates made up only a small fraction of the total number of farmer-delegates.
24. The political affiliation of delegates to Patrons' conventions cannot be determined. From what little information I have been able to gather, Conservatives tended to outnumber Liberals at provincial conventions. Newspapers, however, in their reports of the 1896 election campaigns generally leave the impression that local lodges were about evenly divided between Liberals and Conservatives.
25. Harold U. Faulkner, op. cit., pp. 141-142.
26. Bank of Montreal, Annual General Meeting Held 4th June, 1894, n. p.
27. Ibid.
28. The Canadian Bank of Commerce, Charter and Annual Reports, 1867-1907, Vol. II, p. 348.
29. Ibid.
30. Ibid., pp. 348-349.
31. Ibid., p. 349.

32. Adam Shortt, "Some Observations on the Great North-West", Queen's Quarterly, Vol. II, No. 3 (January, 1895), p. 196.
33. Adam Shortt, "Some Observations on the Great North-West", Queen's Quarterly, Vol. III, No. 1 (July, 1895), p. 21.
34. Charles Braithwaite to W. C. Van Horne, November 11, 1893, as printed in the Brandon Sun, January 18, 1894, p. 1.
35. Brandon Sun, January 18, 1894, p. 1.
36. There was a convention on February 20, 1893, which met at Brandon, but no reports of its proceedings seem to have been printed.
37. Brandon Sun, January 18, 1894, p. 1; Manitoba Free Press, January 18, 1894, p. 7; January 19, 1894, p. 1.
38. L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 135.
39. Brandon Sun, January 18, 1894, p. 1; Manitoba Free Press, January 20, 1894, p. 2.
40. P.A.S., A. T. Hunter, "Farmers' Organizations of the North West", p. 6.
41. L. A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 114-115; Patrons' Advocate, March 13, 1895.
42. Brandon Sun, January 18, 1894, p. 1.
43. James H. Gray, Booze: The Impact of Whiskey on the West, (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1972), pp. 56-57.
44. See Lionel Orlikow, "A Survey of the Reform Movement in Manitoba", (Unpublished M. A. thesis in history for the University of Manitoba, 1955), for a discussion of the Reform Movement.
45. P.A.S., A. T. Hunter, "Farmers' Organizations of the North West", p. 12.
46. Ibid., p. 7.
47. Morden Herald, March 3, 1892, p. 2.
48. Neepawa Register, June 15, 1894, p. 8. The candidates were: Charles Braithwaite in Macdonald, William Postlethwaite in Brandon, Thomas Young in Marquette, James Morrow in Lisgar, and Robert Fisher in Selkirk.
49. P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, C. J. Mickle to Greenway, July 17, 1894.
50. Neepawa Register, August 31, 1894, p. 4.

51. Grain Growers' Guide, March 1, 1916, p. 21.
52. Neepawa Register, August 10, 1894, p. 1; August 17, 1894, p. 4; Manitoba Liberal, August 22, 1894, p. 1.
53. Patrons' Advocate, November 21, 1894, L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 127.
54. Patrons' Advocate, December 12, 1894; November 28, 1894.
55. Patrons' Advocate, February 20, 1895.
56. Patrons' Advocate, July 4, 1894; July 11, 1894; July 25, 1894, August 7, 1894.
57. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, November 2, 1892; L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 125.
58. The Commercial, September 3, 1894, p. 1206.
59. The Commercial, September 10, 1894, p. 1246.
60. Portage la Prairie Weekly Review, November 9, 1892; Morden Herald, December 1, 1893, p. 4.
61. Mrs. Dorothy Vipond, Proudly We Speak: A History of the Rural Municipality of Woodnorth, (Kenton: The Woodnorth Centennial Committee, 1967), p. 212.
62. Morden Herald, June 22, 1894, p. 4.
63. Manitou Mercury, August 18, 1894, p. 3.
64. Manitou Mercury, August 25, 1894, p. 3; September 8, 1894, p. 2.
65. Manitou Mercury, November 3, 1894, p. 2.
66. Neepawa Register, September 22, 1893, p. 4. The first marketing scheme of the Patrons was organized in October, 1892, when Charles Braithwaite was given a commission to set up a marketing plan. Little seems to have been done until the autumn of 1893 when stimulated by the depression, the Order began to market wheat. Morden Herald, October 21, 1892, p. 4; The Commercial, October 1, 1894, p. 53; Birtle Eye-Witness, October 20, 1892, p. 1; Carberry News, January 13, 1893, p. 4.
67. Morden Herald, October 21, 1892, p. 4.
68. Grain Growers' Guide, March 1, 1916, p. 21.
69. P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, Robert Kerr to Chalmers Bros. & Bethune, September 13, 1894; Chalmers Bros. & Bethune to R. Reading, September 21, 1894; R. Reading

to Chalmers Bros. & Bethune, September 25, 1894; Bill of Lading for Car 28452, August 27, 1894; Bill of Lading for Car 16238, August 27, 1894; Peter Cram to Cavanagh & Spink, September 26, 1894.

70. P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, Charles Braithwaite to Peter Cram, October 1, 1894.
71. P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, Peter Cram to Charles Braithwaite, October 3, 1894.
72. P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, Charles Braithwaite to Peter Cram, Jan 7, 1894.
73. P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, G. T. Watson to Greenway, January 2, 1895; December 17, 1894, p. 1.
74. Brandon Sun, January 17, 1895, p. 1.
75. Patrons' Advocate, January 16, 1895.
76. Ibid.
77. Patrons' Advocate, February 6, 1895.
78. The Canadian Bank of Commerce, Charter and Annual Reports, 1867-1907, Vol. II, p. 371.
79. L. A. Wood, op. cit., pp. 138-140.
80. Patrons' Advocate, September 25, 1895.
81. Patrons' Advocate, October 2, 1895.
82. Patrons' Advocate, October 23, 1895; October 30, 1895.
83. Patrons' Advocate, December 4, 1895.
84. Neepawa Register, January 3, 1896, p. 1.
85. Manitoba Liberal, December 11, 1895.
86. King was also probably influenced by his connections with the provincial Liberal party. See P.A.M., Thomas Greenway Collection, Memorandum entitled "Suggestions for Rural Advertising", W. G. King to Greenway, June 5, 1894.
87. Manitoba Liberal, December 11, 1895.
88. Neepawa Register, April 5, 1895, p. 1.
89. Neepawa Register, April 19, 1895, p. 1.
90. Neepawa Register, April 5, 1895, p. 1.
91. Russell Chronicle and Free Trade Advocate, December 30, 1895, p. 1.

92. Norman E. Wright, op. cit., pp. 89-90.
93. P.A.C., Sir Clifford Sifton Papers, M. G. 27, 11, D 15, Vol. III, Charles Braithwaite to Sifton, March 10, 1896.
94. The candidates and the constituencies in which they stood for election were: Alexander Morrison (Morris), Robert Preston (Mountain), Ben Swanson (Manitou), John Borthwick (Morden), Watson Crosby (Dennis), J. W. Shanks (Saskatchewan), W. F. Sirrett (Beautiful Plains), Gavin Ross (Emerson), and S. Davidson (Cypress).
95. They were Alexander Morrison and Robert Preston.
96. They were Watson Crosby (Dennis) and W. F. Sirrett (Beautiful Plains).
97. Only 60 delegates attended the Order's annual convention in 1896 as compared with 135 a year earlier.
98. Timing of the Patrons' decision cannot be determined, but they did not market members' wheat in the autumn of 1896.
99. From 1895 to 1898, I have been unable to find references to the establishment of any new farmers' elevator companies.
100. Bank of Montreal, Annual General Meeting, 1 June 1896, n. p.
101. Pilot Mound Sentinel, June 5, 1896.
102. Manitou Mercury, June 13, 1896, p. 2.
103. Manitoba Free Press, April 25, 1896, p. 1; Russell Chronicle and Free Trade Advocate, May 22, 1896, p. 1.
104. Russell Chronicle and Free Trade Advocate, June 13, 1896, p. 1; June 20, 1896, p. 1.
105. Norman E. Wright, op. cit., pp. 90-91.
106. Manitoba Liberal, June 27, 1896, p. 4.
107. In Macdonald the Patrons received 22.0% of the votes cast; in Marquette, 13.6%; and in Brandon, 15.9%. Of the three candidates only Braithwaite saved his deposit.
108. There was one bright spot in the Patrons' defeat. The Liberals lost both Macdonald and Marquette because of votes siphoned off by the Patrons.
109. L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 143; see also Manitoba Liberal, October 3, 1896, p. 4; November 18, 1896, p. 4.
110. Canadian Parliamentary Guide, 1897.

111. L. A. Wood, op. cit., p. 129.
112. Manitoba Free Press, January 19, 1897, p. 4. Graham seems to have regained the office shortly afterwards. See Brandon Sun, January 28, 1897.
113. Manitoba Free Press, January 19, 1897, p. 4.
114. Marshall may have stood as a candidate in 1896 in the federal election, but he was never regarded as one of the architects of the disaster that overtook the Patrons.
115. Brandon Sun, January 28, 1897.
116. In March, 1898, the Patrons' Commercial Union changed its name to the Farmers' Trading Company and severed its connections with the farmers' movement. The Western Canadian, March 31, 1898, p. 1.
117. Brandon Sun, January 28, 1897.
118. Ibid.
119. Ibid. When arrangements were completed with The Voice cannot be determined, but it must have been shortly after the conclusion of the 1897 convention as a sample issue of The Western Canadian was published in March, 1897.
120. The Western Canadian, November 18, 1897, p. 1; December 16, 1897, p. 1.
121. The Western Canadian, November 25, 1897, p. 1.
122. The Western Canadian, February 10, 1898, p. 1; Regina Standard, February 3, 1898, p. 1.
123. The Western Canadian, February 10, 1898, p. 1.
124. Morden Chronicle, February 3, 1898, p. 4.
125. The Western Canadian, June 9, 1898, p. 1.
126. The Western Canadian, July 28, 1898, p. 1.
127. The Western Canadian, August 11, 1898, p. 1.
128. The Western Canadian, March 17, 1898, p. 1.
- 128A. The Western Canadian, March 24, 1898, p. 1.
129. Bank of Montreal, Annual General Meeting, June 6, 1898, n. p.; Bank of Ottawa, Annual Report 1900, n. p.; The Canadian Bank of Commerce, Charter and Annual Reports, 1867-1907, Vol. II, pp. 418, 438, 464.
130. D. A. MacGibbon, op. cit., pp. 45-46.

131. The Western Canadian, March 24, 1898, p. 1.
132. Paul F. Sharp, op. cit., pp. 22-26.
133. The Western Canadian, June 3, 1897, p. 1; December 2, 1897, p. 1.
134. The Western Canadian, November 25, 1897, p. 5.
135. The Western Canadian, December 9, 1897, p. 1.
136. The Western Canadian, January 19, 1899, p. 1.
137. The Western Canadian, March 11, 1899, p. 1.
138. Ibid.
139. The Western Canadian, May 27, 1899, pp. 1 and 2; June 10, 1899, p. 1; June 17, 1899, p. 1.
140. Canadian Parliamentary Guide, 1901.

## CHAPTER VIII

### CONCLUSION

Agrarian protest, arising from the conditions of the agricultural frontier, was born in Manitoba during the early 1880's. Between 1883, when the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union was organized, and 1900, when the Independent Industrial Association disappeared, agrarianism in the first prairie province found expression in a series of short-lived organizations. No protest movement was successful in achieving the ends for which it was formed; all collapsed as a consequence of weaknesses in organization and in economic and social structure. The farmers of the province who placed their faith in each organization in turn were disillusioned, but continuing economic hardship led them to found new protest vehicles to replace those which had failed them. The ongoing experimentation served to educate the rural residents of Manitoba with regard to the problems which they collectively faced and to provide them with a wide spectrum of possible solutions to their difficulties. Agrarian leaders gained valuable experience in organizing the farmers and in managing co-operative enterprises. Most important, agrarianism in Manitoba developed an identity of its own.

Nineteenth century agrarian protest movements in Manitoba were unstable coalitions of individuals and of political and economic interest groups which were drawn together for a variety of reasons and which were ineapable of furthering agrarian class consciousness. The only common denominator among

the discontented individuals and interest groups who belonged to Manitoba agrarian organizations was a desire for political, social or economic change that the members believed would serve their disparate interests.

Whatever unity nineteenth century agrarian movements enjoyed rested on a common cultural heritage. The vast majority of members in all agrarian organizations were immigrants from Central Canada or from the United Kingdom. British-Canadian in origin and Protestant in religion, they represented the dominant ethnic and religious group in the province after 1880. French-speaking Manitobans and immigrant groups such as the Mennonites, Icelanders and Ukrainians were barred by their language and culture from joining the movement. But the unity given the agrarian agitation by the common cultural background of the members was insufficient to offset the occupational and economic differences among the members.

Because Manitoba agrarian protest was divided in structure, fundamental agreement could be achieved only on those issues which most Manitobans saw as inimical to the development of the province: railway freight rates and the tariff. With their members unable to reach a degree of unanimity except on the most basic of issues, nineteenth century agrarian protest movements were incapable of developing into class conscious agitations.

Agrarianism in Manitoba was conservative. It was conservative because at no time did the farmers of the province conceive of themselves as constituting a distinct economic or social class that needed to resist oppression. Rather the farmers saw themselves as individuals who co-operated in securing

redress of common grievances. Each farmer who supported agrarian organizations did so for his own reasons. Few farmers agreed with the whole programme of any farmers' movement; instead they gave approval to selected sections which applied to their own circumstances. Once it became apparent to the individual farmer that an organization was unlikely to fulfill the objectives which had attracted him to its programme, or if the organization emphasized unsatisfactory solutions to agrarian problems, he left the movement as readily as he had joined it.

Almost all the farmers in the province felt the need to lower overhead costs and to increase prices for agricultural produce in order to increase their margin of profit. It was generally agreed that the best policies to pursue to achieve these goals were to obtain the reduction of tariffs and the regulation of freight rates, and to initiate farmers' co-operation in the marketplace. The major agrarian movements attempted to apply political pressure on governments with the hope of influencing them to alter policies detrimental to agrarian interests, and at the same time to operate farmers' co-operative companies. Unhappily for the farmers, co-operative action and political action were incompatible within a single organization.

Weaknesses in organization are the key in this period to the failure of farmers' co-operation in the marketplace. Both the Protective Union and the Patrons of Industry attempted to purchase farm supplies and to market agricultural products although they lacked in capital resources. As benevolent societies, their only source of funds was membership fees, the monies from

which were just sufficient to meet ordinary expenses. Lack of success of these two organizations in their ambitious programmes of farmers' co-operative action was directly attributable to the inability of both groups to obtain capital. Where the farmers did succeed in creating viable farmers' co-operative companies--local farmers' elevators and co-operative fire insurance companies--these enterprises were organized on a joint-stock basis to make it possible to raise the necessary capital.

Political action proved to be detrimental to nineteenth century agrarian movements in Manitoba. In the 1880's, local grievances, reflecting the uneven development of the Manitoba agricultural frontier, were of greater importance than the common grievances shared by the province's farmers. Although agrarian organizations adopted wide-ranging programmes criticizing Dominion railway, land and tariff policies, action at the provincial level was too often in conflict with local interests. During the 1890's, the Patrons of Industry entered politics as a third party and adopted such social and political reforms as women's suffrage, prohibition, and abolition of the Senate. In 1899, the Patrons' successor, the Independent Industrial Association demanded the implementation of direct democracy and the nationalization of railways and public utilities. Because of the political platforms, designed to build a reform coalition of voters which it was hoped would be electorally successful, many of the farmers of the province were alienated from the agrarian movement. By 1897, the failure of both the political agitation and the co-operative programs conducted by the Patrons

had reduced the movement to a corporal's guard which was largely divorced from the agrarian community of which it claimed to be representative.

The political rhetoric of the Patrons of Industry and the Independent Industrial Association was not an expression of agrarian ideology. The farmers were never interested in building a utopian society, although a few of their leaders may have desired the coming of the millenium. Political and social reforms cloaked a basic desire on the part of the farmers for improved profits from agriculture. Each farmer continued to march to his own drummer, willing to co-operate in securing redress of common grievances, but unwilling, because of his individualism, to alter the existing political and economic structures of Canadian society.

The conservatism of Manitoba agrarian protest was rooted in the economic and social structure of farmers' organizations. Membership in nineteenth century agrarian movements was not limited to farmers. Both the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union attracted large numbers of lawyers, real estate speculators, merchants and newspaper editors to their ranks. Since the non-farmers did not share the same goals for the agitation as did the farmers, their presence was destructive to both movements. At first, the Patrons of Industry learned from the earlier experience and excluded non-farmers from membership. But the Patrons involvement in politics after 1894 made it necessary to admit non-farmers. By the end of the century, non-farmers were again playing a major role in the agrarian movement, and their

presence was an important factor in the adoption of social and political reform programmes and in the consequent growing alienation of the rural population from the agrarian agitation.

In economic structure, no agrarian organization had unity. Those farmers who had so heavily mortgaged their property that they were on the verge of foreclosure held different expectations of the farmers' movement from those held by farmers who had mortgaged their holdings but could still meet the interest charges. Similarly, those individuals who were debt-free did not conceive of the agrarian agitation in the same light as those who were mortgaged. Moreover, the interests of farmers with large landholdings were not those of farmers with small holdings. Although all farmers--debted and non-debted, with large or small landholdings--were, in times of economic crisis, drawn together by the fear of economic ruin, this unnatural alliance disintegrated as economic conditions improved.

In failure, however, nineteenth century agrarian protest movements in Manitoba planted the seeds of future success on the part of farmers' movements after 1900. The programme of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, founded in 1902, contained little that nineteenth century farmers' movements had not desired. In its first years, the Grain Growers' Association was reluctant to advocate many of the more radical policies demanded by the Patrons of Industry and the Independent Industrial Association, possibly because of the fear that by advocating radical reforms, the Association would lose the support of the farmers of the province. Between 1902 and 1904, the Grain Growers' restricted their concern to the problems surrounding

the determination of grain standards and the distribution of railway cars to country points.<sup>1</sup> Gradually, the movement expanded its programme. In 1904, the Association demanded government ownership of all railways, the immediate construction of the Hudson's Bay Railway, and a general reduction in railway freight rates.<sup>2</sup> By 1908, the Grain Growers were demanding provincial ownership of elevators within the province,<sup>3</sup> and by 1909, reports were being presented to the annual convention on the "Beef Trust" and the "Coal Combine".<sup>4</sup> Two years later, the farmers demanded free trade, women's suffrage, prohibition and direct legislation.<sup>5</sup> In 1914, President R. C. Henders of the Grain Growers' Association attacked the evils of "partyism" and emphasized the dignity of labour, while F. J. Dixon addressed the meeting on the value of co-operation between farmers and organized labour.<sup>6</sup> At the next annual convention, Salem Bland, the foremost exponent of the Social Gospel in Canada, reminded the delegates of their Christian duty to seek social reforms.<sup>7</sup>

At no time throughout the course of the agitation did the Association open its membership to non-farmers. In 1912, the organization amended its constitution to prevent any individuals who were not "bona fide" farmers--defined as men who derived their "principal sustenance" from their farms--from being chosen as officers of the Association.<sup>8</sup> Other organizations were welcome to associate themselves with the Grain Growers, including organizations such as the Winnipeg Progressive Association formed to support farmers' political action in 1922, but non-farmers could not belong to the Grain Growers' Association itself. The example provided by nineteenth century farmers' organizations when they

allowed non-farmers to influence deliberations was not easily forgotten.

The experience of nineteenth century agrarian protest was also evident in the attempts of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association to achieve co-operation in the marketplace. Where attempts to market farmers' grain in the 1880's and 1890's foundered when the lack of capital made it impossible to compete with private grain dealers, E. A. Partridge, a former Patrons' organizer from the North West Territories, proposed a solution to the difficulty: a joint-stock company owned by farmers. This solution, implemented when the Grain Growers' Grain Company was founded in 1906, separated the finances of the Grain Growers' Association and the co-operative marketing agency.

Partridge was not the only important agrarian leader in the twentieth century who had belonged to an earlier farmers' organization. J. W. Scallion, the first President of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association and the man who established the organization in the province; D. W. McCuaig, the Association's President from 1904 to 1910; Rev. Robert L. Brown of Pilot Mound, elected as a Progressive Member of Parliament in 1921; and Robert Forke, the national leader of the Progressive Party after 1921, were among the prominent leaders of the Grain Growers' who had been associated with nineteenth century agrarian protest movements. The continuity in leadership between nineteenth and twentieth century agrarian organizations was important for it provided experienced men who had learned from past failures, but who were still willing to take upon themselves the burden of furthering the farmers' cause.

The most important contribution of nineteenth century agrarian protest, however, was that it demonstrated that farm organizations were worthwhile in seeking redress of agrarian grievances. Despite the failures in the 1880's and 1890's, Manitoba farmers learned that agrarian co-operation could lead to the building of local elevators, the successful operation of farmers' stores, and the creation of farmers' mutual insurance companies. Even where the Farmers' Union, the Protective Union failed--in political action and in the marketing of farmers' grain--there were lessons to be learned. Farmers could, if they acted in unison, defeat Liberal and Conservative candidates in the rural constituencies of the province with a candidate of their own choosing; and farmers' grain marketing was feasible provided there was enough capital available to start the enterprise. Finally, nineteenth century agrarian organizations educated the farmers to identify grievances and to find solutions to their problems. By the time the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association was founded, all the farmers needed was a vehicle to implement solutions. In the Grain Growers' Association they found that vehicle.

FOOTNOTES

1. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Manitoba Grain Growers' Association Minutes of Meetings, 1903-1906.
2. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Proceedings and Resolutions of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association. Held at Brandon, Manitoba, February 3 and 4, 1904, p. 14.
3. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Proceedings and Resolutions of the Sixth Annual Convention of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Ass'n. Held at Brandon, Manitoba January 15th, 16th, and 17th, 1908, pp. 18-19 and pp. 23-32.
4. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Annual Convention of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, Brandon, Manitoba, December 15, 16, 17, 1909, Report of Proceedings, pp. 18-19.
5. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Eighth Annual Convention of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, Brandon, Manitoba, January 24, 25, 26, 1911, Report of Proceedings, pp. 6, 17, 26.
6. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, Minutes of the Eleventh Annual Convention, Report of Proceedings held at City Hall, Brandon, Man., January 7, 8 and 9, 1914, pp. 13-14.
7. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, Minutes of the Twelfth Annual Convention, Report of Proceedings held at City Hall, Brandon, Man., January 13-14-15, 1915, pp. 30-31.
8. P.A.M., United Farmers of Manitoba Collection, Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, Minutes of the Ninth Annual Convention, Report of Proceedings held at City Hall, Brandon, Man., January 24, 25, 26, 1912, p. 12.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

1. Manuscript Sources

Public Archives of Canada

Alexander Mackenzie Papers  
Sir Charles Tupper Papers  
Sir Clifford Sifton Papers  
Sir John A. Macdonald Papers  
Sir John Thompson Papers  
Sir Mackenzie Bowell Papers  
Sir Wilfrid Laurier Papers

Public Archives of Manitoba

Acton Burrows Collection  
Alexander Morris Collection  
Biographical Scrapbooks  
Donald Gunn Collection  
George H. Gunn Collection  
Hansard Scrapbooks  
James Wickes Taylor Collection (microfilm)  
J. C. Patterson Collection  
John James Moncrieff Collection  
John S. Ewart Collection  
Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union Collection  
Settlement and Pioneers Collection  
Sir J. C. Aikins Collection  
Sir John Christian Schultz Collection  
Thomas Greenway Collection  
The United Farmers of Manitoba Collection  
Winnipeg Board of Trade Collection

Public Archives of British Columbia

Nellie McClung Papers

Public Archives of Ontario

Alexander Morris Papers  
Edward Blake Papers  
Sir Alexander Campbell Papers  
Sir Richard Cartwright Papers  
W. B. Scarth Papers

Public Archives of Saskatchewan

"Farmers' Organizations of the North-West",  
mss. by A. T. Hunter

University of Manitoba Library

John W. Dafoe Papers

2. Land Records

Morden Land Titles Office

Abstract Books

Neepawa Land Titles Office

Abstract Books

Boissevain Land Titles Office

Abstract Books

Portage la Prairie Land Titles Office

Abstract Books

Brandon Land Titles Office

Abstract Books

Manitoba Lands Branch

Township Registers

3. Printed Sources

a) Newspapers

Birtle Observer  
Birtle Eye-Witness  
Brandon Mail  
Brandon Sun  
Carberry News  
Carman Weekly Standard  
Emerson International  
Gladstone Age Press  
Manitoba Free Press  
Manitoba Liberal  
Manitoba News  
Manitou Mercury  
Minnedosa Tribune  
The Monetary Times  
Morden Chronicle  
Morden Herald  
Morden Monitor  
Neepawa Canadian  
Neepawa Register  
Patrons' Advocate  
Patrons' Sentinel  
Pilot Mound Sentinel

Portage la Prairie Weekly Review  
Rapid City Standard and North West Advocate  
Regina Standard  
Russell Chronicle and Free Trade Advocate  
Selkirk Herald  
Stonewall News  
The Western Canadian  
Virden Advance  
Weekly Tribune and Marquette Review  
Winnipeg Tribune

b) Magazines

The Commercial  
The Grain Growers' Guide  
Manitoba Colonist  
The Nor'-West Farmer and Manitoba Miller

c) Annual Reports

Bank of Montreal  
Bank of Ottawa  
Canadian Bank of Commerce  
Federal Bank of Canada  
Imperial Bank of Canada  
Merchants' Bank of Canada  
Union Bank of Canada  
United Grain Growers Limited

d) Government Documents

i) Canada

Census of Canada, 1880-1881  
Census of Manitoba, 1885-1886  
Census of Canada, 1890-1891  
Census of Canada, 1901  
Debates of the House of Commons  
Debates of the Senate  
Journals of the House of Commons  
Statistical Year-Books  
Statutes  
Report of the Royal Commission on  
Dominion Provincial Relations, 3 vols.,  
1937.  
Report of the Commission to Enquire  
into Trading in Grain Futures, 1931.  
Report of the Royal Grain Inquiry  
Commission, 1938.  
Sessional Papers

ii) Manitoba

Crop Bulletins  
Journals of the Legislative Assembly

Sessional Papers  
Statutes  
The Manitoba Gazette

e) Pamphlets

Anonymous. Brandon, Manitoba and Her Industries.  
Winnipeg: Steen and Boyce, 1882.

Anonymous. Chronicles by the Way. A Series  
of Letters Addressed to the Montreal "Gazette",  
Descriptive of a Trip Through Manitoba and  
the North-West. Montreal: The Gazette, 1879.

Anonymous. Letters on the Anomalous Position  
of Manitoba as a Province of the Dominion.  
n. p. 1881.

Anonymous. Manitoba: The Prairie Province,  
the Finest Agricultural Country in the World.  
Winnipeg: Department of Agriculture and  
Immigration, 1890.

/Armstrong, L. O.7. Southern Manitoba and  
Turtle Mountain Country. n.p. 1880.

/Begg, Alexander7. Letters on the Situation  
in the North-West by Julius as they Appeared  
in the Montreal Gazette. n. p. 1881.

Begg, Alexander, Practical Hand-Book and Guide  
to Manitoba and the North-West. Toronto:  
Belford Brothers, 1877.

Barnes, H. H. Journal of a Trip to Manitoba  
and Back. Halifax: J. W. Daly, 1879.

Burrows, Acton. North-Western Canada. A  
Practical Guide to the Fertile Regions of  
Manitoba and the North West Territories.  
Winnipeg: H. S. Donaldson & Brother, 1880.

Cade, Frank Austin. The British North-West,  
Pen and Sun Sketches of the Canadian Wheat  
Lands. St. Paul: The Pioneer Publishing  
Company, 1882.

Chipman, G. F., ed. The Siege of Ottawa.  
Winnipeg: The Grain Growers' Guide, 1910.

Cliffe, Charles. Manitoba and the Canadian  
Northwest as a Field for Settlement. Brandon:  
The Mail Steam Book and Job Printing Establishment,  
1884.

/Currie, David/. The Letters of Rusticus.  
Montreal: John Dougall & Son, 1880.

Dawson, Rev. Aeneas McDonell. The North-West Territories and British Columbia. Ottawa: C. W. Mitchell, 1881.

Dominion of Canada. Manitoba and the North-West, The Great Wheat Fields and Stock-Raising Districts of Canada. Montreal: 1879.

Elliot, George B. Winnipeg: As It is in 1874 and as It was in 1869. Winnipeg: Daily Free Press, 1874.

Fraser, George B. Morris, Manitoba. Growth and Progress with Personal Sketches. Morris: The Morris Herald, 1882.

/Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba and the North West Territories/. Grand Constitution of the Patrons of Industry, Manitoba and N.W.T. Revised at the Annual Convention of January, 1894. Brandon: Times Job Printing House, 1894.

/Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry of Manitoba and the North West Territories/. The Political Position of the Patrons. Rapid City: Patrons Co-operative Printing & Publishing Company, 1894.

/Grand Association of the Patrons of Industry of The North West Territories/. Minutes of the First Annual Convention held in Oddfellows Hall, Regina, January 12th, 13th, 14th, 1897. Regina: The Standard Print, 1897.

/Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union/. The Manitoba and Northwest Farmers' Union. Resolutions Adopted at the Farmers' Convention Held in the City of Winnipeg 19th and 20th of December, 1883. Instructions as to the Formation of Branch Unions, etc. Brandon: The Sun Printing & Publishing Co., 1884.

/Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union/. Constitution of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union Passed June 5th, 1884. Winnipeg: Manitoba Daily Free Press Print, 1884.

Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union. Statement of the Claims of the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories to the Constitutional Rights of a Province under the British North American Act. Winnipeg: 1885.

Mavor, James, Report to the Board of Trade on the North West of Canada with Special Reference to Wheat Production for Export. London: Printed for His Majesty's Stationary Office, 1905.

Moore, Thomas. A Tour Through Canada, in 1879: To Which is Appended a Report on Manitoba, Specially Compiled from the Reports of the Farmers' Delegates from Great Britain. Dublin: The Irish Farmer Office, 1880.

Palmer, W. J. ed. Dennis County, Manitoba. Winnipeg: Manitoba Free Press, 1887.

Spence, Thomas. Canada: The Resources and Future Greatness of Her Great North-West Prairie Lands. Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1886.

Spence, Thomas. Manitoba and the North-West of the Dominion, Its Resources and Advantages to the Emigrant and Capitalist, As Compared with the Western States of America. Quebec: S. Marcotte, 1876.

Spence, Thomas. Useful and Practical Hints for the settler on the Canadian Prairie Lands. n. p., 1882.

Tanner, Henry. Canada, Manitoba and the Northwest. Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1887.

Tanner, Henry. Successful Emigration to Canada. Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1885.

Trow, James. Manitoba and North-West Territories: Letters Together with Information Relative to Acquiring Dominion Lands, Cost of Outfit, &c. Ottawa: Department of Agriculture, 1878.

Tuttle, Charles R. A History of the Corporation of Winnipeg Giving an Account of the Recent Crisis. Winnipeg: 1883.

Tuttle, Charles R. Open Letter on the Agitation in Manitoba from Chas. R. Tuttle, Esq., to Joseph Mulholland, Esq., of Winnipeg. n. p., 1884.

Webster, W. A. A Canadian Farmer's Report. Minnesota and Dakota Compared with Manitoba and the Canadian North-West. The Facts as Personally seen by a Canadian Farmer. Ottawa: The Citizen Printing & Publishing Company, 1888.

f) Printed Documents

Canadian Annual Review

Canadian Parliamentary Guide

Dominion Annual Register and Review

Henderson's Directory of Manitoba and the North West

Morton, W. L., ed. Alexander Begg's Red River Journal and Other Papers Relative to the Red River Resistance of 1869-1870. New York: Greenwood Press, 1969.

Pope, Sir Joseph. Correspondence of Sir John A. Macdonald. Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1921.

g) Books

Begg, Alexander. History of the North-West. 3 Vols. Toronto: Hunter, Rose & Company, 1895.

Begg, Alexander, and Nursey, W. R. Ten Years in Winnipeg: A Narrative of the Principal Events in the History of the City of Winnipeg from the Year A.D., 1870, to the Year A.D., 1879, inclusive. Winnipeg: Times Printing and Publishing House, 1879.

Bryce, George. Manitoba: Its Infancy, Growth and Present Condition. London: S. Law, Marston, Searle & Livingston, 1882.

Bryce, George. A History of Manitoba: Its Resources & People. Toronto & Montreal: The Canadian History Company, 1906.

Fitzgibbon, Mary Agnes. A Trip to Manitoba: or, Roughing It on the Line. Toronto: Rose-Belford Publishing Co., 1880.

Goodridge, Captain Edmund. A Year in Manitoba. London: W. & R. Chamber, 1882.

Gordon, Rev. Daniel M. Mountain and Prairie: A Journey from Victoria to Winnipeg via Peace River Pass. Montreal: Dawson Brothers, 1880.

Grange, Herbert. An English Farmer in Canada and a Visit to the States: Being Notes and Observations by a Practical Farmer and Commercial Man on Canada as a Field for British Capital and Labour. London: Blackie & Son, 1904.

Gunn, Donald, and Tuttle, C. B. History of Manitoba from the Earliest Settlement to the Admission of the Province into the Dominion. Ottawa: Maclean, Roger & Co., 1880.

Hall, Mrs. Cecil. A Lady's Life on a Farm in Manitoba. London: W. H. Allen & Co., 1884.

Hamilton, J. C. The Prairie Province. Toronto: Belford Brothers, 1876.

Hill, Robert B. Manitoba: History of Its Early Settlement, Development and Resources. Toronto: William Briggs, 1890.

Hind, Henry Youle. Narrative of the Canadian Red River Exploring Expedition of 1857 and of the Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition of 1858. Edmonton: M. G. Hurtig Ltd., 1971.

Holmes, Edward. Letters from a Young Emigrant to Manitoba. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench & Co., 1883.

Huyshe, Captain G. L. The Red River Expedition. London: Macmillan and Company, 1871.

Legge, Alfred O. Sunny Manitoba: Its People and Industries. London: T. Fisher Unwin, 1893.

Macoun, John. Manitoba and the Great North West. Guelph: The World Publishing Company, 1882.

Morgan, Henry James, ed. The Canadian Men and Women of the Time: A Handbook of Canadian Biography. Toronto: William Briggs, 1898.

O'Donnell, John. Manitoba As I Saw It: From 1869 to Date. Toronto: The Musson Book Company Ltd.,

Ontario Agricultural Commission. Report of the Commissioners. Toronto: C. Blackett Robinson, 1881.

Osborn, E. A. Greater Canada: The Past, Present and Future of the Canadian North-West. London: Chatto and Windus, 1900.

Pennefather, Dr. John P. Thirteen Years on the Prairies. London: Kegan, Paul, Trench, Trubner & Co., 1892.

Pocock, Sidney J. Across the Prairie Lands of Manitoba and the Canadian North-West: A Wiltshire Man's Travels in the Summer of 1882. London: J. Tamblin, 1889.

Robertson, John Palmerston. A Political Manual of the Province of Manitoba and the North-West Territories. Winnipeg: Call Printing Co., 1887.

Ross, Alexander. The Red River Settlement: Its Rise, Progress and Present State. Minneapolis: Ross and Haines, 1957.

Sutherland, Rev. A. A Summer in Prairie-Land: Notes of a Tour through the North-West Territory. Toronto: Methodist Book & Publishing House, 1881.

## SECONDARY SOURCES

### 1. Unpublished Works

Jackson, James A. "The Disallowance of Manitoba Railway Legislation in the 1880's." M. A. thesis, University of Manitoba, 1945.

Orlikow, Lionel. "A Survey of the Reform Movement in Manitoba." M. A. thesis, University of Manitoba, 1955.

Panting, Gerald E. A Study of the United Farmers of Manitoba to 1928. M. A. thesis, University of Manitoba, 1954.

### 2. Books

75th Anniversary Section. A History of Minnedosa and Surrounding Districts. Minnedosa: 1958.

Berton, Pierre. The Last Spike. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971.

Beulah Women's Institute. Minnewashta Memories, 1879-1970. Beulah: 1970.

Bogue, Allan G. Money At Interest: The Farm Mortgage on the Middle Border. New York: Russell & Russell, 1968.

Boon, T. C. B. The Anglican Church from the Bay to the Rockies. Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1962.

Bradley, A. G. Canada in the Twentieth Century. London: Archibald Constable & Co. Ltd., 1905.

Buller, A. H. Reginald. Essays on Wheat. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919.

Carberry Agricultural Society. The Carberry Plains: 75 Years of Progress. Carberry: 1959.

Carman Centennial Book Committee. Up To Now A Story of Dufferin and Carman. Altona: D. W. Friesen & Sons Ltd., 1967.

Cleverdon, Catherine L. The Woman Suffrage Movement in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1950.

Clingan, Ida. The Virden Story. Virden: Empire Publishing Company, 1957.

Collier, Anne M. A Rear View Mirror: A History of the Austin and Surrounding Districts. Altona: D. W. Friesen & Sons Ltd., 1967.

Colquette, R. D. The First Fifty Years: A History of United Grain Growers Limited. Winnipeg: The Public Press, 1957.

Connor, A. J. The Climate of Manitoba. Winnipeg: Manitoba Economic Survey Board, 1939.

Dand Women's Institute. Golden Memories: A History of the Dand Community. Dand: 1967

Dawson, C. A. Group Settlement: Ethnic Communities in Western Canada. Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1936.

Denison, Merrill. Harvest Triumphant: The Story of Massey-Harris. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1948.

Destler, Charles McArthur. American Radicalism, 1865-1901: Essays and Documents. New London: Connecticut College, 1948.

Ellis, J. H. The Soils of Manitoba. Winnipeg: Manitoba Economic Survey Board, 1938.

Fahrni, Margaret Morton, and Morton, W. L. Third Crossing: A History of the First Quarter

Century of the Town and District of Gladstone in the Province of Manitoba, Winnipeg: Advocate Printers Limited, 1946.

Faulkner, Harold U. Politics, Reform and Expansion, 1890-1900. New York: Harper & Bros., 1959.

Fite, Gilbert C. The Farmers' Frontier, 1865-1900. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1966.

Fleming, H. Canada's Arctic Outlet. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1957.

Fowke, Vernon C. Canadian Agricultural Policy: The Historical Pattern. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946.

Fowke, Vernon C. The National Policy and the Wheat Economy. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1957.

Francis, E. K. In Search of Utopia: The Mennonites in Manitoba. Altona: D. W. Friesen & Sons Ltd., 1955.

Garland, Aileen. Trails and Crossroads to Killarney. Killarney: The Killarney and District Historical Committee, 1967.

Glazebrook, G. P. de T. A History of Transportation in Canada. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1964.

Gosnell, Mrs. Clifford, ed. Echoes of the Past: A History of the Rural Municipality of Louise and Its People. Crystal City: Rural Municipality of Louise, 1968.

Gray, James H. Booze: The Impact of Whiskey on the West. Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1972.

Ham, George H. Reminiscences of a Raconteur. Toronto: The Musson Book Company Limited, 1921.

Hambley, Rev. Geo. H. Trails of the Pioneers. Altona: D. W. Friesen & Sons Ltd., 1956.

Hedges, James B. Building the Canadian West: The Land and Colonization Policies of the Canadian Pacific Railway. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1939.

Hicks, John D. The Populist Revolt: A History of the Farmers' Alliance and the People's Party. University of Nebraska Press, 1961.

History Committee. The Hills of Home: A History of the Municipality of Thompson. Miami: 1967.

Innis, H. A. A History of the Canadian Pacific Railway. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1923.

Jackson, James A. The Centennial History of Manitoba. Winnipeg: Manitoba Historical Society in Association with McClelland and Stewart, 1970.

Jamieson, A. B. Chartered Banking in Canada. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1953.

Jones, Robert Leslie. History of Agriculture in Ontario, 1613-1880. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1946.

Kernighan, Thomas. Dufferin and Carman, Manitoba Vancouver: 1923.

Lamb, Jack, et al. Newdale, 1870-1970. Newdale Historical Society, 1970.

Lipset, Seymour. Agrarian Socialism: The Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in Saskatchewan. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1959.

Macdonald, Norman. Canada: Immigration and Colonization, 1841-1903. Aberdeen: Aberdeen University Press, 1966.

MacGibbon, Duncan Alexander. The Canadian Grain Trade. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1932.

MacGibbon, Duncan Alexander. Railway Rates and the Canadian Railway Commission. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1917.

Machray, Robert. Life of Robert Machray. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1909.

MacPherson, C. B. Democracy in Alberta: Social Credit and the Party System. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962.

Manitoba Library Association. Pioneers and Early Citizens of Manitoba. A Dictionary of Manitoba Biography from the earliest times to 1920. Winnipeg: Peguis Publishers, 1971.

Maxwell, J. A. Federal Subsidies to the Provincial Governments of Canada. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937.

McClung, Nellie. Clearing in the West. Toronto: Thomas Allen Limited, 1964.

McKenzie, A. F. The Lansdowne Story. Arden: Lansdowne Centennial Committee, 1967.

McWilliams, Margaret. Manitoba Milestones. Toronto: J. M. Dent & Sons Ltd., 1928.

Medora Women's Institute History Committee. Glimpse Through the Years. Brandon: 1970.

Metcalfe, J. H. The Tread of the Pioneers. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1932.

Miniota Women's Institute. Bridging the Years. 1879-1967. Miniota: 1967.

Moir, E. Chronicles of Our Heritage. Steinbach: Derksen Printers, 1969.

Moore, A. J. The Deeper Roots of Oakville. Portage la Prairie: The Vopni Press, 1963.

Moorhouse, Hopkins. Deep Furrows. Toronto: George J. McLeod, 1918.

Morton, A. S. History of Prairie Settlement. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1939.

Morton, W. L. Manitoba A History. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961.

Morton, W. L. The Progressive Party in Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967.

Nesbitt, Leonard D. Tides in the West. Saskatoon: Modern Press, n.d.

Parkinson, Hazel McDonald. The Mere Living. Altona: D. W. Friesen & Sons Ltd., 1957.

Patton, Harald S. Grain Growers' Co-operation in Western Canada. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Porritt, Edward. Sixty Years of Protection in Canada 1846-1907. London: Macmillan & Co., Limited, 1908.

Quickfall, R. A. ed. Rockwood Echoes: A History of the Men and Women Who Pioneered the Rockwood Municipality. Steinbach: Derksen Printers, 1960.

Rathwell Historical Committee. Twixt Hill and Vale: A Story of Rathwell and Surrounding District. Rathwell: The Rathwell Historical Committee, 1970.

Robinson, Elwyn B. History of North Dakota. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1966.

Rome, J. B. ed. Oakland Echoes. Oakland: J. B. Rome, 1970.

Ross, Hugh R. Thirty Five Years in the Limelight Sir Rodmond P. Roblin and His Times. Winnipeg: Farmers Advocate, 1936.

Schofield, F. H. The Story of Manitoba. 3 Vols. Winnipeg, 1913.

Sharp, Paul F. The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada: A Survey Showing American Parallels. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948.

Spence, R. E. Prohibition in Canada. Toronto: Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, 1919.

Stanley, G. F. G. Louis Riel. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1964.

Stanley, G. F. G. The Birth of Western Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1963.

Stewart, Mrs. D. A. The Story of High Bluff Church. High Bluff: 1971.

Street, A. G. Farmers' Glory. London: Faber & Faber Limited, 1936.

Stuart, J. A. D. The Prairie W.A.S.P.: A History of the Rural Municipality of Oakland, Manitoba. Winnipeg: The Prairie Publishing Company, 1969.

Swanson, W. W. and Armstrong, P. C. Wheat. Winnipeg: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1936.

Thompson, Norman and Edgar, J. H. Canadian Railway Development. Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada Limited, 1933.

Vipond, Mrs. Dorothy. Proudly We Speak: A History of the Rural Municipality of Woodnorth. Kenton: Woodnorth Centennial Committee, 1967.

Waite, Peter B. Canada 1874-1896: Arduous Destiny. Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1971.

Warkentin, John, and Ruggles, Richard I. Manitoba Historical Atlas. Winnipeg: The Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, 1970.

Wilgus, William J. The Railway Interrelations of the United States and Canada. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1937.

Women's Institute of Hamiota. A History of Hamiota Village and Municipality, 1879-1956. Hamiota: 1956.

Wood, Louis Aubrey. A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada. Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1924.

Wright, Norman E. In View of Turtle Mountain. Deloraine: Deloraine Times, 1951.

### 3. Articles

Careless, J. M. S. "The Development of the Winnipeg Business Community". Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, Series IV, Vol. VIII, 1970.

Cherwinski, W. J. C. "Honore Joseph Jackson, Agitator, Disturber, producer of plans to make men think, and Chronic Objector". Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XLVI, No. 2, June, 1965.

Glazer, Sidney. "Patrons of Industry in Michigan". Mississippi Valley Historical Review. Vol. XXIX, No. 2, 1937.

Lipset, Seymour Martin. "The Rural Community and Political Leadership in Saskatchewan". The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science. Vol. XIII, No. 3, August, 1947.

MacFarlane, R. O. "Manitoba Politics and Parties after Confederation". Canadian Historical Association Annual Report, 1940.

Michell, H. "The Grange in Canada". Bulletin of the Departments of History and Political and Economic Science in Queen's University. No. 13, October, 1914.

Morton, W. L. "Agriculture in Red River Colony". Canadian Historical Review. Vol. XXX, No. 4, December, 1949.

Morton, W. L. "Direct Legislation and the Origins of the Progressive Movement". Canadian Historical Review, Vol. XXV, No. 1, September, 1944.

Shortt, Adam. "Some Observations on the Great North-West". Queen's Quarterly. Vol. II, No. 3, January, 1895.

Shortt, Adam. "Some Observations on the Great North-West". Queen's Quarterly. Vol. III, No. 1, July, 1895.

Warner, Donald F. "The Farmers' Alliance and the Farmers' Union: An American-Canadian Parallelism". Agricultural History. Vol. XXIII, No. 1, January, 1949.

## APPENDIX A

### A NOTE ON METHOD AND SOURCES

The availability of sources has in large measure governed the method employed in determining the economic and social structure of political agrarianism in Manitoba. Too many collections of documents that would have been invaluable to the historian in attempting to analyse the structure of agrarian protest in Manitoba between 1870 and 1900, remain inaccessible, or have been lost or destroyed. Those collections which are available are less satisfactory than those to which access is denied or which have disappeared.

The most important lost sources have been the official records kept by nineteenth century agrarian organizations. Some pamphlets survive, but minutes, membership lists, and financial records have all disappeared. Reliance must be placed on newspaper reports. Extensive coverage was given to farmers' movements in the 1880's, but in the 1890's, newspapers expressed less interest. Two factors account for the decline in interest in agrarian protest by the province's newspapers. In the 1880's, the Liberal press in Manitoba actively promoted the farmers' agitation because it was helpful to the provincial Liberal party, but in the 1890's, both Conservative and Liberal newspapers were, on the whole, hostile to the farmers' cause, again for political reasons. The Patrons of Industry in the 1890's also discouraged the press from attending their meetings which were usually held in secret. Both the Farmers' Union and the Protective Union in the 1880's welcomed reporters.

Lacking official records, newspapers were used to discover the names of delegates to farmers' provincial conventions. Lists of delegates were printed in the newspapers for every provincial convention of the Patrons of Industry except the provincial convention of 1893, and for every convention and annual meeting of the Protective Union except for the founding convention at Manitou in 1883 and the first annual meeting in 1884. But a delegates' list was published for only one Farmers' Union convention, that of March, 1884, and no list was published for any convention of the Independent Industrial Association. Using newspaper reports, attempts were made, with some success, to reconstruct the delegates' lists to those conventions and annual meetings for which lists were not published. Since the names of speakers were not published in newspaper reports of Independent Industrial Association conventions, and since no newspaper even reported the 1893 Patrons' convention, it was impossible to reconstruct the delegates' lists for those assemblies.

The identification of delegates from the lists posed some problems. From 1877 to 1900, directories of the province's inhabitants were published, usually on an annual basis. The directories provide the occupation and the address of all delegates, and for farmer-delegates, they also gave the section, range and township of the land on which their farmstead was located. Although generally accurate, mistakes occur in establishing the location of farmer-delegates: numbers of township and range are transposed; the digit six becomes zero; and in the Emerson district, the individuals responsible for preparing the directories appear to have misunderstood the survey pattern completely. Spelling errors in

names are common, and a few delegates simply are not listed.

Most difficulties encountered in using the directories were resolved by comparing directories for several different years, and by consulting local histories. Eventually the vast majority of delegates to Farmers' Union and Protective Union conventions were identified, but Patrons' delegates proved harder to identify. As the Patrons gave the name of their local lodge--normally named after the local school district--as their address, and as the directories gave the postal address for persons listed, many Patrons could not be definitely located, especially as duplications of names in the directories was common by the 1890's.

Once the delegates had been identified, difficulties arose in determining the social structure of nineteenth century farmers' organizations. The occupations of delegates were established through the provincial directories, but information regarding marital status, birthplace, religion, date of arrival, and last place of residence before immigrating to Manitoba, proved more difficult to find. Because individual census returns after 1871 remain closed to historians, reliance was placed on local histories and newspapers. In some districts, it was necessary to examine tombstones in local cemeteries. Armed with the death date of delegates so located, obituaries in local newspapers could be found. For a few delegates, biographical dictionaries, and the biographical scrapbooks, in the Legislative Library of Manitoba supplied the required information.

Statistical information regarding the economic structure of Manitoba farmers' organizations was derived from land records held by the provincial land titles offices. The land records, while providing an enormous amount of useful material, were not as

satisfactory as hoped. Since all land records are still working documents, and although they are open to the public for a fee, the extent of the research involved seeking special permission for access to them. Through the kindness of the Provincial Registrar for Land Titles in Manitoba, a week was granted at each local land titles office to examine abstract books. Unfortunately, neither the agreement nor time permitted an examination of those titles under the Real Property Act (the Torrens system) nor of the actual legal instruments. Accordingly, information regarding interest rates could not be gathered. Furthermore, the Crown does not guarantee the accuracy of the entries in the abstract books, with the result that the inaccuracies contained in the land records have re-appeared in statistics derived from them.

One particularly useful source which is not available is the collection of homestead records. The provincial government acquired these documents after the Second World War, but lacking storage space, destroyed the originals after making a single microfilm copy. As only one microfilm copy was made, researchers are not permitted to use it. Some information obtained from the homestead records is available in the Township Registers maintained by the provincial Lands Branch. The Registers were examined, and from them the tables dealing with the type of land grant by which settlers received their land, were derived.

Except for their disorganized state, assessment rolls kept by municipalities might have proved to be an important source for the economic and social structure of agrarian movements. Tax records, assessment rolls, and correspondence over a forty year period are usually mixed together in municipal vaults. In one

instance, the vault in which the municipality's records were kept had been flooded twice in the last fifty years and the records have simply been allowed to dry in the vault. If more time had been available, perhaps it may have been possible to organize and to employ municipal records. But the scope of the topic and time limitations made such a project impossible.

In short, collections of documents, from which statistical information touching on the economic and social structure of political agrarianism in Manitoba can be obtained, are limited in number. In future years, collections, presently closed, will hopefully become available for research. At that time, more complete tables than those contained in this study may be compiled.

## APPENDIX B

### PLATFORMS OF PROVINCIAL AGRARIAN ORGANIZATIONS, 1883-1900.

1. "Declaration of Rights" of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, adopted at Winnipeg on December 19, 1883.

(Source: Manitoba Free Press, December 20, 1883)

Whereas, in view of the present depression in agricultural and commercial industries, in the Province of Manitoba, the farmers of the Province have assembled for the purpose of expressing their views upon the cause of the said depression and the means of removing the cause.

And whereas the present and future prosperity of this Province depends both commercially and otherwise upon the successful prosecution of agriculture.

And whereas numerous and embarrassing restrictions are placed upon every effort made by the settlers to extend their operations and improve their condition.

And whereas such restrictions are unjust and unnecessary and have been inaugurated and continued in defiance of the just rights of Manitoba.

And whereas some of the said restrictions consist of the oppressive duty upon agricultural implements, the monopoly of the carrying trade now enjoyed by the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and the improper and vexatious methods employed in the administration of the public lands of Manitoba.

And whereas the inhabitants of Manitoba are British subjects, and have made their homes here upon the representation that they would be allowed all the privileges which, as such subjects, they would elsewhere in Canada be entitled to, and it appears that by the terms of the admission of Manitoba into Confederation they should be allowed such rights and privileges.

And whereas they are denied such rights, and they find that the representative system of the Province is such that they are practically denied the privilege of securing the redress of their grievances through their representatives in the Provincial or Dominion Parliaments.

And whereas it is the right of every British subject to call the attention of the constituted authorities to the existence of abuses and wrongs.

Therefore, be it resolved that the Province of Manitoba claim:

1. The right of the Local Government to charter railways anywhere in Manitoba free from any interference.

2. The absolute control of the public lands including school lands by the Legislature of the Province and compensation for lands sold and used for Federal purposes.

3. That the duty on agricultural implements and building materials be removed, and the customs tariff on articles entering into daily consumption be greatly modified in the interests of the people of this Province and the Northwest.

4. That it is the duty of the Provincial Government to make such amendments to the Municipal Act as shall empower Municipal Councils to build or assist in building elevators, grain warehouses and mills, within the limits of such municipalities.

5. That it is the duty of the Provincial Government to appoint grain inspectors, whose duty it shall be to grade all grain brought into the market at central points.

6. That this convention is unanimously of the opinion that the Hudson's Bay Railroad should be constructed with the least possible delay.

7. The right of representation in the Dominion Cabinet.

2. "Bill of Rights" passed by the Manitoba Legislature in April, 1884. (Source: Alexander Begg, History of the North West, Volume III, pp. 94-95).

1. To urge the right of the Province to control, management and sale of the public lands within its limits, for the public uses thereof, and of the mines, minerals, wood and timber thereon, or an equivalent therefor, and to receive from the Dominion Government payment for the lands already disposed of by them within the Province, less the costs of survey and measurement.

2. The management of the lands set apart for education in this Province, with a view to capitalize the sum realized from sales, and apply the interest accruing therefrom to supplement the annual grant of the Legislature in aid of education.

3. The adjustment of the capital account of the Province, decennially according to population--the same to be computed now at 150,000 souls, and to be allowed until it corresponds to the amount allowed the Province of Ontario on that account.

4. The right of the Province to charter lines of railway from any point to another within the Province, except so far as the same has been

limited by its Legislature in the Extension Act of 1881.

5. That the grant of 80 cents a head be not limited to a population of 400,000 souls, but that the same be allowed the Province until the maximum on which the said grant is allowed to the Province of Ontario be reached.

6. The granting to the Province extended railway facilities--notably the energetic prosecution of the Manitoba Southwestern, the Souris and Rocky Mountain, and the Manitoba and North-Western railways.

7. To call the attention of the Government to the prejudicial effect of the tariff on the Province of Manitoba.

8. Extension of boundaries.

3. Platform of the Patrons of Industry. (Source: Patrons' Advocate, March 13, 1895).

1. Maintenance of the British connection.

2. The reservation of the public lands for the actual settlers. Mineral and Timber lands to be reserved and preserved by the Crown for the use of the people.

3. That the representatives of agricultural communities shall be farmers: candidates to be selected for ability, integrity, and independence.

4. Rigid economy in every department of public service.

5. Simplification of the laws, and the general reduction in the machinery of government.

6. Tariff for revenue only. Farm implements, binding twine, fencing wire, nails, lumber and coal oil to be free of duty. A policy of protection to industries which supply the farmer with necessities for the production of grain, whilst the farmers' produce is sold in an open market in competition with the world, is a manifest injustice and imposition, especially taking into consideration that agriculture is the principal industry of the Dominion.

7. Legislation that will effectually protect the farmer and labourer from monopolists and from combines which have unduly increased the price of all necessities.

8. Preparation of Dominion and provincial voters' lists by municipal officers.

9. Conformity of electoral districts to municipal boundaries, as constituted for municipal purposes, so far as the principle of representation by population will permit.

10. One man one vote in elections for both the Dominion Parliament and the Provincial Legislature and the disfranchisement of all civil servants.

11. The abolition of the Canadian Senate.

12. That women be admitted to the franchise.

13. The total prohibition of the liquor traffic.

4. Platform of the Independent Industrial Association.

(Source: The Western Canadian, March 18, 1899)

1. Public ownership of railways and other natural monopolies.

2. No further land grants, subsidies, tax exemptions or guarantees to be given by the state to any private corporations.

3. New railways to be owned and operated by the state in the interests of the people. Existing railways, pending government ownership, to be controlled by a railway commission, with power to regulate rates and to enforce due provision of facilities such as cars, etc.

4. Freedom to erect flat warehouses or small elevators at the various railway stations or sidings in Western Canada, and to ship grain through the same or direct from vehicles, 48 hours to be allowed for loading cars.

5. Public libraries to supplement and continue the work of the public schools.

6. Free trade and direct taxation; immediate removal of the chief tariff evils.

7. The land for the actual settler.

8. Abolition of the liquor traffic.

9. Reform of the franchise.

10. Active and thorough enforcement of adequate laws against bribery of voters and similar evils.

11. Non-partisan commissions for: (a) The civil service, including the government railway service.  
(b) The redistribution of electoral divisions.

12. Abolition of the senate; any measure passed by the Dominion Parliament or the local legislature to be subject to ratification by direct vote of the people if either one-fourth of the members or one-tenth of the electorate so petition, within a fixed limit of time.

## APPENDIX C

### BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCHES OF

#### NINETEENTH CENTURY AGRARIAN LEADERS

BAILEY, E. A. He emigrated from Ontario to Manitoba in 1883. A newspaper editor, he was associated with the Nelsonville Mountaineer from 1883 to 1884, and with the North West Vindicator, the Morden Herald, and the Wawanesa Enterprise. A member of the executive of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union from 1883 to 1886, he was later an implacable opponent of the Patrons of Industry.

BASKERVILLE, A. J. A farmer from the Dominion City district, he was Vice-President of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union from 1885 to 1886. Foreclosed by his creditors sometime in the late 1880's, he managed to purchase a new farm sometime in the mid-1890's. From 1898 to 1900, he was an active member of the Independent Industrial Association in his district.

BOULTON, C. A. Born in Ontario in 1841, he came to Manitoba in 1869 with the survey party of J. S. Dennis. Imprisoned by Louis Riel during the Red River Resistance, he was condemned to death, but reprieved. In 1870, he returned to Ontario, only to leave that province for Manitoba in 1880. He founded the town of Russell in that year and began to farm. During the Saskatchewan uprising of 1885, he formed and led Boulton's Scouts. In 1888, he was rewarded for his part in suppressing the Rebellion by an appointment to the Senate. An ardent Conservative, he broke with his party in 1892, when he was converted to free trade. From 1893 until his death in 1899, he was a supporter of the Patrons of Industry.

BRAITHWAITE, Charles. A farmer, he immigrated to Manitoba from Ontario in 1882 and purchased land in the Portage la Prairie district in 1885. In 1892 he was elected Grand President of the Patrons of Industry, a position he held until 1897 when he resigned to take the job of Inspector of Noxious Weeds for the provincial government.

BROWN, Rev. Nelson. A Methodist minister, he came from Ontario in 1872 and settled at High Bluff. A farmer as well as a clergyman, he was a leading member of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union. In 1885, his creditors foreclosed on him, and he left Manitoba.

CAMPBELL, D. D. A farmer and miller, Campbell arrived in the Manitou district in 1878. From 1883 to 1886, he was associated with the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, serving as that organization's President in 1883-1884 and again in 1886. In 1892, he gave up farming and became a cattle buyer for Robert Ironside.

CLIFFE, Charles. A newspaper editor, he appears to have arrived in Manitoba sometime in 1882. Locating first at Portage la Prairie, he moved to Brandon in 1883 where he became editor of the Brandon Mail. A Conservative, he attempted to modify the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union platform, but was unsuccessful.

CROSBY, Watson. Born in Prince Edward Island in 1857, he was a school teacher in that province until he moved to Manitoba in 1879. A farmer, he served as Reeve of Wallace Municipality in the 1890's and was nominated by the Patrons of Industry to contest the riding of Wallace in 1896. Successful at the polls, he served in the House for only a year before dying in 1897.

DUNCAN, Thomas. Born in 1849 in Scotland, he emigrated to Ontario in 1872 and to Manitoba in 1874. A farmer and blacksmith he settled in the Nelsonville district. Active in the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, he served on its executive from 1883 to 1884. A Liberal, he was elected to the provincial Legislature in 1888. He died in 1910.

FLEMING, Alexander. Born in Scotland in 1841, he left for New Brunswick in 1863 and for Manitoba in 1882. A doctor, farmer, and businessman, he settled at Brandon. In 1883, he was elected President of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union. Following the collapse of that organization, he was elected President of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union in 1884, holding the position until 1885. He was not associated with the Patrons of Industry and died in 1897.

FORSYTH, John. A farmer and lay minister, he arrived in Manitoba in 1890, and purchased land in the Neepawa district. Elected to the provincial Legislature for the constituency of Beautiful Plains in 1894 as a Patrons of Industry candidate, he was disgraced by the Order and his membership revoked in 1895 after accepting a railway pass.

GRAHAM, W. C. Born in Ontario in 1860, he came to Manitoba with his parents in 1874. In 1889, he graduated from the University of Manitoba with a Bachelor of Arts degree and took up farming in the Portage la Prairie district. In 1892, he was elected Grand Secretary of the Patrons of Industry. He held that position until 1897, when he resigned, but was re-elected in 1898. Connected with the Patrons Commercial Union from 1894 onwards, he gradually abandoned farming and concentrated on the business founded by the Order. When the Patrons Commercial Union was renamed the Farmers' Trading Company in 1898 and moved to Winnipeg, Graham was hired as general manager. In 1912, the Company folded, and he took a position with the Department of the Interior in Ottawa. He retired in 1931 and died in 1959.

GREEN, C. J. An early resident of the Portage la Prairie district, arriving in 1874, Green was a farmer. Actively engaged in a number of enterprises designed to better the farmers'

condition, he served on the executive of both the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union and the Patrons of Industry. In 1897, he succeeded Braithwaite, a close personal friend, as President of the Patrons, but suffered a stroke in the spring of that year, and died shortly afterwards.

LANG, Rev. James A. A Presbyterian minister, he emigrated to Manitoba from Ontario in 1880. The founder of the Langvale settlement in Riverside municipality, he was a militant member of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union.

MARSHALL, G.A.J.A. "Alphabetical Marshall" has been a bank manager in England before leaving for Manitoba in 1890. He located at Elkhorn and attempted to farm. In 1896, he moved to Portage la Prairie where he edited the Patrons' Sentinel and was associated with the Patrons Commercial Union. Later, after the disappearance of the Patrons, he became a police magistrate at Portage la Prairie.

MARTIN, Joseph. Born in Ontario in 1852, he emigrated to Manitoba in 1882. By profession a lawyer, he entered politics in 1883 and was elected to the Legislature as a Liberal. Largely through his influence, the farmers' agitation of the 1880's was identified with the Liberal party. Following the collapse of the Protective Union, Martin posed as the farmers' political champion. In 1888, he became Attorney-General of Manitoba, resigning in 1891 to contest a by-election for the House of Commons in Ottawa. Successful in 1893, he remained a Member of Parliament until 1896 when he was defeated. Later he became for a brief time Premier of British Columbia, and still later a member of the House of Commons in Great Britain. He died in 1923.

McKENZIE, Kenneth. Born in Scotland in 1822, he emigrated first to Canada and then to Manitoba in 1868. One of the most prominent farmers in the colony, he was elected as a representative to the Second Convention during the Red River Resistance. First elected to the Legislature as a Liberal in 1874, he was re-elected in 1883, 1886 and 1892. Prominent in most farmers' organizations in Manitoba, he played a leading role in the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union, and in 1897, was elected Honourary President of the Patrons of Industry.

McCUAIG, D. W. Born in Ontario in 1855, he moved to Manitoba in 1877. Deeply concerned over the farmers' welfare, McCuaig was associated with the Patrons of Industry, both as a member of the provincial executive in 1896 and as a candidate in the constituency of Lakeside in a by-election in November, 1896. Following the disappearance of the Patrons, he was active in the formation of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association. He served as President of the Grain Growers' from 1904 to 1910 when he resigned to become the first president of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. He died in 1928.

McCUAIG, Roderick. An older brother of D. W. McCuaig, he was born in Ontario, but emigrated first to the United States and then to Manitoba. Associated with the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, he broke with that organization when it turned towards the Liberal party.

MORRISON, Alexander. Born in Ontario in 1851, Morrison emigrated from that province to Manitoba in 1878, locating in the Boyne settlement. A prominent district farmer and a staunch Conservative, he was deeply involved in municipal politics from the mid-1880's on. Interested in the farmers' welfare, he sponsored a farmers' elevator company in 1890, and later was active in the Patrons of Industry. In 1896, he was nominated by the Patrons to contest the constituency of Morris, but withdrew before election day. A supporter of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association, he disagreed with them in 1911 when he stood as a Conservative candidate in Macdonald. He was elected and remained a Member of Parliament until 1917. He died in 1930.

MORROW, James. Born in Ontario in 1856, he came to Manitoba in 1879, settling at LaRiviere. A farmer, he was nominated to contest the federal riding of Lisgar by the Patrons of Industry in 1894. Because of charges that he was working with the Conservatives in the election of 1896, he withdrew. From 1890 to 1895 and from 1900 to 1911, he was Reeve of the Rural Municipality of Louise. From 1911 to 1915 he was a Conservative Member of the Legislative Assembly. He died in 1948.

MUTCHMOR, Alexander. A railway promoter and real estate speculator, Mutchmor arrived in Manitoba sometime in 1882 and left again for his home in Ontario by the spring of 1884. Although he resided in Manitoba only briefly, he was an important figure in the formation of the provincial organization of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union.

PARTRIDGE, E. A. A native of Ontario, he went to the North West Territories to farm at Sintaluta in the early 1880's. Active in the Patrons of Industry in the 1890's, he was one of the men responsible for the formation of the Territorial Grain Growers' Association in 1902, the Grain Growers' Grain Company in 1906, and the Grain Growers' Guide in 1908.

PENNEFATHER, Dr. John. Born in India in 1833, he emigrated from England to Manitoba in 1870. His hope was to establish his sons on farms in the Norquay district of the province. Active in promoting the formation of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union in the autumn of 1883, he was quickly disillusioned and abandoned the organization early in 1884. In 1885, he took a position as a surgeon with the Canadian Expeditionary Force sent out to suppress the Saskatchewan Rebellion, and in 1892, wrote a book about his experiences, Thirteen Years on the Prairies. He died in 1913.

POSTLETHEWAITE, William. A grain dealer from the north of England, he came to Manitoba in the early 1880's and purchased 640 acres of land from the Canadian Pacific Railway in the Brandon district. A grain dealer as well as a farmer in Canada, he supported the Patrons of Industry. Nominated as the Patrons' candidate in Brandon constituency, he was defeated in the federal election of 1896, and was again defeated when he contested the Brandon North by-election for the provincial House later in the same year. In 1897, he broke with the Patrons, when he was accused of being one of the province's "monopolistic" grain dealers.

PURVIS, George. The father of Western Canadian agrarian protest, he emigrated from Quebec to Manitoba in 1880, taking up a Canadian Pacific Railway grant near Brandon. He became provincial secretary of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union in 1883 and provincial secretary of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union in 1884. Forced to resign the office in December, 1885 because of attacks on his personal honesty, Purvis, who was already ruined financially by a series of poor harvests, moved to Minto, Dakota Territory in July, 1886, after the Canadian Pacific Railway foreclosed on him.

ROBLIN, Rodmond Palen. Born in Ontario in 1853, he emigrated to Manitoba in 1878. A land speculator, railway promoter, town promoter, grain dealer, and general merchant, he founded the town of Carman in 1880. In 1883-1884, he was prominent locally in the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union. Later active in local and provincial politics, he became Premier of Manitoba from 1900 to 1915. He died in 1937.

ROGERS, W G. A farmer, he was born in Ontario and immigrated to Manitoba in 1878. A resident of the Carberry district, he was active in the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union, the Patrons of Industry, the Independent Industrial Association and the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association. In 1899, he was elected president of the Independent Industrial Association, and in 1904, he was elected a director of the Grain Growers' Association.

SCALLION, J. W. A farmer in Manitoba, Scallion was born in Ireland, but moved to Canada at an early age. Educated in Hamilton and at the University of Toronto, he taught school for eleven years at Thorold, Ontario, before moving to Manitoba in 1882 and settled at Virden. Active in the Patrons of Industry in the 1890's, he was responsible for the formation of the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association in 1903. The first president of the Grain Growers', he was for many years, the honorary president of the twentieth century agrarian organization. He died in 1926.

SIFTON, A. L. A lawyer, he was born in Ontario in 1859. A founding member of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union in 1883, he later went on to become Chief Justice of Alberta and Premier of Alberta. He died in 1921.

SIFTON, Clifford. A lawyer, he was born in Ontario in 1861. Like his brother, he was a founding member of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union. Entering politics in 1888, he was elected to the Provincial Legislature and in 1892 he became Attorney-General. In 1896, he was appointed Minister of the Interior in the Laurier government at Ottawa, a position he held until 1905. He died in 1929.

SIRRETT, W. F. Born in England in 1848, he immigrated to Canada as a child and to Manitoba in 1873. A farmer in the Neepawa district, he was prominent in the local association of the Patrons of Industry. In 1896, he was elected as a Patron candidate in the constituency of Beautiful Plains.

STEWART, Charles. Born in England, he graduated as a botanist from Cambridge University and emigrated to Manitoba in 1880. A farmer and town promoter, he was responsible for the creation of the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Union. A secessionist, he never held any office in the organization he founded. Bankrupted in 1885, he moved to Winnipeg where, in 1888, he contested North Winnipeg constituency as an independent candidate in a provincial election. In 1889, he moved to St. Paul, Minnesota, where he joined a banking firm. By 1900, he appears to have returned to Manitoba.

YOUNG, Findlay M. Born in Quebec in 1852, he moved to Manitoba in 1879. A farmer, land speculator, and grain dealer he was prominent in the Manitoba and North West Farmers' Co-operative and Protective Union. A Liberal, he was first elected to the Manitoba Legislature in 1883. In 1896, he was appointed Speaker and in 1900, he was made a Senator. He died in 1916.