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In 1913 thirty dairy farmers formed the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, an organization which began operation in 1917 and became one of the most successful cooperatives in North America. The compact nature of the Fraser Valley was a geographic advantage which laid the basis for the success of the Association. The river itself, the railways, and the roads which were built slowly and at great cost, provided transportation which unified the Valley.

The insatiable Cariboo markets enabled pioneer farmers to become well established. The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway opened wider markets which dairymen were able to take advantage of after the creameries became established. The phenomenal growth of Vancouver in the first decade of the twentieth century provided a fluid market which was more lucrative. This market became accessible to farmers as far away as the Chilliwack Valley when the B.C. Electric Railway line was completed in 1910.

Intense competition on the fluid market and some of the practices of milk dealers forced the farmers to unite in order to achieve orderly marketing. The thirty men who initiated the organization in 1913 were, on the whole, prosperous, ambitious men in the prime of life, who believed that the fertile land of the Fraser Valley could provide wealth just as the river had given up gold to the first comers. Most of them had been engaged in farmers' associations or cooperative ventures and it was on the solid foundation of these groups that the
Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association began. It was a merging of established cooperatives rather than a newly created organization.

The Association began operation during a period of war-time prosperity. Its outstanding initial success convinced many in the Valley of the value of the Cooperative. This laid the basis for the strong loyalty of the membership which, along with firm and able leadership, contributed to the success of the F.V.M.P.A. When orderly marketing could not be achieved through voluntary action, the Cooperative members attempted to gain marketing legislation which would equalize the returns from the fluid market. The Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act was in effect throughout 1930. During this time Cooperative members received better returns than previously. This strengthened the loyalty of the membership as the struggle to gain legislation continued.

Geographic advantage, the high quality of the leadership and the strong loyalty of the membership help to explain the success of the Cooperative, but the effect of that success is also worth consideration. The Association controlled production of the milk shipped by its members, preventing a surplus on the fluid market through the establishment of manufacturing plants. The many bitter battles fought in the Valley were between the Cooperative, which struggled to retain for its members the advantages of the stable market their joint action had created, and those who sought to gain control of the fluid market, but who, in the name of free enterprise, refused to share the cost of stabilizing it. The dramatic struggle culminated with the passage of the Milk Industry Act in 1956, but the fact that the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association had survived, prevented complete disruption of the milk market through the long, difficult years and made the impact of the
depression, severe though it was, less disastrous than it might otherwise have been.

Though it protected some who were running uneconomic farms, the Cooperative enabled many to adapt to the constant demands for steadily increasing efficiency as agriculture developed rapidly from bush farming to a complex agro-industry.

The cooperative nature of the Association and the structure of the organization with its locals, and its central directorate elected by the membership, gave a grass roots control which involved every member in decision making (but did not prevent control over the membership by skilful leaders) and thus absorbed some of the unrest created by adverse economic conditions and prevented alienation to a considerable extent.

Many in the Valley had reason to be proud of the success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association: many more to be grateful for it.
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INTRODUCTION

High in the Rockies, tiny mountain creeks, born of melting snow and drizzly rain, merge with the milky streams dripping off glaciers to form rivers which drop in all directions searching for the sea. One of these rivers, the Fraser, named after the first white man to explore it, rises in the central Rockies, and slips northwest for nearly two hundred miles until it changes direction, swinging in a wide arc. Joined by the Nechako, which spills down from coast mountains to the west, and sixty miles later, by the Quesnel which rises in the Cariboo Mountains to the east, the river flows south over plateau country forested with spruce and jack pine. The current is swift, but the river runs smoothly, muddying itself with soil cut from the defenseless banks.

Ahead are the coast mountains, young, jagged giants which lie parallel to the northwest coast. The climate becomes much drier as the river moves into the rain shadow of the massive range. The spruce disappear, the jack pine become scraggly and thin out, giving way to grass and sage-brush and the country becomes more rugged as the mountains close in, savagely pinching the muddy flow, or as a sharp drop in the plateau sends the water tumbling and boiling in furious rapids.

But there is still much open country. From the west flows the Chilcotin, twisting through the gently rolling hills on its way to the main stream. For eighty or ninety miles the river travels through open range land, part of an island in a sea of mountains. It passes
the Camelsfoot Range to the west and Fountain Ridge to the east. But it is not until after the clear waters of the Thompson are swallowed by the muddy Fraser that the southerly path of the river is blocked by the massive barrier of coast mountains lying in a jumbled heap across its path.

The river, relentless, forces its way through the implacable rock, vengefully cutting a deep canyon. The country is wild and forbidding. The pine appear again, taller and greener, but the mountains cast deep shadows and the sombre colors, gloomy in the rain, lighten and fade, but do not soften in the harsh summer sun. The steep cliffs, the sound of the angry water, the gloom and the glare, all accentuate the fierce struggle between the wounded rock and the turbulent, imprisoned river. Eventually the Fraser breaks through its mountain barrier, swings west to find release in the coastal valley it has formed, and empties into the Strait of Georgia.

The lower valley is lush and green, and in contrast to the wild canyon, almost gentle in appearance. Open to the west winds from the Pacific, it receives the heavy rainfall necessary to produce the dense jungle which covered the valley until the settler and the logger cleared the thick underbrush and felled the giant fir and cedar. The country was bare of trees only where the Fraser, laying down mud in annual flooding, or leaving its bed for a new course, had formed "prairies," or where the slackening current had released silt to form deltas.

From Hope, where the river turns, to New Westminster near its mouth, this lower valley of the Fraser stretches for over eighty miles. For the first twenty-five of these, it remains narrow and continues so along the north side of the river. Here, between the ridges of
the Coast Mountains, long lakes -- Harrison, Chehalis, Stave, Alouette, Pitt and Coquitlam -- lie roughly north and south. Fed by mountain streams, their waters spill from southern tips into rivers which flow to the Fraser. These rivers have formed their own flood plains and valleys, but they are short and the mountains close. It is to the south of the Fraser that most of the flat land lies.

At the eastern end of the valley, Chilliwack Lake lies south and slightly west of Hope, its southern tip very close to the forty-ninth parallel. From the northern end it drains into the Chilliwack River, which, joined by the Tamihi, the Liiumchin and numerous smaller creeks, flows swiftly west to the Vedder Crossing.

When settlers first arrived in the Chilliwack-Sumas area, the river flowed northwest to join the Fraser. In 1874 it began to change course. Three years later, Edgar Dewdney, examining the situation, found the river "blocked for a distance of over half a mile with drift timber, packed tightly together, and bound with a deposit of gravel and sand, forming a close impenetrable dam." The river, denied its former outlet, had found new ones. It had begun to flow through Vedder's Creek which carried the greatly increased burden of water into Sumas Lake. It had widened Atchelitz Creek, threatening the settlers in that area with flooding, and the Luk-a-Kuk had taken half the water, changing from a small stream "which could be crossed at Mr. Wells' house on a 30 foot pole to a river over 200 feet from bank to bank with a depth of 18 to 20 feet." Dewdney realized that it would be impossible to reopen the old channel and considered that the Luk-a-Kuk, being the most direct stream, should bear all the water of the Chilliwack River. Bitter disputes over this proposal arose between Sardis and Atchelitz residents which were not resolved until Sumas Lake was drained.
This project, begun in 1920 and completed three years later, added thirty thousand acres of farm land to the Valley -- fertile, productive land, bare of trees and free of stones. Today the Vedder and the Sumas River, which also emptied into Sumas Lake, flow over the prairie land, guarded by dykes, and join, close to their common outlet to the Fraser.

West of Sumas lies Matsqui Prairie, and to the south, the hilly land around Abbotsford, where glacial till has not been washed away or overlaid by river deposits. West again is Langley Prairie. Here the land is flat from the river to the border and beyond, much of it heavily forested in its virgin state. These prairie sections are an extension of the delta plain which lies mainly south of the forty-ninth parallel, between the Cascades and the sea, drained by the Nooksack River.

Close to its mouth, the banks of the Fraser rise to five or six hundred feet. New Westminster was built on the north bank because the sharp rise provides a means of defense. The left bank slopes south after its sharp rise, drained by the Serpentine and farther east by the Nicomekl River which flowed from Sumas Lake until it was drained. Both follow a slow, winding course through marshy, low-lying land in their lower reaches, and empty sluggishly into Mud Bay, an outlet which could quite possibly mark an earlier mouth of the Fraser. Beyond the river mouths is the fertile delta land -- several islands of which Sea, Lulu and Westham are the largest -- and the low-lying land between Boundary Bay and the south arm of the Fraser and Burrard Inlet, an extension of the mainland which New Westminster was forced to share with Vancouver and Burnaby.
For thousands of years Indians lived in this valley, building shelters of wood and bark close to the river which provided them with their food, and on which they travelled in their dugout canoes. The fur-traders were the first white men to invade their territory. In 1808 Simon Fraser, in the interests of the North West Company, explored the Fraser, believing it to be the Columbia. His experiences in the rugged country south of Soda Creek discouraged use of the river below that point. It was not until George Simpson, Governor of the Hudson's Bay Company, newly merged with the North-West fur-traders, began to reorganize the Western Department that a fort was established in the lower Fraser Valley. In 1824 James McMillan came north from Fort Vancouver on the Columbia. He led his expedition up the Nicomekl, portaged to the Salmon and followed it to the Fraser. Near this spot, three years later, Fort Langley was built, a beach-head in territory which would surely remain British.

Horses, cattle and poultry were transported from the Hudson's Bay Company farms on the Columbia to the fort on Langley Prairie and the first farming operations began in the Fraser Valley. The soil was good clay loam, and little clearing was required on the flood plain. By 1848, seventy or eighty cows were being milked, but the only farming in the Valley was confined to this area, and was carried on by employees or former employees of the Hudson's Bay Company. Few other white men ventured into the trading company's preserve.

The discovery of gold in 1858, however, brought thousands through the Valley in their scramble for a spot on the sand bars. Victoria,
Hope and Yale changed overnight from Hudson's Bay Company posts to booming towns, and British Columbia became a colony with a capital city at New Westminster. The sand bars were staked out very rapidly and the river was robbed of much of the gold it carried. Many disappointed gold seekers, too late to share the plunder, left the country. Some intrepid prospectors continued up river to strike gold in the Cariboo, but some of the newcomers took advantage of the land that was hastily made available. In 1861 the population of the whole Valley to Yale was estimated at only 300, but within eight years it had more than quadrupled and farming had become established in the Valley.
MARKETS FOR MILK

The first farming ventures in the Fraser Valley were concentrated mainly on the delta lands, where Victoria and New Westminster provided markets accessible by water, and in the Chilliwack-Sumas Valley, closer to the Yale market and the gold-fields beyond. Trees grew on the rich delta soil, but on the flood plain in the Chilliwack Valley, the land required little clearing, and was covered with lush blue-green grass which could be cut for hay. In 1866 a reporter from the British Columbian visited the area and made an unofficial census. He found fifteen farms in operation and an amazing wealth on some of the farms so recently established. The settlers were producing butter, eggs, beef, pork and vegetables for the Cariboo market and feed crops, not only for their dairy cattle which could be pastured most of the year, but also for the oxen used in the carrying trade. Though much experimentation would later be done with fruit and grain crops, the high production of butter, and the fact that those who were farming on a full-time basis were engaged in dairying, indicates that this type of farming had become established very early in the Fraser Valley.

The remarkable harvest which was recorded by the New Westminster journalist could only have been made possible by the Indian who was, according to Charles Evans, "the pioneer's live capital." Evans, deploiring the degradation of the natives in 1904, recalled that "the
sturdy little Indian of 25 years ago had done farm work, constructed buildings and transported goods and people by canoe. It is a well known fact that many of the settlers had Indian wives, who must surely have been of considerable help. A few of the marriages were permanent, but usually Indian girls were cast aside when white women came west or when settlers were well enough established to return to Ontario for wives.

On the gold frontier, farming ventures and gold mining activity were closely related, for both farmer and prospector, often the same person, exploited the wealth of the colony. It was the abundance of gold which provided capital to be invested in cattle brought in from Oregon, and which made possible quick returns and huge profits. The settlers who found cheap land, cheap labor, large local markets, and access to them by water and over the hastily constructed Cariboo Road, were pioneering on a farm frontier made different from the usual by the quick returns, the enormous profits and the local markets to be found on a gold frontier.

Though many who pre-empted land acquired it for exploitive and speculative purposes, some of the prospectors were farm boys whose knowledge enabled them, not only to make the best use of the unique opportunities, but also to improve their farming methods as rapidly as possible, and to make the transition to the more advanced methods of farming which were transforming the dairying industry during the last half of the nineteenth century. The wealth accumulated by these men, much of it based on the value of their large land holdings, laid the basis for the expectation of prosperity which has constantly dominated the thinking of Valley farmers.
The lush and friendly Valley had vicious aspects, however, not all immediately apparent. Mosquitoes were a scourge as the waters receded every summer. The heavy rainfall, which made the country so green, came mainly in the winter months. The summers could be hot and dry, scorching the crops on which the farmers pinned their hopes. The mild rainy winters were ideal for producing the pasture and feed crops, but early settlers soon learned that when the west wind dumping rain from the Pacific reversed direction, the east wind funnelling through the mountains brought Arctic air which whistled over the open prairie with a ferocity which only people who have lived in the Valley can appreciate. The modern farmers with their tank trucks and heavy snow ploughs are vulnerable when the east wind blows. It is not difficult to imagine what the pioneers must have endured when the river froze over.

Snow melting on the magnificent mountains caused the river to flood every spring. If spring were late and a sudden heat wave in June released the snow too suddenly or if the local thaw coincided with thawing in the interior and in the Rockies, the annual spring flood would become, not merely a danger and a threat, but a disaster. Such a disaster occurred in 1894 when flood waters destroyed dykes at Hatzic, Matsqui and Langley, and even the newly constructed Maple Ridge dyke, built to an average height of 4 feet 9 inches, failed to shut out the water.

Poorly drained soil was a problem in most parts of the Valley. Horses had to be shod to keep them from sinking, even on the A.C. Wells farm, one of the highest pieces of land on the Valley floor. Poor drainage on the delta meant that excessive salt and soggy ground made production of good crops difficult. John Oliver was one of the first to use a system of underdraining to combat this problem.
The problems of dyking and draining were matched only by the enormous difficulties of clearing the heavily forested uplands. Settlers arriving in the 1870's found the prairie and delta lands taken up and cultivated land costly. Forced to choose between low-lying land subject to annual flooding and uncleared upland, they chose to fight the forest rather than the river. Land speculation and the high cost of clearing continued to hinder agriculture for years.

The drainage problems and the difficulties of clearing land slowed road building and contributed to the loneliness and sense of isolation suffered by the pioneers. Steam-boats provided transportation on the Fraser and farms bordering the river had daily contact with New Westminster, but for those living away from the river communication was very difficult. Roads were non-existent or very poor, often mere trails cut by the settlers themselves. Though the completion of the road from New Westminster to Yale in 1875 provided an alternative to the water route and enabled farmers on the Sumas Prairie and in Chilliwack to send produce to Yale more easily, it was not until 1897-1898 that it was gravelled and "put into passable condition." Until Sumas Lake was drained, travellers followed a hazardous road which wound around the side of Vedder Mountain.

These were problems which could best be defeated by increased immigration, and in spite of the difficulties, settlers clung to the belief that the agricultural potential of the Valley was very great. Only gradually did they realize that the "prairie hay" which provided if not gold, at least silver, lacked the nutrition to ensure a high production of milk, and local grain crops could rarely compete in quality with imported feed. Scientific soil analysis revealed that none of the
land which appeared so fertile to the early settlers was first class, and even the good areas would need careful management. In spite of the devastation caused by the flood of 1894, a surprising resiliency was evident in the determined efforts to discount reports of the damage. A successful municipal dyking scheme was started in Delta in 1895, but it was 1903 before dyking was completed in Chilliwack, 1908 in Pitt Meadows, and the draining of Sumas Lake was not completed until 1923. Undoubtedly the problems enhanced the myth. Farmers who had invested heavily in money for cultivated land or in labor—often a lifetime of heavy toil—were reluctant to relinquish their dream, and strove to overcome the problems in order to make it come true.

Because the frontier period was almost non-existent in British Columbia, the enormous geographical problems were overcome more quickly or tolerated more easily than they would have been if population growth had been slow. By 1870 shrinking markets in the Cariboo and increased competition forced down prices and cut into profits, but the growth of New Westminster, and the logging camps and sawmills which sprang up continued to provide markets. Enough people were interested in farming to promote a meeting for the purpose of organizing an Agricultural Society in New Westminster as early as 1867. It was planned that branch committees should be set up in Richmond, Langley, Sumas, Chilliwack and Burrard Inlet. In 1873 the Chilliwack society organized and sponsored the first local exhibition, held the next year.

The decade of the 70's was a period of stagnation in the Valley, but depressed conditions existed in other parts of Canada and of the world. In spite of the problems of the pioneers, population growth was steady, rising from 1356 in 1869 to 7,000 by 1881. Throughout
the Valley the huge fir and cedar which stood in the way of settlement were being attacked. Logging was the main activity in many areas, but the cultivation of the land went on quietly and steadily. Men like A.C. Wells in Sardis and the Shannon brothers in Clover Valley were establishing themselves on farms which would become within two decades showplaces of the Valley and centres for progressive farming. There were those who were discouraged, but the markets of the Gold Rush period remained a lively memory, and there was throughout the Valley a persistent belief that new and greater opportunities lay ahead. The guarantee of a railroad linking the Pacific coast to Canada as a condition of British Columbia's entry into Confederation promised realization of that hope.

The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway in 1885 stimulated the economy and revived dreams. Construction camps provided markets for food and the need for railway ties increased the local market for lumber. Money which had been scarce began to circulate more freely and the railroad facilitated the immigration so badly needed in the Valley. A spirit of buoyant optimism prevailed which was reflected in the pages of the Chilliwack Progress. "Never in the history of the Province has there been such activity in the transfer and settlement of lands," declared the editor in the first issue, published in 1891. In four years Chilliwack swelled from a centre with five places of business to one with fifty-two. Six schools opened in Surrey in 1891, and though the census figures which appeared that year showed a disappointingly small increase for the whole of Canada, the population of the New Westminster electoral district rose from 7,000 in 1881 to 17,866 in 1891.
The distant markets which the railroad made accessible would have been of little advantage to the Fraser Valley milk producers if it had not been for several inventions which revolutionized the dairy industry. The use of the centrifugal cream separator made creamery butter a more profitable product than cheese. Both cheese factories and creameries relieved the farmer of time-consuming and demanding chores and thus allowed him to increase the size of his herd. The use of the Babcock test to determine the fat content of milk made herd improvement easier to achieve. The improvement of cold storage and refrigeration facilities widened the markets available to dairy farmers.

Creameries became the key to the solution of production problems -- a solution which lent itself to cooperative action. Cooperative dairying has been traced back to the 11th or 12th century when farmers in the Alps borrowed milk from each other on a rotating system so that each would have a quantity sufficient for cheesemaking. This practice led to the establishment of a central cheesemaking building where farmers sent milk every day and rotated the task of making the cheese. This type of lending is known to have been done in New England about 1835, and by the middle of the century the first cheese factories in North America were in operation, one in Wisconsin and one in New York. A native of New York was responsible for erecting the first cheese factory in Canada in Oxford County, Ontario in 1864, and the spread of similar factories was very rapid. Many of these factories were established on a semi-cooperative basis, but the basic principles of
cooperation worked out by the Rochdale pioneers were not yet generally understood.

It was in Rochdale, England that one of the first successful modern cooperatives began. The textile industry was the first to undergo enormous changes as a result of the use of steam power and the industrial workers in the textile mills were the first to cooperate to free themselves from exploitation by shop-keepers. Consumer cooperatives, after many abortive starts, took root and flourished. The Rochdale pioneers enunciated the basic principles that membership be voluntary, that the value of shares be within the means of would-be members, that control be democratic with the allotment of one vote to one man regardless of shares held, that services be provided at cost and profits returned to members on a patronage basis.

The success of cooperatives in Britain as economic institutions of self-help among industrial workers provided a model for other disadvantaged groups. Farmers in Europe, threatened not only by industrialization, but also by increased competition from North American producers, turned to cooperation for the purpose of obtaining supplies, improving production and marketing surplus products. Agricultural cooperation was particularly successful in Denmark, a country in which farming was the main occupation. Danish farmers faced serious problems after the loss of Schleswig and Holstein to Prussia in 1864. Farm income was low because the land was impoverished as a result of excessive cropping. World prices for cattle and wheat, Denmark's staple exports, were declining because of increased competition from North America. Cooperatives formed quickly in a country where peasant villages, which retained a heritage of informal cooperation from the manorial economy,
made regional organization almost an instinct. A high standard of rural education and ownership of the land by those who farmed it also explain the ability of the Danish farmers to improve their economic position by moving into more profitable branches of agriculture. Cheese factories, creameries, bacon-curing plants and egg grading and packing plants became established on the cooperative principle.

Danish cooperatives, particularly the creameries, served as models for farmers all over the world. The idea was taken up by the Patrons of Industry, a farm movement which spread from the United States to Canada in the 1890's, but Canadian dairymen were also directly affected by the success of Danish cooperatives -- the Ontario government sent an expert to study Danish methods in 1879. In 1888 the Dairymen's Association of Canada formed and requested that a Dairy commissioner be appointed by the dominion government. Professor J.W. Robertson accepted the position in 1891. He not only created great interest in improving dairy production, but also strongly advocated the establishment of cooperative cheese factories and creameries.

From its beginning as a crown colony, British Columbia had never produced enough food to support its population. For many years, until 1910, the value of imports actually exceeded that of home production. The provincial government established a Department of Agriculture in 1892 for the purpose of assisting farmers to increase food production and improve quality of produce. An act for the regulation of this department was passed in 1894, and a series of acts designed to improve and encourage dairying were passed within the next two or three years. The Dairymen's Association Act, 1895 provided for the incorporation of companies for the manufacture of butter and cheese.
The Milk Fraud Act, 1895 empowered managers of factories to test samples of milk from patrons and to inspect their premises. The Creameries Act, 1896 made provision for loans not exceeding $2000 to companies or associations incorporated for the "purpose of erecting, acquiring and maintaining, managing and operating a creamery upon the co-operative system."

This body of legislation and the activities of dominion government agriculturalists ushered in the creamery period in the Fraser Valley. Though a private creamery began operation in New Westminster, many lower Valley farmers, informed about the advantages of cooperative dairying, organized the Delta Creamery in 1895. Within four months, $3000 had been subscribed, the building constructed and A.A. King brought from the east to manage the operation. Surrey farmers who were wooed by advocates of the Westminster Creamery decided that they preferred to have creameries located in the country. They met with delegates from the Delta Creamery, listened to a deputy sent by Professor Robertson, dominion Dairy Commissioner, and made plans to join the cooperative.

In 1895 Edenbank Creamery, Sardis, incorporated under the Creameries Act with five patrons. It was privately owned by A.C. Wells who had been making butter and cheese on his farm for many years, but it was run like a cooperative. Wells took milk or cream from his patrons and made it up with his own at cost. Each patron was paid once a month at the rate of butterfat supplied less making charges. Other expenses -- interest on capital, insurance, wear and tear on machinery -- were taken out of surplus. Annual meetings of the patrons received accounts of the company, and profits were divided according to the amount of
butterfat sent in by each member. 47

The second annual meeting of the British Columbia Dairymen's Association was held in Chilliwack in 1896. A.A. King, manager of the Delta Creamery, spoke on the subject of creameries, pointing out that they enabled the farmer to survive in an increasingly competitive economy. 48 Within two weeks a meeting took place for the purpose of organizing another cooperative. 49 The Chilliwack Creamery Company was incorporated, but there was not sufficient support for it to go into operation. 50 In the meantime, a private creamery began business in Vancouver. It was six years before the Chilliwack Creamery became organized.

In spite of increased competition, not only locally, but also from government subsidized creameries in the Northwest Territories and Manitoba, Fraser Valley output of milk products increased steadily. Edenbank reduced the cost of manufacturing from 3¢ per pound to an average of 2½¢ 51 and increased the number of its patrons to 72 by 1901. 52 The Delta Cooperative declared a dividend of 10% for the year 1901. 53 It was quite evident that there was room for both the New Westminster and the Delta Creamery as well as for a private one started at Upper Sumas and for a condensary at Mission. 54 Population growth in the lower mainland provided rapidly expanding local markets, and markets were also opening in the Klondyke and Atlin regions, in the Kootenays and even in the Orient. The manager of the Western Condensed Milk Canning, Coffee and Creamery Company at Mission complained that the biggest problem of the operation was to obtain a large enough supply of milk. The company had started its own herd, but required 20 tons of milk per day to operate at full capacity. The proprietors were confident of good markets. 55
It was under such favorable conditions that the Chilliwack Creamery finally began production. Among the trustees were E.D. Barrow, J.S. Mercer and T.R. Whitley, manager of the Royal Bank in Chilliwack, who became the first president of the cooperative. Attempts had been made to amalgamate with Edenbank, but A.C. Wells was convinced that one creamery should serve the district in order to reduce operating expenses. The Edenbank trade mark had become so well known that Wells had no intention of giving it up. The Creamery had agreed to bonus patrons outside a six-mile limit to the extent of ½¢ per pound butterfat to compensate for hauling. The Chilliwack Creamery began in spite of these efforts to thwart it. Its promoters were also convinced that one creamery should serve the whole area, but that it should be established in Chilliwack which would give it the advantage of a central location. Although Edenbank continued to increase its production, within the first year of operation the output of the new creamery exceeded that of Sardis and a rivalry developed between the two.

Dairy farmers who shipped to the creameries prospered because the improved quality of butter ensured steady prices and the farmers' ability to increase production brought larger returns. The success of the cooperative creameries provided the education, the practical experience, the sense of class consciousness among the farmers which laid one of the very important bases for the emergence and success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association.
The Canadian Pacific Railway, a band of steel flung across a continent to grapple a nation together, had a profound effect on the various parts of the empire it created. It peopled the prairies of the Canadian Northwest, but was unable to cope adequately with the huge flow of wheat which the immigrants there produced for world markets. The tensions created led to demands on the part of the wheat farmers for legislation, and the determination that the legislation be justly and equitably enforced led to the formation of the Territorial Grain Growers' Association in 1901, the Manitoba Grain Growers' Association in 1903 and the United Farmers of Alberta in 1906. These farmers' movements organized the wheat-producers and created a body of informed, involved members, capable of cooperating to market their own grain and build their own elevators. Though several types of organization developed on the prairies, they represented "one continuous and indigenous Grain Growers' movement," unlike farmers' movements on the great plains in the United States which spread from various centres and lacked cohesiveness. The Canadian Pacific Railway was undoubtedly a factor in explaining the Canadian phenomenon.

It was the railroad, too, which increased population and opened markets on the prairies to the fruit-growers of the Okanagan Valley. Like the wheat-producers they had a large surplus of a commodity which required access to distant markets. In addition they had the problem of handling a highly perishable product. The railroad was a fore-runner of the period of rapid industrialization which began in the 1890's in Canada. Farmers were forced to produce with increasing
efficiency in order to maintain their place in society. Though all farmers were concerned with improving methods of production and farm techniques, for the wheat-producers and the fruit-growers, the overriding consideration was that of marketing the product efficiently and eliminating the middle man in order to obtain the maximum profit for the producer. In response to this pressing need came the impetus to cooperate.

As in other areas of Canada, the railroad brought settlers to the Fraser Valley and provided access to wider markets, but it was not a band of steel passing through. The grappling iron was hooked to the shore of Burrard Inlet, and it was the phenomenal growth of the city which sprang up as a terminus to the railroad that affected the farmer most. From a small townsite and a sawmill in 1881, Vancouver grew to a port city of 13,709 by 1891; 29,432 by 1901 and 120,847 by 1911. New Westminster fought to retain control of the Valley as its citizens watched "the octopus" dwarf the importance of the "Royal City," but it shared in the growth of the whole area. The coast cities provided rapidly expanding markets for fresh milk which brought the best price for the producer. The condensaries, which produced a less perishable product and returned a better price than butter, played their part in displacing the creameries, but the extension of transportation facilities which made the city markets accessible to various parts of the Valley was a more important factor in phasing out the creamery period.

The completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway made it possible for farmers who began dairying on the north bank of the Fraser to
ship fresh milk to Vancouver at an early date. There were problems, however. Trains which had crossed a continent before reaching the Valley were frequently late. Farmers had to deliver their milk to the station and were expected to load it themselves. This could often mean long waits and time wasted which could be more profitably spent on the farm. In 1907 F.M. Logan, Commissioner of Dairying, succeeded in arranging for a local train to run between Agassiz and Vancouver. 63

The completion of the combined rail and traffic bridge across the Fraser at New Westminster in 1904 and the entry of the Great Northern line to Vancouver in 1907 opened the city markets to farmers in parts of Surrey. The Surrey Cooperative Creamery began producing butter in 1904 when the New Westminster market became easier to reach and closed in 1907 when the Vancouver fluid market became accessible. The completion of the Vancouver and Lulu Island Railway in 1905 opened the same market to farmers in Delta. Many members deserted the Delta Creamery which paid 23¢ to 30¢ per pound butterfat for the fluid market where prices ranged from 40¢ to 55¢ per pound. The Creamery continued a steadily decreasing output of butter until it was replaced by the Pacific Milk plant.

The British Columbia Electric Railway Company operated an interurban tram line between Vancouver and New Westminster from the time of its incorporation in 1897. About a decade later the company began to make extensive additions to its electric railway system. The Lulu Island Railway linking Steveston to Vancouver and Eburne to New Westminster was operated under lease from the Canadian Pacific Railway. A new branch was extended to Burnaby in 1911 and the Fraser Valley line,
"the longest and most costly single tramline in the Dominion," was completed to Chilliwack in October, 1910.

As the milk flow to Vancouver increased so did the number of retail dairies. In 1905 there were six, all privately operated. By 1910 this number had increased to twenty and by 1915 to twenty-eight. In spite of the increased price farmers received from the dealers, they were not satisfied with the new market for they soon came to feel they were at the mercy of the city dealer. There are still farmers in the Valley who remember the grievances of this period. They recall that they put their milk on the train and hoped for the best. Often their cans would not be returned. The dealers were frequently blamed, but the railroad was just as often responsible. When cows were milking, the supply had to be handled daily. To be deprived of cans was more than a grievance; it was a real hardship.

Payment was rarely prompt. When the farmer did receive his returns, he frequently found that he had been credited with sour milk — often one or two cans each day. It was difficult to believe that part of the shipment could have soured on the way to Vancouver. He was convinced that this was another way in which the dealer cheated him. Dealers frequently cut farmers off with little notice and some farmers believed that they were "blackballed." Sometimes the dealer would close down his business suddenly or go into bankruptcy. The farmer who sustained heavy losses rarely felt any sympathy for the middle man. Undoubtedly the complaints were many. In 1909 farmers were demanding a system of bi-monthly settlements "owing to large losses in the past by the failure of a number of retailers in Vancouver."

But the dealers had problems too. Some farmers engaged in winter dairying, but feed costs were so high that the majority followed the
practice of having their cows freshen in spring to take advantage of summer pastures. Thus there was frequently a shortage of milk during the winter which often left the dairies in the embarrassing position of being unable to satisfy all their customers. In the "flush" season there was more than enough to fill the requirements of the fluid market. To the annoyance and frustration of the farmer, the price would drop, usually with little notice.

There was concern in the cities about the quality of the milk supply. Vancouver and New Westminster newspapers gave considerable publicity to complaints of uncleanliness and adulteration. Attempts on the part of medical health officers to control the situation led to further friction between dealers and producers as each blamed the other for the addition of water and preservatives to the milk.\textsuperscript{70}

It proved impossible for anxious officials to prosecute under provincial law because adulteration of food, a matter of criminal law, was within the exclusive jurisdiction of the dominion parliament.\textsuperscript{71} Having failed to control the milk supply through the courts, the medical officers succeeded in having a milk commission appointed in Vancouver in 1909. It was made up of medical men who worked with the vendors and dairy proprietors.\textsuperscript{72} Members of the commission inspected the premises of the dairymen, examined the milk and graded it. Milk producers meeting an acceptable standard were allowed to use the name of the Vancouver Medical Association on cans and bottles.\textsuperscript{73} As a result of an investigation of the milk supply by a royal commission, a Milk Act was passed in 1913, enabling the council of every municipality to pass bylaws for the regulation of milk produced and sold within its bounds.\textsuperscript{74}

Two farmers' organizations formed in response to the complexities
and problems of the fluid milk market. These associations became, along with the Chilliwack Creamery, important bases for the emergence of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association. In 1904 the Richmond Dairymen's Association formed with a head office at 228 Abbott Street, Vancouver. This was a wholesale outlet for the farmers' produce, and an attempt on the part of some of the lower valley farmers to strengthen their position with the dealers through united action. There were several managers in the first seven years, but from 1911 until 1917 E.G. Sherwood served in that position.

Many of the farmers appear to have been willing to conform to more rigid quality standards if dealers were also forced to meet them. Many, who wished to ship milk consistently throughout the year, found it impossible to sustain the high cost of winter dairying unless they could be assured a good price throughout the year. In September, 1909, a group of dairy farmers, organized as the Lower Mainland Milk and Cream Shippers' Association, forced the price of milk from 20¢ to 22½¢ per gallon for milk and from $1.10 to $1.30 per gallon for cream. The position of this organization was weakened, however, when the British Columbia Electric Railway completed its line to Chilliwack in October, 1910, adding the rich Chilliwack district to the Vancouver "milk shed."

For years Chilliwack had looked forward to a railroad connection with the coast. The townspeople had waited for a Canadian Pacific Railway branch line which did not materialize. They had expected the Coast-Kootenay Railroad to open the Valley to Vancouver, only to be disappointed. At last the rail link with the coast was made, bringing enormous changes.
The British Columbia Milk Condensing Company, with its headquarters at New Westminster, built a plant on the line of the B.C. Electric Railway in Sumas in 1911, a year after the Sardis Creamery closed. Increased competition from imports kept butter prices low and condensed milk proved to be a more profitable dairy product. The decline of the creamery period had begun in the upper valley with a private plant being the first to close.

Edenbank Creamery patrons decided to take advantage of the city market. Arrangements were made to have a branch opened in the Vancouver market which would provide an outlet for various products. A pasteurizer and a modern cold storage plant were installed, and a new dairy and milk house built. As an inducement to come through Sardis, the Creamery contributed six acres of land to the B.C. Electric Railway Company for a right-of-way and made a public subscription of $600 towards the project. A station was built and a spur line was laid immediately behind the Creamery.

The Chilliwack Creamery Association had built a new and modern plant in 1908 with an improved water supply. In the spring of 1910, fifty or sixty share-holders of the Cooperative met to consider what action would be of advantage to them as a result of the anticipated access to the city. The question of amalgamation with Richmond Dairy was discussed. E.D. Barrow, president of the Creamery, pointed out that this would strengthen the dairymen's hand and indicated that the Richmond Association looked with favor on such a scheme. But the farmers were not ready for any such commitment. They decided to sell as much milk as possible on the fluid market in the hope that this would create a greater demand for butter and so increase the price. Later that
year a contract was signed with the City Dairy Company of Vancouver for 50¢ per pound butterfat as compared with 22¢ to 32¢ which members had previously received from butter and ice-cream returns. The Vancouver Creamery sent W.K. McLeod to the Chilliwack Valley to establish a depot. Within a year he had accepted a position as manager of the Chilliwack Creamery. It would appear that the patrons had firm control of their production which they had no intention of relinquishing. For them the future looked bright. But the competition of Chilliwack milk was a threat to farmers in the lower valley.

As a result of the expansion of outlets, land values in the Valley rose sharply. Real estate advertising promised great opportunities. The literature was far from false. The success of the two creameries was a well established fact and there were a number of farmers who were willing to testify to the opportunities they had found. Vancouver's rapid growth promised to continue as the Panama Canal neared completion. This prospect was an important consideration for some individuals making an investment in Fraser Valley land.

The whole valley still needed more settlers to open up the unoccupied lands. People attracted to the area as this boom period continued, however, found uncleared lands in the hands of speculators. Low assessment rates on wild lands had kept taxation low, enabling those who held them to wait for higher prices. Land speculation had been a problem since the days of the gold rush but in this hectic period, real estate agents increased in number and the cost of land rose
in some cases as much as 400% in two years. The influx of population brought increased demands for services which would raise taxation rates. A Royal Commission appointed to investigate taxation reported that it found "abundant proof of rapidly advancing prosperity side by side with a strong spirit of optimism on the part of the people." The commissioners came to the conclusion that "complaints were regarding the method rather than the amount of taxation."

The cost of clearing land was prohibitive, often reaching more than $200 per acre. Farmers' Institutes provided some relief by buying stumping powder in large quantities which made it possible to supply members at minimum cost. But wages were high and labor, attracted off the farms to the exploding cities where public works provided better paying jobs, was scarce.

There were many problems in this turbulent period; most, however, were related to rapid population growth which brought with it expectancy of prosperity. The expansion of the cities, particularly Vancouver, created problems for the farmer or the would-be farmer -- increased taxation, increased prices for land, shortage of labor, and pressures to adapt to new marketing methods and to conform to stricter sanitary regulations. But the cities also provided markets which promised to be more lucrative than any yet available. The farmer increased his production and also his determination to gain his share of the city markets.

The agricultural problems were intensified by what was commonly called a "financial stringency" which became apparent at the end of 1912 and persisted through 1913 and into 1914. In December, 1912, a royal commission was appointed with W.H. Hayward as chairman to
investigate agricultural conditions. The report, published in 1914, specified the problems. The commissioners, in order to gain perspective on local conditions had visited Europe, Australia, New Zealand, the prairie provinces, Washington, Oregon, California, Ontario and Wisconsin, and as a result of their inquiries, firmly recommended the encouragement of cooperative association. In 1913 an amendment to the Agricultural Associations Act of 1911 was passed which entitled cooperative associations to a provincial government loan amounting to eighty percent of their subscribed capital. It was under the provisions of this act that the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association incorporated and applied for a charter.

The dairymen who applied for the F.V.M.P.A. charter in 1913 shared with other farmers the problems created by the economic recession of that year. A shortage of capital made credit difficult to obtain. This created hardship for farmers forced to increase production because of decreased returns. The solution appeared to be control of the market -- whether for milk, fruit or wheat -- in order to divert profits from the middle man to the farmer and in order to stabilize the market by preventing seasonal "gluts." The Okanagan United Growers also organized in 1913 in order to improve their position on the prairie market. Okanagan and Fraser Valley farmers were aware of the success that the California fruit-growers had achieved through cooperation. The United Grain Growers' Grain Company had successfully marketed the grain of Canadian prairie farmers since 1906, and through farmer-controlled elevator companies, wheat-producers were eliminating the middle men. Milk-producers in the areas surrounding most large
North American cities were moving towards cooperative action in order to market their milk.

Although these successful ventures provided inspiration and example, each cooperative came into being as a result of local conditions and was shaped in response to local requirements. The emergence of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association can be seen in terms of the entrepreneurial character of the first farming ventures in the Valley, the high cost of land in both capital and labor and the constant, and throughout most of the period from 1858 to 1913, very rapid expansion of markets. The implementation of government measures to encourage more efficient dairying practices had laid the ground work for the success of the creameries which provided experience and education in cooperative action. The creameries and condensaries, placed close to the producer, had solved many of the problems of dealing with a perishable product. Some of the best markets, on the mining frontiers in Klondyke, Atlin and Kootenay communities, reinforced the "Gold Rush" mentality of the Fraser Valley farmers. But dairy products, first butter, then condensed milk, met increasing competition as improved storage and transportation facilities opened markets to world competition. Producers began to crowd into the lucrative fluid market in the bursting city created by the railroad. Among the optimistic, aggressive dairymen were a few who realized that farmers would need to organize in order to achieve orderly marketing if the best advantage was to be obtained from the latest in a series of marketing opportunities.
THE BIRTH OF THE ASSOCIATION

The members of the Hayward Commission on Agriculture who recommended cooperative association found throughout the Valley "a strong theoretical belief in the benefits of cooperation." Although the complexities of marketing agricultural produce were concerning farmers everywhere in British Columbia in 1912 and 1913, there was, as yet, little success in solving these problems through cooperation. Nevertheless, in the Fraser Valley there was more than a "theoretical" belief in the benefits of cooperation. A good deal of practical experience had been obtained in united action, though not all of it was as successful as the creamery ventures.

A commune established in Ruskin in the 1880's had operated successfully for about four years until dissension over wages to be paid "key" men led to its dissolution. E.H. Heaps and Company took over the building constructed by the group. A dairy association had formed in Hammond in the 1890's, and years later the reasons for its difficulties and failure were recalled as being the lack of a comprehensive organization.

A branch of the Farmers' Alliance which organized in 1882 was successful in gaining certain concessions from the government. Through the Patrons of Industry which succeeded the Alliance, farmers were able to gain concessions on freight and wharfage rates in Victoria, Nanaimo, Vancouver and New Westminster. They also
forced down retail prices in New Westminster by bringing in goods from Toronto at competitive prices. Through the Settlers' Association of British Columbia farmers were able to get timber rights and better terms for those who had been unable to make pre-emption payments.

The main object of the Farmers' Institutes, established in 1897 by an act of the provincial legislature, was the "dissemination of information in regard to agriculture." Of the nineteen branches organized, eight were in the Fraser Valley. A dominion experimental farm was established at Agassiz in 1888. Research carried on at this station was of great benefit to farmers attempting to improve production. Through the Farmers' Institutes valuable technical information was more easily made available to producers and they were educated in the principles of cooperation. In an area where land clearing was a major problem, Farmers' Institutes provided an important service by supplying stumping powder at reduced prices. The distrust of government-sponsored organizations, so apparent in Ontario and on the prairies, was much less evident in British Columbia. Until chaotic conditions on the fluid market created complex marketing problems, the farmers' main concern was with production problems - draining, dyking, land clearing, herd and crop improvement and improved methods of handling milk. Legislation and the activities of government-appointed agriculturalists had played an important part in providing effective solutions. Many of the dairymen came to accept and to expect that problems should be solved through government action.

In 1903 the Mutual Fire Insurance Company of British Columbia had been incorporated on the initiative of the Central Farmers' Institute. This organization still carries on business today and
has always been well supported by members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association.

A year after the Richmond producers had formed their Dairy Produce Company in 1904, the Chilliwack Cooperative Association had organized a consumers' cooperative. After some initial difficulties, it carried on business until 1910, paying 9% interest to its members for the first four years. When lack of capital prohibited expansion the stock was sold to a local merchant. The property owned by the Association appreciated in value so that it was possible for the cooperative to dissolve without loss. Charles Evans was president from 1906 until 1910, and though a number of the directors were businessmen, it was a farmers' cooperative. Many of the names that appear over the years are later to be found on the shipping lists of the F.V.M.P.A.

The British Columbia Dairymen's Association, first organized in 1894, was the vehicle through which much information about improved production methods was made available to farmers. It also facilitated the establishment of creameries, and having served these purposes, disbanded. In 1906 the Association was reorganized and played a significant role in unifying and organizing farmers, particularly in the upper part of the Valley.

These farmer groups had formed in response to a particular problem. In most cases they disbanded when that problem was solved; in others, associations disintegrated or disappeared because they failed financially. There was no Fraser Valley farmer group in early 1913 through which marketing problems could be satisfactorily solved; but the earlier organizations, whether successful or not, had provided
the means by which practical experience had been gained, leadership had emerged and farmers had become familiar with cooperative principles.

In 1913, undoubtedly stimulated by the Hayward Commission Report on Agriculture, many cooperatives became incorporated in British Columbia. Of those formed in the Fraser Valley, only the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association was chartered in order to deal with marketing problems on a valley-wide basis. The application for the F.V.M.P.A. charter had thirty signatures. It has been possible to obtain information about most of these men. Short biographies are presented in Appendix C arranged in the order in which the names appeared on the list of subscribers. Three of the farms represented were run on a partnership basis so thirty-three men were involved. An examination of this information provides an insight into the type of leadership which made possible the successful formation of the dairymen's cooperative.

The subscribers' list represents farmers living in various parts of the Valley. The largest group is from Chilliwack. It has been possible to estimate closely or to learn the exact birthdate of twenty-eight of these men. Apart from Heaton, who apparently was still a student, the Starr brothers, Jay aged twenty-eight and Perry aged twenty-six, were the youngest members. George McClelland, at seventy-four, was the oldest member. Seven men were in their fifties and fifteen were in their forties. Of the twenty-eight, only Park, Chadsey and Parker were still in their thirties. The majority of
the farmers were middle-aged; the movement was not led by youthful idealists.

Most of the F.V.M.P.A. charter members appear to have been well established as farmers. Some who had been born in the Valley or who had arrived at an early age had acquired land when prices were low. A few had arrived with financial resources; others had worked hard at farm labor or logging in order to save money to buy their farms. Much of the biographical material is sketchy, but the information obtained indicates that a surprising number of the group of F.V.M.P.A. charter members were involved in public office, either as members of school boards or councils. Most of these men gave leadership in farmer organizations. Four had been or were to become active in politics at the provincial level.

The place of birth of thirty-two of the thirty-three members is known. A comparison of the birthplaces of the male population of the New Westminster district in 1911 with the birthplaces of the charter members of the F.V.M.P.A. indicates that in comparison to their proportion in the population a greater number of the cooperative members were British, American and Canadian born, fewer were European and none were Asian. British Columbians were under-represented in the initial membership of the F.V.M.P.A., probably because a high percentage of those native to the province were in a low age group. It is also probable that many of those born in British Columbia had capitalized on land holdings and had escaped the long hours dairying required by moving into more lucrative business enterprises or less demanding occupations.

The fact that dairy farming requires more capital than most branches of agriculture probably explains why few Asians were engaged
in it. Prejudice against Orientals and East Indians entering the industry was very strong. The F.V.M.P.A. Minutes for April 27, 1918 reveal that directors passed a motion to "allot the list of stock submitted excepting that of Partap Singh." This policy of excluding a milk producer ran counter to the policy of attempting to gain control of all milk in the Valley. It is not surprising, therefore, that one year later the Board of Directors passed a motion "that we take a contract from Hindoos and handle milk but do not issue stock." The Richmond local passed a motion in the summer of 1918 stating that "our association notify Head Office that a Jap is shipping milk... and that our association is decidedly opposed to this."

A few years later, E.D. Barrow, as Minister of Agriculture, announced that he was anxious that no Orientals be permitted to purchase land in the new Sumas reclamation area. And no Orientals did. The land lay vacant for several years until C.E. Eckert assisted Mennonites to settle. The dairying industry had many problems, but in the Fraser Valley the milk producers were never plagued by tensions between Orientals and whites as were the market-gardeners and vegetable-growers.

The percentage of members born in Quebec is less significant that it would first appear, and the Ontario influence is stronger. The Michauds from Quebec, who represent one family, have been considered as separate members, and Alec Jess, though born in Quebec was raised in Ontario. Of the three British Columbia-born, two had parents who were from Ontario, and the third, Perry Starr, had an Ontario-born mother.
Of the four American-born members, two, M.E. Alexander and H.W. Vanderhoof, both directors, returned to the United States. The natural boundaries of the Fraser Valley extend considerably south of the forty-ninth parallel and Sumas was for many years an important Valley centre. The building of the B.C. Electric Railway, however, the draining of Sumas Lake and the completion of a more satisfactory road link to New Westminster and Vancouver tightened the Canadian part of the Valley in defiance of natural boundaries. Nevertheless, friendly relations developed between the F.V.M.P.A. and dairymen's associations in Whatcom and Skagit Counties. Fraser Valley farmers were undoubtedly influenced by the success of the United Dairy Association of Washington which by 1922 had a total membership of 6000 in six county associations and owned manufacturing plants worth $1,500,000.  

One fact that the table reveals very clearly is the strong British influence on the formation of the Cooperative. In Britain, cooperation had less impact on agriculture than on other areas of the economy, but numerous marketing and supply associations developed. Most of the British-born charter members undoubtedly had some knowledge of these associations or experience with some other type of cooperative organization.  

Though there were other men in the Valley who were also responsible for the success of the F.V.M.P.A., among these thirty-three original members was a core of leaders who took the initiative, men who were committed to cooperative marketing. They canvassed friends and neighbors in order to obtain the required number of signatures and then continued to fight inertia and regional jealousies in order to launch the cooperative.
"'Combine, combine, combine' is the watchword of the present age," said W.E. Scott, Deputy Minister of Agriculture for British Columbia early in 1913. Before the year was over, many farmers had combined for various purposes. The fruit-growers of the Okanagan Valley had launched a successful organization which enabled them to market cooperatively. In the Fraser Valley, the F.V.M.P.A. was only one of a number of cooperatives chartered for the purpose of improving marketing or for improving production and facilitating the purchase of supplies.

Early in 1913 a cooperative formed in the Maple Ridge district for the purpose of buying flour and feed in carload lots. Though the shares were priced at 10¢ each, $3,200 was subscribed and by May, the United Farmers were buying eight carloads per month and planning to build a large warehouse in Haney. Similar groups formed in many places, usually through the Farmers' Institutes. Strawberry Hill, Hall's Prairie and Burquitlam were three successful associations in the Surrey district.

The Live Stock Branch of the provincial Department of Agriculture assisted in instituting and conducting Cow Testing Associations under the provisions of the Agricultural Associations Act. Cow testers were appointed to areas pasturing at least 400 cows if farmers wished to support such an association. The first two Cow Testing Associations were organized in Chilliwack almost immediately and six months later a third started in Langley.
Farmers were being forced to produce as efficiently as possible. The Cow Testing Associations were a valuable means by which they could assess the value of various feeds and weed out "the boarded cow."

The Chilliwack Producers' Exchange was granted incorporation early in June of 1913\textsuperscript{25} for the purpose of marketing farm produce and providing feed and other supplies to members. It appears to have been started when it became evident that the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association could not begin to do business immediately. The Exchange provided a wider range of services for the upper valley dairy farmers than the Lower Mainland Milk Shippers' Union, merely a bargaining association, was able to perform for the lower valley members. Most of the directors of the Exchange were later members of the F.V.M.P.A. and three were also charter members. The Producers' Exchange operated successfully until it sold out to Buckerfield's in 1928\textsuperscript{26}.

W.H. Taylor, writing in 1928, voiced an opinion which appears to have been common among many farmers. Cooperative efforts were frustrated and delayed, he suggested, because of the large number of farmers' organizations which divided the producers and prevented united action.\textsuperscript{27} While it is true that regional jealousies were strong, and that it took a combination of firm leadership and economic circumstance to bring the valley-wide cooperative into being, one can see, nevertheless, that the plethora of farmers' groups was an indication, not merely of division, but of regional organization. It was from the smaller cooperatives than the F.V.M.P.A. leadership emerged and it was on the solid basis of their membership that the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association was firmly founded.
It is not difficult to trace the gradual consolidation which led to the announcement in January, 1917, that the Fraser Valley dairymen were prepared to go into business. In 1906 a meeting of representatives from Edenbank and Chilliwack Creameries, the Chilliwack Cooperative Association and the Chilliwack Farmers' Exchange, a successful fruit-growers' cooperative, had considered the advisability and feasibility of establishing a distributing depot in Vancouver. The idea had received considerable support, but several of the farmers voiced fears that the project was too large. Nothing came of it. The pattern for joint action was, however, being established.

The most significant of the organizations which laid the basis for the F.V.M.P.A. was undoubtedly the Lower Mainland Milk and Cream Shippers' Association, a bargaining association through which the farmers of Langley, Pitt Meadows and Delta attempted to strengthen their position in relation to Vancouver dealers. Each member was assessed $5 to meet the expenses of the group. It was the executive of this organization that called a general meeting in New Westminster in 1910, just before the completion of the B.C. Electric Railway line to Chilliwack, at which the idea of forming a valley-wide cooperative was first discussed. Lower Valley farmers suggested a union of the Richmond Dairy Produce Company and the Chilliwack Creamery. Present at that meeting were W.J. Park, Pitt Meadows; John Oliver, Delta; J.W. Berry, Langley; E.D. Barrow and C.E. Eckert, Chilliwack; and H.W. Vanderhoof, Huntingdon. All these men later served as directors of the F.V.M.P.A. and five of the six were charter members. Though they represented various districts, they saw the farmers' problems in terms of the whole Valley.

The Chilliwack farmers were not yet ready to consider amalgamation with Richmond Dairy. E.D. Barrow appears to have encouraged
the creamery patrons to make the best use of their bargaining position. 31 By 1913, however, Chilliwack farmers were also encountering difficulties. Further consolidation occurred as various groups of dairymen used the agency of the Chilliwack Dairymen's Association to solve their common problems. Directors of this organization met on February 22, 1913 "for the purpose of electing commissioners to represent the association in matters pertaining to the adjustment of prices, transportation and legislation for the year 1913." 32 Plans were laid for addresses to be delivered to the members in various districts. Among those chosen to address the meetings were E.D. Barrow, president of the Chilliwack Creamery, and Alex Mercer, a director of the same creamery; E.A. Wells who had taken over from his father the running of Edenbank the year before, and C.E. Eckert, a Chilliwack Creamery director, who was to be largely responsible for the formation of the Chilliwack Producers' Exchange organized later that year.

The commissioners appointed by the directors of the Chilliwack Dairymen's Association met with the Lower Mainland Milk Shippers' Association in the spring of 1913. It was at this meeting that a decision was reached "to organize a milk shippers' exchange where all milk sold in the cities would be handled through a clearing house owned by the milk shippers." 33 The object was to control the supply so that all shippers, large and small, would have a steady market for their milk. 34 The first meeting of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, held in New Westminster on May 20, 1913, was a direct outcome of this decision.
The first business done by the newly elected directors was to appoint Thomas Forster to canvass the lower valley for new members and to appoint Barrow and Eckert to canvass the Chilliwack district. At the first annual meeting in January, 1914, John Oliver and C.E. Eckert were appointed to draft a form of contract. The directors moved slowly and carefully, obviously aware that few farmers were ready for their ambitious undertaking. Dairymen in the lower valley were loathe to share the Vancouver market with Chilliwack producers. They felt that their own location close to the market gave them a stronger claim to it. Patrons of the Chilliwack Creamery were also reluctant to merge their highly successful venture into a larger union. Edenbank patrons had suffered serious financial losses as a result of their venture into the city market. This served as a warning to the Chilliwack Creamery patrons.

Though the Edenbank Creamery Company Limited was installed in the City Market in Vancouver as an outlet for the products of the Sardis Creamery, the producers had little control over the prices received. In the spring of 1912 in a dispute over returns, Wells gave notice that Edenbank Farm intended to discontinue shipping to the retail outlet. The Vancouver branch began to lose money heavily during the recession of 1913-1914 and was closed up, but not before profits from the Sardis business and money advanced by the share-holders had been swallowed up.

The Chilliwack Creamery patrons were less vulnerable. By maintaining their butter production, they had assured themselves of a steady year round return. They were also in a position to take advantage of the fluid market in the winter months when
better prices prevailed. The annual statement for the Chilliwack Creamery indicated that the year which saw Edenbank on the verge of bankruptcy was one in which the Chilliwack Creamery did more business that it had ever done. It showed a gross profit of $49,955.87 and a net profit of $4,765.67. 40 It is not difficult to understand why the patrons rejected overtures made by the directors of the F.V.M.P.A.

Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association directors, their plans made, had to wait for economic conditions to create a climate of dissatisfaction among farmers in order to gain enough support to bring about amalgamation. A step in this direction was taken in May, 1914. Wholesalers in Vancouver repudiated a contract made two months before with the Lower Mainland Milk Shippers' Association. The contract called for the same price for milk during April and May as obtained during the balance of the summer months. That price was to be 55¢ per pound butterfat. 41 The failure of the dealers to honor this contract strengthened the resolve of the small group of men who were attempting to form the cooperative and gained them more support. Mass meetings were held in both Chilliwack and New Westminster. The Westminster gathering was presided over by Thomas Forster, president of the Milk Shippers' Association. E.D. Barrow chaired the Chilliwack rally. 42 Farmers from both ends of the Valley were beginning to act together.
The marketing situation in the summer of 1914 was chaotic. Poor financial conditions still prevailed, affecting the market for condensed milk. Managers of the condensaries in the Valley found their stocks piling up in warehouses and they were rapidly reaching the point where they would have to stop taking milk. This would increase the supply available for the fluid market, already flooded in the summer. This huge surplus put the farmers at the mercy of the dealers.

Judging by newspaper accounts of the meetings, Thomas Forster, the former union organizer, saw the situation mainly in terms of the action which the farmer should take in face of the repudiation of a contract.\(^{43}\) Both Barrow and Eckert presented the situation in more complex terms. The basic problem was not merely oppressive tactics on the part of the dealers. H.E. Almond of Vancouver City Dairy and L. Chevally of the B.C. Condensing Company were asked to attend the Chilliwack meeting to share in the discussion. This invitation was obviously recognition of the fact that they shared a common problem. It may also have been, of course, a not-too-subtle way of putting pressure on the dealers. Almond warned the farmers to be careful in their efforts to control the city milk supply and wished them success in their work,\(^{44}\) highly ironic sentiments in view of the conflicts that lay ahead.

The basic problem was not over-supply. British Columbia continued to import large quantities of butter,\(^{45}\) and the Valley could barely supply the Vancouver fluid market during the winter months. The basic problem was lack of control. The solution lay in handling the summer surplus and thus stabilizing the market. Park, Barrow,
Eckert and their supporters felt that the farmers could do this by cooperation. By cooperation, also, a farmers' association could take over the retail market and by reorganizing the delivery system cheapen the cost of milk to the consumer.\textsuperscript{46}

A handful of men had analyzed the problem and devised a solution, but nothing could be done until they were assured of sufficient support from the farmers. At the next meeting of the F.V.M.P.A. directors in June of 1914, W.E. Buckingham was appointed canvasser for stock subscriptions.\textsuperscript{47}

The European war broke out that summer, and the enthusiasm of the spring meeting appears to have worn off. A new B.C. Milk Condensing plant in Ladner, which had gone into operation in the spring, absorbed some of the Delta surplus. When the Sumas branch of the condensary was forced to partial closure, the Chilliwack Creamery took the surplus milk. An embargo on United States stock and dairy products, brought to a culmination sooner than expected, promised protected markets for Valley products,\textsuperscript{48} and the summer crisis passed.

But the work of amalgamation went on. An attempt was made to unite the Chilliwack Creamery and the Chilliwack Producers' Exchange.\textsuperscript{49} By combining the Exchange, which shipped milk to the fluid market, and the Creamery, which continued to make butter and ice-cream with its surplus, Chilliwack dairymen were attempting to do what it was hoped the F.V.M.P.A. would do for the whole Valley. The producers required more capital. They planned to launch their venture with a provincial government loan made available to cooperative associations under the provisions of the Agricultural Associations Act of 1911.\textsuperscript{50} The provincial government, however, was no longer willing to advance
such loans because the outbreak of war had created a shortage of funds. The members of the Exchange each paid $20 more on their holdings and the cooperative continued in operation. But amalgamation was delayed.

The change of government policy affected the plants of the F.V.M.P.A. too and delayed the commencement of business. At the annual meeting in January, 1915 it was decided to continue collecting funds. The work of recruiting members went on, but since the farm land of France had become a battle ground Canadians were urged to produce food for export to Europe. Buckingham found the farmers of Delta and Langley too busy harvesting grain crops to listen to propositions about a dairy cooperative in the summer of 1915. At the third annual meeting seven directors were elected. John Oliver retired. George McClelland, L.W. Embree and M.E. Alexander joined the rest of the original group. The directors were instructed to proceed with the organization until 80% of the milk producers in the Valley were signed up.

The Canadian Northern Railway, completed in 1915, opened the market to more shippers. Within a short time a milk train operated from Rosedale to Port Mann, stopping at fourteen points. Though the price of dairy products remained stationary, the cost of feed and of most other goods began to rise sharply. The farmers found that they could not make a profit; many were sustaining a loss at the 55¢ per pound butterfat they were receiving from Vancouver dealers.

Individual shippers had attempted to negotiate a better price, but without success. In late October, 1916, forty dairymen, representing several district from Chilliwack to Pitt Meadows and Langley, met with
representatives from the retail firms and succeeded in securing an increase of 5¢, making the price of butterfat 60¢ per pound. The success of this venture proved the effectiveness of united action and revived interest in the formation of a cooperative association.

Farmers in Agassiz had come to the conclusion that a lower return, if steady, would be preferable to the uncertainty of the fluid market. Through the Farmers' Institute they had taken an option on property to be used to build a cooperative creamery. Among the first upper Valley dairymen to gain access to the Vancouver market, Agassiz farmers were now being forced to produce lower-priced secondary products. The plans of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association offered a means by which this pattern could be prevented from taking shape. Presented with the opportunity, most Agassiz farmers joined the Cooperative.

Support was not as strong in all areas of the Valley. Travel was difficult and some places were not canvassed. In Chilliwack there was some friction between the Creamery patrons who remained loyal to the Cooperative and those who took advantage of the winter shortage to ship independently. On the other hand, F.V.M.P.A. directors pointed out that the Creamery, by keeping the surplus off the Vancouver market during the summer, allowed farmers across and further down the river to put all their product on the market. "In short," declared C.H. Evans, "they invested their funds to maintain a creamery to hold their milk off the market so that others with no similar investment could take advantage of it." During periods of shortage dealers could buy accommodation milk at market prices. "The creameries," said Evans, "were working hand in glove with city dealers, allowing themselves to be tools... to play football with producers."
Gradually the arguments took effect. At the annual meeting in January, 1917, it was announced that 80% of the milk produced was under the control of the Association. There were 848 members, each of whom had signed an agreement to buy stock to the value of $50 per can, based on the average can shipment for the previous year. Park let it be known later that the executive had little idea how many shippers were in the Valley. After their organization was more complete they realized that not more than 60% of the dairymen had been signed up. All the large producers in the Valley were members of the Cooperative, however. When the dealers found that the farmers they approached that spring were committed to the F.V.M.P.A. they accepted the declaration of the Cooperative leaders that they had effective control and agreed to buy milk from them.

The farmers were in business, but they had won the first round on a bluff.

Farmers all over the North American continent were faced with the problem of adapting to rapidly increasing industrialization. Many suffered a sense of alienation as urban growth encroached on farm land and drew young people to the city. Caught in an economic squeeze as costs spiralled upward, they resorted to political action or turned to cooperative marketing. The reaction of Fraser Valley dairymen to these pressures and to the strains of a war-time economy which accelerated them was not dissimilar to that of other farmers in North America.

In 1916 the Non-Partisan League of North Dakota elected the governor of the state and won a majority in the state legislature. In Ontario, J.J. Morrison, presided over the growth of the United Farmers of Ontario Clubs which were to provide an electoral machine effective enough to carry a farmer government into provincial office in 1919.
Henry Wise Wood became the president of the United Farmers of Alberta in 1916. In Manitoba and Saskatchewan the farmers were showing an increasing interest in political action. In the Fraser Valley, John Oliver and E.D. Barrow were elected to the provincial legislative as Liberal party members, but they were, in effect, representative of a Fraser Valley farm protest movement.

Milk shippers tributary to most large North American cities were taking collective action. The New England Milk Producers' Association, formed in 1913, incorporated on a non-stock, non-profit basis in 1917 in order to solve the problems of farmers shipping to the Boston market. The Dairymen's Cooperative Sales Company was formed in 1916 in the Pittsburgh area; the Milk Producers' Cooperative Milk Company, started in 1916, was centred in Chicago; and the Dairymen's League Cooperative Association was organized in 1919 by farmers in the Cleveland milk shed. Most of these organizations were based on earlier cooperative associations or stock companies, some of which had become inactive.

California dairymen, no doubt influenced by the success of the California Fruit Growers' Association, organized round market centres in Sacramento, Oakland, San Francisco, Fresno, Los Angeles, El Centro, Soledad and San Diego. The Associated Dairymen, a federation of five of these associations became incorporated on August 4, 1917. At the close of 1919 this organization included approximately eight thousand dairymen and eight associations. The Inland Empire Milk Producers' Association in Spokane, Washington; The Oregon Dairymen's League of Portland, Oregon; and the United Dairy Association of Washington centred at Seattle followed the lead of the California dairymen.
Of twenty-five farmers' milk distributing companies organized in the United States in May, 1920, only three had formed before 1913, the year the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association obtained its first charter. By 1917, the year the F.V.M.P.A. went into business, eleven of the twenty-five were established.

The completion of the B.C. Electric line to Chilliwack in 1910 was one of the most significant factors in creating marketing problems in Vancouver. The dissatisfaction over rising costs of production which drove North American farmers into agrarian movements and political parties created the unrest in the Fraser Valley necessary to gain farmer support for the plan to achieve orderly marketing through cooperative action. The early directors of the F.V.M.P.A. must have gained ideas and knowledge from the experience of other farmers, but both in taking political action and in cooperating to control marketing they were well in the vanguard of North American dairymen taking similar action.
The decision of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association to go into business, announced at the annual meeting in January, 1917, was made at the beginning of a year during which prices for farm products rose very sharply. The initial success of the F.V.M.P.A. can be attributed, in part, to this fortunate timing. The Valley was divided into sixteen districts at the January meeting and canvassing committees were appointed in each. To a large extent the success of the F.V.M.P.A. has lain in the strength of its locals. The locals sprang into being quickly because regional organization had taken place over a long period of time and the consolidation of local groups had been gradual. Success would appear to be inevitable for an organization so firmly based, beginning its business operation at such an opportune time. It was, however, the early success of the F.V.M.P.A. which created division among the farmers and prevented the organization from achieving its goals immediately.

New directors were elected at the January meeting: H.W. Vanderhoof, W.J. Park, J.W. Berry, C.E. Eckert, E.D. Barrow, Alex Davie and C.H. Evans. The directorate moved quickly. They negotiated successfully with the milk condensing plants at Ladner and South Sumas; they obtained contracts from the Valley Dairy, Standard Dairy and Turner's Dairy, and leased both Edenbank and Chilliwack Creameries with an option to purchase. By the beginning of March they had established a head office in the Standard Bank Building in Vancouver and were using the building of the Richmond Dairy Produce Company as a central distributing depot. The F.V.M.P.A.
had taken over all business done by the Richmond Dairy, which had been in serious financial difficulty, and the manager, E.G. Sherwood, had been hired as general manager of the Cooperative. By-laws were drawn up for the newly organized locals. After the milk collecting system was reorganized, milk was delivered to the Chilliwack Creamery and the Condensary without overlapping at a saving of $14 per day. But offers to cooperate with Vancouver authorities and city dealers in an attempt to reorganize the delivery system were not accepted. Small dealers were afraid that in the non-competitive system they would have no opportunity to expand, and could easily be driven out of business.

Prices were steadily increased. In May the F.V.M.P.A. was standing firm to a price of 60¢ per pound butterfat to condensers. Throughout the summer, prices to wholesalers were steadily increased. After the third wholesale increase in July, the retail price rose from 9 quarts for $1 to 8 quarts for $1. A civic committee in Vancouver investigated the situation and came to the conclusion that the farmers were not receiving "an unduly high price for their product." By September the directors set the price of milk to the condensers at 72½¢ per pound butterfat to increase to 85¢ by November 1. A price rise to 7 quarts for $1 followed the November increase in the wholesale price. The average price paid to the farmer for 1917 was 67.3¢ per pound butterfat. Of this, 2.5¢ per pound was kept back as a deferred payment to provide the association with working capital.

Early in 1918 Edenbank and the Chilliwack Creamery were bought out. The patrons refused to consent to a renewal of the lease and an extension of the option to purchase, but did agree that stock-holders who were producers, and the owners of Edenbank, would accept payment in
F.V.M.P.A. shares. The Association offered to purchase the Chilliwack Creamery for $16,500 and the Sardis Creamery for $11,000.

During thirteen years in operation the Chilliwack Creamery had never failed to pay 9% to shareholders, a record for cooperatives.

It is not difficult to understand why creamery patrons were reluctant to give up their thriving enterprise. Having made the decision to join the larger union, however, they were determined that all producers should share the cost of the creamery. Their plant, which had served them well, returned 80¢ on the dollar, a fair rate of depreciation. They brought into the F.V.M.P.A. not only an established creamery and an expectation of a fair return, but also a solid core of members experienced in cooperation and ready to transfer a steady loyalty from the creamery to the new cooperative.

The Chilliwack farmers were not disappointed. For the first time many of them received their share of the fluid market. Others in the Valley were sharing the cost of having the creamery absorb the surplus. The 67.3¢ average price for 1917 was a pooled price and therefore represented a greater gain for the farmer who had been receiving creamery prices, which were usually under 50¢, than it did for those who had received returns from the fluid market. It was these farmers who complained that prices were too low, and muttered to themselves that the F.V.M.P.A. had come into being to keep the Chilliwack Creamery going.

The 6% dividend which was declared at the end of the first year was paid in the form of stock in the Association, strengthening the Cooperative as the farmers prepared themselves to go into the retail business. The directors of the F.V.M.P.A. had committed themselves to raise the price to producers without raising it to the consumer. Though the retail
price had risen much more slowly and less drastically than the wholesale price, control of the retail trade appeared to be the only means by which the objective could be reached. It is clear that this control had been the aim of men like Barrow, Park and Eckert from the inception of the F.V.M.P.A., but there was some division of opinion among members and directors, and this goal appears to have been an issue in the election for directors in 1919.14

E.D. Barrow, the first president, had become Minister of Agriculture in the John Oliver government, and as John Oliver had done, he resigned from his executive position in the F.V.M.P.A. He was succeeded by John W. Berry who, with his new directorate15 and a mandate from the membership, carried out plans to take over the retail milk business of Vancouver.

By assessing members on the basis of $100 for each can of milk shipped and by taking notes for twenty months, the Association raised $150,000. With the notes for security, the directors borrowed the full amount from the Bank of Montreal. Park was always proud that the loan was paid up in 1924 before it was due.16 At a cost of $250,000 the Standard, Turner's, Hillcrest, Mainland and South Vancouver Dairies and one or two smaller distributors were purchased. The Standard Dairy Building was used as the retail headquarters. G.W. Clarke, its proprietor, became a partner, accepting F.V.M.P.A. shares as payment. In 1923 his share was bought out. The dairy was modernized and new equipment and machinery costing $40,000 were installed.17 The Fraser Valley Dairies Limited was incorporated 'with a capital of $500,000 divided into 5,000 shares.'18 The objects for which the company was incorporated were wide ranging, leaving the Association free to deal at the retail and wholesale level in almost
any type of agricultural product.

When the consolidation was complete, the 120 delivery rigs which the retailers had operated in an overlapping competitive system were reduced to 60 even though there was a 10% increase in the number of consumers.19 The average price paid to the F.V.M.P.A. members had risen to 90.9¢ with a 3¢ deferred payment,20 but the retail price of milk remained at 14.03¢ per quart.21 In New Westminster, where no such consolidation of outlets had taken place, the price was 16¢. With the exception of Ottawa, in no large city in Canada or the United States was the retail price of milk lower than in Vancouver.22

The Association began to expand in other directions. A feed department was organized. An agreement was drawn up whereby members of the various locals contracted to purchase all feed requirements through the Association. The cost of feed had been such a major concern of the farmers that numerous feed cooperatives had been formed before the F.V.M.P.A. became organized.23 In 1920-1921, however, when the sharp post-war recession caused a drop in prices there was less interest in cooperative buying. The feed department was abandoned when it lost money. Where there was initiative the directors encouraged the locals to continue their own enterprise. The highly successful Surrey Cooperative, a consumers' association, began in 1921 as an outgrowth of the feed operation carried on by the local.

In 1917 the F.V.M.P.A. had set the price of milk to wholesalers and condensers. When this policy was continued in 1918, the Borden factory closed at a moment's notice, leaving the Association with a surplus of 400 cans. The creameries were put to full production in the manufacture of butter and cheese. In 1919 when there was again lack of agreement over price, the Cooperative took the initiative and cut off the supply
of milk to the condensing plant. The plant closed and did not operate again.\(^{24}\) In 1920 the F.V.M.P.A. established an evaporated milk plant at Delair near Abbotsford and leased it to the Pacific Milk Company for a period of five years.\(^{25}\) In September of 1924 the Pacific Milk Company was bought out by the Association. Because the delta soils are acid, milk produced there is not as suitable for the manufacture of condensed milk as milk produced in areas with less acid soil. In 1928 the Ladner operation was closed and the equipment moved to Delair.\(^{26}\)

Though the returns from the evaporated milk brought $15,000 more than butter or cheese would have, the return to the farmer dropped from an average of 90.9¢ in 1919 to 85.3¢ in 1920.\(^{27}\) In order to pay for the milk plant, dividends were issued in stock and the deferred payment rose from 3¢ to 4½¢.\(^{28}\) Farm prices everywhere dropped from the war-time high in 1919 and farm surpluses began to accumulate. Condensed, evaporated and powdered milk began to pile up in warehouses as world demands fell off in the post-war years. In the spring of 1923, when surpluses had been absorbed, Park travelled to England and secured a contract for 100,000 cases of milk.\(^{29}\) This sale reduced the stock; it enabled the Cooperative to pay off the bank loan in 1924 and to adopt an ambitious plan for extension of facilities.

At an extraordinary meeting held in New Westminster on October 3, 1924, the members voted approval of a development plant which included not only the purchase of the Pacific Milk Company, but also the extension of the Vancouver facilities and the erection of a utility plant.\(^{30}\) The utility plant was built at Sardis and was in operation within a year. Equipment from the Chilliwack Creamery was moved to the Utility Plant. Powdered milk was later added to the milk products.
By owning its own manufacturing plant, the Association was able to use up surplus milk which could not be absorbed by the fluid market and gain a return from skim milk which had previously gone to waste. By placing the manufacturing plants in the central and upper Valley, the directors were able to reduce the distance milk had to be transported. This investment in plants to quote an oft-repeated phrase "held an umbrella over the whole industry." Members of the Association resented those who, by shipping independently, disposed of all their product at the fluid market price, while the Cooperative member accepted a pooled price and paid for the facilities which stabilized the fluid market.

Strenuous efforts were made to persuade every farmer in the Valley to join the Association. When the Cooperative succeeded in raising prices in the first two years of operation the membership rose to 90% to 95% of the producers. The group of farmers outside the Cooperative, however, enabled some dealers to remain independent of the F.V.M.P.A. Because all independent milk was sold on the fluid market, the independent dealers could offer a higher price to their shippers than the pooled price paid to Cooperative members. This was the hole in the dyke which could destroy the Association. It became imperative to gain one hundred percent control.

The decision to go into the retail business had been made in the hope that the buying of retail outlets would reduce costs by providing more efficient delivery methods, and also force all producers to join the Cooperative by eliminating independent dealers. Such rigid control proved impossible. New dealers went into business immediately and lured members away from the Cooperative by offering prices which usually averaged 7¢ per pound butterfat more than the Cooperative could pay.
With this development, membership in the Cooperative declined. Many small shippers who remembered the hardships suffered at the hands of dealers were not tempted away from the Cooperative by the higher prices paid by independent dealers. Large shippers who had invested considerable sums in building up pure-bred herds, and who maintained a steady year round production, felt that a greater investment and a marked efficiency entitled them to higher returns. Though the F.V.M.P.A. secured improvements in the quality standards of milk produced by its members, it was unable, with its "one man, one vote" policy, to have the membership accept resolutions to institute a plan by which the price would be based on quality.

As the efforts of the F.V.M.P.A. stabilized the market, there was a tremendous increase in production. A larger surplus had to be handled. The Utility Plant at Sardis and the Delair Condensary fulfilled this function admirably, but the Association members who had built the plants by investing $100 for every can of milk shipped -- no small sum -- represented the fact that they had provided a stable fluid market for those who had not shared the cost of disposing of the surplus. Large shippers felt that the Cooperative itself had created the surplus by accepting all milk produced. They resented receiving the same returns as shippers who milked grade cattle for a few months of the year.

Feelings ran high and intense bitterness developed between independents and Association members. Among those who left the F.V.M.P.A. in the 1920's were the Starrs, the Shannons and Charles Evans, men who had helped to found the Cooperative. Because they were large shippers they were soon supplying 30% of the Vancouver market though they made up only 10% of the producers in the Valley. F.V.M.P.A. members became resolute in their
determination to eliminate independents. Independents became adamant in their resolve to retain their "earned" position on the fluid market.

It would appear that the decision to engage in price-cutting was initiated by the F.V.M.P.A., though some of the directors also supported the policy. Park and Barrow argued against price-cutting for they realized that the Cooperative, carrying the burden of the surplus, could never sell low enough to force out the independent dealers. In 1921 the price of milk dropped as low as 12 to 14 quarts for $1 before returning to 10¢ per quart. The Cooperative members realized that in a price war they would be ruined before the independents. Nevertheless, whenever independent dealers cut prices the Cooperative always followed suit.

In the spring of 1922 most of the dealers were persuaded by the F.V.M.P.A. directors to pay their shippers the same price as the pooled return of the Cooperative and pay over to the Association the difference between that price and the wholesale city price. In return the Cooperative agreed to take care of all surplus milk and to supply any shortage the dealers might have. This was an ideal solution for the F.V.M.P.A. for the Association was not so much interested in retailing milk as in equalizing returns. But the agreement was short-lived. Some of the dealers broke away; the arrangement was re-negotiated only to be broken again. Price wars and propaganda were continued. The independents cut into the Cooperative membership.

In 1923 E.G. Sherwood resigned after failing to persuade the majority of the directors to increase his salary. John W. Berry, who supported Sherwood's application, resigned from the presidency in protest. The issue at stake involved more than a question of salary. Berry felt that the farmers should have as their manager a man experienced in business,
and that they should be willing to pay a salary comparable to that paid
in other businesses. He supported Sherwood who was interested
primarily in net profits, and was therefore taking a position close to
that of some of the Cooperative members who had begun to ship independently.
Berry retained his membership, but represented a group within the Association who believed, as did most of those who left, that the policies of
the Cooperative should favor the large and the efficient producer.

Among the directors were some who felt that the Cooperative had been
formed primarily as an agency having the power to regulate the market.
In order to obtain this regulation it had been necessary to go into
business. The main aim of the F.V.M.P.A., therefore, was to handle as
high a volume of products as possible; its ideal, to absorb all milk in
the Valley. High volume, they believed, would spread operating costs and
return as large a share as possible of the consumers' dollar to the farmer.

To reduce operating costs the positions of president and general
manager were merged after Sherwood's resignation. Park accepted the dual
position and worked for the F.V.M.P.A. on a full time basis. The positions
of wholesale and retail managers were done away with and separate
accounting systems were consolidated. The management asserted in the
annual report for 1923 that this retrenchment policy resulted in vastly
greater operating efficiency. The majority of the members were satisfied
not only with this policy, but also that they had a farmer rather than a
businessman in the key position in their Association.

One of the greatest achievements of the new management was the success
of a membership campaign. Park, with the help of the directors, combed
the Valley and persuaded many farmers who had been lured away by the
offers of independent dealers to return to the Cooperative. Many did
and in 1924 the F.V.M.P.A. directorate was able to report that only thirteen members had left to ship as independents.  

The executive began publication in April, 1923 of a journal called *Butterfat*. Through this magazine members were kept informed of co-operative business and of developments in agricultural methods and co-operative marketing.

The price-cutting that went on during 1925 led to such serious losses in the ice-cream business that in 1926 the F.V.M.P.A. ice-cream operation was merged with the Port O' Van Ice-Cream Company, made up of the leading ice-cream manufacturers. The F.V.M.P.A. entered the company on the condition that all raw products would be bought from the Cooperative.

The success of this operation strengthened the conviction of the F.V.M.P.A. directorate that controlled marketing could result in savings to the producer without at the same time raising the price to the consumer. As more retail outlets opened in Vancouver and the competition of the independents became keener, members of the Cooperative began to demand that equalization of returns should be mandatory. One of the basic principles of cooperation is that membership should be open and voluntary; it was ironic that the members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, a farmers' cooperative, should resort to compulsion.

Valley farmers had cooperated to control marketing in order to make the greatest possible gains from their investment. This determination to prosper was shared by dealers in Vancouver and by producer-vendors, men established on small holdings close to or within the city limits who had established milk routes.
The success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association in stabilizing the fluid market led to expansion in the industry. Though members left the Association, the membership increased steadily as part-time and beginning farmers, assured a market, flocked into the Association. This expansion of production increased the surplus which had to be manufactured and the lower prices for manufactured milk depressed the F.V.M.P.A. settling rate. Large producers who bore the expense of maintaining a year round production felt justified in dealing directly with Vancouver retail dairies where large and steady producers were preferred. Their defection from the Cooperative and their success in capturing a large share of the fluid market further depressed the F.V.M.P.A. settling rate. The success of the Association in stabilizing the market was of less advantage to its members than to independents.

The 'Gold Rush' mentality which had been an important factor in bringing about cooperative action, now led to enormous friction as Cooperative members, independents and dealers struggled to gain the maximum advantage from the fluid market.
The cooperative movement, the trade union movement and socialism all had roots in the ideas and work of the Welshman, Robert Owen. Owen's experiments at New Lanark persuaded him that man's life and character were influenced by environment. His own attempts to improve the environment and to reform the factory system were based on philanthropy and paternalism and his efforts to establish an Owenite community at New Harmony in the United States met with failure. His idea that the new productive power generated by the use of steam should be under a social control based on cooperation, not competition, led to the birth of both the cooperative movement and socialism. Though he may have developed the confidence and maturity of the British working class, he became what G.D.H. Cole called "a walking principle." New Harmony failed and the cooperatives which became successful were, in reality, joint stock companies. Far from being based on a new social order, they enabled industrial workers to gain some benefit from the capitalist system while achieving protection from its abuses.

The trade unions, which Owen saw as productive bodies that could replace the state dissolved. The fore-runners of the modern British trade unions emerged from the militant chartist movement. Like the successful consumer cooperatives, the trade unions rejected the tactics of Owen. Members fought by means of the strike rather than through cooperation to secure the working man a better position in the capitalist system. The agricultural cooperatives which developed in
North America were basically a means by which farmers, generally of an independent and conservative nature, could retain a degree of independence as producers, but gain the advantages of amalgamation in a competitive business world through cooperative marketing.

The discrepancy between the nature of some cooperatives and the principle that social institutions should be based on cooperation rather than competition troubled many advocates of the cooperative movement. J.P. Warbasse rejected agricultural marketing associations as true cooperatives because they were "organized for the joint marketing of commodities which have not been produced by cooperative associations but by individuals for private profit." Fourteen years later, Professor Humphrey Michell of McMaster University posed a series of questions which indicate that though he approved the success of agricultural cooperation, he was troubled by the fact that he could not see a cooperative commonwealth developing as a result. If a federation of cooperative organizations was to replace the capitalist system would this be a form of state socialism or would it be Sovietism or Fascism? A pertinent question this, when asked in 1937.

To Professor James E. Boyle, supporters of the Warbasse point of view were "eager souls" who saw in cooperation "a vision of a new heaven and a new earth." Boyle was prepared to accept joint marketing as a valid form of cooperation, which to him was "a business, not a religion." This was the view accepted by F.V.M.P.A. directors. No Henry Wise Wood with his belief in the perfectability of man and in "Triumphant Democracy" emerged in the Fraser Valley. W.C. Good's contention that the whole economic system denied "the fundamental basis of civilization itself, viz. the interdependence of men and nations,"
had no appeal for Fraser Valley farmers. For members of the Co-operative, E.D. Barrow was spokesman and philosopher. He said, "The future prosperity of the farmer depends largely on himself. He will continue to produce as an individual but he must market co-operatively."^8

For the Rochdale pioneers, who had very limited political power, cooperative action brought freedom from exploitation by shop-keepers. The twenty-eight workingmen who took the initiative to provide essential services for themselves obtained a voice within their own cooperative and recognition of the principle of "one man, one vote." To the members of this first successful consumers' cooperative, freeing themselves from oppressive economic conditions, voluntary membership became an important principle.

The members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association always adhered to the "one man, one vote" policy. It laid the basis for the Association's greatest strength, the loyalty and commitment of the members to their cooperative. The structure of the Association with its numerous locals allowed for more than equal power in decision-making; it permitted the involvement of members in formulating and discussing policies. Directors attended local meetings to explain policy and answer questions before final decisions were made in general meetings.9

Matters which affected farmers at the local level were discussed in rural community halls and action was obtained. Requests for re-routing of milk trucks were met unless there was a sound reason for not doing so. Frequently the problems were discussed within the local and the compromises made there. The farmer kept a jealous eye on his company's property and would report F.V.M.P.A. cans seen in an auction barn or start a
campaign to have F.V.M.P.A. butter sold in local stores if he failed
to see it on display. Ideas originated with the members. H.J. Skipper,
a member of the Dewdney-Deroche local, was responsible for suggesting
the Memorial Fund which helped pay funeral expenses for members who had
contributed to the plan and J.J. McKimmon urged the manufacture of
powdered milk.

Tremendous demands were made on early directors. They not only carried
responsibility for the business, but also listened to grievances, answered
independent's charges, canvassed the locals, and acted as public relations
men. The yearly election of directors was followed with as much interest
as federal and provincial contests and they were usually carried on in
the same way, with polling stations established in the same rural halls.
Four of the seven directors were elected each year, the three polling
the highest votes for two-year terms and the fourth for a one-year term.
This meant that the entire board could be replaced in two years if the
members so wished.

Frequently there were disputes between locals. For years Langley and
Chilliwack disagreed over the pooling of freight. There was disagreement
between farmers who had Holstein herds and those who had Jerseys. The
annual meetings were often what the Progress described as the "stormiest
assemblies in the Fraser Valley." The meetings may have been stormy,
but they were lively and there was tremendous involvement. A good deal
of farmer frustration was allayed in the Valley because the Cooperative
afforded the milk producers an opportunity to participate in policy
decisions vitally important to them.

The "one man, one vote" policy, however, along with the policy of open
membership constituted a weakness which independent producers and dealers
constantly criticized. A large proportion of the members within the Cooperative farmed on a small scale. Many of these producers were fearful of measures which might reduce their returns or prevent their shipping. Policies designed to improve the quality of the product had to be implemented slowly because of their resistance. The directors of the F.V.M.P.A. carried on an educational campaign through the Cooperative journal, Butterfat. With the support of progressive farmers they introduced the use of the sediment disc which determined the cleanliness of the milk. This was mainly an educational device which gave information to the farmer, but did not penalize him if his results were poor. It proved effective in bringing about considerable improvement in quality, however.14 A field man, Dr. Damman, was employed to smooth out difficulties by explaining to farmers reasons for a poor sediment rate,15 and C.B. Kelly, a qualified bacteriologist, was employed to do tests at the Eighth Avenue plant where milk for city consumption was received.16

In an Association which admitted members freely and allowed each man equal power in decision-making, the support of the majority for progressive measures was not always easy to obtain. In 1925 a motion that a plan be worked out whereby milk would be paid for according to grade was defeated, but the minority secured an amendment proposing that the Association put on an educational campaign in preparation for the establishment of a system of payment according to grade.17 It was not until 1933 when the intensive competition of the depression period created the necessary pressure that the majority supported such a system.18

This struggle within the Association and the open membership which allowed anyone to join the Cooperative without restriction became widely publicized by independent dealers and producers. The fact that the
F.V.M.P.A. was the first dairy organization in Canada to employ a bacteriologist in a quality control program was much less widely known. The directors felt they had made great progress. They would have welcomed provincial regulation of quality which would have eliminated shippers who were an embarrassment to them. The Milk Inquiry of 1954 revealed that the barn inspection system, a provincial government responsibility, though operating in other parts of British Columbia, had completely broken down in the Fraser Valley. It would appear that the sporadic shipper and the inefficient producer, a burden on other Cooperative members, wielded power, not only within the Cooperative, but also within the political system.

The "one man, one vote" policy always remained in effect within the F.V.M.P.A., but the principle of voluntary membership was considerably modified. The original contract signed by members of the F.V.M.P.A. in 1917 was a one-year agreement. It was replaced by a three-year contract which was in turn replaced by an agreement "for a continuous period until he shall retire absolutely from the dairy business in the lower mainland of B.C., subject to cancellation by twelve months notice." There was some resistance to this binding contract, but discussion and explanation by the directors led most members to accept the necessity of making it difficult to leave the Association.

On January 1, 1926, James Bennewith who had taken out a contract with the F.V.M.P.A. in 1921 began to ship to an independent dealer because "he wanted the extra dollar." A decision of the Supreme Court awarded the F.V.M.P.A. an injunction restraining Bennewith "from selling or delivering milk or cream otherwise than in accordance with an agreement with the association." Damages of 20¢ per pound butterfat of milk and
cream were awarded to the F.V.M.P.A. Though the Cooperative had
instituted a binding contract in 1920, this was the first attempt to
enforce its terms. Members could still "freely and voluntarily"
join: the Cooperative, but once a contract was signed it became
virtually impossible for them to leave. This locked members into the
Association and was another move away from the principles of cooperation.
It foreshadowed the decision to close the membership completely,
made during the depths of the depression.

The Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association had organized not
merely for the purpose of bargaining with city dealers, but to form an
agency which would stabilize the fluid market by absorbing the surplus
into manufacturing plants. This plan could only work to the full
advantage of cooperative members if all producers in the Valley shared
the burden of the surplus. Several groups remained independent of the
Cooperative. Producer-vendors, many of whom were established before
the Association went into business, were of less concern to the Cooperative
members than were independent dealers. Many of the producer-vendors were
men who were starting, as had so many of the farmers themselves, with
meagre resources. The high cost of land made large holdings beyond their
reach. Most of them purchased three or four acres within the city limits
or farmed on the outskirts of the city. They faced the demands of winter
dairying, and usually maintained a high quality of production in order
to hold customers on the milk routes they built up for themselves. They
were indeed independents and contributed little to the support of the
independent dealers.

It was the farmers who had broken away from the Cooperative in order
to gain the higher prices obtainable on the fluid market who made possible
the survival of the independent dealer. F.V.M.P.A. members considered these producers not independents but "scabs," \(^{24}\) who took advantage of the stable market the Cooperative member provided and who had few problems with dealers because the Cooperative offered an alternative and set standards in price and service which independent dealers were forced to exceed.

To Cooperative members who had accepted contracts binding them to the Association until retirement, the implementation of legislation which would compel the independents to share the returns from the fluid market was a logical and inevitable step. Dean F.M. Clement of the Faculty of Agriculture at The University of British Columbia felt that the farmer was "entitled to the same rights and privileges as other business organizers of the country." \(^{25}\) An efficient marketing system would put him into "a position to render a large service to himself and the consuming public." \(^{26}\) He saw the farmer's attempt to gain a proportionate share on the high price market as an evolutionary economic movement. \(^{27}\) The F.V.M.P.A. directors agreed. They felt that government policies had often favored businessmen and they could see no reason for farmers to be denied an opportunity to adjust to a rapidly industrializing society. They saw the legislation they sought as "an advanced marketing measure," \(^{28}\) which would correct the ills of the marketing system.

To the opponents of the F.V.M.P.A., the legislation the Cooperative advocated was "compulsory or socialistic." \(^{29}\) It struck at the very heart of the "free enterprise" system. Equalization of returns would subsidize the inefficient and unprogressive producer at the expense of the shipper whose initiative, greater investment and higher production costs entitled him to a large share of the fluid market.
To large shippers within the Cooperative, this was a compelling argument. They had remained within the Cooperative, however, in order to solve the problem of the surplus, which uncontrolled, destroyed the stability of the fluid market. They were less concerned with the burden of the inefficient producer than with forcing all shippers to share the burden of the surplus. They argued that in a democratic society a dissenting minority should be obliged to abide by the wish of the majority and be forced to support the plants which absorbed the surplus. J.W. Winson supported the F.V.M.P.A. demands for legislation to equalize returns. "It would be no infraction of that wonderful thing called British justice," he stated, "if every farmer in a district was compelled to join the organization which was marketing the commodity he wished to produce." 30

But for many, even among those who accepted the idea that cooperation was "a business not a religion," compulsory legislation was "legally indefensible, socially undesirable and economically unsound." 31 George Keen, editor of the Canadian Co-operator and general secretary of the Cooperative Union of Canada, felt that cooperation should "demonstrate its right to exist upon its merits in rivalry with the competitive system." Cooperation, he pointed out, only succeeded when it rejected the paternalism of Robert Owen and established itself on the principle of self-help and self-reliance. "In its essence," he said, "there is no difference between the private paternalism of philanthropists and state paternalism." 32

This was an idea with which John Oliver agreed. The fact that the arguments of both Winson and Keen were published in Butterfat is an indication that a good deal of soul-searching went on within the Co-
operative and the principles basic to the formulation of policy were closely examined. The issue was argued not only within the Association, but also throughout the whole community. Other farmers faced the same decision. The fruit-growers of the Okanagan opted for compulsory legislation with a minority group of independents opposed. The wheat-producers of the Canadian prairies, whose ranks were divided on the question, were urged by Aaron Sapiro, an American who had worked with the highly successful fruit-growers' cooperatives in California, to accept long term pool contracts and compulsory legislation.

The arguments against compulsion were strong, particularly for farmers who accepted the basic competitiveness of the economic system. Men who had been motivated to form a cooperative by their desire to preserve their individuality as producers; men who claimed, as Barrow did, that cooperative marketing was a means of self-help, must surely have had some difficulty in refuting the arguments of those who upheld the "free enterprise" system. It was not, however, on the basis of arguments which would refute those of the independent producers that Cooperative members justified their position, but rather on the manner in which independents operated within the free enterprise system.

The independent milk shippers who left or refused to join the Cooperative soon found, as had so many producers before 1917, that an individual shipper was at a disadvantage on a competitive market. Independents began to organize in the summer of 1925. Under the name of the "Twin City Cooperative Milk Producers' Association," they worked with the F.V.M.P.A. in order to obtain more stable prices throughout the year.
The new organization attempted to sign up all the independent shippers in the Valley. It ran into difficulties when Steeves Dairy obtained an injunction to prevent the Association from interfering with the contract of supply of the Steeves Dairy.\textsuperscript{37} The Supreme Court judgment which resulted from the subsequent court case granted a perpetual restraining injunction and stated that freedom of trade had been interfered with and the actions of the association were not justifiable.\textsuperscript{38} This decision set the precedent the Cooperative followed by prosecuting James Bennewith.

The Twin City organization went into liquidation as a result of the Steeves case. The need for united action was evident, however, and the independents were soon organized again, about two hundred strong, as the Independent Co-operative Association. One of their objectives was to operate a large distributing plant in Vancouver in order to reduce the overhead cost of handling the milk,\textsuperscript{39} but they had no intention of producing butter or cheese.\textsuperscript{40} They began receiving milk in May, 1927, but failed to sell their members' product on the fluid market and were forced to dispose of it through the butter channel. The members had been promised, and were paid, fluid market prices so the Association was in a very difficult position financially.

The Vancouver Creamery, a subsidiary of P. Burns and Company Limited, bought the plant and business. The members shipped to the Burns Creamery and to the City Dairy and Produce Company Limited, controlled by Vancouver alderman, H.E. Almond.\textsuperscript{41}

Rumors spread that unfair practices on the part of the F.V.M.P.A. had been responsible for the failure of the Independent Co-operative Producers' Association. Some F.V.M.P.A. members demanded an explanation.
Representatives of the Independent Association were invited to present their complaints at a meeting of the Dewdney-Deroche local. Directors of the F.V.M.P.A. were present to reply. The explanations, as reported in Butterfat, made clear that independents who argued that compulsive legislation nullified the advantages of the free enterprise system were themselves seeking protection from its operation. They believed in free enterprise when it worked in their favor.

In November, 1926, when the retail price of milk rose from 11¢ to 13¢ per quart, distributors' receipts rose from $4.40 per 40 gal can to $5.20. Independent producers, however, received no increase in the $2.17 per can which they had been getting during the summer. A delegation of independents asked for a civic investigation into milk prices. At a meeting arranged by the Vancouver City Council, E.G. Sherwood, who was at this time proprietor of Sherwood Creameries, explained that the independent dealers could not make changes in payment until they knew what the F.V.M.P.A. would pay for the month as the contracts of the independents specified a 7¢ per pound butterfat price over the F.V.M.P.A. settling rate.

In asking for the meeting, independent producers charged that the 67¢ per pound butterfat price which they had been receiving in comparison to the 60¢ F.V.M.P.A. settling rate was small compensation for the advantages of deferred payment and lower freight rates enjoyed by the F.V.M.P.A. members. Directors of the Association informed the press that the Cooperative had received no cut rates from the railroads but had reduced freight costs because farmers shipped to the closest outlets and the savings were distributed among members.
It became increasingly evident that the main purpose of the independents was to get all their milk on the fluid market without taking any responsibility for the surplus in the Valley. Cooperative members saw them as social parasites. It was their actions as such, not their arguments, which convinced members of the F.V.M.P.A. that they were justified in demanding legislation which would make compulsory the equalization of returns from the fluid market.

Like the Rochdale Pioneers, members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association cooperated in order to gain advantages from the capitalist system and to protect themselves from middle men. Both cooperatives granted members the power to improve their economic position through collective action, and a sense of individual worth through the opportunity to participate in decision-making. It was possible for consumers' cooperatives to adhere to the principle of voluntary membership. These organizations, once established, offered advantages to members which could not be gained without the cooperative. The milk producers of the Fraser Valley had found that the operation of the free enterprise system created chaotic conditions on the fluid market. They had cooperated in order to stabilize that market. It was impossible to retain the advantages which resulted from that action only for members within the Association. Determined that they should not be denied opportunities they had made possible, members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association supported legislation which would equalize returns to the producers.
V.

COMPULSION

And so began the long struggle to gain legislation which would provide equalization of access to the fluid market. For almost thirty years the members of the Cooperative worked to achieve a goal which was but an extension of the purpose for which the organization had first formed. The struggle was complicated by the effects of the depression and by basic faults in the methods employed to achieve equalization. The farmers of the Fraser Valley were struggling with a regional problem but the story of that struggle is a case study of some of the problems of Confederation, and the conflicts and tensions within the Valley can be seen as a microcosm of conflicts and tensions among larger regions of the country. The process of arriving at a workable solution to marketing problems in the Fraser Valley can be understood only if it is examined in relation to changing economic conditions in the country. It can be understood only if there is some recognition of the judiciary's role in policy-making and responding to currents of thought within society. It can be understood only if it is realized that there have been safeguards as well as obstacles in the cumbersome process of defining areas of provincial and federal jurisdiction in a federal state. Just as these principles are basic to an understanding of the struggle between provincial and federal governments, and between French and English in Canada, so they apply to the struggle between cooperative and independent producers in the fertile Fraser Valley.
The fruit-growers of the Okanagan, who had cooperated to stabilize the market by central selling and by building storage facilities, were the first in British Columbia to seek legislation which would control marketing. In 1927 the Produce Marketing Act was drawn up to deal with the sale of all agricultural production and to apply where a large majority of producers favored its implementation. E.D. Barrow, Minister of Agriculture in the John Oliver government, brought in the measure as a private member's bill. Though most of the Liberals supported it, the Premier did not agree with the principles of the legislation and refused to vote for it. The bill passed with little trouble, but a last minute move to include milk products under the provisions of the Act met with a hostile reaction and this amendment was soundly defeated.

Barrow was determined to provide the same relief for dairy farmers as for fruit-growers. The Dairy Farmers' Losses Redistribution Bill, similar in principle to the Produce Marketing Act, was drawn up early in 1928. Violent opposition came again, as it had in 1927, from city members of the Legislative Assembly, as well as from Mayor Louis D. Taylor of Vancouver and from members of his City Council. The fruit-growers were selling what was considered a "luxury" product; their main market lay on the Canadian prairies. Vancouver representatives were willing to support legislation to provide relief to the fruit-farmers or were indifferent to the enactment of such measures. Milk, however, was considered a necessity; the dairy farmers' main market was Vancouver. Producers and dealers who opposed controlled marketing had no difficulty in creating city opposition to legislation designed to equalize returns to the producers.

Proponents of the dairy bill were helpless before the type of propaganda used by those who opposed it. Mayor Taylor pledged that
there would be no control "foisted on the citizens of Vancouver" by
the Association, which "sought to control the milk in the baby's
bottle." Samples of milk were sent to Victoria and placed in evidence.
F.V.M.P.A. directors protested to the City Council that Association
milk, which was in poor condition, was ten days old and had not been
properly refrigerated. The quality control program instituted by the
F.V.M.P.A. had had considerable effect on the standard of milk shipped.
As early as the spring of 1925, tests made by Dr. F.T. Underhill, city
health officer, indicated that the quality of milk supplied by the
Cooperative was very high. Directors of the F.V.M.P.A. protested that
no report from the City Health Department had been placed in evidence.
Alderman Angus McInnis, the only member of the Vancouver City Council
who did not oppose the legislation, pointed out that the issue involved
was equalization of returns. The question of quality should not have
been introduced into the controversy. Mayor Taylor retorted that the
delegation from Vancouver had not raised the subject. Questioned by
Alderman McInnis, Dr. Underhill said that the bottles of milk from
F.V.M.P.A. and independent dairies were shipped to Victoria at the
request of the city solicitor.

Association members were even more embittered by the fact that
Alderman H.E. Almond, who was sent to Victoria as a member of a
Vancouver City Council delegation to protest the legislation, was an
independent milk dealer, proprietor of the City Dairy. The F.V.M.P.A.,
which had its own representatives in the legislature, protested this
representation of dealer interests in the civic delegation.

City groups took sides in the dispute according to their view of
the necessity of government control. Alderman McInnis, though he had
some reservations about the Fraser Valley Cooperative, supported the
legislation its members were demanding, because he saw "organization for control of all commodities" as inevitable. The Milk Bill was unanimously supported by the Vancouver and New Westminster District Trades and Labor Council. Delegate Birt Showler declared that the Cooperative was "based on union principles," and opposition to it was "from vested interests." The president of the Vancouver Board of Trade considered the part that group played in blocking the dairy farmers' legislation in 1927 as one of the successes of the year.

Most Vancouver consumers were probably more affected by Mayor Taylor's colorful language and stories of "rotten milk" than by arguments about the necessity of government control. Many were probably more influenced by the views of the man who delivered their milk than by arguments in the legislature. W.J. Park attempted to quiet their fears. "The proposed legislation is not for the purpose of fixing milk prices," he declared. "It is not concerned with the operations of the various milk distributors in Vancouver and it will not affect the consumers of milk in any way whatever. It is a producers' problem."

Whatever merits the arguments of Cooperative members contained, the weakness of their case lay in the fact that the problem was viewed as one between producers. In asking for marketing legislation the farmers were moving away from "laissez faire" principles to a collectivism the implications of which they did not fully understand or accept. The fact that they saw their problems in terms of competition between producers is an indication that this was so. A long struggle lay ahead; equalization of the market could not be attained until there was wider acceptance of government control and a better understanding of the means by which such control could be implemented in the public interest.
Barrow's Milk Bill was referred to the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture. The Committee recommended that an independent and complete investigation be made into the milk industry. A Royal Commission headed by Dean F.M. Clement was appointed immediately. It submitted its report to the legislature on January 22, 1929. The Commission recommended "that the production, distribution and sale of milk and cream for the fluid trade be treated as a public utility, to be closely regulated and safeguarded in the interests of the public as a whole." The principle of equalization was also upheld. The Royal Commission recommended that a Committee of Direction should be appointed. The task of this committee would be to assess independent producers who had a disproportionate share of the fluid market and use their contributions to compensate Cooperative members who had stabilized the market. It was recommended that the committee would use the F.V.M.P.A.'s proportions of the various markets and the F.V.M.P.A. settling rates as the basis from which to calculate. In spite of the brave words about safeguarding "the interests of the public as a whole" this method of equalization was based on the assumption that the marketing difficulty was "a producers' problem" and that all producers belonged to two well-defined groups.

Shortly before the recommendations of the Milk Inquiry Commission were made public, the legality of the Produce Marketing Act was upheld by a decision of the British Columbia Court of Appeal. The validity of the Act had been questioned on the ground that it was an attempt to regulate trade and commerce which is exclusively within the jurisdiction of the dominion parliament. The decision, made on January 8, 1929, upheld the legality of the Act on the ground that it concerned property and civil rights and could not lose that character whether the produce
shipped was contracted for within or without the province.\textsuperscript{14}

This decision, coupled with the recommendations of the Milk Inquiry Report, strengthened the members of the F.V.M.P.A. in their demands for legislation which would equalize returns to dairymen. The Royal Commission established to inquire into the milk industry had been appointed by the Liberal government but the report was submitted to a Conservative government, Dr. S.F. Tolmie had succeeded Dr. J.D. McLean as premier and William Atkinson, who had defeated Barrow in Chilliwack, was Minister of Agriculture.

J.W. Berry, Conservative member from Langley, as chairman of the House Agricultural Committee, was responsible for introducing the Dairy Sales Adjustment Bill in March, 1929. Most of the Liberals in opposition supported his bill, but the issue divided the Conservative party. Renewed opposition from independent dealers and from Vancouver City Council members led to compromise on the part of the F.V.M.P.A. In reply to charges that they were seeking power and that such power would be dangerous to the consumer, the directors assured members of the Legislature that they would guarantee that the price of milk would not rise for five years.\textsuperscript{15}

The Act would become operative only if 66\% of the persons present at a public meeting voted to submit a petition to have it implemented.\textsuperscript{16}

Assurances were given that the F.V.M.P.A. would not petition the government for at least one year, and that during that time the Cooperative would make every effort to negotiate with independents.

Soon after the legislation was passed, the F.V.M.P.A. directors met with a group of independent distributors including the Burns interests to negotiate an agreement.\textsuperscript{17} Meetings were held throughout the Valley. An overwhelming majority of Cooperative members and a majority of the
Independents, reorganized as the Independent Milk Shippers' Association, voted in favor of petitioning the government to implement the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act immediately. The F.V.M.P.A. elected A.H. Mercer as their representative on the Milk Board set up under the provisions of the Act. The independents chose Samuel H. Shannon. Charles A. Welsh of New Westminster, a choice acceptable to both groups, was appointed chairman. The nature of the Milk Board with its representative function reflected the assumption that the complexities of milk marketing could be handled by a process of negotiation between two groups of producers.

It soon became evident that production was not confined to farmers in the Valley who shipped either to the Cooperative or to an independent dealer. Producers of preferred raw and certified milk were allowed to seek exemption from the Act. In the main this provision protected producer-vendors, but Jersey breeders of the Fraser Valley also asked for exemption from the Milk Act because they claimed there was a strong public demand for their product and they wished to preserve their identity. Members of the B.C. Jersey Cattle Club were granted the right to retain their membership in the F.V.M.P.A. though they shipped to Spencer's Dairies which sold a special milk strictly from purebred herds. In 1931 when they discovered that their returns were pooled, the Jersey Breeders established their own cooperative.

Milk control came into effect on January 1, 1930. An agreement had been signed by the F.V.M.P.A. and independent dairies which settled the wholesale prices and guaranteed that the retail price of milk would not be raised from 9 quarts for $1 for five years. By May 95% of the producers had complied with Milk Board orders. Collections were made
and adjustment cheques sent out. Shippers bore equally the burden of the surplus and each was granted a proportionate share of fluid market prices. The Milk Board report issued by C.A. Welsh in December, 1930 showed that in spite of an increase in production of almost 600,000 pounds of butterfat, the average settling rate for 85% of the dairy farmers had increased from 57.77¢ during the first nine months of 1929 to 66¢ for the same period in 1930. A comparison of prices for nine Canadian and five American cities showed the retail price of milk to be lower in Vancouver than in any city except London, Ontario and the spread between producer and consumer price in Vancouver to be the smallest of the fourteen cities. There is little doubt that Cooperative members had good reason to be satisfied with the effects of the legislation. In a world plunged into depression, they inhabited an island of relative economic stability. For them this was a golden period long to be remembered.

Independent producers who were sharing the burden, not only of an increased surplus, but also of an average reduction of 8¢ per pound in the price of butter, were very dissatisfied. Small dairymen selling milk produced on their own premises in North Vancouver and Burnaby as well as within Vancouver and on the outskirts felt most insecure. They began to offer "preferred raw" milk in order to remain exempt from the equalization levies. Before implementation of the Act only three dairies had sold a high quality product in this category. Members of the City Health Department became concerned about the quality of the milk supplied to the city by the "scores of dairies" suddenly offering "preferred raw" in order "to stay outside the scope of the act." Dr. Underhill suggested to the provincial government that amendments of the milk regulations should be made in order to ensure a safe milk supply. Raw milk producers protested this tightening of regulations. Their lawyers stated that
Dr. Underhill was "playing into the hands of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association and would put the independent milk producers out of business."26

The response of City Council members to this representation was far from unanimous. Alderman George C. Miller sympathized with the small producer and expressed fear that the "big companies" would force them out of business. Alderman R.N. Fraser expressed more concern about the quality of the milk and supported stricter regulation. Dr. Underhill had been strongly supported by J.F.C.B. Vance, city analyst. Both declared that they had been able to prevent epidemics by prompt action.27 Alderman Angus McInnis was critical of the manner in which the action had been taken. The recommendation of the medical health officer and the Council committee had not been submitted to the City Council.28 He deplored the tendency "to go round corners to obtain legislation" and demanded that full publicity be given efforts to control the milk supply.29

This mixed reaction reflects the weaknesses in the methods of implementing control over the fluid milk market. The Milk Bill of 1927 had been passed to ensure regulation of milk quality. It was separate from the Dairy Products Act which had become a tool to protect one group of producers. Legislation to equalize the market would not work successfully until it was comprehensive enough to protect the interests of all groups and until the administration of the Act was impartial.

In spite of the unrest of independent producers and producer-vendors, F.V.M.P.A. Members had reason to feel secure when the validity of the Produce Marketing Act was again affirmed in 1930 by a British Columbia court. This Act which had already withstood attack on the ground that it interfered with trade and commerce, which is within the jurisdiction of the dominion parliament, was now challenged on a different point.
A.O. Lawson, an independent fruit-grower, asked for a declaration that the Produce Marketing Act was *ultra vires* the province of British Columbia because the levies imposed by the Interior Tree Fruit and Vegetable Committee were indirect taxes. On March 11, 1930, Mr. Justice Denis Murphy affirmed the validity of the Act on the ground that the levies were not raised for public or governmental purposes, but were for the purpose of defraying the cost of operation and were used to provide services. Though there were differences in the two pieces of legislation, the Produce Marketing Act and the Dairy Sales Adjustment Act were based on similar principles. When the validity of one act was questioned the result strengthened or jeopardized the position of those working under the provisions of the other.

The Produce Marketing Act had twice been declared valid by British Columbia courts. The Milk Board members, therefore, felt reasonably certain that they could impose orders and be upheld by law. Prosecution of four farmers who refused to submit to the order of the Lower Mainland Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Committee was begun. The cases, however, were thrown out of court on a technicality. "Lower Mainland" had been omitted from notices and warnings. The validity of the Dairy Products Act was not in question, but this failure to enforce the provisions of the Act was an ominous warning that resistance to the legislation would eventually render it inoperative.

The independents who had resisted the Milk Board now began to attack it. In June, 1930 proceedings to unseat Samuel H. Shannon, choice of the independents, from his position on the Board were instituted by James Whittaker on the ground that unqualified voters had taken part in the election. This attempt was unsuccessful. Mr. Justice M.A. Macdonald held that the meeting which elected Shannon was properly constituted.
When Shannon's term of office was near expiration at the end of 1930, Fraser Valley independent producers refused to appoint a member to the milk control committee. They also started a petition to have the Act repealed. The Milk Board carried on with two members, Welsh and Mercer. In face of this determined opposition, the provincial government left the issue entirely to the farmers and any prosecutions to be launched to the Lower Mainland Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Committee.

In August, 1930 eleven dairies in Vancouver, representing 94% of the retail outlets, amalgamated to form the Associated Dairies. W.J. Park became General Manager. He explained that the merger was an attempt to cut down distributing costs. The price of dairy land was 80% to 100% higher in the Valley than in other parts of Canada. Clearing and draining costs added to capital required. The cost of labor, higher than in the east, and the higher freight charges on feeds which had to be imported long distances kept up the cost of production. This action undoubtedly effected temporary savings by eliminating overlapping milk routes. Elimination of competition in 1930 as in 1919, however, was no guarantee against new competition emerging.

The formation of the Associated Dairies created tremendous bitterness. W.L. Macken, president of the F.V.M.P.A. from 1935 to 1947, in looking back over those years, felt that if this move had not been made, "the loss sustained through litigation, various trade practices and adverse publicity would never have been suffered." Plants and equipment of those entering the merger were appraised and the companies were paid in 7% preferred stock. Common stock and profits were based on gallonage of milk handled by the various interests entering the merger. This business move was harshly criticized by independents, especially when
Macken admitted that a "pretty stiff" price had been paid for one of the plants.40

Because there was no provision for the fixing of prices under the Dairy Sales Adjustment Act, contracts were negotiated individually. The Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association obtained a contract to sell fluid milk at 73¢ per pound butterfat.41 Some independent producers who had been shipping to dairies which went into the merger complained that their contracts were sold as if they had been slaves. Then the "combine" had signed them up at a lower price.42

Though the surplus which had to be diverted into manufactured products was a burden, a certain surplus was always necessary in order to ensure that fluid market requirements be met. Independent cooperatives kept their surplus as low as possible. Independent dealers expected to be able to buy milk from the Cooperative if they required it. After the formation of the merger; the F.V.M.P.A. sold accommodation milk only to the outlets affiliated in the Associated Dairies. This created bitterness. Independent dealers, who to a large extent built up their custom in Vancouver by decrying the quality of the Association milk, were only too anxious to have it during periods of shortage.

There were continuous complaints throughout this period about the size of the levies against independent producers. Milk production which increased considerably during the early 1930's and lower prices for manufactured dairy products because of fierce competition on world markets were factors responsible for making the levies heavier than had been anticipated. Independents also complained bitterly that "C" grade shippers to the Cooperative, though not eligible to ship milk for city consumption, were receiving a bonus taken from the "A" and "B" grade shipper liable for equalization.43
The protest against control gained momentum with the publication early in 1931 of the report of a Royal Commission investigating problems connected with the production and distribution of British Columbia fruits. The Commissioner, W. Sanford Evans, analyzing the factors involved in the struggle between the cooperative and independent fruit-growers in the Okanagan, saw the choice as being between two principles — "centralization by statutory enactment, or freedom of action within the general laws of the land." Evans felt that it would be unwise to choose compulsory legislation and advised against it.44

The recommendations of the Evans Report were a complete reversal of those of the Clement Investigation. This contradiction cannot be explained in terms of differences in the fruit and milk industry for the problems were similar in most respects. F.M. Clement who headed the Milk Inquiry was Dean of the Faculty of Agriculture at The University of British Columbia. He had focused his career on encouraging the development of efficient and scientific agriculture. William Sanford Evans did not come from the academic world. He represented Winnipeg as a Conservative member of the Manitoba legislature and was proprietor of the Sanford Evans Statistical Services. He had been a journalist, editor, broker and investment dealer and was the author of The Canadian Contingents and Canadian Imperialism.45 Wheat-producers and fruit-growers depended on distant markets; both groups saw their markets vanishing as a result of the depression. Evans had obviously been chosen to investigate the fruit industry because of his knowledge of the problems of prairie grain-producers.

It may be possible to see differences between the two men who
headed the Commissions, but it is much more likely that the tremendous economic changes in the two-year period between the publication of the reports provides a more satisfactory explanation for the changing tide of opinion. Clement was appointed in 1928, when prices were rising and markets expanding, by a Minister of Agriculture who had a clear and definite policy and the support of the majority of his party members. Evans was appointed during a period when vanishing markets and reduced returns were creating ruinous competition. He was selected by a Minister of Agriculture who had no clear policy. The fruit-growers had little strong representation in the legislature, but were relying on paid counsel to frame acceptable legislation. J.W. Berry had become the spokesman for the dairy farmers, but he had little support within his own party. As president of the F.V.M.P.A., Berry had been aggressive and determined to build the Cooperative into a powerful and efficient business. His sponsorship of the Milk Bill may have lent credence to the fears of independents that legislation would create a monopoly which would crush "the little man."

The publication of the Sanford Evans Report marked a turning point in the struggle for marketing legislation. From 1931 until 1937 measures requested by a majority of farmers, made law through the legislative process, were challenged by minority groups and found invalid by the courts. There has been a great deal of discussion in Canada about the role of the courts in resolving conflicts within the state. Decisions made by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, until 1949 the highest court of appeal, have been severely criticized for the damage they inflicted on a centralized federal system by building up provincial power and for the role they played in favoring a system of free enterprise by invalidating regulatory legislation. An examination of the struggle waged
by dairy farmers in the Fraser Valley over marketing legislation may serve to illustrate the effect of judicial decisions on the economy and the society of a specific area; a consideration of some of the arguments in the long controversy over the role of the judiciary may make clear some of the factors which made possible the development of acceptable methods of market control in the dairy industry.

As a society develops and customs harden into a body of law, there must also evolve means by which the laws may be adapted to meet the changing needs of the society. The long struggle between king and parliament in Britain resulted in the development of a constitutional monarchy in which parliament is sovereign. J.R. Mallory has pointed out that "the fact of parliamentary sovereignty has given the British constitution a flexibility which has enabled it to serve the changing needs of different periods..." The Canadian federal system with its division of parliamentary authority and two sets of sovereign bodies, "each sovereign in its own sphere," has depended on the courts to define the powers of the legislature which have lost sovereignty. When in Canada there has been resistance to legislation demanded by a majority, the minority has made that resistance felt by challenging the authority of the legislature which enacted it. During the early years of Confederation provincial parliaments, which John A. Macdonald had envisioned as mere "guarantees for local institutions and for local laws," built up their power and had that power affirmed by decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. It was the provincial parliament which passed marketing legislation demanded by a majority of British Columbia farmers. It was provincial courts which upheld the validity of the Produce Marketing Act by affirming the right of the provincial legislature to enact the legislation. That decision was not final, however,
for the dissenters had recourse to the other "sovereign body."

A.O. Lawson, the independent fruit-grower, who had attempted to have the Produce Marketing Act declared invalid in the Supreme Court of British Columbia on the ground that the province had no right to levy indirect taxes, now carried his case to the Supreme Court of Canada. Here the Act was disputed not only on this point, but also on the right of the province to regulate trade and commerce. Chief Justice Lyman Duff delivered the judgment on February 16, 1931. The Supreme Court reversed the decisions of the British Columbia courts, holding the legislation to be ultra vires the provincial legislature because "the purpose of the Produce Marketing Act, 1926-7 (B.C.), in conferring powers upon the Committee to dictate routes of shipping, termini to which shipment may be made, quantities which may be shipped to each point, referring to shipments beyond the Province, is to assume control over trade and regulate the producers as traders and shippers."50 Because the levies imposed by the Committee increased the price of the product sold outside the province imposing them, the Chief Justice found such levies to be taxes. The levies, judged to be indirect taxation, were therefore ultra vires the provincial legislature.51

As the long process of developing marketing legislation and testing it in the courts went on, it was this judgment which had to be checked and reversed. It has been considered "a bad decision,"52 and a decision which established a precedent judges were later forced to follow. This line of reasoning is based on the assumption that judicial decisions are circumscribed by precedent. It ignores the creative role of the judiciary and denies the fact that judicial decisions can be influenced by social forces. There has been detected in Privy Council decisions,
a bias in favor of the rights of individuals, whether they be independent producers resisting group action or provinces within a federation.

It is surely not without significance, however, that the Duff decision, made by Canadian Supreme Court judges, was pronounced a month after the publication of the Sanford Evans Report during a period when increasingly competitive conditions made regulatory legislation intolerable to a growing number of people. A judicial decision respecting the authority of the provincial legislature rendered invalid legislation which had never been completely implemented. With the benefit of hindsight it is possible to see that it was the Duff decision which had to be reversed before satisfactory marketing control could be established. It is impossible not to speculate, however, that a different judicial decision made in 1931 could have affirmed the validity of a law which the editor of the Columbian predicted would become as impossible of enforcement as prohibition in the United States if its opponents were not "converted to a belief in its beneficence." 53

The minority had triumphed, but the majority of the farmers in the province were dismayed by the decision. Attempts were made to ensure some control. The B.C. Fruit Growers' Association presented a piece of legislation to the Agricultural Committee providing for the compulsory selling of fruit and certain vegetables, but avoiding features of the Act which had been declared invalid. Amendments to the Milk Act were drawn up in the hope that the legislation would be intra vires the provincial legislature. The desperation with which these changes were made and the fact that most adjustments were to exempt groups from the operation of the Act is an indication that the assumption that independent producers could be forced to share fluid market returns equally with cooperative...
members through compulsive legislation was a naive one. Both the new legislation and the Milk Act amendments, brought in by private members, were ruled out of order by the speaker on the ground that policy was being forced on the government.  

Though the milk industry did not come under the provisions of the Produce Marketing Act, the principles of the Dairy Products Act were so similar that the Lower Mainland Products Sales Adjustment Committee dropped its plans to prosecute W.A. Hayward who had refused to pay adjustment levies. Efforts to amend the Act were continued. Finally some minor changes were secured. The F.V.M.P.A. agreed to pay the costs of referring the legislation to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The uncertainty about the fate of the Act was one of the factors contributing to the disruption of the milk market in May, 1931. But other factors were even more important. As a result of a mild winter and early spring, cows were pastured on good grass sooner in the year than was usual. Sporadic shippers, sheltered within the F.V.M.P.A., increased their milk production as jobs in sawmills and lumber camps became scarce. The price of milk on the fluid market was relatively inelastic. Increased milk production meant greater dependence on returns from manufactured products. This in turn meant greater dependence on world markets where fierce competition forced down prices. American tariffs cut off some export markets. Canadian tariffs offered little relief to Fraser Valley farmers faced with competition from other parts of the Commonwealth and of Canada. Butter from New Zealand, where production costs were lower, and from Alberta, where wheat farmers had turned to dairying, afforded competition not only on world markets but even on local markets.
The F.V.M.P.A. followed the practice of paying farmers an advance in the middle of the month. After the settling rate was determined, a second cheque sent early the following month covered the balance of the farmers' returns. In early June, 1931, many of the Association members received a debit notice in place of a cheque. The depression struck the Fraser Valley as suddenly as the stock market had crashed in New York almost two years before.

Desperate efforts were made to retain control of milk marketing. The Lower Mainland Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Committee brought a test case against Crystal Dairy. Their counsel, R.L. Maitland, argued that the Milk Act differed from the Produce Marketing Act in that the Committee kept no one out of the fluid market and had no control over prices. The levy, he argued, was paid by producers for services rendered. Mr. Justice D. Murphy, however, dismissed the action on September 26, 1931, holding, on the authority of the Supreme Court decision, that the levies were indirect taxation. Murphy was the same judge who had upheld the validity of the Produce Marketing Act little more than a year before. He was, of course, bound by the Duff decision but in delivering judgment, he stated, "The true pith and substance of this legislation is, in my opinion, to prevent the operation of this economic law (that price is regulated by supply and demand) by eliminating competition thus lessening supply and thereby creating a monopoly market." It would appear that though Murphy's decision was dictated by judicial precedent, his change of opinion was genuine, effected by depressed economic conditions.

The Milk Board was appointed for another year, operating with only two members, as the independents refused again to appoint a representative.
The majority of producers conformed to its ruling, but the Board members were in a difficult position as the test case moved through the courts. The decision brought down by the Court of Appeal on January 5, 1932 upheld the Murphy decision. Mr. Justice M.A. Macdonald of the Appeal Court Bench dissented in part from the judgment, however, and issued a minority judgment to that effect. Again it would appear that the thinking of the judges was influenced by the extreme economic depression. "This legislation looks communistic to me," was a comment made by Mr. Justice A.E. MacPhillips to the counsel for the Milk Board. Nevertheless he was not unaware that the legislation was considered to be necessary by a majority of the milk producers. He declared later that though he felt much doubt about the constitutionality of the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act, he hoped the case would be carried to a higher court. "In a country as large as Canada," he said, "with the varying conditions existing many matters are of a local and private nature and vital to the community, and it is conceivable that we have here legislation which is peculiarly necessary and that there should be legislation such as this challenged act."

Ten months later, on November 10, 1932, the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, following the principles laid down by Chief Justice Duff in the Produce Marketing Act case, held the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act to be ultra vires. The Act was not within the legislative competence of the province since adjustment levies constituted taxes which the provincial legislature did not have the power to impose. The Judicial Committee found it unnecessary to determine the validity of the Act respecting the regulation of trade.
This decision ended the life of the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Committee. A meeting was called by order of Justice W.A. Macdonald to dispose of almost $17,000 collected in levies. No producers attended to lay claim to their share -- a powerful indication of the resentment felt by the cooperative members.

From February 16, 1931 when Chief Justice Duff delivered the decision which declared the Produce Marketing Act invalid, until November 10, 1932 when the Dairy Sales Adjustment Act was found to be ultra vires by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, the cooperative members were in a state of great uncertainty. Independent producers greeted as a victory each judicial decision which invalidated the marketing legislation. But their own position was made insecure by general conditions. Though earlier attempts on the part of the independent producers to organize in order to protect themselves had met with failure, firmer associations now took root. A group of milk producers of Lulu and Sea Island incorporated under the Societies Act as the Independent Milk Producers' Association, Local No. 1, and in 1935 re-incorporated under the Societies Act as the Independent Milk Producers' Cooperative Association. Six weeks after this group first formed, the Richmond and Marpole Farmers' Cooperative Association organized "because someone had not been paid." They also re-incorporated in 1944 to gain advantages under the Cooperative Associations Act. A third group, the Milk Shippers' Agency, organized in 1935 with Acton Kilby as president. These three independent groups, along with the Jersey Breeders' Cooperative, continued in existence for many years.

Local businessmen, dismayed by the disruption of the Valley economy, initiated moves to stabilize the market through cooperative action. After the Appeal Court decision of January 5, 1932 upheld
Justice Murphy's decision that the Milk Act was _ultra vires_, an emergency committee consisting of three F.V.M.P.A. representatives, three independents and three businessmen was established. This committee drew up plans for a new group which would embrace all producers. The plan was accepted by the F.V.M.P.A. Independent representatives were invited to the 1932 annual meeting of the Association. Some independents, fearful of being absorbed by the Cooperative, attempted to organize all independents as a separate group. On May 31, 1932 the Lower Mainland Milk Producers' Cooperative Association incorporated for this purpose. S.H. Shannon, F.O. Jones, J.E. Starr, G.M. Smith, A.H. Weston, and L. Leighton were elected provisional directors and Charles H. Evans, president. Evans' diary entries, with their daily accounts of milk meetings and attempts to sign up farmers, sound similar to those made in late 1916 as he scoured the Valley persuading farmers to join the F.V.M.P.A. His caustic remark on April 12, 1932 about recalcitrant independents who refused to sign up, "each one having some peculiar excuse," sounded a more bitter note, however, than anything recorded during the earlier period.

The chaotic marketing conditions and the accusations of independents created the pressure necessary to bring about changes in F.V.M.P.A. policies. It was decided at the annual meeting in 1933 to pay shippers on a grade basis and to recognize the winter shipper. The adoption of these policies was intended to prepare the way for joint action with the independents. R.W. Hare, Professor of Dairying at The University of British Columbia, was instrumental in bringing the groups together. He addressed the annual meeting of the F.V.M.P.A. which again was attended by a committee of independents. As a result of the united action which
followed, milk prices were raised from 12 quarts for $1 to 11 quarts for $1. The increase was a notable achievement, but it failed to provide sufficient relief.

Extreme competitive marketing conditions and the deep bitterness between Cooperative members and independents made sustained voluntary action impossible. F.V.M.P.A. members continued to press for equalization of fluid market returns and independents adamantly refused to voluntarily share their "earned market." As a result of unrest among Association members, the directors instituted an inquiry into their organization. Hugh Davidson, Alex Patterson and Henry Bose made up a committee with Davidson as chairman. The Davidson Report which resulted in 1932 suggested that since neither voluntary cooperation nor statutory regulation had been successful in distributing the burden of the surplus, a third alternative was possible. By a temporary sacrifice on the part of all Association members the price of fluid milk could be reduced to the price of manufactured products. This would eliminate the premium which dealers paid independent producers, and as T.M. Edwards said in 1954, "would immediately necessitate a reorganization of the distributors." The report was not adopted. "It was not," said Edwards, "the cooperative approach." It is also likely that too many F.V.M.P.A. members recalled the bitterness of a decade before when the F.V.M.P.A. had initiated price-cutting and gained nothing as a result. The fluid market was too important to every producer to attempt tactics of this type. Nevertheless it was galling to F.V.M.P.A. members to be accused of belonging to a dangerous monopoly when that monopoly which had the power to ruin the market, continued to practise restraint.
There was a great deal of unrest in the Valley as the "flush season" of 1933 began. Vancouver City Council had been paying 6.67¢ per quart for relief milk tickets. The organized farmers attempted to force the price to 8¢, but three independent dairymen in Chilliwack agreed to provide milk for less. Three hundred dairymen marched to the homes of the three independent farmers and warned them against shipping directly to the city. A local F.V.M.P.A. meeting at Whatcom Road Hall adjourned and seventy farmers visited a local farmer to warn him not to break his contract. The most spectacular example of unrest, however, was the action taken by a crowd of two or three hundred milk producers who intercepted a truck carrying milk from a Hatzic farm to Empress Dairies, a company which began business on May 1, 1933. Empress Dairies bought from independents and sold to independent distributors. The truck driver was forced to deliver the milk to Mainland Dairy in Vancouver.

Attorney General Harry Pooley came down on the side of law and order. "We shall not permit in this province the open violation of the law or any interference with lawful traffic on public roads. No group of men, no matter what their reason will be allowed to take the law into their own hands," he declared.

Whieldon's Truck Line claimed damages against the F.V.M.P.A. and the farmers who had led the crowd. These men were frightened, but they had the support of a powerful cooperative. It was the men who had agreed to ship milk to the Empress Dairy who were in an unenviable position when they were sued for breach of contract by Whieldon. They refused to answer any questions as to reasons for the breach, and the Court of Appeal upheld their right to refuse. Feeling ran so high that the plaintiff (Whieldon) asked to have the trial in Vancouver rather than
in New Westminster where he felt a fair trial would be impossible. Although there was unrest throughout the whole Valley, there is more evidence of violence in the Dewdney-Matsqui area than elsewhere. Many times independent producers found milk cans left on the stands emptied by hostile cooperative members, and occasionally cans were dumped in the river. Basil Gardom insinuated at the Clyne Commission hearings that cooperative members had been responsible for his barn, filled with quality oats, being burned to the ground. These incidents are a clear indication that division between independents and cooperative members became deeper and more bitter as a result of the extremely competitive conditions of the depression period. Nevertheless they shared a common problem which continued to pull them together.

Although efforts to achieve Valley-wide cooperative action were futile, a new movement swept through the Valley after the Lower Mainland Cooperative Producers' Association disbanded on August 31, 1933. It began at a meeting in Langley of the Independent Milk Producers' Association and a newly formed company of eight Vancouver independent distributors who called their organization the Independent Milk Distributors Company Limited. F.W. Scott, a Sumas producer, interrupted the meeting several times with a proposal that Valley farmers form a union and dictate prices to the distributors. The idea caught on. Meetings were held throughout the Valley attended by independents and F.V.M.P.A. members alike. The first, at Chilliwack, adopted a program which demanded 55¢ per pound butterfat for fluid milk and producer control of the dairy industry. Membership in the union skyrocketed. Farmers at the Cloverdale meeting adopted the slogan "55 Will Keep Us Alive."
The talk of "One Big Union" was inspired, no doubt, by the president of the National Farmers' Holiday Association, Milo Reno, who had called for strike action on the part of American farmers, and by the example of Okanagan farmers who had massed on the railroad tracks in Kelowna and Coldstream to prevent shipment of independent apples and won a victory when the federal government had caused an injunction to be issued to prevent the shipment. 84
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Gradually the forces in support of marketing legislation began to gain strength. While the Farmers' Cooperative Union was taking shape, the province moved toward a general election. T.D. Pattullo spoke about "Work and Wages" in Chilliwack the same week that six hundred producers had to change their meeting place to accommodate all the farmers anxious to support a union. 85 Barrow shared the platform with his party leader. Many in the crowd may have echoed the remark of one farmer who said, "I disgraced myself voting against Barrow last time." 86

The directors of the union, representative of all groups of producers and all areas of the Valley negotiated with distributors and they found that the Associated Dairies, Crystal Dairy, and Jersey Farms were willing to cooperate. Other dealers, however, wished to raise the price of milk to consumers. This the farmers refused to do for they felt their returns were low, not because of the prices to the consumer, but because price-cutting had gone on at the wholesale level. Hotels and restaurants were paying only 20¢ per gallon for milk and the City Council, still taking advantage of the surplus, paid only 7½¢ per quart for relief milk.
Strike action was discussed at the union meetings, but the executive left the decision to the locals. As the excitement mounted, A.H. Mercer, F.V.M.P.A. director, pricked the bubble by announcing to the press, "Let Mr. Jones call his strike but the milk flow to Vancouver will still continue." The Cooperative members sullenly expressed their rage and frustration by refusing, two months later, to vote Mercer back in as F.V.M.P.A. director.

At the time of the annual meeting, Mercer was in Ottawa where plans were underway to draw up a federal Natural Products Marketing Act which would become part of R.B. Bennett's "New Deal" legislation. The union movement faded away; the editor of Butterfat rebuked the F.V.M.P.A. members for their ingratitude to Mercer; the directors appointed him General Manager of the Association and the farmers began again to pin their hopes on marketing legislation.

T.D. Pattullo, the new provincial premier, had made it clear to the Farmers' Union that strike action would be considered intolerable. His "Work and Wages" campaign, however, had also reflected "New Deal" thinking. Both he and his Minister of Agriculture, Dr. K.C. MacDonald, were committed to assisting the farmer through government action. Many obstacles lay ahead, but MacDonald was aggressive and determined to implement marketing legislation.

As soon as the intentions of the federal government were made clear, a provincial marketing act was passed to make provision for provincial marketing boards to be constituted which would cooperate with the dominion board. The act was to come into operation on the proclamation of the lieutenant-governor. The Natural Products Marketing Act brought in by the Bennett government in July, 1934 provided for the
establishment of a Dominion Marketing Board with power to regulate time and place of marketing, distribution, quantity and quality of product, to conduct pooling, to compensate for loss and to require registration and licensing of producers. These powers could be delegated to local boards, thus enabling production and marketing to be controlled by those engaged in it. Provision was made for persons engaged in production and marketing to petition the Governor in Council to approve a scheme for the regulation of marketing of a natural product.

In August, 1934 both provincial and dominion marketing boards were established. Fruit-growers and milk producers were among the first groups to draw up schemes for approval. After several weeks of controversy and negotiation, MacDonald brought the rival milk factions together and the Lower Mainland Dairy Products Board, made up of Chairman Hugh Davidson, W.J. Park and W.T. McArthur, was appointed under both the dominion and provincial statutes. This meant, in effect, that there were two boards, but the personnel, office and staff were the same for each.

The first act of the Milk Board was to raise the price of milk, including relief milk, in an effort to end the ruinous price wars. On January 25, 1935 the Dominion Board passed an order imposing a toll fixed at one cent for every pound of butterfat content marketed. This money was used to pay Milk Board expenses. In July a bonus of 1½c was paid to compensate farmers who shipped milk to cheese factories. The Board was using its power to regulate the market to a very limited degree, but the provincial government intended to use the right to pool which the board possessed. It was proposed that a single agency be set up which would put every producer on a quota according to his ability to supply milk throughout the year. With his single agency and quota
plan, MacDonald was attempting to provide equal access to the fluid market. The nature of the milk boards, however, continued the principle of producer representation from each group.97

There was great resistance. The independents who were supplying 80% of the fluid market opposed the idea of a single agency which would force them to share the market. The Jersey Breeders' Association members saw the single agency as a threat to the special place they had created on the market and the F.V.M.P.A. members resisted any plan which would mean the dissolution of the Cooperative. W.J. Park convinced the Association members to give the plan a try because it meant that equalization, the main aim of the F.V.M.P.A., would be achieved. MacDonald was convinced that only a single agency scheme would work satisfactorily. But when the Dominion Marketing Board refused permission, a plan was substituted which gave every producer his share of the market without abolishing the existing agencies, the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, the Independent Milk Producers' Association and the Jersey Milk Breeders' Association.98

The future of compulsory pooling was very uncertain. R.B. Bennett's ship, with its "flag of progress" nailed to the masthead, had sunk and Mackenzie King, who had criticized the "New Deal" legislation in opposition, submitted it to the Supreme Court for an opinion on its validity in January, 1936. Independents appealed to the Provincial Marketing Board against the pooling scheme,99 Their wish was granted by the Dominion Marketing Board which suspended the orders of the B.C. Milk Marketing Board setting up a pool.100 This move was not inconsistent with the policies of Mackenzie King who had objected to "the arbitrary and bureaucratic powers" which the Act conferred.101 The Act was further
undermined when both Alberta and Saskatchewan Appeal Courts ruled federal marketing acts *ultra vires*. In the United States, the Agricultural Administration Act implemented by the Roosevelt government was found invalid by the Supreme Court, an ominous warning to Canadian cooperative members.

MacDonald persisted in his efforts. The Dominion Marketing Board was persuaded to grant powers to a single agency on the condition that the Milk Board regulate the quality of milk on the fluid market to a bacteria count of 150,000 and the quantity to a daily minimum of 60 pounds. Through plebiscites farmers could indicate whether or not they favored continuation of the provincial milk marketing scheme and whether or not they favored a single agency. Ninety-two percent of the large number who voted approved milk marketing, but only seventy-four percent voted for a single agency. From a slate of seventeen candidates, W.J. Park and T.M. Edwards were elected to the new Milk Board by the milk producers and W.T. McArthur was appointed by the government.

All this was accomplished before the Supreme Court of Canada made public in June, 1936 its judgment on the Natural Products Marketing Act, 1934. The Act was unanimously rejected on the ground that it attempted to regulate the provinces by a commission. Such "regulation of individual trades, or trades in individual commodities in this sweeping fashion" the Court held to be not within the competence of the parliament of Canada.

The government of British Columbia immediately proclaimed the Natural Products Marketing Act (B.C.) and named the incumbent board to continue in office until March 31, 1937. Pooling was avoided, but it was possible to achieve the same effect by granting the board the power to authorize an agency to purchase milk marketed through it, to fix
maximum and minimum prices and to collect licenses. In two curtly worded telegrams to the Prime Minister, Pattullo affirmed his support for compulsory legislation, indicated that British Columbia would appeal the Supreme Court decision and attempted to secure some guarantee that the federal government would not introduce a marketing measure based on a voluntary scheme. King's replies were vague and wordy, but he did indicate that he favored marketing legislation which had no compulsory features and he welcomed an appeal to the Privy Council.

All the provinces had passed marketing acts designed to complement the federal act, but it was the Attorney-General for British Columbia who appealed the Supreme Court judgment to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Attorneys-General of Ontario, Quebec and New Brunswick were critical of dominion invasion of a provincial field. The Attorney-General for Canada supported the appeal. His representative argued that all powers for the self-administration of Canada and the provinces "were imparted to one or the other of the Legislatures and that what was not in one was of necessity in the other." The two legislative authorities, "having between them the whole of the powers. . . should be able to exercise them in such a way as is proper for the good administration of the inhabitant."

Although Lord Atkin, who delivered the judgment, expressed appreciation of the importance of the aim of combined legislation, the appeal was dismissed. "Unless and until a change is made in the respective legislative functions of Dominion and Province it may well be that satisfactory results for both can only be obtained by cooperation," stated His Lordship. "But the legislation will have to be carefully framed and will not be achieved by either party leaving its sphere and encroaching upon that of the other."
The Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association had been formed in 1913 by men who hoped to control marketing through voluntary joint action. When this could not be achieved, they had attempted to gain equalization of returns through compulsive legislation. The long struggle had led to this blind alley. Neither provincial nor federal legislation had proved effective and they were now faced with the problem of bridging the gap between the two areas of jurisdiction or of finding a way that would avoid the "No Man's Land" between the two.

Of eight reform laws referred to the Supreme Court by the Mackenzie King government in January, 1936, only two had been found to be valid. This indication that the federal government was unable to legislate in the interests of the whole country caused great consternation among historians and constitutional lawyers. Professor D.G. Creighton, a convinced centralist, was prepared to admit that the changes in relative position of leadership between federal and provincial authority were determined by social forces. In spite of this, he believed that the Canadian constitution would have been shaped differently but for the machinations and inadequacies of members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Without questioning the reasons decisions continued to be referred to this Committee, Creighton lampooned its members and placed the blame for the weakening of federal power, not on a growing Canadian sectionalism, but on the decisions of the members of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council whom he called the "stepfathers of Confederation."
Many authorities accepted this verdict and it became "the common sport of constitutional lawyers" to condemn Lord Watson and Lord Haldane for perverting the intentions of the Fathers of Confederation. Canadian farmers may have shared some of this antipathy to British judges, but because it was Cooperative members throughout the country who supported the controlled marketing, their resentment was directed at the groups which challenged the legislation. Both attitudes were reactions rather than a reasoned response. Professor J.R. Mallory's perceptive analysis provided a better explanation for the "No Man's Land" in which those seeking marketing legislation found themselves. He pointed out that the courts, which have become instruments for interpreting and resolving conflicts within the state are limited in this function because they can act only in the presence of litigation. Like a ouija board, the courts can give only limited answers to questions presented to them.

The Supreme Court of Canada in rejecting legislation in 1931 over which there was intense conflict could only react to this tension by denying the authority of the provincial legislature. The Supreme Court of Canada in 1936 and the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in 1937 were powerless to restore the authority which the provincial legislatures had gained. The decisions could only reject the authority of the federal parliament in order that precedents established earlier could be followed. This delay, while frustrating to those who saw marketing legislation as a necessity, prevented hastily conceived and faulty legislation from becoming established.

While Creighton was voicing a vigorous nationalism in his attack on the Privy Council, Professor Harold A. Innis was expressing a real concern about the economic trend. Innis, who declared nationalism to be "the last refuge of scoundrels," expressed this disquiet when he
said, "Compulsion has reared its ugly head where cooperation was the password." The members of the F.V.M.P.A. had been convinced that the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act was an "advanced marketing measure." Perhaps men like Innis were troubled because they were aware that it was a tool developed by one group of farmers committed to a "free enterprise" system in order to compete with another group which refused to join them. Court decisions which cancelled each other reflected the problem.

The struggle for legislation was protracted because it was played out against the backdrop of the depression, which not only increased competition among producers, but also paralyzed any move toward progressive marketing measures. The formation of the F.V.M.P.A. was a response to pressures which forced farmers to increase their efficiency in an increasingly industrialized society. Though it was not clear to many of the farmers demanding compulsory legislation, the concept of government control implied more than the use of a centralizing power to equalize opportunities for producers; it implied that a collective authority would safeguard the interests of all. Consumers would be served best by increased efficiency in agriculture. The sort of pressure required to bring this about could be exerted under prosperous economic conditions, but during the harsh depression years the producer-vendors, operating on a small scale, clung desperately to their share of the market and there was a reluctance to force them out of business, particularly when their problems were so similar to those of the small shipper within the Cooperative. During the difficult depression years the Cooperative helped one group of producers to survive; the failure to impose legislation either to enforce pasteurization or to equalize returns protected another group. It is difficult not to conclude that the Sanford Evans'
decision to support the principles of freedom of action and the
Supreme Court decision pronounced by Chief Justice Lyman Duff in 1931
were based not so much on a consideration of the principles at stake
as upon a sensitivity to the severe stress in the agricultural
population as a result of an unprecedented economic depression.

The Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association was, as Perry Starr
stated, on the right track, but economic conditions would have to
improve and the issues would have to be placed in a broader context than
a struggle between producers before success could be achieved.
The marketing legislation had been declared *ultra vires* when it had been challenged by independent producers and distributors. The dealers may have gained some temporary advantages from the failure to improve control over marketing, but the independent producers did not. For them, as for the F.V.M.P.A. members, an assured market and an adequate return were very important. In 1955 The Honorable J.V. Clyne, Commissioner of the Milk Inquiry, spoke of the "surprising outburst of amity" which brought independents and Cooperative members together to form the Associated Dairies. The "outburst" is not so surprising if we realize that the chaotic marketing conditions caused by the enormous surplus was a problem for all producers. The incredible bitterness which developed between independent producers and Cooperative members revolved, not around control, but around the question of equalization of returns. The independents spoke of the importance of the law of supply and demand. They insisted that by maintaining a high standard of production they had created a demand and therefore had earned a right to the market which they refused to relinquish.

In spite of this insistence on a special place in the market, independent producers found solutions to marketing problems which were similar to those worked out by Valley farmers in 1917. When pressures mounted, the independents organized into cooperatives in order to deal more effectively with distributors. Though it was independents who resisted attempts to implement a pooling scheme and who challenged
the authority of the Milk Board, they attempted to impose the same type of control on their members.

The Independent Milk Producers' Cooperative Association had paid the tolls levied by the British Columbia Lower Mainland Dairy Products Board from February, 1935 until June 15, 1935. They ceased payment when the plans to implement a pooling scheme were announced. On January 28, 1937, the day the Privy Council announced its decision that the Natural Products Act was invalid, the Independent Milk Producers' Association brought action to recover the tolls which had been paid to the Board, a total of $3,954.26. The action was dismissed.  

In the meantime, the same cooperative had taken action against a dairyman, T.C. Brooke, who resisted equalization levies. At the time when Dr. MacDonald failed to achieve his single agency, three of the existing bodies, the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, the Jersey Breeders' Association and the Independent Milk Producers' Cooperative Association, had been authorized as agencies through which dairymen could sell their product. Gibson's Dairy, to which Brooke shipped, chose to market through the I.M.P.C.A. Though he had been secretary of the association, he later withdrew his membership but continued as a shipper. On the ground that he was not a member, Brooke took action to recover the levy. He was awarded a judgment for $293.12 and the I.M.P.C.A. lost their appeal against the decision.

The Independent Milk Producers who led the fight to oppose equalization had operated an individual milk pool within their own association "to distribute the burden upon the producers whose fluid milk quota was fixed, and who then sold their surplus milk on the manufacturing market at a lower price." Brooke stood in relation to
the I.M.P.C.A. as the Independent Cooperative did to the Lower Mainland Dairy Products Board. Any producers' group was forced to have a surplus in order to ensure a steady supply to the distributors. The I.M.P.C.A. was using the same method to deal with the surplus that the F.V.M.P.A. advocated for the whole Valley. It was as powerless to force equalization upon producers unwilling to cooperate as was the F.V.M.P.A. I.M.P.C.A. members must have felt a real sense of grievance toward a former executive member who grasped advantage but refused to share responsibility. It is the height of irony that if they had obtained control over this recalcitrant shipper they would have lost the right to justify their own existence.

The burden of the surplus became so oppressive to the members of the F.V.M.P.A. that in September, 1936, when hope of legislative measures appeared dim, the Association decided to close its membership. Not only were current members locked into the Association, but others who wished to enter were kept out. This was a far cry from cooperative principles. Many members were uneasy about the decision. The majority voted in favor of the action, however, because new shippers meant an increase in the amount of milk which would have to be manufactured. This could only result in a further depressing of the settling rate.

Some farmers were moving into the Valley from the prairies, men whose meagre resources were still sufficient to prevent them from becoming completely immobile. They had almost invariably belonged to grain growers' cooperatives, and as they settled into Valley communities their sympathies became known. It would surely be difficult for an association which called itself a cooperative to bar such men from its membership. They were also young men attempting to get started who had to be considered. F.V.M.P.A. members
were certainly not Boyle's "eager souls who saw a vision of a new heaven and a new earth," but neither was it mere lip service which they paid to the principles of cooperation. Shipping contracts were given to chosen applicants, "bona fide producers." At the end of the year these men were admitted to full membership. Independent shippers who were cut off by distributors were thus kept out as were sporadic shippers. The closed membership was debated at every annual meeting but was retained until 1942 when improved conditions made the policy a disadvantage. Even then "contract breakers" were not allowed entry.

With the unanimous rejection of the federal Natural Products Marketing Act by the Supreme Court of Canada in June, 1936, the provincial government immediately proclaimed the Natural Products Marketing Act (B.C.) to take effect at 11:30 A.M., June 18, 1936. The incumbent board was retained in office. It could not pool prices but was given power to authorize an agency to purchase milk marketed through it and to prohibit the sale of milk to any other agency. It could fix maximum and minimum prices, and in place of the former Board's power to collect a levy, it was authorized to collect licenses from producers, processors, manufacturers and marketers of milk. This was an attempt to use only powers which the provincial government possessed. Costs of administering the scheme were to be met by revenue from licenses required of all groups in the milk industry rather than from equalization levies on producers. The Board's power to set quotas and fix prices through a single agency would have the effect of equalizing the producers' share of the market even though the province had no power to establish a pooling scheme.

The independents strenuously opposed the milk marketing plan. Acton Kilby, president of the Milk Shippers' Agency, claimed the Board was implementing a scheme which was, in effect, a pool.
attempts to do indirectly what it could not do directly, contrary to the sound legal principle that when anything is prohibited directly, it is also prohibited indirectly. Basil Gardom, president of the Independent Milk Producers' Cooperative Association, declared that compulsory pooling of milk from Grade A and B farms placed superior and lower grades on the same basis. W.J. Park protested that fancy barns did not necessarily mean clean milk. The quality of the product was the important factor.

In November, 1936 new registration was required of all milk producers by the Milk Board. G.W. Shannon, T.H. MacDonald and M.B. McDermid claimed they were under no obligation to register to obtain licenses or to pay fees. They sought an injunction to restrain the Board from collecting fees and asked that the Natural Products Marketing Act be declared *ultra vires*. Mr. Justice A.M. Manson, referring to the Privy Council decision regarding the federal Natural Products Marketing Act, and quoting Lord Atkin to support his judgment, found the British Columbia Act to be invalid.

The Attorney-General referred the legislation to the Court of Appeal to determine in what particulars and to what extent the Act was *ultra vires* the legislature. The Court held that the Act was not in any particular beyond the powers of the legislature of the province of British Columbia. When Shannon, MacDonald and McDermid appealed this decision to the Privy Council, the judgment of the British Columbia Court of Appeal was affirmed. The judges, Lord Atkin among them, found the provincial Act to be valid, reminding the appellants that "within its appointed sphere the Provincial Legislature is as supreme as any other Parliament." This judgment was most significant supporting as it did the authority of the provincial government to
regulate particular businesses entirely within the province, to impose licenses and to delegate authority to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. The Committee suggested "with great respect" that Chief Justice Duff had taken "a somewhat narrow view of the Provincial powers" on the question of levies in Lawson v. the Interior Tree Fruit and Vegetables Committee of Direction. The decision in the Shannon case, announced on July 27, 1938, removed an enormous obstacle to the attainment of controlled marketing.

It was not enough for the provincial government to have the authority to control marketing. The means by which control was exercised had to be generally acceptable. Marketing boards set up under the Act had become increasingly unpopular. The B.C. Coast Vegetable Board, in an attempt to control the Vancouver vegetable market, had set quotas for interior and coast producers and had fixed prices. Guards were set on the bridges leading into Vancouver to prevent untagged potatoes from coming in. There was a great deal of zeal in imposing control and a great deal of resistance to it. Chinese market gardeners in the Ladner and Richmond area had been particularly obstinate in resisting regulation.

The courts began to show a decided lack of sympathy for the purpose of the board. Mr. Justice A.M. Manson granted an injunction ordering the B.C. Coast Vegetable Marketing Board not to interfere with Lowe Chong and Low Yee in their business of exporting potatoes. "The trouble about these boards is that sometimes they know their business and sometimes they don't," commented Manson, after pointing out that
potatoes were selling at a high price and growers had no need of a marketing board.23

A committee was appointed to investigate the activities of the Board. Though there were complaints of dishonesty,24 many growers defended the Board at the inquiry.25 The probe was discontinued without charges being laid. It was decided that the main problem was bootlegging by Orientals.26

T.G. Norris, K.C., addressing the eleventh annual meeting of the Canadian Agricultural Economics Society, exposed the essential weakness of marketing board control. Because there was no dominion legislation to complement the provincial control, marketing boards had tended to extend their power and, in many cases, were endeavoring to do indirectly what could not be done directly.27 If Orientals were a menace, he argued, legislation designed directly to meet this ill should be implemented. The attempt to deal with racial questions by a marketing control measure could only lead to improper administration of marketing control.28 The competition of Chinese farmers which led to racial tensions among the fruit and vegetable growers was not a problem in the milk industry. But the attempts to enforce regulation on a minority group made the public distrustful of any attempts at control. In a society where a growing uneasiness about totalitarian methods of achieving efficiency had given way to alarm and preparation to do battle against Nazi and Fascist aggression had begun, there was a growing intolerance for forced regulation. Legislation enacted for the benefit of producers could succeed only when it had the support, not only of all the producers, but also of all the people.
Milk Board members, W.J. Park, T.M. Edwards and W.T. McArthur were zealous in carrying out their duties. It may be that the members, two of whom belonged to the F.V.M.P.A. hoped to establish a reputation for impartiality. Far from accomplishing this, they merely lost the confidence of the group of producers who had consistently fought for marketing control. Dissatisfied F.V.M.P.A. members registered their disapproval by defeating Park in the election for directors in 1937, but he remained on the Milk Board which continued an uncertain existence. The Manson decision in the British Columbia Supreme Court announced in May, 1937, destroyed the credibility of the Board. When the B.C. Court of Appeal reversed the Manson decision in July, the term of office of the Lower Mainland Dairy Products Board was extended to November 30, 1937.

Farmers were very slow to re-register with the Board. Of 900 Cooperative members only 44 responded. Members of the Board were accused of neglecting good salesmanship and psychology in promoting satisfactory relations between themselves and the farmers. Their principal statements had been threats to prosecute. In response to this antagonism, Milk Board members resigned, recommending that a neutral board be appointed. They had learned through experience that as representatives of producer groups they could not work effectively. If a marketing board was to operate successfully, its members would have to be selected on some other basis that a representative one. The method by which this could be done remained to be worked out. The need for control was great but in selecting a new Milk Board the principle of neutrality was extended only to the chairman of the Board, who was chosen much as the chairman of an arbitration board would be.
The F.V.M.P.A. members chose E.D. Barrow as representative on the new Milk Board, the Milk Shippers' Agency chose W.T. McArthur and W.E. Williams, K.C., choice of the elected members was appointed chairman. The new Milk Board attempted to raise prices and improve quality, but for several months before the Privy Council decision in the Shannon case was announced, resistance intensified. Members of the Board pointed out in a letter to the editor of the Province that in March, 1936, producers had voted 1246 to 92 for the continuation of the scheme. Circulars and propaganda issued by dairies whose supply came from the Independent Milk Producers' Cooperative Association were creating misunderstanding.

Gardom, in replying, traced a history of oppression of independents by "the combine" which extracted "tribute." In reply to Gardom, J.W. Carmichael attempted to explain the need for control and the role the F.V.M.P.A. had played in achieving better conditions for the farmer. When 21,500 housewives sent letters to Premier Pattullo through the I.M.P.C.A. protesting the inclusion of dairy products in the marketing scheme in B.C., it was obvious that the independents were winning a propaganda war. F.V.M.P.A. members always sensitive to the importance of the consumer and bewildered by the spate of propaganda, were unwilling to give wholehearted support to the methods of controlling the market which were developing. When his term of office elapsed at the end of March, 1938, McArthur resigned because of producer apathy. The independents refused to elect a new member and Barrow and Williams were left to carry on alone.

The Privy Council decision in July, 1938 upholding the validity of the Natural Products Marketing Act stimulated more support for the
Milk Board. A marketing plan was agreed upon almost immediately by the F.V.M.P.A. and the I.M.P.C.A. In addition to the existing board, the creation of a single agency was proposed to market all milk for sale in the Lower Mainland. It was emphasized that the primary producer should have complete control of this agency, an indication that there was no realization of the fact that control would be ineffective as long as it continued to be a tool or a weapon in the hands of producers. A plebiscite was held and milk producers voted overwhelmingly in favor of control and also of a single agency.

E.D. Barrow was elected Milk Board member by the F.V.M.P.A. and Acton Kilby was elected by the independents. W.E. Williams was appointed chairman. The independents elected E.G. Sherwood as a member of the new single agency; the F.V.M.P.A. elected W.J. Park. J.W. Carmichael was appointed by the Lower Mainland Dairy Products Board when the two elected men failed to agree on a third member. By May 1, 1939 the single agency was organized as the Milk Producers' Clearing House Cooperative Association. This association was prepared to purchase milk from licensed producers for resale to licensed dealers and producer-vendors. The retail price of milk was set at 11¢ per quart in Vancouver and 10¢ per quart in Burnaby and New Westminster.

Neither Cooperative members nor independents were satisfied with the action taken in setting the retail price of milk. They felt that price-setting would be of advantage to the dealer but would do nothing to prevent the price-cutting at the wholesale level which was disrupting the milk market. They protested that the board was distributor-controlled. Meetings were called under the auspices of both the F.V.M.P.A. and the I.M.P.C.A. A resolution was passed at one large
gathering asking the Milk Board to change its orders to meet objections raised at the meeting.49 A group of independent dealers and producer-vendors50 obtained an injunction to prevent the clearing house scheme from coming into effect. Crystal Dairy also sought a ruling that Orders 3 to 6 of the Milk Marketing scheme were invalid. Though the F.V.M.P.A. members were not enthusiastic about the milk scheme, they did not wish to see the Milk Board cease to function; neither were they willing to provide money to fight the injunction.51

W.A. Hayward, representing the plaintiffs, asked for the injunction on the grounds that the clearing house was carrying on its business as a pool association and was therefore illegal.52 The action was dismissed by Justice H.B. Robertson of the Supreme Court. But an appeal reversed the decision. The Clearing House Association was declared to be a corporation which was not an effective agency because an amendment to the rules laid down in Section 27 of the Cooperative Associations Act had not been complied with.53 Not all members of the Board had been elected as the rules required. The scheme was, therefore, declared invalid on a technicality. A similar action brought by Crystal Dairy also reversed an earlier decision by Justice Robertson, but in both cases Justice W.G. McQuarrie dissented from the judgment.54

The battle against the clearing house had been fought not only in the courts but also on the streets. On the next page is a fascimile of the pamphlets which were distributed, describing the milk scheme as fascist. Readers were invited to sign, clip out and send to Premier Pattullo petitions which were published in the newspapers. The propaganda war had a telling effect on opinion in Vancouver. Though Mayor Lyle Telford echoed distributor propaganda when he claimed that the Milk Board was attempting to impose "despotic
Are We to Feed FASCISM on MILK?

...We ask the question in all seriousness.
It concerns you because—

1. A Milk Board and its agency, supported by the Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association, whose milk is distributed in Greater Vancouver by the Associated Dairies, is exerting every force to obtain power over the entire industry and create a common pool of milk. Do you approve? Have you been consulted?

2. This group, if it succeeds, will have the power of life and death over the economic existence of farmers, dairymen, truckers and producer-vendors. To one it may say: “You may do business”; to another, “You may not do business.” Is this Canada—or is it Germany? Do you approve such un-Canadian power?

3. Independent farmers and dairies have been forced to fight for existence and now a corporation has been formed with issued capital of FIVE one-dollar shares, to buy and sell all the milk in the Fraser Valley. Two out of three of its active directors are members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers Association which for twenty-two years has tried to dominate the milk business in Vancouver. Do you want to click your heels to these would-be “fuehrers” of the milk trade?

4. The Milk Board and its monopolistic agency is prevented only by court action from putting your dairy at its mercy, probably putting your milkman and others out of jobs in these days of unemployment. If their jobs aren’t safe, is yours? Perhaps “efficiency” could eliminate you, too! Fascism makes its appeal on the basis of efficiency, but it is actually inefficient in practice. Do you believe in the right of a man to work in freedom if he serves courteously and well?

5. We like to feel that you buy your milk from us because we take special pains to search out the best and safest supply. Do you want us to agree to the Board’s demand that we take what milk we are given—for this is exactly what we have been asked to do—and thus lose control over the quality of our product?

We are fighting against a form of tyranny. Now we ask you to stand with us for fair play and basic British principles. It is YOUR fight, too. The only hope of winning it is by the weight of public opinion. Will you register your opinion this easy way? Please sign now.

CRYSTAL DAIRY LTD.,
1803 Commercial Dr., Vancouver, B.C.

Unless you wish to mail this letter to the Premier yourself, just sign and leave it for your milkman. He will see that it reaches its destination.

ION. T. D. PATTULLÒ,
Premier of British Columbia,
Victoria, B.C.

June 1930.

I, the undersigned, and the members of my household, indignantly protest against the action of the Milk Board in its effort to create a monopoly in the milk business in Greater Vancouver. We believe that monopoly and restraint of trade are undemocratic and against the interests of the citizens and we accordingly hereby register our strong disapproval.
political dictatorship in its most vicious form,"55 his criticism voiced a concern for the Vancouver citizen. His suggestion that "the only possible solution is a non-political utility commission,"56 was a demand for consumer representation on the Milk Board.

In spite of their doubts about the methods of the Milk Board,57 F.V.M.P.A. members continued to give it reluctant support. The situation was discussed at the annual picnic in July, 1939. The ineffectiveness of the Milk Board destroyed hope for control. There were no reasonable alternatives to consider. Both Macken and Barrow advised against price-cutting,58 but there was a good deal of talk among Cooperative members that such a threat should be implemented. When independents protested, Macken replied that "any fluid market price above the world price of manufactured products could only be maintained by statutory regulations, and since statutory regulations seemed impossible because of court decisions, the association members seemed to feel that there was no sense in continuing the struggle."59

An attempt by Turner's Dairy, representing a number of producers and distributors,60 to bring an action questioning the validity of Milk Board orders was held up by the refusal of W.E. Williams to answer questions put to him on his examination for discovery. The decision of Justice D.A. McDonald of the Supreme Court that a member of the Board must answer any question61 was reversed by the Court of Appeal.62 This decision protected members of the Board. But a judgment was handed down in favor of Turner's Dairy and associates when five orders of the Milk Board were declared ultra vires.63 An appeal upheld the decision, the judges finding that the orders made by the L.M.D.P. Board and the scheme established were "in real purpose
and effect a colourable device for equalizing the returns to producers and imposing an indirect tax, and therefore ultra vires." Chief Justice M.A. Macdonald dissented from the judgment.

Members of the F.V.M.P.A. decided at their annual meeting in March, 1941 to assist the Milk Board in carrying an appeal to a higher court. The provincial government announced that it would also give financial assistance. Representatives of the Fruit and Vegetable Marketing Boards volunteered support since all marketing schemes would be affected by the decision. The Supreme Court of Canada upheld the judgment of the British Columbia courts. The proposed clearing house was declared illegal. The provincial government had the power to control marketing of milk, but the means used had been found to be illegal. In rejecting measures which were reluctantly accepted by those who demanded them and completely unacceptable to others, the judiciary, reflecting the conflict and indecisiveness, was playing a creative rather than a purely legalistic role.

War-time demands brought an increase in the price of manufactured milk products. This improved the position of the F.V.M.P.A. and removed their need for a milk board. They refused to support the independent milk producers' attempts to obtain better prices. As a result, the eight hundred independents began to revive the Farmers' Union. The movement collapsed with the announcement by the War Time Prices and Trade Board that subsidies would be paid to milk producers for milk for manufacturing and in some cases for fluid milk.
Because of the national emergency, the federal government had power, not only to grant subsidies, but also to fix both producer and consumer prices. From September 1, 1942 when the marketing of milk came under the control of the War Time Prices and Trade Board until July, 1946 when the control was removed, there was peace in the industry because of controlled marketing, good prices and expanding markets for manufactured milk.

During this period of war-time prosperity, there was evidence that attitudes were changing and hardening. In 1940 the Rowell Sirois Report had described the movement away from "laissez" policies which had been an established trend for years and had recommended that there be concurrent legislation for grading and marketing of produce. A Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into marketing boards, repudiated the Sanford Evans Report and predicted that the sphere of governmental control would become wider.

The Milk Inquiry Report of 1928 had recommended "that the production, distribution and sale of milk and cream for the fluid trade be treated as a public utility." The main interest of the Cooperative was in control over marketing. It was difficult for a minority within the Association to gain support for more stringent production standards. After a certain point was reached, the pressures had to come from without. Over the years governments had supported controlled marketing but had not taken enough responsibility for setting and controlling the standard of quality. This explains why distributor propaganda in Vancouver was difficult for the Cooperative to refute. It also explains, in part, the antagonism of Vancouver mayors towards marketing legislation. Too often the consumer was forgotten in the desperate
struggle between independents and the F.V.M.P.A.

As World War II neared its end, a bill to bring milk under the control of the Public Utilities Commission was brought into the legislature in an effort to prevent chaos in the milk industry with the removal of war-time controls. Legislation to control creameries and dairies, a logical accompaniment to such a bill, was withdrawn, however, because it was considered too severe. Obviously the small producers continued to constitute a powerful voting bloc. Bill 38 to control milk as a public utility became law in April, 1946 and became operative three months later when the War Time Prices and Trade Board control was lifted. Provision was made for a one-man Milk Board. E.C. Carr, who had been Milk Sales Controller in Saskatchewan, was appointed Commissioner. Carr not only had experience in milk marketing control, he was also neutral in his affiliations and was therefore in a much better position to represent the interests of all groups concerned -- producers, distributors and consumers. By making such an appointment, the government avoided many of the problems of the pre-war period when representation on the membership of the Milk Board created conflict among Co-operative members, independent producers and independent dealers. The basic principle that the interests of a particular group should receive representation had not been departed from, however. Treating milk as a public utility was an attempt to protect the consumer. The bill to control creameries and dairies, which would best have served the public interest, was withdrawn.

As government subsidies were removed, the Milk Board fixed prices to the producer and the consumer. Increases in price necessary in
the inflationary post-war period were decided upon by the Milk Commissioner after a public inquiry was held. The independents continued to petition for higher prices for fluid milk and the F.V.M.P.A. continued to oppose increases, claiming that lower consumption of milk would result. The Cooperative members, in a much stronger financial position after the prosperous war years, knew that the best hope for increasing their share of the fluid market lay in expansion of that market. Any contraction would force the Cooperative to divert more milk into manufactured products with the inevitable depressing effect on the settling rate.

Prices for many goods were rising steadily, almost unnoticed, but the public meetings called by the Milk Board stimulated great interest in the need for price rises in the cost of milk. Alderman Anna Sprott of Vancouver carried on an active campaign against higher prices on behalf of the people she championed,

the majority of the wage earners in B.C., along with old age government pensioners, other pensioners, annuity groups, and a large segment of our over-45 year workers... have a difficult time to meet expenses and are forced to live in a sub-standard state much below the cost of living.75

In response to consumer pressure, spearheaded by Alderman Sprott, the Milk Board was increased to include Hubert King, a U.B.C. professor, and Mrs. Rex Eaton, a Vancouver housewife. This return to the representative principle destroyed the impartiality of the Milk Board.

Within the milk industry there was a return to the bitter competition of the depression period. Fixed prices of milk to producer and consumer prevented price-cutting at the retail level, but in order to secure fluid milk orders, distributors offered ice-cream freezers, low interest loans and cut-rate prices on ice-cream to
retail outlets. Restaurants and hospitals which called for tenders received milk at prices much below retail. In the fall of 1951, Canada Safeway applied for a reduction in the price of milk sold through stores, and announced that plans had been made to build a milk plant. This threat of increased competition intensified demands for skip-a-day delivery in order to cut production costs. The B.C. Milk Board announced the abandonment of a fixed price of milk to the consumer, the retention of a minimum price to the producer and the allowance of skip-a-day delivery.

Such an outcry greeted this announcement of control of the retail price of milk that it was not implemented. It was not only distributors who were concerned. The B.C. Dairymen's Association also petitioned both the Milk Board and the provincial cabinet to retain control over the retail price of milk. The Milk Board worked with distributors to cut costs by eliminating overlapping milk routes. Milk Board order 37 permitted the sale of milk in stores at 1¢ below the price of home-delivered milk.

This was too small a concession for those concerned about the decrease in the consumption of milk in Vancouver in spite of the rapid population growth. Dr. Joseph Blumes, Vancouver dentist, began a campaign for free milk in schools. Alderman Sprott not only supported lower prices but began a campaign for hooded caps on milk bottles. These demands increased the pressure on distributors.

With the change of government in the summer of 1952, Kenneth Kiernan became Minister of Agriculture. Though his wife belonged to a pioneer farm family, Kiernan was a garage mechanic whose knowledge of agricultural problems was minimal. On assuming office he was struck
by the numerous conflicting claims in the representations that were made to him on the milk question.\textsuperscript{84} He set up a uniform accounting system among distributors,\textsuperscript{85} began a careful study of the problems, and postponed any decision on decontrol\textsuperscript{86} until after the 1953 election which gave the government a comfortable majority.

A public hearing followed the election. Canada Safeway pressed for decontrol and for permission to sell carton milk 2c below delivered milk prices. This would be possible if Safeway received permission to build its own milk plant.\textsuperscript{87} R.W. Bartlett, professor of Agricultural Economics at the University of Illinois, Chicago, testifying for Safeway at the hearing, stated that "wholesale price fixing legalizes inefficiency."\textsuperscript{88} Throughout this period there was considerable controversy over the issue of decontrol. J.R. Gould, counsel for eleven milk distributors and D.R. Nicholson, on behalf of the F.V.M.P.A., urged that control be maintained.\textsuperscript{89} Both predicted that decontrol would result in chaotic marketing conditions which would eventually harm the producer. Other groups supported this view. Milk drivers protested chain store pricing policies\textsuperscript{90} and political leaders were critical of decontrol. Arthur Laing, leader of the Liberal party, urged a protectionist policy for agriculture.\textsuperscript{91} E.E. Winch, C.C.F. member of the legislature, predicted that the drop in price which would follow decontrol would eliminate the small man. Once the large operators had a monopoly, prices would rise again.\textsuperscript{92}

Spokesmen for the consumer supported decontrol. Alderman Sprott, Chairman of the Social Services Committee on the Vancouver City Council, favored the Safeway Store plan.\textsuperscript{93} Editorials in the Province consistently supported Safeway policies. The editor declared the removal
of price controls to be "a good healthy experiment for all concerned."

He was convinced that "too much tampering with the natural laws of
economics had created more problems in the milk business than it
had solved."

Kiernan declared his aim to be "maximum order with minimum control."

On September 14, 1953 he implemented decontrol at the retail level.
The price of milk to the producer was set at $5.03 per hundred pounds
of 3.5% butterfat milk and $1.96 for milk used for manufacture. Quota
regulations were introduced which fixed the amounts of milk each
producer was allowed to ship to the fluid market, to be based on his
shipment for a three-month period previous to February 15, 1954.
Vigorous protests at this move to establish a quota without warning resulted in quotas being set over a six-month period. There was no
attempt to equalize the market. The quotas were based on the distributors' current share of the market, but dairymen increased their production in order to secure as large an individual quota as possible. The tremendous milk flood which resulted, increased the surplus and added to the serious problems in the milk industry.

Though plans to operate a milk processing plant were postponed when the Milk Board refused to grant a permit for this purpose, Canada Safeway began to sell milk in stores for 20¢. Operating under the Public Utility Act, as it did, the main concern of the Milk Board was public convenience and necessity. It was on the basis of this criterion that issuance of a permit to Safeway was refused. The company continued to purchase supplies from Richmond Milk Producers' Cooperative. After hearing appeals from Safeway and from other Vancouver distributors who fought Safeway's application, the government gave permission for the plant to be built, overruling the Milk Board order.
Milk Company, a subsidiary to Safeway, entered into and intensified the competition on the fluid market.

A Milk Board order required distributors to be bonded in order to protect producers and guarantee the fixed price of $5.03 per hundredweight. This order was protested by several dealers who found the fixed price difficult to maintain as competition increased after decontrol. Everett Crowley, president and manager of Avalon Dairy, refused to take out a license. A police court conviction was appealed and the provincial order-in-council requiring bonding was declared ultra vires. The judge instructed the Milk Board to issue a license to the dairy. The intent of the Public Utilities Act was to protect the consumer rather than the producer. The bonding arrangement, according to the judge, was designed to protect the producer and "does not carry out any purpose expressed by the act." It had become evident that it was impossible to control the milk industry under the Public Utilities Act.

Vancouver milk distributors reported a loss of almost a cent on every quart of milk they sold during the first three months of decontrol. The F.V.M.P.A. maintained that it also found the $5.03 price impossible to pay. As a cooperative it deducted expenses and divided the profits among the members. The jurisdiction of the Public Utilities Act and that of the Cooperative Associations Act were in conflict. Considerable resentment was felt that the Association was not paying the price fixed by the Milk Board. By September, 1954 eight milk agencies were failing to pay the fixed price for milk. When Magistrate Scott dismissed a charge against the Milk Shippers' Agency for failing to pay its members in accordance with the provisions
of orders 40 and 41 of the Milk Board, it became evident that though
the Milk Board had the power to set prices under the Public Utilities
Act, it could not enforce them. To suggest that the milk industry was
in a chaotic state is surely a miracle of understatement.

In response to a Milk Board order (Order 46) requiring that every
primary producer be furnished with a statement showing butterfat
test, total weight, price, total value and deductions, the F.V.M.P.A.
issued a statement to its shipping members which included, under
deductions, an item listed as "decrease in returns due to decontrol."101
The Milk Board retaliated to this rather arrogant gesture by issuing
Order 48 which rigorously limited charges that could be deducted.

Kiernan admitted that decontrol had not worked out as he had
expected.102 He became increasingly unpopular with distributors who
were losing money and with farmers struggling to increase their quota.
He explained to a farmers' meeting that "it was his duty to see the
milk problem from where all the people stand."103 D.R. Nicholson,
president of the F.V.M.P.A., took issue with this statement. "Is it
too much for agriculturalists to expect their minister to look at
agricultural problems from an agriculturalist's viewpoint?"104 he
demanded. Kiernan was groping for solutions to unfamiliar problems,
but his understanding of his responsibility to "all the people" stood
him in better stead than experience as a farmer or a cabinet minister
could possibly have done.
In September, 1954 Kiernan, realizing the complexity of the problems, appointed Justice J.V. Clyne as Commissioner to conduct an investigation into all aspects of the supply, production and marketing of milk. Hearings were begun immediately. Farmers, distributors and consumers proved only too willing to give evidence. Books were opened, figures provided and long-standing grievances aired. The conflicts were evident, but though there were many tense moments during the hearings, there was common agreement in the desire to find a solution.

It became evident that the large surplus (twice as much milk as was required for fluid consumption was being produced) created the problem which had caused unrest for nearly forty years. The various arguments were presented. Cooperative representatives stated that a small group of farmers received a disproportionate share of a government guaranteed price while Cooperative members who absorbed the surplus were forced off the market they protected. This was countered by the allegation that many farmers did not deserve the right to ship to the fluid market because of their failure to adhere to sanitary regulations.

The investigation revealed that the barn inspection system had broken down in the Fraser Valley and there were a considerable number of farms where conditions were unsanitary and milk of poor quality was being shipped to the fluid market. Stricter controls were implemented immediately and a number of producers prevented from shipping. It was apparent that the F.V.M.P.A. with its open membership had sheltered many poor farmers. It also became evident, however, that the F.V.M.P.A. was supplying milk to many distributors who had
switched their custom to the Cooperative in order to obtain a supply of good quality milk in sufficient quantity.  

The Cooperative had formed in response to increasing industrialization. Individual producers could not pasteurize their milk and other processing and marketing could be done more efficiently through collective action or large scale operations. Some small producers were able to survive, not because of their efficiency, but because they played on a widely held belief that "raw" milk was good milk and that "dirty" milk required pasteurization. The implementation of the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act increased the number of producer-vendors and the effects of the F.V.M.P.A. to eliminate retailers gave impetus to this type of propaganda. The fact that the increasing demands of an urbanized society were eliminating the small independent producer explains why the Cooperative, by quietly negotiating with the dealers and by providing a steady supply of pasteurized milk, had more success in gaining a share of the fluid market during the 1940's and 1950's than it had in retaining it through less subtle aggression in the 1920's and 1930's.

The argument of the independents that they had "earned" the right to the market was exposed as a fallacy. Basil Gardom admitted that the amount of milk an independent producer could get on the market depended more on the exertions of his distributor than on his own. The argument that the independent producer maintained a more consistent supply than the members of the Cooperative was refuted by the evidence that in 1939 independent distributors were forced to buy 92,100 pounds of butterfat from the Cooperative and in each succeeding year the amount had increased until it reached 1,621,000 pounds in 1947.
The fact that the F.V.M.P.A. supplemented the supply of independents in this way effectively exploded the myth of superior quality. The Commissioner discussed reasons the independent producers had achieved a greater share of the market. He suggested that "personal connection, individual enterprise or greater service" could be possible causes, but he touched on these matters very lightly. For Cooperative members with bitter memories of distributor propaganda, the destruction of the "earned market" myth must have been very satisfying.

Having established that all producers had a right to share the fluid market if their milk was of a uniform high standard, the Commissioner insisted that the law should apply equally to all. The F.V.M.P.A. took the position that the Cooperative should receive a corporate quota which would then be divided on a pooled basis. The Cooperative was fighting to maintain the right it had under the Cooperative Associations Act to deduct expenses and return the profit to its members. This released the Association from its obligation to maintain the guaranteed price to the producer and enabled it to compete against companies like Lucerne which geared production to the fluid market. In presenting arguments for the F.V.M.P.A., their representatives did not admit that this was their purpose. They spoke instead of the importance of the member's contract and the basic principles of cooperation. They argued that a fixed consumer price would prevent Dairyland, the F.V.M.P.A. retail outlet, from taking unfair advantage of its competitors. This argument the Commissioner refused to accept. He had found the fixed consumer price in effect from 1948 to 1953 to be "a blanket under which all kinds of unwholesome practices flourished" and he felt that the government should not allow this to continue.
The Commissioner expressed dismay that both the independent and the Cooperative member should continue to argue — one that it had won the right to a market, the other, that it should be exempt from the law which applied to others. The Commissioner predicted that the surplus production of milk which created the problems in the milk industry would disappear within thirty years. Though he felt inclined to leave the feuding producers to their fate, he realized it was imperative to overcome the difficulties. He found four prices being paid for milk which was, in the main, of the same quality — the fixed board prices of $5.03 for fluid and $1.96 for milk for manufacture and the F.V.M.P.A. prices of $4.25 for fluid and $3.00 for manufactured milk. There was also a price-spread between the average return of $3.40 per hundredweight to F.V.M.P.A. shippers and $4.12 per hundredweight to independents. Inefficient farmers were being subsidized by the controlled price, thus lowering the income of good producers in his opinion. The distributing end of the business was in serious financial difficulty as a result of excessive competition. Distribution costs were high, but the guaranteed price spread had apparently discouraged efforts to introduce economies in this area. The cost of retail milk in British Columbia had become the highest in Canada and the consumption of fluid milk now the lowest.

Commissioner Clyne recommended that the seven different laws which dealt with the milk industry should be codified into one law. He suggested that control of consumer price had been a failure and should not be attempted. Producer price, however, should be controlled and should be determined by a formula which would recognize a measure of change in producer costs and in the purchasing power of money it would also contain a supply-demand adjustment factor.
high standards and producing milk of good quality should be licensed to ship to the fluid market, but all farmers meeting those standards should be allowed their proportionate share of that market. Quotas should be based on a market-wide basis rather than on the basis of distributor pools.

It had always been assumed that the creation of a single agency would be necessary if the fluid market was to be equalized. This would destroy the Cooperative which had come to mean so much to the farmers who had built it for their own protection. By implementing a formula and fixing producer price to it, the Cooperative could be allowed to retain its identity. Though the F.V.M.P.A. had employed restraint in using the power it possessed to break the market, as a cooperative deducting costs and returning the profits to the producer, it had that power. Only a fixed price to the producer could provide a guaranteed restraint.

The basic principle of the Clyne Commission report, that every dairyman producing good quality milk should share equally the fluid market and the burden of looking after the surplus, was, in essence, the goal of the thirty farmers who had organized in 1913. The solution, once it was found, seemed to be a simple one, but a great deal of credit must go to Commissioner Clyne for finding a way of straightening out the "legislative and administrative muddle" which Kiernan claimed he had inherited. Clyne had made use of expert advice, not only in the dairying and marketing field, but also in the legal field. He had requested that the Hon. T.G. Norris be appointed Counsel to the Commissioner. Both men became reasonably certain that valid marketing legislation could be drawn up.
The outcome of the Clyne Commission report was a defeat for the independents. But their numbers were declining as a result of changes in methods of agriculture. Shortly after World War II most of the producer-vendors were put out of business with the implementation of pasteurization in urban areas through municipal by-laws. The I.M.P.C.A. dwindled to eight shippers. The Richmond Milk Producers' Cooperative Association with 48 members was dependent on Safeway. The Milk Shippers' Agency with its 242 producers was in a stronger position but dependent to a large extent on its customer, Palm Dairies.

The position of the Cooperative members was vastly improved.

"It is my considered opinion," said D.R. Nicholson, F.V.M.P.A. president, "that Justice Clyne's report is the greatest judicial vindication of legislative and regulated marketing of agricultural products that Canada has ever heard or seen."

The labor interests were satisfied with the report. George Shaw of the Milk Drivers' Union expressed satisfaction that the new formula would mean that as farmers' costs increased, the price to the producer would follow automatically. No longer would milk prices be discussed in open forum with various interest groups applying pressure. Since increases in wages was one of the important factors in pushing up costs, the men who delivered the milk were in an insecure position. Clyne had found that the wages paid to drivers compared favorably with those paid in other trades. It seems evident that the Cooperative had led the way. Palm Dairies paid their Vancouver drivers a considerably higher wage than they paid in other parts of Canada where they operated. J.J. Brown recalls that it came as a shock to most Cooperative members to realize that if they demanded a fair price for milk, they must accede to the demands of the Milk Drivers' Union.
The consumers, whose voice Clyne said was faintly heard, could only hope that the Commission recommendations would prove beneficial. Alderman Sprott, who carried on their battle, had frequently been proven to be using inaccurate figures to support her claims that the farmer was "milking" the city customer. When the farmers' case was presented, she usually agreed that his plight was as real as that of the consumer and so blamed the distributor. When the Clyne Commission revealed that the distributors were in serious financial distress, it was obvious that attempts to control the milk industry in the interests of the consumer had not succeeded under the Public Utilities Act.

The government drew up legislation based on the Clyne Commission recommendations. In 1956 the Milk Industry Act was passed. It was referred to the courts and was found to be valid by the British Columbia Court of Appeal. William Crawford, Hillside Dairy and Hillside Farm Dairy Limited appealed the decision to the Supreme Court of Canada which upheld the judgment and declared the Act to be within the competence of the British Columbia legislature. By establishing one class of producer and equalizing the market rather than the returns, the government protected itself from being accused of making levies which could be considered indirect taxation or a "colourable device for equalizing returns."

Nevertheless the producers' price, set by the Board, was a melded price arrived at by pooling the price of milk used on the fluid market and milk used for manufacturing, which was subject to world prices. The vendor who received a balance in hand over the producers' price was required to pay this to the Board. If most of the milk was sold on the manufacturing market, the Board would make up the difference.
to him. All producers of qualifying milk shared the high and the low price markets. The legislation had been found valid because a lawful means of equalizing had been discovered. Methods of equalization had been found invalid in both the Crystal Dairy and the Turner Dairy cases, however. It is difficult not to conclude that the Milk Industry Act was found *intra vires* not because methods of equalization could be proven to be legally correct, but because the Clyne Commission Report had exposed the very real need for control in the milk industry. The judges had no compunction in declaring the Act to be, "in its pith and substance a statute to regulate distribution and marketing of milk and manufactured milk products within British Columbia and... within the competence of the Legislature."¹¹⁹

The question of whether or not the Act infringed upon the jurisdiction of the parliament of Canada in relation to trade and commerce was not argued. The Agricultural Marketing Act, passed April 30, 1949 by the federal parliament, granted authority to provincial boards to exercise powers of regulation outside the province.¹²⁰ This Act was found to be *ultra vires* by the Prince Edward Island Supreme Court,¹²¹ but an appeal to the Supreme Court of Canada resulted in a reversal of the decision and the Act was declared to be *intra vires*. "It is not a tenable argument that the provincial Board has no capacity to accept and exercise the federal authority,"¹²² declared the judges.

The long struggle to achieve orderly marketing and to gain equalization of the market came to an end with the passage of the Milk Industry Act. Many of the dairy farmers gave credit to the Minister of Agriculture, Kenneth Kiernan, and he had no difficulty in being returned term after term in his Fraser Valley riding, even after he had left Agriculture for another portfolio. There is no doubt that Kiernan
attacked the problems in the milk industry with energy and determination, but the time was ripe for solutions. The federal Agriculture Act and the decision in the Shannon case gave the province the necessary authority to control marketing. Considerable experience was needed in using this authority. It was not until the milk industry had reached a chaotic state with both producers and distributors in financial difficulties that controlled marketing became generally acceptable. It was not until all producers were paid on the same basis that the milk board, no longer reflecting strains among producers, gained popular acceptance.

The Cooperative which for so many years had stabilized the fluid market continued to prove its value. Time and again its surplus was diverted to the fluid market when other producers failed to provide an adequate supply and its manufacturing plants were pressed into service when severe weather conditions prevented shipment of milk to Vancouver. Dr. Leland Spencer, who had a wide knowledge of cooperatives on the North American continent, was surprised at the strength of the F.V.M.P.A. and its ability to maintain a large and loyal membership. The fact that the surplus was so much greater than in other areas of the continent was undoubtedly a factor in forcing farmers to remain within the Cooperative in order to stabilize the fluid market. Any attempt to equalize that market by what Mercer called a "killing off" process led only to bitterness and depressed prices for everyone. If some independent dealers were forced out, new outlets sprang up as soon as the market returned to normal. So the members of the Cooperative struggled on, protecting the fluid market, gaining whatever share they could of it and placing their hope for a solution in marketing legislation.
The farmers who cooperated were as eager for profit as the prospectors who preceded them had been for gold. They were concerned about their own interests, but by working together they also served the dairy industry, the farmers who refused to join them, and every resident in the Fraser Valley where the economy depended so much on the men who milked the cows. And that, no doubt, is what cooperation is all about.
Through cooperative action, farmers were able to strengthen their position in buying, handling, manufacturing and marketing goods, and to safeguard their individuality as producers. Of the thousands of agricultural cooperatives which mushroomed in North America in the second decade of the twentieth century, a high percentage failed. James E. Boyle, discussing the reasons, stated:

Cooperatives have failed where they have undertaken to guarantee cost of production plus a profit, where they have fixed prices under a temporary monopoly power, where they have been overpromoted, where they have been too highly centralized, where they have been extravagantly managed, where they have increased the speculative risks of the business and where they have violated the laws of farmer psychology or the principles of good business management.

The Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association had avoided all of Boyle's pitfalls. Many factors account for this success. In the Fraser Valley, the nature of the short frontier period, with its rapid transition from a gold to a lumber frontier, provided the farmer with local markets and cash returns. The development of transportation, followed by rapid urban growth, opened distant markets and enlarged local ones. Revolutionary changes in the dairying industry allowed farmers to increase production and thus take advantage of marketing opportunities. Such conditions created a vigorous farm population, unwilling to tolerate difficulties.
Many cooperative ventures and farmers' groups, formed for various reasons, provided experience in joint action and a proving ground for leaders. As dairying became the most important agricultural activity in the Valley, the gradual consolidation of regional organizations into the Valley-wide association provided a firm basis for the cooperative which emerged to control milk marketing. Barrow attributed the success of the F.V.M.P.A. to the fact that regional organization had preceded organization by commodity. As the years passed it became increasingly evident that the success of the Cooperative depended to a large degree on the strength of the locals, which provided a forum for individual members to air grievances, discuss policy and originate ideas. Important decisions were made at general meetings, but always after a great deal of discussion at the local level. As the business became larger, it became more difficult to follow the early practice of referring most things back to the locals. A Senate or Council of Locals was set up, composed of the local presidents and secretaries. This group met quarterly and established a line of communication between members and their executive.

Many of the dangers outlined by Boyle had been avoided by the F.V.M.P.A. because of shrewd leadership capable of guiding but always responsive to the membership. Among the thirty charter members of the Cooperative were a number of men who were not only very strong leaders, but who also possessed differing qualities. The hard-headed, businesslike approach of J.W. Berry was complemented by the tact of W.J. Park; the self-reliance of John Oliver by the vision of E.D. Barrow; the enthusiasm of C.H. Evans by the business ability of C.E. Eckert.
A.H. Mercer and W.L. Macken, after long apprenticeships as directors of the Association, became General Manager and President respectively during the thirties. These two men, so very different in personality, worked well together to provide firm and able leadership which carried the Association through trying and difficult years.

Alec Mercer, born in Ontario in 1878, was elected a director of the Chilliwack Creamery in 1909 to fill a vacancy created by the death of his father, one of the first trustees of the Cooperative. He was among the 848 members who began shipping to the Association in 1917 and he was elected director in 1920, a position he held until 1934 when he was defeated, not so much by depression-bitter farmers who voted against him as by the majority, made apathetic by hard times, who neglected to vote at all. The directors, confident that the membership would accept their decision, appointed Mercer as General Manager, a position he held until 1961.

Mercer was "noted for his ability to hold his own in any kind of controversy from milk to politics." It was his success in dealing with opponents in a forceful and often humorous way that most delighted many farmers. During the long bitter years, Mercer's pithy remarks, frequently directed at wrangling members in annual meetings but more often hurled at independents in open forum, were retold countless times. Toward the end of his long career, a description of Mercer in Butterfat paid tribute not only to his "sound integrity" and "sincere, kindly character," but also to his "devastating wit and platform acumen."

This assessment of Mercer is corroborated by the recollections of many retired cooperative members. When queried, they chuckle as they recall his sharp wit and they speak with warmth of his frank manner.
and friendly concern. Independents speak differently, however; they make no secret of their dislike for a man whom they remember as merciless in opposition. It was undoubtedly this element of toughness in his character as much as his kindly nature which made Mercer an effective leader.

William Lyle Macken, President of the F.V.M.P.A., was born in Forest, Ontario in 1882 and there completed his high school education and trained as an accountant. He came to Chilliwack in 1900, worked on a farm, clerked in a feed store and then operated a public bookkeeping business for several years. In 1911 he became an associate of F.J. Hart, a New Westminster realtor, and in 1915 bought out the business, changing the name to Home Makers Realty. He was president of the Chilliwack Telephone Company, and a partner in two successful lumber companies — Collins-Macken and Freeland-Macken. He was president of the Associated Boards of Trade of British Columbia, a director of the Canadian Lumberman's Association, and in 1927 he was the British Columbia member of the National Immigration Committee of the Canadian Chamber of Commerce.

Macken was active in a wide range of community activities which extended from campaigning for the Patriotic Fund during World War I to serving on a two-man rehabilitation commission after the 1948 flood. In 1907 he was secretary-treasurer of the Chilliwack Creamery, a position which he filled to the satisfaction of the members. He ran as Conservative candidate in the provincial election of 1916, losing to E.D. Barrow after what the Chilliwack Progress called a "lively campaign." Macken did not run again, but his close affiliation with the Conservative party was of advantage to the Association. It was Macken who wrote the
Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act in 1929 which embodied the principles of equalization of the market recommended by the Milk Inquiry Commission of 1928.

Macken was not a farmer, nor did he ever pretend to be. According to the rules of the Association, only producers could be members of the F.V.M.P.A. This rule was circumvented when a herd was established in his name. Cows belonging to W.L. Macken invariably made a good showing in Cow Testing Association records, but he had nothing to do with this success. He was a businessman and as such made his contribution to an association which was of enormous importance to the community to which he belonged. It was undoubtedly Macken's interest and constant involvement in community affairs which explain his long association with the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association.

As secretary-treasurer of the Chilliwack Creamery, he had gained a good understanding of the problems of the dairy farmers. It is not surprising that he was asked to become a director in 1923 during a period when conflict between cooperative members and independents was intense and the F.V.M.P.A. was launching an extensive building program. He took part with Park and other directors in the highly successful membership drive that year, and with Mercer led a delegation of two hundred farmers to the Victoria legislature in March, 1929 to urge the passage of the Dairy Products Sales Adjustment Act. He was manager of Associated Dairies from 1933 until 1948 and president of the F.V.M.P.A. from 1935 until 1948 when ill health forced his retirement from both positions.11

Many stories have been told about Lyle Macken; some of them became legends in his own lifetime. Probably to an outsider attempting
to assess his contribution, the most convincing proof of his ability is the lucid manner in which, in issue after issue of *Butterfat*, he explained to the membership the policies of the Association.

Even Mrs. Basil Gardom, widow of one of the F.V.M.P.A.'s bitter enemies, had considerable respect for Macken's ability, and Everett Crowley, adamant opponent of marketing legislation, found him to be an honest man.

The editor of *Butterfat*, who was with the "two hundred" at Victoria in March, 1929, printed a comment made by a man he identified only as an "outstanding lawyer."

> You fellows don't need anyone else but Macken to present your case. I listened to him before the Agricultural Committee the other day, and I can honestly say that never in all my life have I listened to a plea that was so impassioned and yet so coldly logical.

It was not only his ability to give leadership in formulating and directing policy that made Macken such an asset to the Cooperative; it was also the dignity and firmness with which he maintained control at Association meetings where bitter disputes were common. A member at the annual meeting in Mission in 1948 is reported to have commented, "He's worth $1000 a day just as chairman of these affairs."

But Macken apparently did not place undue importance on money. One of the Macken legends not only indicates this, but also the ability he had to influence the membership. The incident, dramatic enough at the time, lost nothing in the retelling.

People still talk about the day, years ago, when a section of the membership decided that Macken would have to go. He rose in his own defense. They wound up by giving him a cheque in appreciation of his services and he refused to accept.
At the Royal Commission hearing in 1954, Macken told the Commissioner that he should never have been in the milk business. But he stayed in year after year apparently because he felt that the farmers needed him. Macken's personal life was rather sad. His only child died as a little girl and his wife was an invalid for years. It may be that this rather reserved man found in the close bonds which the Cooperative forged among its members some compensation for the family he was denied and the limited companionship his wife was able to give him.

"You have been very kind in your expressions of regret at my leaving," he said in closing his last speech as president of the Cooperative, "but be assured my friends, I will miss you infinitely more than you will miss me." Macken's parting advice to Cooperative members was that young men employed by the Association should be encouraged to expect advancement if they showed promise and he urged the farmers to expect to pay for services as other businesses did. It was the task of the directors to choose the next president from among themselves, and they elected D.R. Nicholson, a Mount Lehman farmer, son of pioneers who had come from Prince Edward Island. He was born on the Mount Lehman homestead in 1893, and as a young man was active in the F.V.M.P.A. The first pencilled minutes of the Mount Lehman local were written in his sprawling hand. In 1930 he became a director and in 1935, vice-president. His career, from a youth scribbling minutes in a rural community hall to president of a highly successful business, spanned the fifty year period during which the Cooperative members struggled to attain their initial goals. He headed the Cooperative ably during
the period of chaos in the milk industry which preceded the calling of the Clyne Commission and handled the difficult annual meetings, the crucial test for any president, as though "there was nothing to it."22

During the 50's the two key positions in the F.V.M.P.A. were held by men who had their basic training on farms, in Cooperative locals and as directors. The farmers had proved that they could find capable leadership within their own ranks. After the retirement of Mercer, however, Macken's advice was followed. L.A. Atkinson who became General Manager in 1961 and G.J. Okulitch who succeeded him in 1966 were both university graduates who started their careers in the F.V.M.P.A. laboratories. The presidents who succeeded Nicholson, J.J. Brown,23 J.C. Brannick and H.S. Berry were all farmers and sons of men who had been early and loyal cooperative members. The Association had responded to the pressures which forced farmers into agro-industry by combining trained management with farmer-controlled direction.

Though there were many factors which contributed to the success of the F.V.M.P.A., good leadership was one of the most important. Without it, the Association would not have been formed in the first place. Once formed, it could not have survived the opposition of independent dealers without the determination and dedication of W.J. Park and the group of directors who served with him in 1923.24

During the 1920's, though policies were implemented gradually, the record of the Cooperative for improving the quality of the milk product appears to have been quite good. The credit for this must go to the leadership given by directors and to the active support of the
more progressive members. An editorial comment in *Butterfat* deplored the fact that members took to innovation slowly. It seems likely that without good leadership many would not have taken to it at all.

Once the Association journal was started in 1923, good use was made of it, not only to keep members in touch with developments within the organization, but also as a means of carrying on an active educational program. Dozens of articles were printed, written by Dr. Damman and C.E. Kelly, or reprinted from other farmer magazines suggesting means by which the quality of milk could be improved. Countless articles urged greater efficiency and described methods by which it could be achieved. The results of the Cow Testing Associations were published, and pictures were run of prize-winning cows and good barns. The principles of cooperation were also kept constantly before the farmer. Always he was reminded that the sacrifices he made in accepting lower returns or submitting to sanitary regulations were in his own long term interest.

The directors did not rely entirely on contact through the journal, however. Policies were carried to the locals and discussed so thoroughly that by the time they were implemented every member had become closely involved in the decisions. Several of these policies, implemented by directors, contributed to the success of the Cooperative. The decision in 1919 to enter the retail trade in Vancouver and the decision in 1924 to build manufacturing plants granted the Association a measure of control which enabled the Cooperative to survive the depression years.

Many cooperatives which returned all profits to the members failed in times of financial crisis because of lack of capital. At the
annual meeting in 1933 the Association adopted a revolving capital plan in order to prevent this problem from arising. The entire outstanding capital was called in and each member was issued his holding in ten certificates to mature in from one to ten years. Funds with which to redeem the 10% block of certificates were set up by making deductions from shippers' milk accounts. At the end of the year, ten-year certificates were issued for the deductions so made. This plan, whereby the entire capital revolved in a ten-year period, prevented rapid depletion as retiring members redeemed their stock. This revolving plan ensured the F.V.M.P.A. of working capital during the long depression years when new members were prevented from entering the Association. Gradually as the reserves built up during the period of war-time prosperity the Cooperative was able to expand and thus compete successfully in the hectic post-war period. Another important result of the plan was that each member, as he retired, was paid off within a ten-year period. Thus the largest part of the stock was held by those whom the F.V.M.P.A. was currently serving.

The directors sought to foster the loyalty of the members through the Butterfat, through their speeches, through the local associations and the annual picnic. But the loyalty was not merely a result of propaganda, though it may have been kept warm by it. Many farmers remembered the grievances of earlier days. Many who shipped enough milk to have had little difficulty in gaining contracts from independent dealers refused to break away because of a sense of responsibility to others.

"A man who has a liking for the Community, the district he lives in, has to put in it something that is going to benefit the industry..."
and he forgets little financial gains," said one farmer who joined the F.V.M.P.A. in 1917 and remained a member until he retired more than fifty years later. The story of the F.V.M.P.A. is the story of individuals like this, men who milked cows twice a day and formed the base from which the leadership emerged.

The loyalty of the Cooperative member was a very real thing, but often it became fanatical and the directors must have, on occasion, had problems in attempting to control it. C.E. Nelson, at the Milk Inquiry hearing in Chilliwack in 1928, declared that "the cooperative association had come to be a sort of religion among the farmers of the Chilliwack area." The reluctance of the F.V.M.P.A. members to accept Dr. K.C. MacDonald's single agency plan was an indication that the Association itself had become more important than the aims for which it had been organized.

Throughout the depression years members stayed in the Cooperative, locked in by their own rules, made only after urging by the directors, and by the fact that there was nowhere else for them to send their milk. The sense of discouragement and defeat was overwhelming. At the annual picnic in 1937 Macken warned them against a sense of inferiority which foes of the Association were attempting to foster among the members. The fact that Macken stayed with them, a man respected not only in the Chilliwack Valley, but also in the province, was some consolation.

Barrow, Macken, Mercer and Berry all played key roles in the fight for legislation, and it was the directors who worked hard to create a favorable image for the Cooperative before a public relations department was established. There can be little doubt that the leadership was able and many-faceted. There has been evidence of integrity,
political skill and shrewd business judgment. It is important to remember, however, that it was the members themselves in their locals who elected their directors. No man ever became a director until he had proved himself and gained experience in his local. The president and vice-president were chosen by the directors. No man achieved this position until he had served for several years as director. Thus the men who headed the Cooperative were always selected -- first by the membership and then by the very small group of men with whom they had worked closely.

Though the management may have educated, guided and controlled the membership and conducted its business efficiently, the members showed shrewd judgment in selecting their leaders. The quality of its leadership may explain the survival of the F.V.M.P.A., but the grass roots control is an equally important reason for its success.

The Association failed in its attempt to gain complete control of the milk production in the Valley. This apparent failure may have been an important factor in ensuring the success of the Cooperative. Though the independent producers gained a disproportionate share of the fluid market and ensured the survival of the independent dealers, they presented a challenge to the F.V.M.P.A.; they prevented the formation of a dangerous monopoly and they forced Cooperative leaders to clarify constantly Association aims. The clear understanding which Cooperative members had of their goals was one of the healthiest aspects of their intense loyalty.
The independents provided a target for the resentment of Cooperative members during their long and frustrating struggle to achieve controlled marketing. This had the effect of preventing Cooperative members from blaming the political system and was, in part, the reason agrarian third party political movements failed in the Valley.

Their inherent respect for British justice, which F.V.M.P.A. members mistakenly assumed was basic to the shaping of the Canadian federal system, prevented them from directing their resentment at the judicial system, though the fact that frequently at least one of the judges dissented from the judgments must have created considerable doubt about the process. Their resentment tended to focus, in part, on the lawyers who benefitted most from the litigation, but mainly on the independents who initiated the action to contest the legislation.

Basil Gardom, a vocal and fierce opponent of legislation designed to equalize returns, became the chief target of the F.V.M.P.A. members' pent-up fury. Macken's ringing denunciation of Gardom's "opposition to the will of the majority" in an article he entitled "Gardomination," may have sprung from his own intense frustration over the refusal of independents to share the burden of the surplus. But this article was written at a time when hope of retaining marketing legislation was very dim and the Cooperative was closing its membership. It would appear that Macken, who consistently abjured personal vituperation, realized that his fierce attack on Gardom's "vociferous clamour," "scurrilous pen," and "jeering journalism" could direct the Cooperative members' anger and despair away from the Association toward the target which Gardom so conveniently provided.
When the depression affected the Valley, many farmers failed to realize the importance of the milk flood of 1931, the collapse of world markets, the increased competition from Alberta farmers who turned from grain growing to butter making, the decreased consumption of milk because of high unemployment. They were slow to realize the faulty structure of the milk boards. They did know that the marketing legislation worked to their advantage throughout 1930. Many remained convinced that the depression would not have affected the Valley at all if the marketing legislation had gone unchallenged. It was no coincidence that the upsurge in interest in a militant farmers' union occurred between the defeat of provincial legislation and the initiation of efforts to implement federal laws.

This period of stability at the beginning of the depression was not the only case of timing which contributed to the success of the Association. The sharp rise in returns to the producer during the first year the F.V.M.P.A. was in business resulted from the economies practised by the Cooperative, but these were easier to effect because of the upward swing in the war-time economy. This initial success created a core of loyal members who never forgot that their returns had doubled within the first year of the F.V.M.P.A.'s operation.

Geographic factors contributed to the success of the F.V.M.P.A. The compact nature of the long narrow valley, where soil and climatic conditions were so admirably suited to dairying, made initial organization easier, particularly when the attempts of city dealers to play one end of the Valley against the other after the completion of the B.C. Electric Railway, drove farmers to united action. The rapid growth of an international sea-port at the mouth of the Valley provided
a lucrative market which had the enormous advantage of being local. Though it created great controversy, the decision of the Cooperative members to enter the retail field in 1919 and to form the Associated Dairies in 1930 gave the Association farmers the distinct advantage of being able to control both the production and distribution of their product. Such control would have been difficult under different geographic conditions.

The success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association resulted from a unique combination of economic, geographic and human factors, from a fortunate timing of events and from an opposition which, though it created problems, prevented the formation of a dangerous monopoly and directed the farmer's discontent away from his own organization. An examination of the reasons for the success of the F.V.M.P.A. reveals a good deal about the Cooperative; a consideration of the effect of that success, however, reveals the significant role played by the Association in politics, in the economy of the Valley and in the milk industry of the province.

L.A. Wood, discussing in 1924 the farmers' movements in Canada, stated that, with a few minor exceptions, British Columbia had "remained entirely outside the sphere of influence of agrarian movements in Canada." Wood failed to realize that in the Fraser Valley, farm movements, adapted to local conditions, had been the means through which farmers had made considerable gains. Wood maintained that a class-consciousness, hindered by "the physical characteristics of British
Columbia and the diversity of its farm occupations," had not evolved among the farmers of the province. The diversity cannot be denied, but in the Fraser Valley, farmers had been class conscious enough to engage in collective action.

Professor M.A. Ormsby, examining the United Farmers of British Columbia in much greater detail than Wood had done, realized that the "movement sprang out of the Conservative Party rather than, as on the Prairies, out of the Liberal Party," and attributed, in part, the lack of success of the movement to form a third party to the "conservative outlook" of the farmers.

It is true that there was very little support among the farmers for a radical political philosophy in British Columbia, and there were obvious factors which explain the more conservative attitude of the coast farmer. The preponderance of those with Anglo-Saxon background engaged in dairying meant that farming communities were closer knit than those of Alberta. The short frontier period with its waves of Ontario and British immigration had not allowed the laying of seed beds for agrarian unrest as had occurred in the Clear Grit areas of Ontario. Nevertheless, an examination of political behavior in the Fraser Valley in comparison with the development of the United Farmers of Alberta and the United Farmers of Ontario will reveal that the "conservative outlook" was not only a cause for the weakness of the radical movement, but was itself caused by the success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association.

Farm movements on the Canadian Prairies and in Ontario had their roots in the farmers' fear of losing their place in society as a result of the increasing subordination of agriculture to other economic interests. The rapid increase in industrialization during the first
two decades of the century was characterized by an increase not only in the number of manufacturing, business and financial concerns, but also in the size of each. The sense of disillusionment which spread with the economic recession of 1912-1914 was aggravated by the farmer's belief that he had been duped by a distortion of the "free trade" issue during the election of 1911.

It has been generally assumed that because British Columbia farmers were not represented on the Canadian Council of Agriculture which had petitioned the Laurier government for free trade in December, 1910, they were unaffected by the outcome of the 1911 election. In the Fraser Valley, however, John Oliver ran as Liberal candidate for the Fraser Valley in the dominion election, having been defeated as M.L.A. for Delta in 1909. His opponent was J.D. Taylor, owner of the British Columbian, a newspaper which published not only a daily, but also a weekly with a wide circulation throughout the Valley. The news was geared to its large population of farm readers. Columbian editorials dealt at great length with the dangers of free trade and continentalism. The Chilliwack Progress also supported the Conservative Party's protectionist stand and ridiculed John Oliver "whose pathetic and self-sacrificing mission it was to offer for the Conservative orators ready-made targets for their most telling shafts." Oliver was decisively defeated, polling only 1849 votes to Taylor's 3542. He was defeated again in the provincial election of 1912.

In 1916 when rising costs of production, labor shortages and poor returns were creating unrest among Valley farmers, John Oliver was returned as M.L.A. for Dewdney riding. The election of 1916 must be seen in terms of the collapse of the Conservative government, in office since 1903 and facing its first general election without the leadership
of the dynamic and popular Sir Richard McBride. The predicament of the Conservatives tends to obscure the fact that in the Fraser Valley there was a farmers' victory as dramatic as the election of the farmer government in Ontario three years later. John Oliver, so much the epitome of the rustic, defeated W.J. Manson, Minister of Agriculture in the Bowser government. The resentment of prairie and Ontario farmers was shared by the Fraser Valley farmers and the reason for Oliver's success against a strong Conservative candidate can be seen, in part, as a sign of farmer frustration and a repudiation of the 1911 election results. Valley farmers had not only elected a representative; they also made it possible for Oliver to become Farmer-Premier in 1918.

E.D. Barrow, elected in Chilliwack in 1916, was nominated from the floor of the hall at the Liberal Party nominating convention in a manner similar to the way in which U.F.O. candidates were selected for the Ontario provincial election three years later. He was opposed by W.L. Macken, a popular candidate who was supported by many in the business community. But the farmers elected Barrow who was to become Minister of Agriculture in the Oliver government.

A.D. Paterson, farmer nominee running as a Liberal, was opposed in Delta riding by Lieutenant Frank J. MacKenzie, Conservative candidate, still in uniform.

"Farmers who stay at home and engage in the production of foodstuffs are doing their share for Canada and the Empire, and nothing more should be required of them," Paterson declared. He went even further and pointed out that "he did not see his opponent, Lieutenant F.J. MacKenzie, producing anything though he was in uniform." As the returns came in from the rural polls, Paterson was in the lead, a certain indication that the farmers were indeed class conscious.
It was not until the soldier vote was counted that MacKenzie edged ahead to gain a 58 vote majority.\textsuperscript{42}

In another respect this 1916 election bore some resemblance to the U.F.O. surge to power in Ontario in 1919. A number of labor candidates were in the field. Parker Williams of Newcastle, grateful to the Liberals because they refrained from running against him in his home riding, appeared on the platform with E.D. Barrow and helped him open his campaign.\textsuperscript{43}

The dominion election campaign of 1917 followed a pattern of hysteria similar to that in the majority of constituencies in English-speaking Canada. The electoral district was split into New Westminster, where W.G. McQuarrie, a Conservative, became the Government member, and the Fraser Valley, where the Unionist candidate, F.B. Stacey, a Liberal, received the nomination.

Stacey was opposed by an independent Laurier Liberal, Major P.B.H. Ramsay, who agreed with everything in "the Laurier manifesto except conscription" and claimed to be representing the farming interests.\textsuperscript{44} Of almost 5000 votes polled, Stacey won a majority of 2282,\textsuperscript{45} but over 1700 people had voted for Ramsay, and Barrow had apparently thrown his support to the Major. When Barrow had to stand for re-election in his riding in order to accept the Agriculture portfolio in the Oliver cabinet, he was opposed by H.J. Barber, a nominee of the Unionist party. The issues at stake, according to the Barber supporters, were the position taken by Barrow during the 1917 dominion election and the provincial government record.\textsuperscript{46} The provincial Conservatives were still weak and undoubtedly there were many who felt that a by-election for the purpose of approving a representative who would as a result
become a member of the cabinet should go uncontested, but the timing of this local election is quite significant.

On April 20, 1918 the Unionist government, which during the election of 1917 had pledged that farmers' sons would be exempt from military services, passed an order-in-council empowering the government to abolish exemptions in the age group 19-22. Hundreds of Ontario farmers marched to Ottawa to protest the move. They were joined by a group from Quebec and, though the executive of the U.F.A. had sent a telegram to Ottawa to affirm the farmers' support of the government move, there was considerable admiration among prairie farmers for the strong stand taken by eastern farmers and the breach this action created was rapidly repaired. Membership in the U.F.O. Clubs rose from 12,000 at the end of 1917 to 25,000 in 1918 and 60,000 in 1919. The reaction to the cancellation of the exemption was an important factor in propelling Ontario farmers into politics in 1919 and Alberta farmers in 1921.

There appears to have been no protest from British Columbia farmers. Was this an indication that they were conservative and loyal? On May 2, 1918, two weeks before the Ontario farmers marched to Ottawa, Chilliwack farmers had an opportunity to re-elect E.D. Barrow who was being attacked for his support of a Laurier Liberal. Barber gained 795 votes to Barrow's 1323. Of these 795 votes, 302 were won in the city of Chilliwack and 127 in Sardis, where the conservative pattern laid on the community by A.C. Wells and the creamery disputes may have been factors in throwing support to the Conservative candidate. Barrow obviously had strong support from the farmers.

The F.V.M.P.A. and the United Farmer movement were both organized as
a response to rapid urbanization and industrialization. The sharp recession of 1912-1913 had brought the U.F.O. and the F.V.M.P.A. into being, and the war-time demands on the economy stimulated their growth. By 1917 the F.V.M.P.A. had gone into business and the United Farmer movement had spread to B.C. The United Farmers of British Columbia originated with the Cowichan Creamery Association a week or so after the Fraser Valley farmers won their first substantial victory over Vancouver dealers. The first convention was held in Victoria on February 16, 1917, just one month after the F.V.M.P.A. directors at the fourth annual meeting of the Association announced their intention of going into business.

The main leadership and support for the U.F.B.C. came from Vancouver Island and the Okanagan. J.W. Berry was elected vice-president on the first executive, and at a convention in Smithers in June, 1919 he was named one of a committee of five to bring about the amalgamation of the U.F.B.C. and the Farmers' Institutes. Berry took a neutral position on this issue, declaring that he was named to the committee without his consent. He also denied any involvement in the formation of a plan to form a provincial council of agriculture. Neither his name nor that of any other representative from the Fraser Valley appeared on the U.F.B.C. executive in 1920. Though a number of United Farmers locals formed during this period, it is obvious that farm leaders in the Valley saw no need for the movement.

E.D. Barrow, who was at the time M.L.A. for Chilliwack, spoke at the first annual meeting of the United Farmers. His contribution was to tell "an engrossing story of the success of the F.V.M.P.A.," a monopoly which he said did not abuse its power. P.P. Woodbridge,
a member of the United Farmers of Alberta, arrived in British Columbia early in 1919 to assist with the organization of the U.F.B.C. He stressed the necessity for education in cooperative effort, but must surely have found his work superfluous when he discovered cooperatives already working successfully. Later that year, H. Higgenbotham, U.F.A. secretary, pronounced the F.V.M.P.A. to be "a perfect plan for cooperation." This "perfect plan" was implemented to enable farmers to compete successfully. It is hard to imagine Fraser Valley cooperative members taking Henry Wise Wood seriously when he said at the U.F.B.C. convention in 1920, "Competition is the false law."

Prairie farmers, resentful of eastern control, and Ontario farmers resentful of big business and disillusioned with the way the "system" worked, were vulnerable to Henry Wise Wood's ideas of group government and citizenship organization. The Fraser Valley farmer had some control over his market, and his opposition was visible. He was not helpless against the railroads when, through cooperation, he could pool freight rates and put his own trucks on the road and rigs on the city streets. The Fraser Valley cooperative member was able to practice a rather pure form of democracy within his cooperative, but even more important, he had no desire to change the economic system, for through his cooperative he had some hope of controlling it. Just as rising prices and the success of the Grain Growers' cooperatives led to the decline of the Progressive party, so the success of the F.V.M.P.A. diverted the interest of Valley farmers from political movements.

In spite of the fact that there was an increase in area of farms in Ontario during the 1911-1921 period and the rural population continued to increase, Ontario farm literature constantly reiterated the theme of rural depopulation. Census figures, though significant
enough, did not show what the editor of the Farmers’ Sun called the "city overflow." The fact that the area of farm land had actually increased was not nearly so apparent as the visible spread of the cities. The small villages were wiped out by improved roads, rural mail delivery and prohibition, and with them went the focal point of the rural community. The farmer was forced into greater dependence on the city where much of the farm work was now carried on. Skilled city tradesmen produced and repaired agricultural implements, and garage mechanics gradually replaced the village blacksmiths.

There was some city-country conflict in the Fraser Valley, but there was little evidence of the frequent expressions of fear and hatred of the city to be found in Ontario farm literature. Vancouver's growth had been as rapid as Toronto's, but Vancouver was planted in primeval forest and crushed no rural hamlets as it spread. Its rapid growth stimulated the development of farming and triggered the growth of valley centres. Though the city dealer was a threat to the farmer, and the Vancouver City Council fought the marketing legislation, the farmers' dependence on the fresh milk market in the city muted the city-country conflict.

Apart from logging operations on the mountain slopes and sawmilling by the river, there was virtually no industry in the Valley to compete with agriculture. Small towns developed as centres for the farming communities and newspapers centred in these towns gave strong support to agricultural interests. The struggle of the "Royal City" to maintain its position as chief centre for the Fraser Valley also served to mute the city-country conflict. Though the self-interest of New Westminster merchants and city fathers frequently showed through, they constantly courted Valley farmers. Members of the F.V.M.P.A. in turn played off
one centre against another. 69 The fact that they could do so and the fact that they could clearly distinguish between the city people who were their customers and the interests which opposed them prevented the development of the sense of frustration which drove farmers to political action.

In 1916 the Valley farmers were divided and powerless. They selected as their representative, John Oliver with his tweeds, heavy boots and vulgar accent, the maligned farmer who had been ridiculed and defeated. Oliver was always suspicious of the city and frequently advocated a return to the land. His creation of the Soldier Settlement plan indicated his faith in rural virtues. In 1919 he saw the labor unrest in Vancouver as "a subversive move towards anarchy" in the "crowded cities." 70 By 1920 the Cooperative had not only taken over the creameries but had also established its retail outlet in Vancouver. The Oliver image was no longer tolerable to some farmers who now saw themselves as shrewd businessmen. J.W. Berry, speaking to a Farmers' Convention in 1918, spoke of "the early suspicions of farmers towards the urban residents" and contrasted this with farmers who "now, however, realized their true importance and gloried in their work." 71

But Oliver was also resented by farmers who were suffering as a result of the collapse of the post-war boom. There was a great deal of dissatisfaction over the land settlement scheme and a strong core of farmer discontent was to be found among veterans attempting to become established on farms. Land taxes were high and municipalities, left to bear the costs of roads and schools, had insufficient revenue to meet the heavy financial burden. The farmers, disappointed in their Farmer-Premier, turned savagely against him. There was so much
bitterness among Dewdney farmers who were demanding a north shore road that Oliver left the riding. He ran in both Victoria and Delta where he was opposed, not only by Frank J. Mackenzie, Conservative M.L.A., but also by R.A. Payne, who ran as an Independent-Soldier candidate.

Payne, clerk of Langley municipality, was nominated by a meeting of seventy farmers who adopted the platform of the United Farmers with the exception of the clause favoring prohibition. Several speakers made it clear that the farmers hoped to gain some benefits from the enormous liquor profit, which should relieve the tax burdens. Sam Shannon, president of the U.F.B.C. local which first met in Cloverdale six months before was the first choice of the meeting but declined to become the candidate. Like Berry, Shannon appears to have changed his mind about the usefulness of the United Farmer movement. Both men actively supported F.J. Mackenzie; both were on the executive of the F.V.M.P.A.

Payne gained almost as many votes as Mackenzie, and this splitting of the vote allowed Oliver to win the election by a small margin. When he resigned, choosing to represent his Victoria seat as the safer of the two, Payne threw his support to the Liberal candidate, Paterson, who won the by-election with a six hundred vote majority. This support was an indication that Payne's whole purpose had been to defeat Oliver.

W.J. Park, Reeve of Pitt Meadows, supported J.W. Catherwood, Conservative candidate in the Dewdney-Deroche riding which Oliver had fled. He was made member of a resolutions committee by a meeting which deplored the "moss-backed and primitive methods of Premier Oliver." It was during this pre-election period that Park, explaining the success of the F.V.M.P.A. in an interview, referred to the fact that at a
meeting in November, 1913, John Oliver had told the other directors that there was nothing but defeat in sight for the F.V.M.P.A.  

The Cooperative obviously provided an alternative to agrarian political movements for those engaged in dairying. The Valley men best fitted to give leadership refused to support a farmers' political movement, directing their energies instead towards establishing farmer-control over production and marketing of milk. The case of the Shannon brothers may lend support to this argument. Sam Shannon, prominent dairy farmer who had helped form the Cloverdale U.F.B.C. local, had deserted the movement. His brother, Tom, a well-known livestock farmer, became publicity manager for Payne.

By 1921 farmers dominated provincial governments in Ontario and all the prairie provinces, and the Progressive party was forming to contest the federal election. It has been supposed that British Columbia farmers failed to join the movement because of lack of agreement over tariff policy. When T.A. Crerar, leader of the Progressive party called for the removal of duties on fruit in the House of Commons, Okanagan farmers who looked to the prairie for markets were dismayed. Fraser Valley farmers were also in favor of continuance of tariff duties.

"Free milk," said J.W. Berry, "would do a big injury to producers in the Fraser Valley and other districts."

In the dominion election of 1921, however, the Fraser Valley constituency returned a Liberal member to Ottawa. E.A. Munro, who opposed Stacey, the Government candidate, had been the first choice of the Unionist party in 1917, but had refused the nomination because of family commitment. His personal popularity, and reaction to
conscription (his majority in Mallairdville came close to equalling his overall majority) have both to be taken into account as reasons for the narrow victory. Nevertheless, Fraser Valley farmers must have been less frightened of "free trade" in 1921 than has been generally supposed. Munro's speeches sounded, in many respects, like those of Progressive candidates.

"The real issue," he declared to a Chilliwack audience, "is that of the big interests against the common people, that is you and I." 80

He declared that the tariff was not the issue, but the Conservatives saw to it that it was discussed as such. H.H. Stevens spoke in the Valley in support of Stacey and in an able and effective presentation defended the protective tariff as necessary, not only to the farmer, but also to the country as a whole. 81

Fraser Valley farmers, like the prairie wheat growers who had demanded fixed prices for their grain through the retention of the Canadian Wheat Board, could support free trade in all areas but those which subjected them to sharp competition. In 1921, there was a sharp recession and the Cooperative ran into stiff opposition and began to lose members. During this period the Fraser Valley farmers' response bore some resemblance to that of other farming during this period. If the United Farmers had been a militant and growing organization in B.C., Crerar would have had to qualify his free trade program to gain their support, for he was, after all, like E.C. Drury of Ontario, committed to the party system and to broadening out.

But the conditions of 1921 were temporary. Prices improved, the Valley Cooperative re-organized and instituted the development plan which gave it power to control the milk surplus. The farmers were tightening control on their membership and moving rapidly towards their
support for compulsive legislation. When American milk became a threat, brought in by independent dealers fighting the Cooperative, E.A. Munro was defeated by H.J. Barber, Conservative candidate, in the dominion election of 1925. The farmers' ability to control his market shaped his "conservative outlook" as much as his "conservative outlook" prevented the emergence of radical politics.

In the provincial general election of 1924 a third party movement emerged. The Provincial party, which won 24.2% of popular vote, had its roots in both the U.F.B.C. and among a group of dissatisfied Conservatives. In both the Dewdney and Delta ridings the Provincial party candidates won so few votes that the movement cannot be viewed as having any significance in the Fraser Valley. In Chilliwack, however, E.D. Barrow was opposed not only by a Conservative candidate, but also by John MacLeod, Reeve of the municipality. The election results were close, with Barrow winning 1305 votes to MacLeod's (Provincial) 1222 and Pcvhees (Conservative) 1036. It is impossible to see this election in terms of farmers supporting a candidate who would further their interests. The farmers had elected their candidate in 1916 and now wished to repudiate him. The most important issue was the heavy cost of the Sumas Reclamation project and Barrow's determination to make the land bear the cost. In 1928, with no third party to split the opposition, he was finally defeated.

The Populist party in the United States, a third party movement based largely on agrarian unrest, was defeated in the election of 1896. The Patrons of Industry, which had won 17 seats in the Ontario legislature in 1894, failed to gain significant representation in the dominion election of 1896. Among farm leaders, the failure of these movements left a legacy of distrust for political action. Because
the formation of a cooperative presented a feasible solution to the economic pressures of the period for the majority of Fraser Valley farmers, they were able to resist the pressure to form a political party. This meant no farmer was forced to choose between his allegiance to a traditional party and to his "interest group," and it granted the Cooperative its maximum potential as a political pressure group.

At the Fraser Valley annual picnic in 1928, Barrow and Paterson, Liberal candidates for two Valley constituencies, moved among the cooperative members while Berry and Atkinson, Conservative candidates, aided by their leader, Dr. Simon Fraser Tolmie, campaigned equally vigorously in another area of the picnic grounds. The farmer was in the happy position of knowing that he could support either political team and be assured of representation favorable to the interests of the Cooperative. When Barrow was defeated, the Delta Conservative Association demanded the appointment of Berry as Minister of Agriculture. Berry appears to have been too dominant a personality for Tolmie to tolerate in his cabinet, but the Valley farmers retained their vital pressure point when Atkinson received the appointment.

When enormous opposition against the Milk Bill developed in Vancouver, the delegation of farmers which went to Victoria was led by Lyle Macken, a staunch Conservative, and Alex Mercer, a firm and loyal Liberal. When the "Milk Twins," as they were dubbed, arrived back in Chilliwack with their delegation, their mission completed successfully, they were met by hundreds of cheering farmers and townsmen, were paraded through the streets in triumph and feted at a hastily organized party that evening. Cooperative members realized that no political agrarian movement could produce men as effective as these
community leaders whose abilities, personalities, and political affiliations so admirably complemented each other.

When the Tolmie government fell in 1933 victim to the depression, and Chilliwack farmers rejected Atkinson, Premier T.D. Pattullo appointed Dr. K.C. Macdonald, an Okanagan representative, as Minister of Agriculture. A roar of protest went up in the Valley. H.W. German led a delegation of Conservative farmers to the Liberal meeting to add their names to the petition to Pattullo demanding the appointment of Barrow. Macdonald, like Pattullo, was an advocate of government control. His tireless efforts to attain marketing legislation won him the reluctant admiration of the F.V.M.P.A. members. Until the period of political decay which set in after the formation of the Coalition government, the cooperative member had little dissatisfaction with the political system.

Throughout the depression years, the interest in third party politics occurred only when hope of marketing legislation appeared dim. A good deal of the farmers' frustration was directed at independents, and much was released within the Cooperative itself. Mercer was defeated in the election for directors in 1934 and Park in 1937. To satisfy criticism, the directors appointed a committee, headed by Hugh Davidson, to investigate the structure and operation of the Association. The recommendations of the Davidson report would have provided for a nine-man directorate with automatic retirement of one-third of the board annually, ineligible for election for another three years. These suggestions were never implemented, but the investigation served the purpose of siphoning off dissatisfaction.

During the period when the C.C.F. party was building support among Saskatchewan and Ontario farmers, Fraser Valley members flatly rejected
a proposal from one of the locals to support the C.C.F. party. The tradition of insulating the Cooperative from affiliation with any party in order to gain maximum advantage from the political system had become firmly established. The effect of war-time controls further convinced F.V.M.P.A. members that they had not been mistaken in their goals.

The period of chaos in the milk industry, which succeeded the war, led Valley farmers, along with others in the province to bolt ranks and support a Social Credit candidate rather than a member of the weak Coalition party. The C.C.F. party which also gained considerable strength in the election of 1952 had little support from Cooperative members who refused to commit themselves to a party which attacked the system. They had a conservative outlook, which may explain, in part, their rejection of radical politics, but that conservatism was strengthened and reshaped by local conditions.

The stability created by the Milk Industry Act convinced F.V.M.P.A. members that they had always been right and established one of the first firm strongholds in the province for the Social Credit party. Any person who has witnessed the messianic reception accorded their Minister of Agriculture and the intolerance for his opponents at all-candidate election rallies, must have some serious reservations about the conservative outlook of the Valley farmer. Given different geographic conditions and a different type of market, he would surely have been as capable of radical politics as the farmers who supported the U.F.A., the U.F.O., the Progressive party and the C.C.F. The success of the F.V.M.P.A. was a key factor in delaying the emergence of radial politics in the Fraser Valley until the decade of the 1950's.
The success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers’ Association has been of enormous significance to the economy of the Valley. By building its own manufacturing plants, the F.V.M.P.A. not only provided a means of controlling the surplus which stabilized the fluid market, but also by providing a secure market, it allowed farmers, attempting to become established on a small scale, to begin farming with a few cows and gradually increase and upgrade their herds. This function of the Association was important in an area where land values were high and where urban sprawl threatened, as it continues to do, the preservation of agricultural land. In his report in 1954, J.V. Clyne predicted that the surplus milk production, which had been the chief cause of the bitter friction in the Valley, would disappear within thirty years. That such a surplus was available was a direct result of the success of the F.V.M.P.A.

Throughout the depression years, the F.V.M.P.A. provided a shelter for many small shippers. Though many farmers who had large mortgages, lost or were in danger of losing their holding, and though many had too little money to buy feed for their cattle, F.V.M.P.A. cheques were issued regularly and the cash trickled throughout the community. It is not difficult to understand why businessmen became involved in trying to find some solution when the marketing legislation failed. The protective role played by the Cooperative, however, was responsible, in part, for the fact that inefficient shippers and farmers whose premises were unsanitary were shipping to the fluid market, though the breakdown of the
government barn inspection system was more directly responsible.

The Milk Industry Act, which granted equalization of the fluid market, freed the Cooperative from carrying the burden of the surplus. The implementation of government standards freed it of shippers who were a burden, and the Cooperative members found it much easier to make the transition from dairying to agro-industry. Membership dropped and production soared. The tank truck completely replaced other forms of transport and the new Dairyland plant was built in Burnaby.

The surplus milk used in the manufacturing plants continues to be an important factor in the milk industry. On several occasions the F.V.M.P.A. has been able to supply fresh milk when other dairies have had shortages because of problems in production or because of strikes. The Cooperative which for years created a stable fluid market by absorbing the surplus milk, though this meant engaging in less profitable production, now performs the same function in the province. The Bulkley Valley producers were brought into the F.V.M.P.A. as associate members in January, 1968, the Comox Cooperative Creamery Association merged with the F.V.M.P.A. in January, 1969, and in January of the next year the F.V.M.P.A. purchased the home delivery business of Jersey Farms. Again they were absorbing an important but less lucrative branch of the milk business in contrast to dairies which concentrated on providing carton milk and other products to the super markets.

Large international milk businesses are gradually absorbing smaller Canadian concerns. The F.V.M.P.A. marketing milk throughout B.C. and east to Thunder Bay is expanding, but it is meeting stiff opposition. Whether or not it will continue to succeed depends on many factors, not the least of which is the loyalty of the members and their understanding of cooperative principles.
A tradition of cooperation unique to the Fraser Valley has developed among F.V.M.P.A. members. Many early shippers were undoubtedly familiar with British traditions of cooperation. Park and Barrow among the directors were representative of this group. That this influence continued is evident by the election of T.M. Edwards as director from 1932 until 1956 and of A.D. Rundle who succeeded him. Both were Englishmen familiar with British cooperatives. This tradition, combined with that of pioneers from Ontario who contributed to the success of the creameries, laid the groundwork for the indigenous tradition which developed as the Association; an amalgamation of local cooperative groups, succeeded in becoming well-established in the 1920's, in surviving during the 30's, in expanding during the 40's and in persuading the Milk Inquiry Commission in 1954 that the Cooperative continued to have an important role to play in the milk industry of British Columbia.

C.E. Eckert was responsible for bringing Mennonite settlers to Yarrow. They arrived shortly before the depression which made it difficult for them to become established in dairying for some time. The election of P.J. Friesen, representative of this group, as F.V.M.P.A. director in 1964, was an indication that the Mennonite dairy farmers had become an important part of the Cooperative membership. The commitment of Mennonites to their own traditions of cooperation and the success with which they have organized fruit and feed cooperatives and a credit union means that the F.V.M.P.A. tradition has been reinforced and strengthened.

J. Hoogendoorn, elected in 1967, represented the Dutch farmers who moved into the Cooperative in great numbers after World War II. By 1965 approximately 85% of the Dutch farmers in the Valley belonged
to the F.V.M.P.A., and 21% of the Cooperative shippers were Dutch. The energy and resourcefulness of this immigrant group has acted as a stimulus to the dairy industry as a whole. The F.V.M.P.A., by continuing its function of providing an opportunity for newcomers to become more easily established in dairying, has not only benefitted the milk industry, but has also strengthened its own base.

In a technological society in which individual initiative is increasingly restricted by the growth of government, business and commercial institutions, the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association provides a unique combination of farmer direction and business management. As Canadians become increasingly aware that their economy has become dominated by multi-national corporations, the F.V.M.P.A. provides an example of a company owned and controlled by its members.

The decision of F.V.M.P.A. directors and members to expand their membership throughout B.C. and their marketing throughout Western Canada, their decision to provide service in as many areas of the milk industry as possible has precedents in the decisions made to go into business in 1917, to retail milk in 1919, to increase membership and farmer control in 1923, and to handle the surplus in their own plants in 1924. The clear-sighted view of the Parks and the Barrows and those who caught their vision, that the farmer could best safeguard his ability to produce as an individual if he marketed cooperatively, made possible the success and survival of the Cooperative. This conviction that the individuality of the producer should be preserved underlay their belief that government control should ensure equality of access to the fluid market. Just as the soundness of these principles has been largely responsible for the past success of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, so they provide its best hope for the future.
NOTES

INTRODUCTION


2. Ibid.


4. In 1859 the Royal Engineers surveyed Douglas, Lulu and Sea Islands, and open land north of the Fraser in the Pitt Meadows area and south of the river on Hall's Prairie and the area north of it. These lands were offered for sale at ten shillings per acre. A proclamation of 1860 allowed pre-emptions of unsurveyed lands for which title could be secured upon payment of ten shillings per acre after improvements had been made. In January of 1861 the price was reduced to four shillings tuppence. (F.W. Laing, "Historical Sketch," Colonial Settlers on the Mainland of British Columbia, 1858-1871 (Victoria: manuscript, 1939), 6).


6. Canada, Census of 1901, Vol. I, Table 1, 2. The population in 1869 was 1356.
CHAPTER ONE

1. Hugh McRoberts dyked and cultivated land on Sea Island in 1861. His nephews, Fitzgerald and Samuel McCleery, settled on the north side of the river across from the island in 1862. (Thomas Kidd, History of Lulu Island, 1927, 22). In 1868 William and Thomas Ladner pre-empted property on the land now named after them. By 1872 all land along the river and sloughs was claimed by the settlers who followed. (Gordon de R. Taylor, Delta's Century of Progress (Delta Centennial Committee), 19).

2. Jonathon Reece was the first to pre-empt land in Chilliwack, filing his claim in London in 1859. He carried on an operation in Yale as a butcher and stock dealer until 1870, using his Chilliwack ranch to pasture and to raise feed for the cattle he brought in from Oregon. His cousins, Isaac and James Kipp, left the gold fields in 1862 intending to return to Ontario. Reece, whose cattle were being stolen, persuaded them to settle in the Valley where they pre-empted land and managed the combined holdings. (Interview with Casey Wells, grandson of Isaac Kipp, August 22, 1970. Also Biographical Dictionary of Well Known British Columbians with an Historical Sketch by J.B. Kerr (Vancouver: Kerr & Begg, 1890), 274-275).

3. See Appendix A.

4. In 1866 it was estimated that 3,000 animals were being used in the carrying trade. (British Columbian, Sept. 19, 1866, 3).


6. Ibid.

7. In 1870 the Kipp brothers, Nowell and Blanchard shared the $1,000 cost of the first threshing machine to be brought into the Chilliwack Valley. (Gibbard, 239). A picture of the thresher and its proud owners is in the Barber collection in the Wells Memorial Museum, Chilliwack. The same men brought a separator in the next year. (Mainland Guardian, Oct. 4, 1871).

8. It was Isaac Kipp and George Chadsey who were active in attempting to start a cooperative cheese factory when milk production warranted it. Henry Kipp offered an acre of land as site for the new factory. (Chilliwack Progress, April 14, 1892).


10. Ibid., May 22, 1894, 4.

11. Oliver Wells, Edenbank Farm, mimeographed pamphlet, 1.

13. A farmer twelve miles back from the river was charged one dollar for each letter or newspaper sent over to him. (Mainland Guardian, June 24, 1871, 3).


15. C.C. Kelley and R.H. Spilsbury, Soil Survey of the Lower Fraser Valley, Dominion of Canada, Department of Agriculture, Technical Bulletin 20, October, 1939. The soil survey reported in this publication was conducted by the Department of Agriculture, Victoria, B.C. with the cooperation of the Experimental Farms Service, Dominion Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

P.N. Sprout and C.C. Kelley, Soil Survey of Surrey Municipality, B.C., Department of Agriculture, 1961. Information from this report was included in the Lower Mainland Regional Planning Board publication Land for Farming, 1962. The map and soil description are reproduced in Winter, 112-113. There are extensive areas of good soils, considerable medium and some fair to poor soil, but no very good soil anywhere in the Valley.

16. Some farmers were forced to borrow from Indians in order to survive. Oliver Wells, Early Days in the Fraser Valley (Chilliwack Historical Society pamphlet), 5.

17. In spite of the rather restrained accounts of the flood damage published by the Columbian, a letter from Westham Island protested that the report of the damage was exaggerated. (Daily Columbian, June 15, 1894, 1).

An editorial expressed dismay over the "reckless character of the reports of the freshet" published in eastern papers. (Ibid, June 22, 1894, 2).

One suspects that every Valley resident was concerned about real estate values. One letter written from Hope expressed concern for the Chilliwack farmers who suffered great loss, but in so doing managed to make the point that Hope was high and dry. (Ibid., June 15, 1894, 3).

18. Lack of money and resistance on the part of Sardis residents to plans which proposed to divert the water of the Chilliwack River into the Luk-a-Kuk delayed the project until 1920. Three years later it was completed.

19. As late as 1968, George R. Winter felt impelled to point out the "weaknesses, shortages and false starts" in spite of the "diversity and richness" of Fraser Valley agriculture. (Winter, 101). Surely this is a clear indication that the myth persisted.


21. Wells, Edenbank Farm, 4.

23. Allen Casey Wells, born in Napanee, Ontario in 1837 of United Empire Loyalist parentage, could trace his ancestry to Governor Thomas Wells of Connecticut, a Puritan who arrived in America in 1636. Wells came to British Columbia for the Cariboo gold rush and took up land west of the Chilliwack River in 1867. He was an advocate of progressive farming methods. In 1885 he built the first creamery in the Valley. This was incorporated as a company in 1896 and run as a cooperative. As an early advocate of winter dairying, he built the first silo in B.C. in 1891 and grew corn to fill it. His dairy barn completed in 1895 still stands, a magnificent structure of hand-hewn timbers, wooden pinned with mortised brace joints, set on a stone and mortar foundation. From the time he began dairying, Wells kept records, selected his best milkers and beefed poor ones. Gradually his grade cattle were replaced with purebred Ayrshires. His herd was one of the first to give support to the R.O.P. system started in 1906. As one of the first directors of the Chilliwack Agricultural Society and as president of the British Columbia Dairymen's Association for many years, Wells contributed a great deal to the progress of dairying in British Columbia. (Information obtained through conversation with three of A.C. Wells' grandsons, Ray, Casey and Oliver Wells and from Oliver Wells' biography of his grandfather).

24. William and Thomas Shannon, young Irishmen who had settled in Ontario with their parents, reached the Cariboo in 1862. Tom worked a gold claim and Will freighted by bull team. In 1865 they took up land in Chilliwack where they were joined by a younger brother, Joseph, in 1872. Joe moved to Surrey in 1874 and Will and Tom followed him to the area they named Clover Valley. Tom Shannon, who remained in Clover Valley all his life, married Mary Robertson, native born daughter of a Hudson's Bay Company official and an Indian girl. Of the couple's five children, the oldest, Samuel, became a prominent dairy farmer and one of the early directors of the F.V.M.P.A. Later he shipped milk as an independent. G. Fern Treleaven, The Surrey Story, Vol. I (Surrey Museum and Historical Society, 1969), 25, 26.

25. Dunn claimed people were discouraged and would have left if they could but there was little market for their land during the years of stagnation before the building of the railroad (69).

26. Chilliwack Progress, April 16, 1891.

27. Ibid., Nov. 8, 1892. This indication that the town had grown quickly after the coming of the railroad is somewhat modified by a bitter complaint about nuisances -- litter and garbage on the streets, dozens of mongrels, wandering cattle and run-away horses.

28. Treleaven, 60.

29. Canada, Census of 1901, Vol. I, Table 1, 2.


32. Ibid. 82, 83.


34. B. Perkins, *Co-operatives in Ontario* (Guelph, Ontario: Department of Agricultural Economics, Ontario Agricultural College, 1960). 2. Perkins drew up this simplified list from various statements of the Rochdale principles.


39. Ibid., 1895, Chapter 15.

40. Ibid., Chapter 36.

41. Ibid., 1896, Chapter 17.


43. G. Hadwen read a paper on cooperative creameries at the first B.C. Dairymen's Convention in Victoria. (Chilliwack Progress, Feb. 27, 1895). T.A. Sharp of the Dominion Experimental Farm, Agassiz, addressed a meeting of dairymen at Ladner's Landing on the subject of cooperative creameries and before the meeting adjourned, ninety $10 shares were subscribed. (Daily Columbian, Mar. 27, 1895), 4.

44. Daily Columbian, June 3, 1895, 4.

45. Ibid., July 2, 1895, 3.

46. Ibid., July 17, 1895.


49. Ibid., Feb. 26, 1896.

50. Ibid., June 10, 1896. The damage done by the 1894 flood was probably a factor in delaying the incorporation of the creamery.
51. *Chilliwack Progress*, Feb. 9, 1898.


54. **Output of butter in pounds**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Edenbank</th>
<th>Delta</th>
<th>New Westminster</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>53,605</td>
<td>10,867</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>81,212</td>
<td>61,542</td>
<td>37,994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>96,943</td>
<td>70,138</td>
<td>50,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>107,615</td>
<td>75,820</td>
<td>84,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>130,181</td>
<td>84,127</td>
<td>74,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>118,580</td>
<td>198,535</td>
<td>133,920</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

From R.E. Gosnell, *Year Book of British Columbia* (Victoria, 1903), 104-106.


59. Edenbank had made a practice of publishing monthly reports in the local press. Now fully audited yearly statements were made by each concern. In December, 1903 and January, 1904 a series of letters to the editor appeared in which Wells and M.H. Nelems, secretary of the Chilliwack Creamery, disputed the quality of service provided to the patrons of each establishment. Letters from patrons supporting their two spokesmen indicate not only that fierce loyalties had developed toward both Edenbank and the Chilliwack Creamery, but also that among all dairymen there was considerable respect for Wells and a sense, almost of embarrassment, that the quarrel had become public.

60. Harald S. Patton, *Grain Growers' Cooperation in Western Canada* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1928), 476. The types of organization are the provincial farmers' associations, the farmers' grain and elevator companies, the provincial pool organizations and coordinating institutions such as the Canadian Council of Agriculture and the Canadian Cooperative Wheat Producers.


66. See George McClelland, Appendix C.
68. W.M. Page, formerly of Matsqui, tells the story of his father losing six weeks' returns in this way. When H.F. Page went into Vancouver to discover why he had received no returns for six weeks, he found the dairy to which he shipped boarded up. His son claims that the milk dealer later prospered in the automobile business.
69. Vancouver Province, Sept. 25, 1909, 1.
70. As a result of action by the Health Department of Vancouver, several vendors were prosecuted and convicted. (Province, Mar. 17, 1906, 1). There was a strong feeling in the city, however, that the wrong people had suffered. Samples of milk were taken on the C.P.R. and B.C.E.R. trains into Vancouver, and as a result, a number of farmers were prosecuted under provincial law. (Province, Sept. 10, 1906, 1). Among the names of those summoned were many prominent farmers, two of whom became charter members of the F.V.M.P.A. Most were charged with adding a drug to the milk to preserve it, but three were accused of adding water. The farmers reacted in anger and threatened to cut off Vancouver's milk supply. W.E. Buckingham, president of the Richmond Dairymen's Association was among a group of farmers who came into the city to discuss the matter (Province, Sept. 22, 1906, 1), but the charges were dropped because it was impossible to prove who put the adulteration in the milk. (Province, Nov. 14, 1906, 1).
71. Province, Mar. 28, 1908, 1. Mr. Justice Clement declared provincial regulations null and void in the case of Rex vs. Garvin though the milk was declared adulterated by dominion authorities.
72. Ibid., April 24, 1909, 18.
74. British Columbia, Statutes, 1913, Chapter 43.
75. The British Columbia Gazette, Nov. 10, 1904, 2218.
76. Province, Sept. 25, 1909, 1.
77. Chilliwack Progress, July 26, 1911, 1.
78. Ibid., Sept. 1910, 4.
79. Ibid., Oct. 5, 1910, 1.
80. Wells, Edenbank, 5, 6.
81. Chilliwack Progress, Mar. 30, 1910, 1.

83. *Chilliwack Progress*, Nov. 30, 1910, 8.

84. Ibid., Dec. 20, 1911, 6.

85. The Fraser Valley (F.J. Hart & Co.), 1908. In this very informative real estate brochure, John Hepburn from Scotland told that he had taken up a farm of 31½ acres in 1907 and with the combined efforts of his family had cleared $1,400 the first year -- a feat which would have been impossible in Scotland. W.J. Hawkshaw who came from Ontario stated his cows averaged $60 per head profit in 1905 for cream alone. He expected that his farm would yield a profit of 15% to 20% within two more years.

86. Letter from Professor Robert Wallace, University of Edinburgh, to Hon. Maurice R. Gifford.


89. Ibid.


91. Ibid.

92. Ibid., 7, 8.

93. Ibid., 33.

94. British Columbia, *Statutes*, 1913, Chapter 2, 4. Section 4 of this act amended Section 45 of the Agricultural Associations Act, 1911 by changing the amount of the loan from one-half to eighty percent of the subscribed capital.
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5. Chilliwack Progress, Dec. 11, 1895, 1.
9. Chilliwack Progress, April 27, 1910, 1.
10. See Charles Evans, Appendix C.
11. See Appendix D.
12. F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, April 27, 1918.
13. Ibid., Mar. 29, 1919.
14. Ibid., Richmond Local, Aug. 8, 1918.
15. Chilliwack Progress, June 29, 1922, 1.
16. See C.E. Eckert, Appendix C.
17. The changing focus of the Valley can be detected in the diaries of Charles Evans. His frequent trips to Sumas became fewer and stopped completely with his use, first of the B.C.E.R. tramline to New Westminster, then of the road to Vancouver.
18. Farm and Home, Mar. 30, 1922, 5.
19. None of the relatives of the British Charter members can recall hearing of their fathers or husbands having any association with cooperatives in Britain, but H.W. German of Chilliwack, a life-long F.V.M.P.A. member and former neighbor of Barrow, tells of a feed supply cooperative and a fruit cooperative that his father belonged to in England. He feels quite certain that Barrow, who came from a neighboring county would have had similar experiences.
20. It seems highly probable that McClelland, from the heart of the textile country, would have been familiar with the work of co-operatives, and several passing references in newspapers suggest that Park brought with him from England a thorough understanding of co-operative principles. Certainly Forster, active in the trade union movement, could not fail to have been familiar with these same principles.

21. British Columbia, Statutes, 1911, Chapter 2, "An Act Respecting Agricultural Associations," The provisions of the act required that the association forming have 25 or more members. See also Appendix B.


23. Ibid., May 8, 1913, 8.

24. Ibid., Oct. 21, 1913, 1.

25. Chilliwack Progress, June 4, 1913, 1.


29. A.G. Lytle, "Fraser Valley Dairymen Did It," Farmers' Magazine, Oct. 15, 1920, 9. Lytle stated that the Shippers' Union had organized ten years before but its activities were reported in the Province, Sept. 25, 1909, 1.


32. Ibid., Feb. 26, 1913, 1.

33. Ibid., April 16, 1913, 1.

34. Ibid.

35. The first directors were: John Oliver, C.E. Eckert, E.D. Barrow, John W. Berry and W.J. Park.

36. F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, Aug. 29, 1913.


42. The British Columbian, reporting the New Westminster meeting, called the sponsoring organization the Mainland Milk Producers' Association, and the Progress listed as officers of the organization the executive of the Lower Mainland Milk Shippers' Association and the executive of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association. Obviously the Shippers' Union was merging into the larger cooperative and observers would not distinguish between the two associations.

45. There was a rapid increase in agricultural imports from 1912 to 1914. The Report of the Department of Agriculture, 1913-1914, R1 showed values for each year.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1912</td>
<td>$13,099,885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1913</td>
<td>$20,070,757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1914</td>
<td>$25,199,125</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46. Chilliwack Progress, Aug. 20, 1913. Eckert published a chart which showed milk handling costs. He hoped to eliminate wholesale costs and reduce the costs of retailing.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dairyman's share</td>
<td>$1.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of retailing</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesaler</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freight</td>
<td>.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total paid by consumer</td>
<td>$4.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

55. *Chilliwack Progress*, Nov. 2, 1916, 1.

56. In December, 1916, E.D. Barrow and W.J. Park attended the meeting of Agassiz farmers called to organize a creamery association. They asked for support for the F.V.M.P.A. H.W. German, president of the Agassiz Farmers' Institute, and chairman of that December meeting, recalls that their proposal appealed to Agassiz farmers and all but one joined the Cooperative. (Interview with H.W. German, July 20, 1970).


58. Ibid.


60. Ibid., 794.


63. Ibid., 180-181.

64. Ibid. Erdman had knowledge of twenty-six farmers' distributing companies operating in the United States in May, 1920.

65. Ibid.
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1. Chilliwack Progress, Mar. 8, 1917, 1.

2. Price of Milk

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>May</th>
<th>June</th>
<th>July</th>
<th>November</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>48¢</td>
<td>52¢</td>
<td>55¢</td>
<td>65¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>60¢</td>
<td>62¢</td>
<td>65¢</td>
<td>75¢</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ladner</td>
<td>50¢</td>
<td>54¢</td>
<td>57¢</td>
<td>67¢</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Compiled from F.V.M.P.A. Minutes.


4. Ibid., July 31, 1917, 3.

5. F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, Sept. 22, 1917. The motion was passed again at the meeting on Oct. 16, 1917.


8. F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, Feb. 9, 1918.


11. Ibid.

12. Perry Starr claims that this sentiment was frequently voiced in the early years of the Association.


14. See Charles Evans, Appendix C. Hoard's Dairyman, Jan. 1, 1926, 793. The reporter who had interviewed W.J. Park stated, "The proponents of the direct to the consumer route were unable to win a majority of the board of directors until 1919."

15. Election of 1919

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Park</td>
<td>558</td>
<td>C.N. Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Davie</td>
<td>543</td>
<td>J. Erskine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. Keith</td>
<td>513</td>
<td>H.F. Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Berry</td>
<td>503</td>
<td>M. McLean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.W. Vanderhoof</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>C. Evans</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, Mar. 8, 1919. The first seven men were elected.
17. Lytle, 9.
23. Early minutes of the Mount Lehman and Eburne locals indicate that the main purpose of the meetings was to deal with the feed business.
24. Lytle, 45.
28. Ibid.
30. Ibid., Nov., 1924, 2, 5.
33. Harry S. Berry, son of J.W. Berry recalls this as being his father's position.
35. Ibid., 1924, 10.
36. Ibid., 1926, 13.
CHAPTER FOUR


6. This term was used in a statement made by Henry Wise Wood, quoted in Paul F. Sharp, *The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1948), 147. "The Triumphant Democracy cannot fail because the Supreme... Power has this work in hand and will not let it fail."


8. "Fraser Valley Milk Producers," *Agricultural Journal*, Vol. 8, No. 2, April, 1923, 41. This was a synopsis of an address delivered by the Hon. E. Dodsley Barrow, Minister of Agriculture, at the F.V.M.P.A. annual general meeting, March 9, 1923.

9. The editor of the *Progress*, describing the meeting at which the development plan was finally approved in 1924, throws light on the manner in which the decision-making process worked within the Co-operative.

   It is plainly evident that the directors have a very clear conception of the situation with which the association is faced, and having such, have made a most careful and minute study of the plan offered as a solution. There is nothing of a blanket or take it for granted attitude. Everything is explained in detail and questions and criticisms earnestly invited and courteously answered, the members being placed in the position of a jury in the case after the evidence is presented.

   Chilliwack Progress, September 24, 1924, 4.
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APPENDIX A

THE FIRST FARMS
THE BRITISH COLUMBIAN
Wednesday, September 19, 1866.

THE AGRICULTURAL INTERESTS OF THE
LOWER FRASER

A visit to several of the settlements on the Lower Fraser has served still more deeply to impress us with the importance of our agricultural interests, and the extent and adaptibility of the bottom and prairie lands for supporting a large rural population, and for supplying the markets of the Colony. We have often been sneered at for attaching so much importance to these interests, and for asserting that there is an abundance of good land to produce enough to meet all the demands of the population, and that nothing but a liberal and enlightened policy with respect to the farmers is needed in order to have millions now sent out of the country to buy foreign produce, retained in it, and spent amongst us — invested in permanent improvements. Our recent visit to the Chilliwhack and Sumass settlements has convinced us of the correctness of this position. Although most of the settlers have only very recently gone in there, and are even yet occupied chiefly with preliminary arrangements, and although all of them have had to struggle against numerous obstacles, both natural and legislative, yet the following list, prepared on the spot with great care, and with due regard to accuracy, will help to show that a good deal had already been accomplished:—
THE CHILLIWHACK SETTLEMENT

Messrs. Kipp & Reece. (3rd year of settlement.) -- 800 acres of land; 350 under cultivation; well fenced with 40,000 rails, large barns, sheds, and other outbuildings. This season's harvest:-- 100 tons of timothy hay; 40 tons oaten hay; 25 tons prairie hay; 6000 bushels grain; 340 head cattle; 20 head horses; 220 hogs; 250 poultry; 500 bushels potatoes; 700 bushels turnips; 20 acres Indian corn; together with a fair proportion of garden vegetables etc. They have manufactured 1,500 lbs. of cheese this season, and of a quality superior to the best brands being brought in from the States. They have also sold a large quantity of butter and eggs.

Mr. James Bertrand. (1st year) -- 160 acres of land, 16 cultivated; 150 bushels grain; 12 tons prairie hay; 350 bushels potatoes; 100 bushels turnips; 7 hogs; 35 poultry; dwelling house and outhouses.

Mr. Reuben Nowell. (3rd year) -- 160 acres of land; 12 under cultivation; 550 bushels grain; 25 tons prairie hay; 300 bushels potatoes; 100 bushels turnips; 7 hogs; 1 yoke cattle; 75 poultry; dwelling and outbuildings.

Mr. Henry Cooper. (1st year.) -- 160 acres; 5 under cultivation; 100 bushels grain; 5 tons prairie hay; 300 bushels potatoes; 100 bushels turnips; 7 hogs; 40 poultry; dwelling and outbuildings.

(The above are situated on the north side of the Chilliwhack River.)

Mr. John Blanchard. (2nd year;) -- 160 acres; 4 under cultivation; 400 bushels potatoes; 40 tons prairie hay; 40 poultry; dwelling and outbuildings.
Mr. M. Sweetman. (2nd year.) -- 160 acres of land; 4 under cultivation; 400 bushels potatoes; 50 bushels grain; 40 tons prairie hay; 2 horses; 1 bull; dwelling and outhouses.

Messrs. Marks & Barber. (4th year.) -- 160 acres; 43 under cultivation; 1500 bushels grain; 700 bushels potatoes; 800 bushels turnips; 20 tons prairie hay; 2 tons timothy hay; (the timothy yielded at the rate of 6 tons to the acre!) 10 head cattle; 37 hogs; 120 poultry; large barns, outhouses and dwelling.

Mr. Charles Evans. (1st year.) -- 500 acres of land; 55 under cultivation; 2000 bushels grain; 50 tons prairie hay; 800 bushels potatoes; 250 bushels carrots; 8 head cattle; 8 hogs; 50 poultry; 50 cows on the way from Oregon; large barns, etc.

Mr. Wm. Hall. (1st year.) -- 160 acres; 4 under cultivation; 60 bushels grain; 25 poultry; dwelling and outhouses.

Mr. John Shelford. (3rd year.) -- 160 acres; 25 under cultivation; 800 bushels grain; 800 bushels potatoes; 200 bushels turnips; 3 tons timothy hay; 1 yoke oxen; 12 poultry; keeps a country store; barns and outbuildings, etc.

THE SUMASS SETTLEMENT

Chadsey Brothers. (3rd year.) -- 640 acres of land; 80 under cultivation; 1000 bushels grain; 650 bushels potatoes; 800 bushels turnips; 1700 tobacco plants; 6 tons timothy hay; 80 tons prairie hay; 126 cattle; 22 hogs; 4 sheep; 200 poultry; large barns, sheds etc. and good dwelling. Have made and sold 2000 lbs. butter this season.

(In the above Mr. Miller's name does not appear as he has sold
his interest to the Chadsey's and is about to remove to his own property, a beautiful place at the steamboat landing, where building and other improvements are now in progress.)

Mr. William Collinson. (2nd year.) -- 160 acres of land; 30 tons prairie hay; garden and poultry, usual buildings &c.

Mr. Lewis Thomas. (1st year.) -- 160 acres; 4 under cultivation; 9 head cattle; 3 hogs; 50 poultry; 30 tons prairie hay; dwelling, barn, sheds, &c.

Mr. V. Vedder. (4th year.) -- 200 acres; 15 under cultivation; 400 bushels grain; 130 tons hay; 40 head cattle; 30 hogs; 200 poultry; 2 barns, sheds, dwelling &c.

Mr. Thomas York. (1st year.) -- 160 acres; 6 under cultivation; 160 bushels grain; 40 head cattle; 14 hogs; 50 poultry; barns, houses &c.

Messrs. Crawford & Wilson. (1st year.) -- 160 acres; 14 head cattle; houses &c.

Mr. James Codville. "Codville's Landing." (2nd year.) -- 480 acres; cut 200 tons hay; has an excellent run for stock, keeps a hotel and ferry, and receives stock to winter.

Mr. Bates. (2nd year.) -- 160 acres; 30 under cultivation; the usual buildings.

Mr. J. Burton. (1st year.) -- 160 acres; fencing, building &c. under way.

RECAPITULATION

Land taken up 4,860 acres; land under cultivation 653 acres; quantity of hay cut this season 818 tons; ditto grain 12,770 bushels; ditto
potatoes 5,200 bushels; ditto turnips 2,800 bushels; number of cattle 744 head; poultry 1,207; hogs 425.

We may remark that in nearly all the above instances there are gardens of greater or less extent, some of which are well stocked with as fine vegetables as can be found in any country. In some we saw ripe tomatoes, and melons, while Indian corn was growing luxuriantly. We also saw cabbages weighing as high as 25 lbs., and other vegetables in proportion. The prairie lands of the Chilliwack and Sumass are of a better quality and more extensive than we had supposed. The soil is a rich clay loam, slightly undulating in many places, and easily cultivated, and both cereals and root crops appear to grow most luxuriantly upon it. There are still many thousands of acres of this land inviting the settler, and there is perhaps no part of the country which presents a better opening.

It is our intention to follow up this subject, as soon as we can collect the necessary data from the other settlements.
APPENDIX B

THE FIRST CHARTER
DECLARATION OF ASSOCIATION
WITH SHARE CAPITAL

1. The intended corporate name of the Association is THE FRASER VALLEY MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION.

2. The portion of the Province within and for which the Association is constituted is the Fraser River Valley, north of Yale "C.E.E." and including the City of Vancouver, B.C.

3. It is proposed that the head office of the Association be situated at Vancouver, B.C.

4. The names of those who are to be the first Directors of the Association are:

JOHN OLIVER, C.E. ECKERT, E.D. BARROW, JOHN W. BERRY and W.J. PARK.

5. The objects of the Association are:

The manufacturing of cheese and butter: The dealing in poultry, egg, milk, cream and all other agricultural and horticultural products for patrons of this Association. The dealing in foods for all kinds of farm stock, for the purpose of supplying such foods to patrons of this Association. And the erection and maintenance of a cold-storage plant and the sale of ice.

6. The amount of the capital of the Association is Two Hundred and Fifty-thousand Dollars, divided into 25,000 shares of the par value of Ten Dollars each.

The liability of each shareholder is limited to the amount unpaid on the shares held or subscribed for by such shareholder. Form C. 100/0/1912.

We, whose names are subscribed hereto, being desirous of forming ourselves into an Association, to be known as "THE FRASER VALLEY MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION OF VANCOUVER, B.C.," do hereby severally agree to conform to the rules and bylaws of the said Association, and to take the number of shares of the share capital of the Association set opposite our respective names.
WHEREAS there has been filed in the office of the Minister of Finance and Agriculture a Declaration of Association, numbered 15, subscribed by not less than twenty-five persons who are desirous of forming themselves into an Association under the provisions of the above Act:

AND WHEREAS the requirements of the said Act have been duly complied with:

I DO HEREBY CERTIFY that on and after the date of this Certificate the persons whose names are subscribed to the said Declaration of Association, numbered 30, together with such other persons as may from time to time become members of the Association, shall be a body corporate by the name of THE FRASER VALLEY MILK PRODUCERS' ASSOCIATION, with all the powers conferred by law in that behalf.

The portion of the Province of British Columbia in which the Association proposes to do business is THE FRASER RIVER VALLEY, west of Yale and including the City of Vancouver, B.C.

The place where the head office of the Association is situated is Vancouver, B.C.

The Association is incorporated under Part II of the above Act.

The amount of the capital of the Association is $250,000 dollars, divided into 25,000 shares of the par value of $10.00 each.

The liability of each shareholder is limited to the amount unpaid on the shares held or subscribed for by such a shareholder.

Dated at the City of Victoria in the Province of British Columbia, this Eighteenth day of June A.D. 1913.

"PRICE ELLISON,"

Minister of Finance and Agriculture.
APPENDIX C

THE FIRST MEMBERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name in Full</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>No. of Shares</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Starr Bros.</td>
<td>Abbotsford</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E. Eckert</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>10 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Oliver</td>
<td>Delta P.O.</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>10 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thomas Forster</td>
<td>Glen Valley</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian A. Harrison</td>
<td>Langley Prairie</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jno. W. Berry</td>
<td>Langley Prairie</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>10 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.R. McMyn</td>
<td>Pitt Meadows</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith Bros.</td>
<td>Ladner</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Harper</td>
<td>Silverdale</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1 share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.H. Rottluff</td>
<td>Matsqui</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.E. McKay</td>
<td>Lulu Island</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>10 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.W. Embree</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Morley</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. McClelland</td>
<td>Lulu Island</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Heaton</td>
<td>Delta</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1 share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M.E. Alexander</td>
<td>Matsqui</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michaud Bros.</td>
<td>Langley Prairie</td>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>3 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.B. McLean</td>
<td>Lulu Island</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1 share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.V. Worrell</td>
<td>Milner</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Park</td>
<td>Pitt Meadows</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Kerr</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>4 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E.D. Barrow</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex Jess</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>2 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matt Brannick</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1 share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F.W.E. Beldam</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1 share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.H. Copeland</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>1 share</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name in Full</td>
<td>Address</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td>No. of Shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.A. Harding</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles H. Evans</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>25 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex P. Chadsey</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>5 shares</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Herbert Parker</td>
<td>Chilliwack</td>
<td>Farmer</td>
<td>3 shares</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Grandfather
(born in Ireland
one of five sons
which came to U.S.A.)

Grandmother
(Pennsylvania Dutch)

John Starr
(born in Iowa, 1850)
m. Agnes Buce Matheson
(born in Ontario of
Scottish parents)

Mabel
(born in Minnesota,
1882)

Jay Lambert
(born in Billings,
Montana, 1885)

Perry
(born in log house
where Coast Meridian
Road meets Nicomekl
River)

John Starr and his wife came to Chilliwack in 1886, attracted
by accounts they had read in the British Columbian to which they
subscribed. The Starrs found so little money circulating in Chilliwack
that Starr, who was a blacksmith, had difficulty obtaining cash for
his services, so the family moved to the area which is now Cloverdale.
In 1890 a man called Robertson, who owned the land on which the present
town is situated, offered to deed a site to anyone who would build a
hotel. He was anticipating the railroad from the border to South West­
minster via Clayton and Port Kells which was completed in 1891. The
Starrs accepted the offer and built the Starr Hotel which they ran until
1905. They bought the adjoining property on which Starr built a
blacksmith shop. Though Jay was born in the United States and their
father was American, the Starr brothers considered themselves to be
Canadian. Their Ontario-born mother, with her Scottish Presbyterian
background, appears to have been a dominant influence in their lives.

1 Mrs. Starr's brother had preceded them to British Columbia where he
found employment with the C.P.R.
In 1904 Jay and Perry Starr acquired several hundred acres of land south of Sumas Mountain which they farmed in partnership for many years. In 1913 they bought five shares in the F.V.M.P.A., but the Association minutes of February 25, 1918 indicate that they were far from satisfied with the price they were receiving for their milk.² During the 1920's they began shipping independently, and J.L. Starr was the Sumas representative on the Independent Milk Shippers' Association executive in 1929.³ When the Milk Shippers' Agency formed, they joined and remained members until changed conditions made it more profitable for them to return to the F.V.M.P.A. Perry Starr states, with a certain refreshing candor, that he and his brother left the Cooperative "for the sake of the money," and returned when it was to their advantage. He does say that neither he nor his brother were satisfied with the change in management in 1923, and favored the idea of retaining Sherwood as general manager.

When asked about the bitter feeling between cooperative members and independents, Starr stated quite emphatically that he had suffered no discrimination, and that he had never harbored any ill feeling toward the Cooperative, which he felt was "on the right track." He admitted that his brother, who was "more of a public man," may have felt some hostility of which he was not aware, but neither had any regrets. They appear never

²J.L. Starr seconded a motion "that this meeting of milk producers affirm that the price paid for milk during this winter has not been sufficient to pay for the cost of feed and that if no better prospect is in view many present will curtail their milk production in the future." F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, February 25, 1918.

³British Columbian, November 19, 1929, 11.
to have had the strong sense of commitment or allegiance to their shipping agency which so many of the farmers developed.

Sources

Interview with Perry Starr, 4070 Brandon Street, Burnaby, August 23, 1970.

British Columbian, November 19, 1929, 11.


F.V.M.P.A. Minutes, February 25, 1918.
Henry Eckert, of French and Dutch descent, was born in New York state in 1845. When he was ten years of age his family moved to Wisconsin where he learned the carpenter's trade which he followed for six years. In 1867 he married Caroline Hicks, probably of Pennsylvania Dutch parentage. They began farming in Winnishick County, Iowa where Chauncey Erwin was born. In 1883 Henry Eckert moved his family to South Dakota.

As a young man C.E. Eckert carried on a banking business in Mound City, South Dakota until he moved to Chilliwack, B.C. in 1906. His parents had moved to Olympia, Washington in 1890 where his father was engaged in raising and shipping fruit, and then to New Westminster in 1899 where Henry Eckert built a factory for making fruit and butter boxes. Because this was the only box factory in the province, it was a thriving operation. In 1907 the business was sold and Henry Eckert and his wife followed their son to Chilliwack in order to retire there.

When he moved to Chilliwack in 1906, C.E. Eckert built a handsome home on spacious grounds. It was later sold to H.J. Barber, local druggist and for many years federal member of parliament for Chilliwack. Eckert bought and sub-divided property south of the city. He also bought several hundred acres of land on the edge of Sumas Prairie near Yarrow station. In 1910 he built large well-equipped barns to house 120 cattle. He was planning to sell milk and cream to special customers in Vancouver, but this business received a temporary set-back when his barns were destroyed by fire in 1911.¹

¹Chilliwack Progress, November 15, 1911, 3.
Eckert served as school board trustee and as alderman in Chilliwack. He was responsible for organizing the Chilliwack Producers' Exchange, and he was very active in launching the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association. He is probably best remembered in Chilliwack for his efforts to develop the land reclaimed by the draining of Sumas Lake. It was he who was responsible for inducing Mennonites to settle in Yarrow. He assisted them in many ways, and is still remembered with affection by older members of the Mennonite community. Many Chilliwack people, however, resented this invasion of non-Anglo-Saxon people even though the lake bottom was lying untilled.

Because of the important role he played in organizing both the Chilliwack Producers' Exchange and the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, Eckert made a significant contribution to agricultural progress in the Valley. In spite of this and in spite of his own ambitious farming ventures, most Chilliwack people remember him as a successful business man.

Sources


Chilliwack Progress. November 15, 1911, 3.
September 2, 1915, 5 (Obituary of Mrs. Henry Eckert)
June 29, 1918, 2 (Obituary of Henry Eckert)
January 17, 1951, 1 (Obituary of C.E. Eckert).


F.V.M.P.A. Minutes.
John Oliver was born in Hartington, Derbyshire, England in 1856. His father was a farm laborer on the Duke of Devonshire's estate.

He obtained a contract to operate a lead mine where John, when he had completed his education in the village school, ran a donkey cart to remove the lead. In 1870, when the mine contract was not renewed, the Oliver family moved to Canada, settling on a 100-acre farm near Guelph.

Seven years later, at the age of twenty-one, Oliver travelled west where he obtained work as an axe-man on the C.P.R. survey crew. The money was used to become established on land which he pre-empted near Sullivan in Surrey in 1877. In 1882 he became municipal clerk, assessor and tax collector, but before the end of the year moved to Delta where he pre-empted low-lying land on the Mud Bay flats. The soil was rich but subject to flooding. Oliver, a sturdy individualist, constructed his own dykes, refusing to join a municipal scheme, which in the end would have cost him less. This incident may have taught John Oliver something about cooperation, but it did nothing to strengthen his faith in experts.

In 1902 after second reading of a bill to amend the Public Dyking Act, he "insisted that the works done by farmers without the assistance of engineers had been successful, while those done under the supervision of engineers had proved failures." ¹

Rooted in the Victorian tradition of self-help and influenced by his experiences as a pioneer, Oliver came to realize that in order to help

¹Weekly Columbian, April 15, 1902, 7.
themselves, farmers would have to work together. He organized a branch of the Patrons of Industry through which farmers in Delta were able to force lower freight rates to Victoria, Nanaimo, Vancouver, and New Westminster, and obtain better wharfage rates in Victoria and Vancouver. They had also been able to force down the price of certain goods in New Westminster. It was John Oliver who was responsible for the formation of a branch of the Patrons of Industry in Chilliwack.

F.C. Kickbush, later to be reeve of Chilliwack, president of the Chilliwack Creamery, and for years a staunch F.V.M.P.A. supporter, was elected guide for the patrons. In addressing their inaugural meeting in Chilliwack, Oliver advocated the formation of a cooperative association in the Fraser Valley so that farmers could sell through agents in the city markets and reduce their costs of production.

John Oliver also took part in local government in Delta, serving as school trustee, councillor and reeve. In 1900 he became M.L.A. for the district, joining first the Martinites, then Richard McBride, who forced him into opposition by building his government on party lines. Oliver continued in opposition until his defeat in 1909. During this period he constantly advocated united action for the farmers and he became increasingly suspicious of the city dealers. At the opening of the Surrey Fair in the fall of 1909, he attacked the middlemen who exploited farmers in what a Vancouver Province reported described as a "characteristic speech."

---

2 Chilliwack Progress, December 11, 1895, 1.
3 ibid.
4 Vancouver Province, October 6, 1909, 19.
In 1911 John Oliver ran in the federal election as Liberal candidate in the New Westminster riding. He supported free trade and the interests of the farmer. His opponent, J.D. Taylor, using both the British Columbian and the Chilliwack Progress which he owned, ridiculed Oliver as a rustic, and won the election with a large majority. Oliver, who wore tweeds and heavy boots, had a vulgar accent which made him an easy target for such attacks.

There is no doubt that John Oliver helped to lay the ground work for the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association, but his faith in its future appears to have been uncertain. He told other directors at a meeting in the Russell Hotel in New Westminster in November, 1913 that he could see nothing but defeat in sight. He was provisional director of the F.V.M.P.A. in 1913 and was re-elected in 1914. He was re-elected to the legislature in 1916, however, and became Minister of Agriculture in the Brewster government. As a Patron, John Oliver had advocated that party politicians should be barred from membership in the group, but that Patrons should send men to parliament who would look after the farmers' interests. He now hoped to do this, but in so doing considered himself disqualified for a position on the executive of the Cooperative. This policy the F.V.M.P.A. firmly adhered to.

Men who entered politics relinquished executive positions in the Association.

---

5 Mrs. William Gillis, daughter of Thomas Forster, has a vivid recollection of hearing Oliver speak at a political meeting in Glen Valley, and of the sense of shock she experienced when she heard his accent. She felt that her father whose education was as limited as Oliver's was a much better speaker.

6 A.G. Lytle, "Fraser Valley Dairymen Dit It," Farmers' Magazine, October 15, 1920, 44.

7 Progress, December 11, 1895, 1.
When Brewster died, John Oliver became premier and invited E.D. Barrow to be his Minister of Agriculture. The two men were similar in many ways. Both were English immigrants who had worked hard, had farmed successfully, and had become leaders in their respective communities. Both were rugged individualists, but Barrow became convinced that the farmers' cooperatives should be protected by government action. John Oliver could not agree with this. His Victorian ideas of self-help were too deeply engrained for him to support the legislation which Barrow hoped to implement. It was one thing for the farmers to unite to fight the city dealers, but quite another to expect the government to support them in their struggle. He was one of eight in the legislature to vote against the Produce Marketing bill which Barrow brought in as a private member's bill. When an amendment was proposed eliminating milk products from its provisions, Oliver again voted with the minority, but this time in opposition to the amendment. Although he disapproved of the principles of the bill, he apparently felt that the milk producers had as much right to marketing legislation as the fruit-growers. It may also be that the violent opposition to the milk clauses in the bill from both Vancouver and Victoria influenced Oliver, for in any conflict between city and country he was strong in his support of the farmers he represented.

If John Oliver was heir to the Victorian tradition of self-help, he also believed in Christian charity. Taking advantage of the federal

---

8 T.D. Pattullo was also among the 12 members who supported the milk clauses of the bill.
Old Age Pension Act, he brought in provincial legislation to make British Columbia the first province to have such a scheme. This was accomplished during his last session in parliament. Oliver, a man of 71, was fighting a losing battle with cancer. He died within months and his government did not survive him for long.

Sources

As indicated in footnotes.


Lang, Margaret. Along the Way. White Rock, B.C.: Margaret Lang copyright.


Thomas Forster was born near Hexham, Northumberland, England in 1858. He was raised on a farm, but left home at the age of nineteen to work in the coal mines at Newcastle-on-Tyne. Four years later, in 1881, he left England.

He was in the United States for eight or nine years, and though his family do not have any written records of his activities, they recall him telling of being in New Orleans and Texas. They cannot give specific dates or places but they do know that he moved north through mining communities and that he became involved in miners' organizations.

His son-in-law remembers hearing that Forster stayed for two years in one town where the owners had closed the mines. The miners formed a cooperative, leased the mine and ran it at a profit. The owners, however, broke the cooperative by forcing the railroad to close the branch line into the mine. Forster also told of travelling to mining towns with a partner in order to conduct meetings for the purpose of organizing the miners. In one of these towns, a group of vigilantes attended the meeting so Forster and his partner discreetly left by the back door and travelled all night while others carried on the meeting.

Forster said that he heard of poor working conditions at Nanaimo, and so came north in order to help in the fight to improve them. The miners in Wellington asked him to run on the labor ticket, but James Dunsmuir, who knew that Forster was interested in establishing himself as a farmer, offered him a farm and $10,000 to stock it if he would agree not to run.
These family recollections are practically impossible to corroborate, but there is no doubt that Forster ran as a miners' representative in the election of 1890 and was elected. Along with Thomas Keith, elected in the neighboring Nanaimo riding, Forster supported the Workingman's Platform drawn up in May of the election year by the newly formed Miners and Mine Labourers Union.¹

Keith became chairman and Forster a member of a Select Committee appointed to enquire into the causes of the strike in the Wellington Colleries which had created great anguish. The committee came to the conclusion that the refusal of the management to recognize the Miners and Mine Labourers Union was the primary cause of the strike,² but, apart from the airing of grievances, the formation of the committee had little effect.

Forster was obviously intent on establishing himself as a farmer, and was not as aggressive as Keith in supporting the miners' interests.³ Influenced by the ideas of Henry George, he advocated the single tax, and after his forced retirement from politics completed a book on the subject. His daughter remembers that the manuscript was put into a friend's safe, but the family have lost track of their father's unpublished work.

¹The Workingman's Platform appeared in the Victoria Daily Times, June 10, 1890, 4.

²British Columbia, Journals of the Legislative Assembly, 1891, CCXI.

In 1894 Forster ran in the Delta riding as an opposition candidate and defeated James Punch, who represented the government. He was listed in the *Parliamentary Guide* as a liberal and a farmer. Loosmore suggests that Forster may have made the move to Delta because the Northfield miners had criticized his voting record, and Eleanor Mercer suggests that by opposing the parliament buildings bill he had "injured his prospects on the island." Whatever the motivation behind the move, Forster continued on friendly terms with the labor group. His diary indicates that in 1903, after he had left politics, he was warmly welcomed in Nanaimo when he attended a smoking concert at which Ralph Smith was presented with a gold watch in recognition of his services as secretary of the union.

Forster's support in Delta, however, was not very firm. According to an item in the Victoria Colonist "the opposition caucus of the Delta division" chose John Oliver as candidate in place of Forster. Oliver was a much less capable man in the opinion of the news commentator. However, it was Forster who ran in the election of 1898, defeating Henry Benson, the government candidate.

---

4 The Canadian Parliamentary Companion, 1897 (ed.) J.A. Gemmill (Ottawa: 1897), 372.

5 Loosmore, 60, 68.


7 Diary, February 7, 1903. *Victoria Daily Times*, February 9, 1903, 3.

8 *Victoria Daily Colonist*, May 12, 1898, 8.
When the weak Semlin government formed, Forster became speaker and the *Daily Colonist*, usually very critical, "recognized in him a gentleman of ability, a good fighter and a courteous opponent."\(^9\)

As speaker, Forster assumed the robes of office and entered and retired from the chamber preceded by the sergeant-at-arms bearing the mace, an innovation which disgusted Joseph Martin, Attorney-General.\(^10\)

After Martin's break with the government, the speaker's position became crucial as Forster's casting vote in favor of the government saved it from defeat more than once. He began to attend government caucus meetings,\(^11\) and firmly aligned himself with the Semlin Liberals. In the election of June 9, 1900 Forster was decisively defeated by John Oliver, who supported the Martin government. A third young man, Conservative candidate for the riding, ran second to Oliver. This was J.W. Berry's first appearance in politics, and thus three of the men who were later to cooperate in founding the F.V.M.P.A. were political opponents in 1900.

After this defeat, Forster had more time to devote to his farm at Port Kells. In 1899 he had married Mary Bothwell, the first white woman born in Tynehead, a young woman many years his junior. The farm was run by a series of hired men, but in 1902 Forster himself did most of the work of attending to 10 to 12 cows, and sold 2930 pounds of butter in the New Westminster market.\(^12\)

---

\(^9\) Ibid., January 6, 1899, 4.

\(^10\) Ibid., January 18, 1899, 2.

\(^11\) Ibid., August 6, 1899, 4.

\(^12\) Diary, "Retrospect of 1902."
In 1904, on the advice of his old friend, Professor Odlum, he bought a farm in north east Langley from the Vancouver City Council. From his farm, skirting the Fraser, he could send milk to Vancouver, ferrying it across the river to be shipped by C.P.R. He encountered difficulties with the dealers, as did so many valley farmers, and became a member and president of the Lower Mainland Milk Shippers' Association. Not only was he a charter member of the F.V.M.P.A., but also was appointed at a provisional meeting on August 29, 1913 "to canvass the Fraser Valley, except for the Chilliwack district, for members and stock subscriptions."

Forster is rather a shadowy figure. Because he was not married until he was forty-one, his children always saw him as an old man. As young people, their interest in his early life was minimal and Forster appears to have said little about it. A *Columbian* reporter who wrote a series of articles about local pioneers produced a very sketchy account of him. Forster's daughter recalls that her mother answered the questions; her father had nothing to say. She speculates that he felt he had been "left behind."

It may be that Forster's interests lay not so much in union activities, or in farming, as in politics. He may, like Barrow and Oliver, belong to an important group among the charter members of the F.V.M.P.A. -- ambitious Britishers, who saw an opportunity to establish themselves on estates and become political leaders. Forster

---


14 *F.V.M.P.A. Minutes.*

15 *The British Columbian*, October 8, 1929, 48.
appears to have been less successful at farming than Barrow or Oliver, perhaps because he had less interest in it. His sons, inheriting a heavy mortgage with the farm, had no compunction about shopping as independents in order to pay it off.

Sources

As indicated in footnotes.

Interview with William Forster, Glen Valley, son.

Interview with Mrs. W.M. Gillis, 13010 Old Yale Road, Surrey, daughter. Mrs. Gillis made available her father's diaries.
Brian A. Harrison was born in Darlington, County Durham, England in 1872. He farmed in England, but found it impossible to buy land there. Neighbors, who moved to Canada, settled in Langley and sent back favorable reports of conditions in the Fraser Valley. The Harrisons came out in 1903, bought two hundred acres of land, and farmed successfully. J.W. Berry was beginning to clear his land at this time and the two families became close neighbors and good friends.

Harrison was vice-president of the Lower Mainland Milk and Cream Shippers' Union in 1913, and took an active part in organizing the F.V.M.P.A. Though never elected a director, he spent a good deal of time travelling all over the valley acting as a trouble shooter, and remained loyal to the Cooperative all his life.

Sources

Telephone conversation with Mrs. Brian H. Harrison (widow).

Minutes of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association and of the Langley-Milner local.
JOHN W. BERRY

John W. Berry came to British Columbia in 1897 from Ontario where his family had lived for three generations. He was born in Mildmay, Bruce County, in 1869 and taught school there as a young man.

In British Columbia he took over a general store and blacksmith shop at Fort Langley, later moving to Murrayville. He bought land which he cleared after business hours, a particularly remarkable achievement because he was lame. In 1905 a home was built on the property and the next year Berry began to farm full time. He added to his holdings and built up his herd until it was one of the best in the valley.

He belonged to the Lower Mainland Milk Shippers' Association and was a director of the Richmond Dairy Produce Association. In 1913 he became a director of the F.V.M.P.A. and in 1919 succeeded E.D. Barrow as president. He resigned both positions in 1923. The general manager, E.G. Sherwood, had demanded an increase in salary which Berry supported but which the majority of the directors refused to grant. Berry's resignation was accepted along with Sherwood's. He continued as a member of the Cooperative, however.

The Langley-Milner local minutes of the F.V.M.P.A. which have survived indicate that Berry was usually strongly supported as director by his local group. He was on occasion a controversial figure, however. During this period, in addition to his many other activities, he worked as an auctioneer. He took advantage of his opportunity before crowds of farmers to support the F.V.M.P.A. At the time the Cooperative was preparing to launch into the retail trade, Berry stated at a sale at the farm of J.T. Jones that the farmers were "now
in a position to force buyers to pay a high price, and that they intended to do so."\(^1\) Needless to say, these comments were widely quoted as proof that the cooperative was a dangerous monopoly.

In 1928 Berry was elected to the British Columbia legislature as Conservative member from Langley, and his constituents requested that he be made Minister of Agriculture.\(^2\) The new premier, S.F. Tolmie, chose instead William Atkinson of Chilliwack and when he resigned carried the portfolio himself. From his position in the legislature, however, Berry was able to bring in as a private member's bill, the legislation demanded by the F.V.M.P.A. and initiated by E.D. Barrow before his defeat. The Liberals, in opposition, supported the bill, but the Conservative party was badly split on the issue which made J.W. Berry's position a difficult one. He suffered defeat in common with many members of the Tolmie party in 1933, and in 1936 again became an F.V.M.P.A. director.

Berry held many public offices. He was a director of Associated Dairies, president and director of the Farmers' Mutual Fire Insurance Company, president of the Holstein Breeders' Association and director of the National Dairy Council of Canada.

**Sources**

Interview with Harry S. Berry, son and current director of the F.V.M.P.A. The British Columbian, September 7, 1943.

\(^1\) The British Columbian, February 18, 1919, 30.
\(^2\) Tolmie Letters, from Delta Conservative Association, Cloverdale, July 23, 1928.
W.R. McMyn, born on January 8, 1862, was raised on a farm near Edinburgh, Scotland. His uncle, John Ferguson, had come to Canada and taken up land on Sea Island. Ferguson's accounts of life in Canada intrigued his nephews, John, William and James McMyn. By 1885 the farm in Scotland was sold and the whole McMyn family had settled in Canada. The father, an old man by this time, bought a farm on Sea Island, but John and William, after trying various jobs, farmed on land rented from their uncle, John Ferguson. It was on the John McMyn place that W.J. Park got his first farm job after coming to Vancouver.

In 1905 John and William McMyn and W.J. Park bought property at Pitt Meadows, where they cleared the land and began dairying on adjacent farms.

Source

Interview with Mrs. W.J. Park, daughter of John McMyn, niece of W.R. McMyn.
The Smith brothers were born in Crimmond, Aberdeenshire, Scotland, John on November 19, 1866 and Alexander on December 27, 1869. With a third brother, George, they came to Marpole in March, 1893 and worked in sawmills. John also took a contract hauling logs at Gibson's Landing. In 1889, when they had earned enough money to establish themselves as farmers, they took land on Jericho Road where they raised sheep. In 1904 Alex and John went into partnership on a farm they bought in Langley. They began milking in 1905, sending their milk to New Westminster by boat.

Alex married Julia Miller, daughter of a neighboring pioneer farmer, but John remained a bachelor. In 1910 the Smith brothers moved to Ladner where they shipped milk to the Delta Creamery until the F.V.M.P.A. formed. They continued as members of the Cooperative until they retired, Alex in 1935, John in 1940.

Source
Interview with A. Frank Smith, Ladner, son of Alexander.
John Harper came from Kilkenny, Ireland during the last decade of the nineteenth century. He bought land in Silverdale, but put off farming in order to join the rush to the Klondyke. He was milking cows at the time the F.V.M.P.A. organized, but gave up dairying later and began logging.

Source
Telephone conversation with Harold Harper, Silverdale Road, nephew.
Herbert Parker, a brother-in-law of Alec Jess, was born in Paisley, Ontario in 1876. He moved to Vancouver in 1894 and worked with the Nelson-Welsh Transport Company. In 1896 he went to Chilliwack and pre-empted 25 acres, most of which had been cleared by Dutch immigrants who wanted the wood. From 1910 to 1912 he worked at hauling and transport, but returned to his farm after two years. In 1917 he sold out and went to Conquest, Saskatchewan, lured by reports of good crops and high prices ($2.60 per bushel). His crops, however, were poor for seven years, so he returned to the Fraser Valley in 1925 and bought 40 acres of the newly reclaimed Sumas Prairie. He farmed there until he died in 1934 at the age of 58. During the years that he farmed in Chilliwack, Parker always belonged to the F.V.M.P.A.

Source

Telephone conversation with H. Gordon Parker, 762 East Third Avenue, North Vancouver, son.
G.H. Rottluff was born in 1873 in Winona, Minnesota. The family moved to South Dakota in 1880 where he received his education and taught school. He farmed with his parents and in 1901 moved west with them. The parents settled on a farm at Everett, Washington, and the son worked in a sawmill and farmed rented land at Mount Vernon. He could not find a suitable farm to buy in Washington so moved to Matsqui, intending to return to the United States at the first opportunity. He did well in Matsqui, however, and was able to pay for his farm in nine years.

G.H. Rottluff was not only a charter member of the F.V.M.P.A. but remained a loyal supporter till he retired. His son and grandson run the farm at present. They left the F.V.M.P.A. in 1963 in order to ship to Lucerne.

Source:
Interview with R.H. Rottluff, son.
D.E. McKay's parents were from Dornoch, Scotland. They came to Canada and settled in Embro, Oxford County, Ontario where D.E. McKay was born in 1866. At the age of 16, McKay left home for Steveston, British Columbia. He leased land from Monah Steves and farmed for four years. He went into business, running a store for eleven years, but returned to farming, first renting, then buying his own farm on Lulu Island. He built up and improved his herd until it became one of the best in Delta. He was president of the Richmond Agricultural & Industrial Association, of the Richmond Dairy and Produce Company and of the Holstein-Freisian Association. McKay remained with the F.V.M.P.A. until his retirement. His youngest son, Gordon E. McKay carries on the farm, shipping to Jersey Farms.

Sources


Telephone conversation with Mrs. A.E. McKay, eldest daughter (Pearl).
Lester W. Embree was born in Amherst, Nova Scotia in 1870. He worked with his father, a farmer, until 1889 when he came west to Vancouver. He worked in a sawmill for a very short time and then as a farm hand for H.F. Page for three and a half years. He saved enough from his $400 a year wages to buy 20 acres of land in Matsqui, but was washed out in the flood of 1894. He worked for the C.P.R. gang repairing bridges damaged in the flood and then began to clean up his farm only to be flooded again in 1896. The next year he moved to Delta where he bought 160 acres from John McKee.

L.W. Embree was the first president of the McKee Athletic Society, the first president of the Delta Parent-Teacher Association, served five years on the Delta School Board and twelve years on the Delta Municipal Council, and was a member of the F.V.M.P.A. for twenty-two years. In 1916 he served as director.

Sources

Where Trails Meet. Abbotsford, Matsqui, Sumas Centennial history. p. 38.

The British Columbian, October 1, 1929, p. 48.
Sam Morley was born in Milton, Halton County, Ontario in 1858. His father was English and his mother Irish. In 1866 he came to British Columbia and farmed at Aldergrove for several years, then moved to Delta. He had two farms there and so was dependent on hired help. When it became impossible to get help during World War I, he rented his farms and moved to Burnaby where he raised chickens. He died in 1940 at the age of 82.

Source
Telephone conversation with Miss N.S. Morley, 7763 Morley Street, Burnaby, daughter.
George McClelland, an Irish Protestant, was born in Monaghan County, Ireland in 1839. When he was twenty-one years of age, he went to Manchester where his brother worked as a police inspector. He joined the force for a short time, but began buying and "jobbing" and then went into paper making. His business was very successful until the crash of 1890 "wiped him out." He attempted to recover his fortune by buying and selling cotton in partnership with Colonel Drew, an American. Colonel Drew accepted payment for cotton, but did not send the goods. McClelland made a trip to America, but discovered that he could not sue Colonel Drew because he (McClelland) was not an American. He was forced to declare bankruptcy and the disgrace prompted him to leave England in 1905.

In 1907 he rented 100 acres on the Brighouse Estate, sent for his family and began farming. This remarkable man farmed from the time he was 68 until he retired at 84. He died two years later. His sons declare that he was an excellent salesman, and that this accounts for his ability to start again after his severe setback. When he began farming he would take his produce into Vancouver and had more success than most farmers in finding a market for it.

They also tell that he had trouble with the milk dealer to whom he shipped. When his returns arrived at the end of the month, he would usually be credited with two or three cans of sour milk each day. He took the train to Vancouver one morning and asked to have his milk checked while he watched. All the milk was declared to be fresh and McClelland called several of the workers in the dairy to witness that
this was so. When the returns arrived and he found that he had been credited with sour milk for that particular day, he returned to the dealer, called on his witnesses and demanded that the error be corrected. He found that after that he was always credited with fresh milk.

In 1916 he was elected director of the F.V.M.P.A. and remained a member until his retirement.

Sources

Telephone conversation with G.A. McClelland, Suite 308, 2430 Point Grey Road, Vancouver, B.C., son.

Telephone conversation with Robert McClelland, 555 Dover Road, Richmond, B.C., son.
In 1901 William Heaton, who farmed in Lancashire, England, brought his family to Moosomin, Saskatchewan where he bought a large farm. They went through hard times, so moved to Ladner in 1904 or 1905. In 1912 the family moved to Victoria but one son, Eli, stayed with friends for a year. In 1925 he returned to Delta and took up dairy farming. He shipped through the F.V.M.P.A. and continued a member until he retired.

The Heaton family lived across the road from the John Oliver farm and the two families became well acquainted. Mary Heaton married Joseph Oliver and Helen Heaton married William Arthur Oliver. Mrs. Joseph Oliver is the only surviving member of the Heaton family. She finds it difficult to believe that her brother could have been a charter member of the F.V.M.P.A. in 1913 since he was still a student at the time. It is quite unlikely, however, that there could have been another E. Heaton in Delta at the time. It may be that John Oliver, attempting to get the required number of signatures, bought the share for the boy.

Source
Telephone conversation with Mrs. Joseph Oliver, sister.
The Martin Alexanders came to Matsqui from Washington. Several of their former neighbors remember them well and report that a married daughter, Mrs. Chomaut, lives in Kamloops. She proved impossible to trace, however.

In 1916 Alexander was elected director of the F.V.M.P.A. but the family returned to the United States in 1919.

Sources

Interview with R.H. Rottluff.

Telephone conversation with Wyvern Page.
Maximilian Michaud was born in Quebec, but came west about 1867 or 1868. He worked as a bar tender in New Westminster for a short time and then bought a hotel from a "Mr. Hocking" — the first hotel in Hastings. He became the first postmaster in Vancouver, and with his savings, bought 600 acres of land on Langley Prairie from a "Mr. Dunlop."

In 1878 his brother, Joseph and his family arrived in British Columbia. They had come from Quebec by rail to San Francisco, by coastal steamer to Victoria and by tramp steamer up the Fraser to Fort Langley. Joseph ran his brother's farm, buying part of it later. The Michauds brought in cattle and began stock raising. They drove cattle down the Whatcom Trail to sell in the United States. Two of Joseph's sons, Maximilian and Zatique, took over the farm, and it was they who became charter members of the F.V.M.P.A. in 1913.

Max married Annabelle Smith, whose parents had come from England to farm. Mrs. Michaud recalls with pleasure that during the early years of her married life, she and her husband spent part of each year on the Sumas Prairie where the young couple would be in charge of grazing stock. These cattle would be driven to Brownesville on the south bank of the Fraser opposite New Westminster, a three day trip, and from there would be taken by boat to markets in England.

The Michaud brothers shipped to the Fraser Valley cooperative until they retired. According to Mrs. Max Michaud, they never forgot
the fact that their returns doubled after the F.V.M.P.A. formed.

Sources


Telephone conversation with Mrs. Max Michaud, Langley.
J.B. McLean's name appears in the British Columbia Directories from 1913 until 1918. G.A. McClelland believes that his farm was located at the corner of Blundell and the No. 2 Road, but no further trace of him has been found.
Francis Vanston Worrell was born in King's County, Ireland in 1855, and twenty-one years later came to Canada. He lived in Victoria for two years where he met and married Maria Oakes, an Irish girl.

He lived on McLarty Road for five years and then moved to Milner. He had two sons, George and Francis Vanston Jr. It was the younger Francis Vanston who carried on the family farm, became a charter member of the F.V.M.P.A. and remained with the Cooperative as long as he shipped milk.

Worrell was director of Landley Cow Testing Association when it was organized in April of 1914.1

Source
Telephone conversation with Mrs. Heady, widow of Francis Vanston Worrell, Jr.

---

1The British Columbian, April 4, 1914, 3.
W.J. PARK

Pitt Meadows

W.J. Park was born in Yeovil, Somerset, England, in 1879. His father was a Scotsman who had moved to England and built up a successful dry goods business which he expected his son to carry on. "Billy" Park was sent to London to apprentice as a draper, but he had a strong desire to become a farmer and work outdoors. Against his father's will, he came to Canada in 1899. With two friends he went west to Manitoba where he found jobs as a laborer on farms and on railroad construction. The latter was heavy work which he escaped when he was made time-keeper.

British Columbia was his ultimate destination and he came west with friends, walking part of the way. He worked on a farm in Vernon, then came to Vancouver where he obtained employment with Law's, a dry goods store in Vancouver. His apprenticeship in England made him a valuable employee, but he was determined not to be trapped in a shop and so applied for farm work. He was hired by John McMyn who had a farm in Delta.

In 1904 he went to England for a visit. When he returned in 1905, he, his future father-in-law, John McMyn, and W.R. McMyn bought property in Pitt Meadows from a pioneer family called Harris, who had preempted it in 1874.

Park cut hay in the summer of 1906, then moved to Pitt Meadows in 1907 and boarded with the Harris family. He began to clear his land, selling the wood for telephone poles and as cord wood. Using an old engine he set up a saw and cut lumber to sell to the C.P.R. and for his own farm buildings. By 1910 he had two cows and was carrying a milk
can to the C.P.R. station every day. He married Mary McMyn, whose father gave her a cow as a wedding present, increasing the herd to three. From this humble beginning, Park built up his herd, gradually replacing grade cattle with pure bred cows.

W.J. Park took an active part in community activities. He was first clerk of Pitt Meadows municipality, was reeve for twenty-eight years, and school trustee for twenty years. He was active in the Boy Scout movement, in C.A.R.S. and in the Rotary Club. He was honorary president of both the Federation of Agriculture and the Holstein-Friesian Association.

Park was active in the Milk Shippers' Association which pre-dated the F.V.M.P.A., and was a director of the cooperative for eighteen years. He was secretary in the early years, but in 1923 became both president and general manager. He resigned as president in 1930 to become the manager of Associated Dairies, but was forced to resign from this position in 1933 because of ill health. He served as secretary until he was defeated as director in 1937.

According to J.J. Brown, early F.V.M.P.A. member and president of the association from 1960 to 1963, it was W.J. Park more than any other person who was responsible for the success of the Cooperative. He had tact and determination. He held the farmers together and persuaded many who were discouraged to stay loyal to their association. The young man who eschewed business for farming made a career of looking after the farmers' business.

Sources

Butterfat, August-September, 1964.
Minutes of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association.

Interview with Mrs. W.J. Park, Pitt Meadows.

Interview with J.J. Brown, Surrey.
Charles Kerr was born in Stricken, Scotland on October 1, 1873 and came to Canada in 1901. He took a contract with the Canada Shingle Company and logged for ten years, mainly on Bowen Island. His fiancée followed him from Scotland to be married. When their eldest child was school age, he decided that logging camps were poor places to raise children so in 1911 he used his savings to buy the Maynard farm in Chilliwack. Two years later he became a charter member of the F.V.M.P.A. and remained loyal to the cooperative all his life. His widow declares that he was firmly convinced that "cooperation was the only way."

Kerr was second in the whole valley in one of the first Clean Milk contests put on by the F.V.M.P.A. The trophy has become a family treasure and the pride of achievement still glows after forty-five years.

Kerr served as school trustee in Chilliwack for several terms.

Source
Interview with Mrs. Charles Kerr, Valleyhaven, Chilliwack.
In 1867 Edward Dodsley Barrow was born on a farm in Ringwood, Hampshire, England which his forebearers had occupied as far back as anyone could remember. He came to America with an older brother and worked in Chicago for some time. He wanted to settle on a farm so decided to move west in search of land. In 1892 he reached the Fraser Valley where he found various jobs, one with promoters attempting to reclaim Sumas Lake.¹

In 1896 he bought 71 acres on Camp River Road which he cleared and farmed. He was elected councillor in the Chilliwack Municipality several times, usually heading the poll. In 1908 he resigned and ran against the incumbent reeve, F.C. Kickbush, not because he had any criticism of the administration of municipal affairs, but because he "thought his time had come for advancement."² Kickbush won the election, but his majority was not large.

Barrow was a director of the Chilliwack Cooperative Association when it organized in 1905³ and was on the Managing Board in 1908.⁴ He was one of the first directors of the Chilliwack Creamery, and was president in 1913, a position he held until the Creamery merged with the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association in 1918.

²The Chilliwack Progress, January 22, 1908, p. 1.
⁴Ibid., May 20, 1908, p. 6.
In 1916 he attended the Liberal convention in Abbotsford and was nominated candidate for the election of that year. He became M.L.A. for the riding and in 1918 was named Minister of Agriculture by John Oliver. Following the precedent established by the premier, he gave up his position as president of the F.V.M.P.A. and turned his attention to his new job.

One of the projects he supported was the reclamation of Sumas Prairie. Surveys were made in 1919; work was begun in 1920 and completed three years later. Barrow had hoped that the sale of lands would finance the project, but the cost was $2,250,000, considerably exceeding initial estimates. It was several years before the land was suitable for settlement. Both Oliver and Barrow made clear that the government would not assume responsibilities for the reclamation. The land would have to meet its obligations. The resentment of farmers who feared increased competition from new settlers and who rebelled against the increased taxation was undoubtedly one of the factors which led to Barrow's electoral defeat in 1928. He affirmed his own faith in the area by selling his Camp Slough farm in 1928 and buying 120 acres on Sumas Prairie, which he farmed until his death in 1956.

Barrow belonged to the same school of sturdy individualists as John Oliver. He was opposed to government financing and "paternalism," and stated that real farmers minded their own business; those who cried for help were "misfits and ne'er do wells." The farmers, Barrow was convinced, could help themselves by cooperation. For the non-cooperators

---


he had nothing but scorn, placing them in the same class as the "ne'er do wells." He was reported as saying, "It is a pity that there is no law that would permit the government to deport them." 7

Since this was unthinkable, Barrow came to the conclusion that the cooperative should be assisted by legislation. For him there was no inconsistency in this policy, for he saw the Natural Products Marketing Act which he sponsored, not as a paternalistic measure, but as a guarantee that farmers could pursue a course of independent action.

His policies were severely criticized by the editor of Farm and Home who saw his opposition to government financing as lack of enterprise, and his attempt to equalize returns to farmers as interference. Barrow, according to the editor "had not the vision, initiative or breadth of knowledge to carry out duties," and he confused "performances of duties with interference in farmers' affairs." 8 These attacks were coupled with attacks on the F.V.M.P.A., which was accused of being a dangerous monopoly.

To John Oliver, Barrow's policies were paradoxical. He was too much aware of the farmers' problems and too sympathetic with cooperatives

---

7 Details in this paragraph were obtained from a report in The British Columbian, October 18, 1923, 14.

8 Farm and Home, April 19, 1923, p. 8. Barrow was also criticized in articles on May 31, 1923, p. 8, and November 15, 1923, p. 8. On June 6, 1923, p. 8, the editor said, "Mr. Barrow has figuratively snored in his chair when he has not been guiding Fraser Valley producers of milk into new seas of trouble."
to oppose his Minister of Agriculture, but he refused to accept the proposed legislation as a government measure, and he could not bring himself to vote for it. Barrow brought in the Natural Products Marketing Act as a private member's bill for the relief of fruit farmers. A last minute attempt to include milk under the provisions of the act created such controversy that it was left for later legislation. John Oliver died in 1927, and the new government headed by Dr. John McLean faced an election in 1928.

Barrow was re-nominated by acclamation as Liberal representative at a well-attended convention. The Conservatives had more trouble selecting their candidate. William Atkinson, a jovial auctioneer, who had been the unanimous choice of a Conservative convention choosing the federal candidate in 1920, had refused to run at that time. Now he let his name stand with five other candidates. Five ballots were taken, with Atkinson making gains on each count, but failing to head the poll until the final crucial vote. Such was the candidate who opposed Barrow, and won the election.

In 1933 support swung back to Barrow and he was returned as member for the riding. T.D. Pattullo, the premier who succeeded Tolmie, chose Dr. K.C. MacDonald from an Okanagan riding as his Minister of Agriculture. A meeting of 1,000 dairymen in Chilliwack, both Liberals and Conservatives, demanded Barrow's appointment to the portfolio.

---

10 Charles H. Evans Diary, November 3 and 4, 1920.
12 Ibid., November 14, 1933, p. 5.
but Pattullo held firm, and MacDonald hastened to Chilliwack to meet with the farmers, promise them his support and announce that he understood their disappointment. Barrow continued to represent the riding until he was defeated by Leslie Eyres in 1937.

He was president of the B.C. Federation of Agriculture, belonged to the Masonic Order and the Rotary Club and was elected to the Milk Board in 1937 and 1938, a position which meant little since the board failed to operate effectively. Many of the farmers in the F.V.M.P.A. who had almost lost faith in the marketing board, were better satisfied when Barrow became their representative.

As a young man, Barrow had a sensitive, brooding face. He showed industry, skill, and initiative in running his own farm and his advice on farm matters and municipal affairs was listened to with respect. With age his face wrinkled like an apple left too long in the bin, giving him a homespun, Lincolnesque appearance which, combined with his gentle manner, earned him friends even among those who refused to vote for him.

E.D. Barrow was the first man to receive the Chilliwack "Citizen to be Remembered" award, and the F.V.M.P.A. named a special reading and meeting room after their first president. He lived long enough to see his Sumas reclamation policies fully justified, and he was honored many times by grateful Valley residents. The farmer who sought advancement in 1908 succeeded in leaving his mark on the valley where he spent most of his life.

13 The Vancouver Province, November 20, 1933, p. 7.
Sources

As indicated in footnotes.

Diary of Charles H. Evans.

Minutes of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association.

Telephone conversation with Miss Dorothy Barrow, 41310 Yale Road West, R.R. 1, Sardis, B.C., daughter.

Interview with H.W. German, Chilliwack, former neighbor.
Alex Jess was born at Port Neuf, Quebec and raised in Owen Sound, Ontario. He came to the Chilliwack Valley and pre-empted 160 acres of land before the flood of 1894. His sister married Herbert Parker. Jess was a member of the F.V.M.P.A. until he retired.

Source
Telephone conversation with A.R. Jess, Chilliwack, B.C.
Joseph Brannick was born in Bohemia, Austria in 1816. Thirty-eight years later he emigrated to Hamilton, Ontario with his wife and two sons, Matthew and Joseph. His wife died and some time later Mat Brannick married Mrs. Snyder, a widow. They moved with their children to Keppel in County Bruce, Ontario. In 1885 they followed Brannick's stepson, Ludovic Snyder, to Chilliwack and pre-empted 160 acres. Both Matthew and Joseph Brannick became dairy farmers. Mat was a charter member of the F.V.M.P.A. and Clark Brannick, son of Joseph, was a director of the association for many years and was president in 1964-65.

Sources

The Chilliwack Progress, July 17, 1901, p. 1.

Telephone conversation with Mrs. John Hickman, Chilliwack, daughter of Joseph Brannick, Jr., sister of Clark Brannick.
F.W.E. Beldam was born in England on August 13, 1856. He farmed his own estate in Bedford, Cambridgeshire, but in 1908 came to Chilliwack. He had four sons and it is probable that he came to Canada, though not a young man, in the hope that his three youngest sons would have more opportunity in a new country. He bought the 80 acre Cross farm on Hope Slough and in 1911 also purchased Little Mountain, all but the reservoirs and cemeteries, from the Elk Creek Water Works Company.  

Early in 1911 he wrote a letter to The Chilliwack Progress pointing out the need for a market in Chilliwack which would provide fresh produce for townspeople, bring business to storekeepers and encourage the farmer to produce quality goods.  

Beldam's eldest son was killed overseas during World War I. This is probably what prompted him to give up farming and return to England in 1916.

Sources

The Chilliwack Progress.

Interview with Mr. and Mrs. W.H. Beldam, 229 Maple Avenue, Chilliwack, B.C. Mr. Beldam is a son of the late F.W.E. Beldam.

1The Chilliwack Progress, May 3, 1911, 4.

2Ibid., February 8, 1911, 8.
J.H. Copeland, an experienced Scottish gardner from Ontario, arrived in Chilliwack in 1906 where his activities soon created great interest. He bought 20 acres of badly drained peat land, considered by most people to be impossible to farm. He put in a system of tile drain and the "black muck" produced 7500 celery plants and 7½ tons of cauliflower per acre in the summer of 1908, yielding a net profit of $100 per acre. The next year he extended his operation to 60 acres and worked with two associates. They raised celery, onions and cauliflower and found ready markets from Lake Superior to Victoria.

J.H. Copeland is still remembered in Chilliwack as the "Celery King," but after a few years of raising vegetables, he moved to East Chilliwack where he began dairying. His name appears as a director of the Chilliwack Canning Company in 1911, and as a director of the East Chilliwack branch of the Chilliwack Producers' Exchange in 1913.

Sources

The Chilliwack Progress.

Telephone conversation with J.C. Barnard, 46570 Brooks Avenue, Chilliwack, B.C.

1 The Chilliwack Progress, July 22, 1908, p. 2.


3 Ibid., April 19, 1911, p. 1.

S.A. Harding was born in Windsor, Ontario on April 1, 1860. His father was an Englishman who had fought in the Crimean War and the Indian Mutiny before settling in Canada. As a young man, Sam Harding went to Balmoral, Manitoba where he stayed for four or five years before he moved west to settle in Chilliwack in March of 1890. He bought 80 acres in the Camp Slough area and began farming. He was school trustee after the school opened in 1893 and was a charter member of the Camp Slough Hall Association. He joined the F.V.M.P.A. in 1913 and continued with the Cooperative until he retired in 1944.

Source
Telephone conversation with Mrs. F.I. Moss, 6257 Princess Avenue, East Chilliwack, B.C., daughter.
Charles Evans was named after his father, a Welshman who came to Ontario in 1860 or 1861, and from there to British Columbia via the Panama route in 1862. He operated a real estate business in Victoria for a year and then moved to Yale to become agent for the Barnard Express Company. 1 In 1866 and 1868 he pre-empted and purchased land in Chilliwack. 2 After his sudden tragic death in the spring of 1871, 3 his wife moved to Chilliwack with her three small children and began making butter on her bush farm. She was assisted by her brother, A.C. Wells, who purchased property next to the Evans farm in 1867. 4

On reaching manhood, Charles and his brother, John Allen, each took over part of the family farm. Charles Evans was elected president of the local Dairyman's Association in 1912, he was a member of the Chilliwack School Board from 1915 to 1921, and he actively supported Conservative candidates in most elections. During World War I he campaigned for the Unionist party, supported the Canadian Patriotic Fund and the Military Y.M.C.A. and fought for prohibition. 5

---

1 Information supplied by Oliver Evans, nephew.


3 Mainland Guardian, March 18, 1871, p. 3.

4 Wells, Oliver, Early Days in the Fraser Valley, Chilliwack Historical Society pamphlet, p. 2.

5 Diary entries.
In 1906 Evans became president of the Chilliwack Cooperative Association, a consumer cooperative organized for the purpose of giving farmers goods — particularly feed — at cost. He held this position until the association was forced to sell its stock and dissolve in 1910 because of lack of capital.

Though he did not become a director of the F.V.M.P.A. until 1917, entries in his diary and in the F.V.M.P.A. minutes indicate that he was doing committee work in 1915 and 1916. In 1919, however, he failed in his bid to be re-elected as director. Some issue, obscured by time, was at stake, and S.W. Keith received support for his plan, mentioned but not explained in the Evans' diary. It is probably safe to assume that the issue was over the entry of the F.V.M.P.A. into the retail market. Evans stated at the Milk Inquiry of 1928 that he had never approved of the cooperative going into the retail field. W.J. Park stated in 1926 that it was not until the F.V.M.P.A. had directors agreeable to entering the retail field that they were able to do so in 1919. Evans' experience in the Chilliwack Cooperative Association, and the fact that he had been satisfied in his dealing with F. Turner of Vancouver, may have influenced his thinking.

---

6 The Chilliwack Progress, April 18, 1906, p. 4.
7 Ibid., April 27, 1910, p. 1.
8 Diary entries, January 10, 1919 and January 11, 1919.
9 The Chilliwack Progress, September 13, 1928, p. 4. The Vancouver Province, September 10, 1928, p. 12.
10 Hoard's Dairyman, January 17, 1926, 793.
11 Diary, September 10, 1923.
Evans continued as a member of the F.V.M.P.A. until 1925 when he began shipping to Haggerty, an independent dealer who paid seven cents more per pound butterfat than the Cooperative. He was shipping twenty-five cans of milk every day which meant a difference of $750 per month -- a powerful argument for shipping independently. On February 23, 1930 he signed a contract with Associated Dairies, but switched to Crystal Dairy in November of 1931. In 1932 he was active in organizing the Independent Milk Shippers and was elected president of the newly formed association at a meeting on May 28, 1932. Among the provisional directors were Shannon and Starr, two early members of the Fraser Valley Milk Producers' Association. Evans remained a director until 1940, three years before his death at the age of seventy-five.

Sources

As indicated in footnotes.

Telephone conversation and correspondence with Oliver Evans, nephew, son of J.A. Evans.

Diaries.

In possession of Mrs. Frank Thomson, daughter, 402 Mary Street, Chilliwack, B.C. Mrs. Thomson made available diaries from 1912 to 1943.

12 Ibid., October 1, 1925.
13 Progress, September 13, 1928, p. 4.
14 Diary entries.
The Chadsey family were descendants of pioneers who immigrated to Ontario from Pennsylvania and settled along the shores of Lake Ontario. Four Chadsey brothers and their brother-in-law, D.W. Miller, came west via the Panama route looking for gold. They discovered, as Chester Chadsey said years later, that it took a hundred cents worth of silver to get a dollar's worth of gold. Sumas Prairie lay untouched, covered in places with blue joint grass so thick that five tons an acre could be cut and sold for $20 per ton.

The Chadsey brothers settled on the prairie, drove in dairy cattle, and began making butter. In 1866 they had 640 acres of land, 80 of which were under cultivation. In the summer and fall of that year they had harvested 1,000 bushels of grain, 650 bushels of potatoes, 800 bushels of turnips, 1700 tobacco plants, 6 tons of timothy hay, 80 tons of prairie hay. They had 126 head of cattle, 22 hogs, 4 sheep, 200 poultry, large barns, sheds, and a good dwelling. They had made and sold 2,000 pounds of butter which was sealed in tins and carted to the Cariboo by wagon where it sold for as high as $1.50 per pound. Obviously the Chadsey family were off to a prosperous start in British Columbia.

One of the brothers, James Lonson, married Harriet Hall, daughter

1 The Chilliwack Progress, March 25, 1908, p. 1.

2 Ibid., June 17, 1908, p. 1.

3 The British Columbian, September 19, 1866, 3.

4 Progress, June 17, 1908, 1.

Oliver Wells, Early Days in the Fraser Valley, Chilliwack Historical Society pamphlet, 1.
of William Hall, an officer of the Royal Engineers who took up his grant of 150 acres and began farming on Sumas Prairie in 1864. In 1875 James Chadsey built the first flour mill in the district and operated it until 1891.\(^5\)

Alexander Chadsey, elder son of James Chadsey and his wife, was born in 1882. He became a dairy farmer, was active in local organizations and interested in progressive farming. His name appears as one of the first directors of the Sardis-Sumas Cow Testing Association. He joined the F.V.M.P.A. in 1913 and continued as a member until he stopped farming.

Sources
As indicated in footnotes.

Interview with Earl McLeod, Chilliwack, grandson of William Chadsey.

\(^5\)Progress, May 21, 1891, 4.
APPENDIX D

BACKGROUND OF CHARTER MEMBERS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BIRTH PLACE</th>
<th>% OF MALE POPULATION</th>
<th>% OF F.V.M.P.A. MEMBERS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>England</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotland</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL BRITISH</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Columbia</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Scotia</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CANADIAN</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>40.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EUROPE</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNITED STATES</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASIA</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OTHERS</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

APPENDIX E

THE DIRECTORS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Directors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1917</td>
<td>E.D. Barrow, J.W. Berry, W.J. Park, H. Vanderhoof</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1918</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1919</td>
<td>J. Erskine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1920</td>
<td>A. Mercer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1922</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1923</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1924</td>
<td>R. Hamilton</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1926</td>
<td>C.E. Eckert</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1929</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930</td>
<td>D.R. Nicholson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1933</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>J.J. Brown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1938</td>
<td>T.J. Robertson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1939</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1940</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1942</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1943</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1944</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1947</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>J.C. Cherry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1962</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>P.J. Friesen, R.A. Robson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>THE F.V.M.P.A.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.H. Evans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.W. Keith</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. McCutcheon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beharrell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Twiss</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T.M. Edwards</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R.J. Appleby</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. McDonald</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.D. Rundle</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.W. Park</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E. Eckert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.N. Bell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Miller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Berry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

THE PRESIDENTS AND GENERAL MANAGERS
### PRESIDENTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.D. Barrow</td>
<td>1917 - 1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.W. Berry</td>
<td>1919 - 1922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Park</td>
<td>1923 - 1930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Miller</td>
<td>1931 - 1934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.L. Macken</td>
<td>1935 - 1947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D.R. Nicholson</td>
<td>1948 - 1959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.J. Brown</td>
<td>1960 - 1963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J.C. Brannick</td>
<td>1964 - 1965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H.S. Berry</td>
<td>1966 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GENERAL MANAGERS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E.G. Sherwood</td>
<td>1917 - 1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W.J. Park</td>
<td>1923 - 1933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A.H. Mercer</td>
<td>1933 - 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L.A. Atkinson</td>
<td>1961 - 1966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G.J. Okulitch</td>
<td>1966 -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
John W. Berry
William J. Park
THE MILK TWINS

W. Lyle Macken and Alex Mercer
Patrons delivered their milk to the Creamery where it was made into butter. The skim milk was dumped into the Luk-a-Kuk unless patrons collected it to feed animals. A.C. Wells is on the left.

The churn inside the Creamery and butter boxes with the famous Edenbank label.
The Utility Plant at Sardis, completed in 1925, produced butter, skim milk and cottage cheese. Upper Valley milk was sent there, shortening the haul and absorbing the surplus.

The Pacific Milk Plant was centered at Delair near Abbotsford in 1928. Milk from the central Valley was sent to the condensary, while Delta milk, less suitable for this purpose because of the acid delta soils was sent to the fluid market.
The Eighth Avenue plant, bought from Standard Dairy became headquarters for Fraser Valley Dairies in 1919, the Associated Dairies in 1930 and Dairyland in 1943.

At the annual general meeting on March 17, 1961, the membership voted to replace the Eighth Avenue plant. In 1964 Dairyland, the Burnaby plant went into operation.
Associated Dairies' Rig

F.V.M.P.A. Kitsilano Depot

Producer-vendor, 1915
The clip-clop of the horses' hooves became a memory.

Milk cans became obsolete as the tank truck carried milk from cow to plant without being touched by human hands.
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INTERVIEWS

Many farmers and other Valley residents were questioned on an informal basis. People listed as sources of information in Appendix C were usually able to supply, as well as detail about charter members, useful information about many aspects of Valley life. Of the people interviewed the following are listed because their particular experiences were somewhat different from the usual.


Crowley, Everett, proprietor of Avalon Dairy, started by his father in 1907. Interviewed August 1, 1971.

Gardom, Mrs. Basil, widow of President, Independent Milk Producers' Cooperative Association.
Telephone conversation, July 11, 1967.
Interviewed April 16, 1971.

German, H.W., F.V.M.P.A. member since 1917, former neighbor of Barrow, secretary of local association for many years.
Interviewed July 20, 1970.

Grey, J., Public Relations Manager, F.V.M.P.A.
Interviewed June 10, 1967.

Mitchell, Alan, former co-owner of City Dairy, Chilliwack, son of a producer-vendor.
Interviewed July 10, 1970.

Norris, T.G., Hon. Mr. Justice, Counsel to the Commissioner on the Milk Inquiry Commission of 1954.

Park, G.W., Director, F.V.M.P.A. and son of a charter member.

Rundle, A.D., Director, F.V.M.P.A.
Interviewed March 12, 1971.

Starr, Perry, only surviving charter member of the F.V.M.P.A.
Interviewed July 12, 1970.

Wells, Casey, grandson of A.C. Wells and volunteer archivist for the Chilliwack Historical Association.
Interviewed July 11, 1970.

Wells, Oliver, grandson of A.C. Wells, proprietor of Edenbank Farm until his death.