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ABSTRACT

The organization of Winnipeg from 1870 until 1885 can be described as an intense period of spatial transformation and expansion. After the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) surrendered Rupert’s Land and the North-West Territories to the Crown in 1870, the re-formulation of land tenure transformed the urban space. Different actors in the still young and small community used diverse mechanisms to secure common land as private property allowing the formation of a dynamic real estate market.

The importance of the formation of a main city—the lay out of streets, the construction of government buildings, and the extension of other public works—was of paramount importance in this stage because the city would be the place where the different factions of the emerging bourgeoisie would organize their institutions and through them exercise power.

During those years Winnipeg expanded rapidly and the availability of city lots soon became limited. Lot prices soared and land transformed into a commodity generated the conditions for the reproduction and circulation of capital in the city. The arrival of investors and financial institutions helped to create the real estate boom of 1881-82 and transform a small village into a modern capitalist city. By 1885, Winnipeg was ready to initiate an uneven and fast transition to industrial capitalism.
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Chapter 1

Introduction

After Confederation, Canada initiated a movement to enlarge its frontier margins, construct a transcontinental rail network and eventually incorporate the new space it had acquired into the expanding global economy.¹ The economic and political enterprise of moving westward, as it was articulated in Prime Minister John A. Macdonald’s National Policy, also included regulating and defining a new regime of land tenure and ownership in the newly acquired territories of Western Canada. This thesis explores how this new legality of land appropriation was experienced in Winnipeg from the late 1860s until 1885, and how its development moulded the formation of the local state and its institutions and organized the definite boundaries of classes and of class relations in a new urban space.

Over those years, Winnipeg evolved from a tiny village to a large city—the third largest Canadian city by the turn of the century—becoming the commercial centre of Western Canada. The first residents associated their future with the evolution of the

¹ Harold A. Innis and Mary Quayle Innis, Essays in Canadian Economic History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1962; 1956), 72.
village and left their particular imprint in the formation of the social, cultural and political institutions of what formally became the City of Winnipeg in 1873. These settlers acting alone or in partnership with other members of the still small community endeavoured to appropriate the public space of the frontier as property and, therefore, attempted to consolidate economic and political power in their own benefit.

Almost all the individuals involved in the early development of Winnipeg were born elsewhere, especially Great Britain and Ontario, and immigrated during the second half of the nineteenth century. The newcomers brought with them a mode of social and political organization moulded upon what they understood as the necessities for the expansion of capitalism in significant parts of the world after the 1850s. The expansion of what Gerald Friesen has called the “investment frontier” in anticipation of the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) provoked the emergence of a real estate market that promoted the appearance of a business elite of investors, speculators, and real estate agents who shaped the political and social activity of Western Canada. In so doing, they also helped to promote the expansion of the nation state with its marks of class and privileges. This uneasy implementation in a new society, however, intensified the struggles for the political and economic control of the village between the different factions in dispute—old settlers, newcomers, merchants, investors, real estate agents, speculators and entrepreneurs—and forced the intervention of the recently formed state to

---

2 The Act of Incorporation was approved by the Legislature on 8 November 1873 but the first civic election was held in January 1874. See Alan F. J. Artibise, *Winnipeg: A Social History of Urban Growth, 1874-1914* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1975), 18-19.

mediate among those who tried to take advantage of the new investment opportunities in
the growing city.

The formation of classes in Winnipeg as the consequence of the expansion of
modern capitalism in the region was not a homogeneous process. The consolidation of a
group of persons as the emergent bourgeoisie experienced an uneven and unequal
development. The leadership of this new emerging class, thus, was in a continuous
dispute according to particular economic interests and historical moments. Old settlers
who had for some time organized the economic activity of the village as merchants,
general store owners, or small manufacturers and artisans soon were threatened by the
arrival of new actors. After 1870, the slow but continuous arrival of capital brought by
newcomers and investors gave Winnipeg an important boost and dynamism. For
example, in addition to the incorporation of four local chartered banks and a number of
private bank and investments companies, the Merchants’ Bank established a branch in
1872, as did the Ontario Bank in 1876.4 Another actor that attempted to dispute power
between old and new fragments of capital was the Hudson Bay’s Company (HBC). Its
officials tried to reformulate the Company’s business strategy from fur traders to land
holders and soon found common interest with Dominion Lands agents, CPR
representatives and with land speculators during the real estate boom of the 1880s. In
sum, the consolidation of power and leadership in the new city was not a simple task; it
followed the pattern of land dispute and accommodation of particular interests which

---

traced the map of world capitalism since its beginnings in the fifteenth century and continued until all the fertile land was allocated in the 1900s.\footnote{John Weaver, \textit{The Great Land Rush and the Making of the Modern World, 1650-1900} (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2003), 348.}

The expansion of European empires in the New World and the conquest of new territories were the principal foundations for the allocation of capital at a world scale since the 1600s. Immanuel Wallerstein states that during that period “three things were essential to the establishment of a world-economy: an expansion of the geographical size of the world in question, the development of…labour and…the creation of a relatively strong state machinery in what would become the core-states of this capitalist world-economy.”\footnote{Immanuel Maurice Wallerstein, \textit{The Modern World-System: Capitalist Agriculture and the Origins of the European World-Economy in the Sixteenth Century} (New York: Academic Press, 1976), 38.} Giovanni Arrighi, further, identifies four moments in the expansion of capitalism around the world. The first cycle was dominated by the Genovese-Iberian bankers until the seventeenth century. The second cycle was dominated by the Dutch bankers and lenders after the Peace of Westphalia, and the third cycle of capital accumulation inaugurated in the nineteenth century the period of British dominance around the world.\footnote{The fourth cycle introduced the dominance of the United States since WWII onwards. For a complete account of capital accumulation see Giovanni Arrighi, “Hegemony Unravelling II,” \textit{New Left Review} 33 (May-June 2005): 83-116; Giovanni Arrighi, “Spatial and Other “Fixes” of Historical Capitalism,” \textit{Journal of World-Systems Research} x, no. 2 (Summer 2004): 532-534.} During that time, Great Britain expanded its domain and initiated the reorganization of its overseas colonies. In 1869, the Hudson’s Bay Company, established in a vast part of North America since 1670, surrendered Rupert’s Land and the North-West Territories to the Crown. Shortly thereafter, the land was transferred to the
Dominion of Canada; as A. S. Morton describes it “one of the greatest transfers of territory and sovereignty in history was conducted as a mere transaction in real estate.”

This thesis aims to demonstrate how capitalism evolved and how classes formed and organized in specific areas of the Western frontier following what Neil Smith has called the “production of nature.” Since the expeditions of H. Y. Hind and John Palliser during the mid-1800s, Ontario’s politicians and investors desired to enlarge the country’s territory in order to create a new settlement frontier which would absorb the flow of new capital. The Hind and Palliser’s expeditions, however, intended to gather geographical information about the region but on condition of an economic assessment to measure the area’s potential to evolve into a capitalist endeavour. As Suzanne Zeller has noted, Great Britain promoted in its imperial domains a colonial scientific model to canvass a large extension of its geography. This interest, however, was not to fulfill its geographical curiosity but, mainly, to start a geological exploration with the possibility to obtain information about the distribution of mineral resources in this extended land. As Neil Smith argues, space was no longer a geographical term linked to the exploration of the landscape, but the last margin for the survival of capitalism in the nineteenth century. It was this last process which moulded the new legality of land tenure allowing in this way the appropriation of the commons.

---

8 Quoted in Friesen, The Canadian Prairies, 117.


12 Smith, 4.
The region, however, was not an “empty space” waiting to be populated and
civilized as Western minds have frequently thought. First Nations peoples lived in the
area for thousands of years with a very different understanding of “property.” The
appropriation of the commons, as Irene Spry has argued, was “the story of a tragedy” for
First Nations and Métis peoples. ¹³ Aboriginal groups contested European power and
resisted the appropriation of the commons in different areas, but dealing with new terms
alien to their everyday practice, such as “sale” and “property”, undermined their capacity
to contest the advance of the state’s powerful machinery of law enforcement.¹⁴ In the end,
the formation of the Province of Manitoba was the consequence of negotiations that
followed the Métis resistance of 1869 led by Louis Riel. In Winnipeg, particularly, the
city police harassed the Aboriginal population who contested the appropriation of the
urban space by establishing their seasonal campsites.¹⁵ As Megan Kozminski has
explored, one of the main activities of the local police was to control Métis and
Aboriginal population within the limits of the city,¹⁶ or as the Free Press smugly noted,
“the largest Indian encampment in the city just now are the cells of the Provincial jail.”¹⁷

The authority of the state forced the new legality of land tenure and ownership by
power, harassment, or by negotiations with Aboriginal people through the negotiation of
several treaties. David Harvey has particularly described this methodology of land

¹³ Irene Spry, “The Great Transformation: The Disappearance of the Commons in Western Canada,” in
Man and Nature on the Prairies, Canadian Plains Studies 6 (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center,
University of Regina, 1976), 21.

¹⁴ Spry, 29. See also Friesen, 165-168.


¹⁶ Megan Kozminski, “Patrolling Winnipeg ‘According to Order’: A Social History of Policing in a Prairie
City, 1874-1900” (M. A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 2004), 90.

¹⁷ “Local and Provincial,” Manitoba Free Press, October 24, 1874, 5.
appropriation as “accumulation by dispossession.”18 This new legality, as Ian McKay has argued, followed a “specific project of rule” shaped by the ideas of liberalism in a new capitalist frontier.19 The Dominion intended then to institute a new legal regime based on private property of the land in the recently acquired territories. The organization of land tenure in Winnipeg, Calgary or Vancouver during the expansion of the Canadian nation state followed a similar pattern, although in different periods. This new process permitted the accumulation of new fortunes which often were obtained by taking advantage of particular political connections when the authority of the state was in its formative stage. In Winnipeg, these initial fortunes, reinvested in real estate properties helped to put in motion the circulation of capital through loan, mortgages, and investment companies. At the same time, private and chartered banks, established in Winnipeg during this period, promoted the expansion of wholesale businesses, the import of commodities from the East and Britain and, later, the establishment of modern industries.

The structural economic change experienced in Winnipeg in the period here analyzed showed the dynamic elements of a class in the making. Land commodification increased the availability of city lots and the process of urbanization needed the expansion of public works. The layout of streets, construction of a sewer system, provision of water, extension of sidewalks and construction of bridges and other works, transformed the prairie town into a capitalist city. The construction of new buildings, in addition, provoked demand for skilled workers and journeymen. In this way, immigrants and investors coincided in the same place to initiate a new business cycle based,

---


particularly, on wage labour. This process was consistent with what David Harvey has
called the “spatio-temporal fix.” Overaccumulation in Great Britain and eastern Canada
allowed the allocation of long term investments in Winnipeg. In this form, the increase of
public works and the expansion of the construction industry absorbed the influx of new
workers and new capital, allowing international capitalists to initiate another cycle of
accumulation in a new territory. Small workshops and stores accompanied this
transformation by employing a growing number of workers and so increased production
and sales. The establishment of new industries that progressively incorporated modern
machines and technology marked the arrival of industrial capitalism and initiated a new
period of class relations. The formation of new labour organizations gave workers new
possibilities to demand better labour conditions and to collectively negotiate wages. In
1885, Winnipeg was still recovering from the consequences of the world recession of the
1880s and, particularly, the end of the real estate boom of 1881-82. Despite the
commercial failures and bankruptcies that characterized this period, Winnipeg had
consolidated itself as the wholesale centre of the West and incorporated the initial
elements of industrial capitalism. As such, the city was well prepared to become the third
largest Canadian city.

Other Voices

Since Frederick Jackson Turner advanced his frontier thesis in 1893, studies
about the mythology of the West have abounded. The study of the frontier and the

---

20 See David Harvey, “‘The New Imperialism’: Accumulation by Dispossession,” The Socialist Register 40
(2004): 64.

21 Frederick J. Turner, “The Significance of the Frontier in American History,” in The Frontier in American
settlement of Western Canada produced over the years an immense literature. This thesis extends the works of other scholars who had chosen Winnipeg and Western Canada as the centre of their research. Alan Artibise’s several studies of the expansion of Winnipeg are an important point of departure. His “biographical” study of Winnipeg became a cornerstone of research about the city’s formation. He identifies the individuals involved in the formation and expansion of Winnipeg as a commercial centre and the ways they achieved business success by becoming involved in the new local state. He acknowledges that the majority of the members of the City Council were members of the local business community, but for Artibise the political body of the City was an autonomous entity. He considers the business elite a strong group that used its power to “persuade” the Council to “improve and expand…Winnipeg.” Artibise cannot identify that the political institution and the business institution were emergent organisms of the same social class. Moreover, for Artibise, Winnipeg’s nascent bourgeoisie was a “business elite” almost without internal contradictions, which formed a solid bloc during the period of state consolidation and capital accumulation.

David Burley demonstrates that those who acquired power in Winnipeg after Confederation had the advantage to take positions of privilege in the acquisition and appropriation of land. But unlike Artibise, who views the Winnipeg’s elite as the promoters and makers of a distinctive business frontier culture, Burley argues that the elite utilized the mechanisms of reproduction of capital by using the commodification of

---

land and real estate as a point of departure and gave to that process a distinctive class component.23

Don Nerbas scrutinizes the life of several members of the nascent bourgeoisie who settled in Winnipeg after 1874 and describes their family connections, their way of life and the form their businesses developed and expanded well over the twentieth century until World War I.24 Nerbas contests the widely accepted “thesis of boosterism,” accepted by J. M. S. Careless and Alan Artibise in several works.25 Careless imported the American idea of “self made man” in his analysis of the development of Winnipeg, but Nerbas clearly shows that entrepreneurs who settled in Manitoba since the second half of the nineteenth century had come to the area with important connections and abundant capital. The problem with his thesis is that it only explores the biographical aspect of this group. The formation of the bourgeoisie in Winnipeg needs to be explained in connection with the development of their own political institutions which defined them as a class: the City Council and the Board of Trade.

Thomas Flanagan, Douglas Sprague, and Paul Chartrand dispute the understanding of the Métis land tenure, the role of the recently formed state and the emergence of land speculators to argue about the failures of the Métis people to obtain

---


the benefits promoted by the Manitoba Act. Though, they have different views, none can identify the class process of land appropriation in the frontier using the tool developed by capitalism and liberal democracy: private property. Gerhard Ens separates from that discussion and brings a different understanding of the Métis relationship with the complexities of the advance of capitalism. For him, the Métis participated in the transition from fur trade to industrial capitalism since early times by connecting the two worlds, the pre-capitalist Aboriginal economy and the British capitalist world.

John Weaver brings a global understanding of land appropriation in the times of the expansion of capitalism and the formation of the laws that generated the private property of the land. The importance of Weaver’s work resides in the description of a rather universal pattern of capitalist expansion in the New World. Nevertheless, his meticulous work does not cast light on the extent of local particularities, like the ones that characterized Winnipeg.

The consolidation of Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie during this period had not come in isolation. Classes, as E. P. Thompson explained, are not a thing but relationships. In that relationship, the working class assumes the role that completes that binary component. James Naylor shows the initial steps Winnipeg’s working class made towards the consolidation of their institutions. Similarly, Gerry Berkowski’s M.A. thesis explores the

---


28 Weaver, *The Great Land Rush*.

development and organization of Winnipeg’s construction workers from 1880 onwards and John Hample explains the uncertainties of the handicraft culture among tailors in Winnipeg after the incorporation of the city into the national economy after 1880.30

This thesis, on the other hand, explores how Winnipeg’s new fortunes coincided with the formation and the expansion of the Canadian nation state and its regional representation: the local and provincial governments. Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie not only disputed political power through the City’s corporation, as Artibise asserts, but also, from the beginning, traced powerful links of class solidarity within the provincial political body and Ottawa. Winnipeg’s ruling class, in this way, profited from these political connections by trying to obtain economic benefits when new opportunities arose as a consequence of the new legality of land tenure and ownership. They created the conditions of land commodification, profited by utilizing the appropriation of land, increased their fortunes in these new endeavours and created social, civic, and political institutions that enforced hegemony over the whole society. As we shall see, people like John Sutherland, John Christian Schultz, William Gomez Fonseca, Edmund L. Barber, A. W. Ross and others, had built direct connections with important politicians in Ottawa and with Prime Minister John A. Macdonald. The attempt to appropriate the Point Douglas Commons by Fonseca and others, as this thesis shows, would not have happened if John Schultz, Member of Parliament at that time, had not intervened directly during the process.

Frontier expansion ran side by side with the extension of the CPR lines and the organization of land tenure that resulted from that process. The establishment of new towns on both sides of the CPR lines brought real estate agents and speculators to every corner of the West. Analyzing the growth of Vancouver, Robert A. McDonald states that “Canadian businessmen [traveled] across the West from one CPR-generated land boom to another”\(^{31}\) and distinctively left their particular imprint on the new Western landscape.

Similarly, as Henry C. Klassen shows, the fortunes made in Calgary during the “Great Land Rush” were particularly “derived from the increase in real estate value in the late nineteenth century.”\(^{32}\) Certainly, CPR investments boosted the economy in the recently formed towns and brought a new dynamic of capital accumulation, but, as Klassen illustrates, “in Calgary and the Bow Valley, government intervention…and assistance in the financing and construction of railways” helped the entrepreneurial parties to succeed.\(^{33}\)

**Methodology**

This study is based on government records, newspapers, and court cases, which documented the process of land appropriation, as well as on private papers of a group of individuals who intended to control the private and public life of the city. Research in newspaper databases and digital collections brings everyday a new finding. The valuable information found in the Canadian press supplement government records and

---


\(^{33}\) Klassen, xxviii. For a more clear understanding of the involvement of the state in promoting the railroad, see Ken Cruikshank, *Close Ties Railways, Government and the Board of Railway Commissioners, 1851-1933* (Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1991), 4.
publications. The same is true for the material held at the Archives of Manitoba and the Manitoba Legislative Library.

Studies of working class, women, Aboriginal peoples, and ethnic communities for the last decades or so were the focus of scholarly attention. These works aimed to contest the revisionist narratives on the lives of the “Founding Fathers” and the “heroic” process of nation-building, giving voice, as Antonio Gramsci has put it, to the “subalterns.”

Certainly the bourgeoisie cannot exist alone. The involvement of the working class in shaping the attitude and response of the ruling class was present since the beginning of the formation of Winnipeg. By 1881, for instance, Winnipeg’s prominent businesses, banks and manufactory establishments employed more than 2,700 workers, including about 1,000 in the CPR yards and workshops.

This thesis recognizes the role played by the Winnipeg’s working class in promoting with their labour the growth of the city, but, instead, it deals mainly with the ruling class and the way they achieved wealth and consolidated economic and political power.

This thesis assumes a historical materialist approach and, as such, aims to explore, borrowing E. P. Thompson’s term, the making of Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie after Confederation. In this making I shall attempt to explore how the emergent bourgeoisie used the mechanism of reproduction of capital to acquire wealth, privileges and power and consolidate as a class in a formative period of Western Canada. “Social” interpretations of prestige and wealth of the ruling elite abound. The intention of this


35 See the *Winnipeg Board of Trade Annual Reports*.

thesis is not to unveil how much money the bourgeoisie obtained or how much political power they managed to build but, instead, the aim is, as Göran Therborn explains, to “define the nature of power, not its subject or quantity.”

This investigation rejects, as Mariana Valverde has once put it, “the political and philosophical assumptions of “Great Men” (or “Great Women”)” in the process of nation building. Certainly, individuals are capable of reshaping determined circumstances and can make history but, as Marx argued, “they do not make it just as they please; they do not make it under circumstances chosen by themselves, but under circumstances directly encountered, given and transmitted from the past.” It is this very last assumption that makes sense of this thesis.

Structure

The exploration of the formation of Winnipeg’s ruling elite is divided into three chapters. Chapter 2 examines a particular case of land appropriation in Winnipeg after Confederation. The attempt to appropriate the Point Douglas Common, a place located north of the junction of the Red and Assiniboine rivers in Winnipeg, shows the mechanism of land acquisition moments of state formation in Manitoba. Some of Selkirk’s settlers, former dry goods merchants, adventurers, or former HBC officers, arriving during the first quarter of the nineteenth century in the Red River settlement, had taken advantage of their position and consolidated their presence in the village as an emerging elite through family and business relations. By taking advantage of the unclear

---


formulation of a new regime of land tenure, W. G. Fonseca, E. L. Barber, Alexander Logan, John C. Schultz, John Sutherland and others engaged in a commercial partnership to obtain fast benefits in the private sale of the Point Douglas Commons. This particular case shows how class solidarity, political links, and family relations shaped the new fortunes that emerged after the commodification of land and the expansion of the city. This expansion provoked the appearance of new neighbourhoods in the re-shaped space of the city and established new frontiers of class within its limits by drawing a definitive map of inequalities that continues today.

The dynamic the city developed after incorporation showed the elements of a transitional society. Chapter 3 illustrates the structural change of a new society in the period that shaped the formation of the new capitalist organizations. The arrival of financial institutions, the expansion of the wholesale business and commerce, and the transformation of the mode of production into the new manufacturing facilities initiated the transition to industrial capitalism. By 1885 the new working class with a new methodology of collective organization entered into the scene, contesting bourgeois power.

The consolidation of the bourgeoisie could not have been possible without its control of the city’s political and economic institutions. Chapter 4 shows how the group of small merchants who were the nascent bourgeoisie in Winnipeg after Confederation had transformed themselves into a defined class. Through the political control of the recently formed municipal government they regulated the resources of the city. By the 1880s, this group, who initially tried to manipulate the legality of land tenure exploiting the weakness of the state, had been replaced in the control of the local government.
Another group of small merchants and petty ward politicians who dispensed public funds without control had obtained the management of the city’s resources. The involvement of the Board of Trade in municipal politics after 1884 reshaped the political structure of the city and the Board undoubtedly became the de-facto organ of control and power of the bourgeoisie by managing not only industrialists and merchants but also by directing the political agenda of the city.

In sum, the men who shaped Winnipeg’s history since its initial years took advantage of the open opportunities the frontier offered to them and, as a consequence, they tried to reshape, organize, and control the city but not under their own terms, but under the ones that history allowed them to achieve in this important period.
Chapter 2

Land

The possession of real estate is a substantial capital. No theft can steal it; it needs no insurance policy to screen it, or vault to keep it safe. A good farm or suburban garden, with rich soil, or city property in a rising commercial centre, is better than stock in the Bank of England as an investment.

*The Trade Review* (Winnipeg), vol. 1, no. 7, September 1881, 10

The social, economic, and political organization of Winnipeg from 1870 until 1885 can be described as a period of spatial transformation and expansion. After the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) surrendered Rupert’s Land and the North-West Territories to the Crown in 1870, the re-formulation of land tenure transformed the urban space. During those formative years, different actors in the still young and small community used diverse mechanisms to secure common land as private property allowing afterwards the formation of a dynamic land market. In this way, land transformed into a commodity generated the conditions for the reproduction of capital and helped to initiate an uneven and fast transition to industrial capitalism. This chapter analyzes the different strategies of Winnipeg’s nascent bourgeoisie to accommodate urban spaces to their personal interest. It shows how those strategies changed according to the necessities of capitalism in that historical moment.
The agreement between the Crown, the Dominion of Canada and the HBC after the acceptance of the “Deed of Surrender” on 23 June 1870 allowed the Company to obtain a payment of £300,000, retain all land “adjoining each of their posts or stations,” and claim one-twentieth part of the land on the fertile belt.\(^1\) The HBC obtained in this way about 50,000 acres of land and a prospective 7,000,000 acres in the fertile belt, once the Dominion completed the survey.\(^2\) The 500 acres that formed the Company’s Reserve near Upper Fort Garry became the principal asset the HBC held in Winnipeg when the Manitoba Act was passed (See Figure 1). As one of the principal land holders in the village, the Company used an intelligent strategy to offer city lots for sale within the Reserve in order to influence the market and obtain extra benefits.\(^3\) The urbanization of the Reserve, the layout of streets and location of future government buildings were meticulously planned. The Company’s project, as John Selwood and Evelyn Baril suggest, was “in advance of town planning in the rest of Winnipeg.”\(^4\)

The Company was not alone in planning urban developments. The old settlers were a second group with important interests in the region. Former employees of the HBC, and settlers and descendants who located in the Red River after Lord Selkirk founded the Colony in 1812 had lived in the region for many years. During that time they

---

\(^1\) “Order in Council admitting Rupert’s Land and the North-Western Territory into the Dominion of Canada. At the Court at Windsor, the 23rd day of June, 1870,” in The Letters of Charles John Brydges, 1879-1882, Hudson’s Bay Company Land Commissioner, ed. Hartwell Bowsfield, Publications of Hudson’s Bay Record Society 31 (Winnipeg: Hudson’s Bay Record Society, 1977), 287-296.

\(^2\) Ibid., xiv.


\(^4\) Ibid., 107.
occupied large tracts of land in the settlement and some had established themselves as merchants and traders and brought a dynamic economic activity independent of the HBC. Such were the cases of Andrew McDermot, his son-in-law Andrew Bannatyne, Alexander Logan, James Ross, Donald Gunn, or John Sutherland among others.\textsuperscript{5}

\textbf{Figure 1} - City of Winnipeg, 1874. The shaded areas show the HBC Reserve after the lay out of city lots and Point Douglas and the Point Douglas Common. The small triangle beside Lot 12 was occupied by Fonseca and he claimed a patent for lots CDE and F and also attempted to claim ten chains along the southern side of the Common.\textsuperscript{6}


Following the opportunities the Canadian frontier appeared to offer, others had established themselves in the Red River valley in the 1860s. John Christian Schultz, Edmund L. Barber, William Gomez Fonseca, James Ashdown, and Alexander Begg, among others, forged commercial and personal links with the old members of the Colony and soon managed to secure a solid economic position in the still small village. Unlike the old settlers who had long established and secured relative wealth, these individuals were still in the process of securing land or properties. The new regime of land tenure, initiated with the *Manitoba Act*, offered them an excellent opportunity to take advantage on uncertain legal situation.\(^7\)

In sum, the formative years of Winnipeg saw a broad dispute among different actors to obtain profits offered by the commodification of land. The transformation of one regime of land tenure, organized according to the necessities of the HBC, to another regime, organized according to the necessities of a capitalist state, exacerbated disputes over ownership of “common” land.

**Common Land and the Hay Privilege**

In 1855, several years after Lord Selkirk’s death, the HBC took over the administration of the settlement. The colony now extended into twenty-four parishes

\(^7\) Uncertainties about land tenure happened also in previous times. Archer Martin has described the way Selkirk and the HBC held land registers and also the controversies about the meanings of lease hold and free hold. See Archer Martin, *The Hudson’s Bay Company’s Land Tenures and the Occupation of Assiniboia by Lord Selkirk Settlers, with a List of Grantees under the Earl and the Company* (London: William Clowes and Sons Limited, 1898), 87. Similarly, Joseph J. Hargrave has mentioned the controversies generated by deeds and documents before 1870. See Joseph James Hargrave, *Red River* (Montreal: Printed for the author by J. Lovell, 1871), 309-310. The *Manitoba Act* inherited those controversies and exacerbated the uncertainties in moments when land was increasingly becoming a commodity.
along both sides of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. When the Company surveyed the land and tried to extend land titles to Selkirk’s settlers, it encountered great difficulties. The informality of Selkirk’s system of registering grants and lack of proper documentation complicated the process of granting tenure. Most of the colony’s settlers were occupants in good faith because they did not hold a valid land title or a patent of any sort. As lawyer Archer Martin found in 1898, there were no clear evidences or documents to demonstrate Selkirk’s grants to the settlers.\(^8\) The HBC, nevertheless, did not make a substantial change to improve this situation and continued to use an informal method of lot register. Archer Martin provided as an example the certificates submitted by Governor George Simpson, which were “almost invariably written on a manuscript blank in an engrossing hand, [and] the spaces being filled in nearly always by the signer.”\(^9\) Claimants were, thus, able to delineate the boundaries of their property or to claim land they had never occupied.

The appropriation of the new space was carried out in a legal vacuum, an activity inventing its own rules or accommodating to settlers’ previous experiences. Selkirk had already drafted the plan of the settlement in one of his visits and newcomers to the colony consequently used a system similar to that used in Scotland to lay out lots: “a cultivated infield and an outfield pasture.”\(^10\) In that way, river lots that developed in the settlement followed a straight pattern of “the land divided into long narrow strips and at right angles

\(^8\) Martin, The Hudson’s Bay Company’s Land Tenures, 32.

\(^9\) Ibid., 48.

\(^10\) Weaver, The Great Land Rush, 253.
to the general course of the river.”\textsuperscript{11} According to this system, the first two miles of inner land were for farming and construction of dwellings, the outer two miles were for the cultivation of hay and pasture. In almost all the parishes the use of the outer two miles was commonly known as “Hay Privilege,” a permission granted by the Council of Assiniboia to river lot holders to cut hay from August 1\textsuperscript{st} to the 15\textsuperscript{th} of each year.\textsuperscript{12}

**Point Douglas and the Point Douglas Common**

By the 1870s, many of the original settlers, former HBC employees, and newcomers had established stores, workshops, and houses in Point Douglas and in the vicinity of Point Douglas Common. These settlers were commemorated in streets’ names. Barber, Edward, Logan, Alexander, Gomez, Sutherland, Schultz, Bannatyne, McDermot, and Ross Streets, among others, reveal the prominent figures of a city in its making. As Figure 2 shows, lots less regular and smaller than in other parts of St. John Parish formed the 224 acres of Point Douglas. As a consequence, the outer two miles were used more extensively and shared as a common by all the Point Douglas holders, a practice the HBC had accepted for many years. Moreover, the Common, especially the area located near the east and west sides of Main Street, became the most dynamic part of the town. Occupants appropriated a number of lots and by 1874, stores and commercial buildings initiated the transformation of the area into what would become a flourishing commercial district.

When the *Manitoba Act* was passed, Section 32 left space for discussions and political pressure. The *Act* established that those freehold grants made by the HBC before 8 March 1869 could be confirmed by the Crown at the holder’s request. During 1871, as the newspapers of the time showed, innumerable claimants attempted to secure land patents. On 17 March 1875 a memorandum of the Minister of the Interior authorized the issue of patents. Among the fifty-seven claims, Andrew McDermit, Andrew Bannatyne and Alexander Logan obtained patents for about 450 acres in the Parish of St.

---

12 “Council of Assiniboia,” *Nor’Wester*, 14 April 1860. See a complete map of Winnipeg with the layout of river lots in Appendix 6.

13 See, for instance, “Land Claims,” *Manitoban and Northwest Herald*, 2 September 1871, 3. This is just one example of the number of claims published in the *Manitoban*. 
John, while John Sutherland obtained a patent for about 400 acres in Headingley.\textsuperscript{14} Others settlers, particularly those who held properties in Point Douglas, became concerned about the interpretation of article 5 of Section 32, especially that of the commutation of the rights of common and of cutting hay.\textsuperscript{15}

Alerted by the prospect of a future allotment by the government, Point holders, as they came to be called, decided to claim that the 667 acres of the whole Common should be divided among them. Some of the holders had already occupied sections of the Common for several years and others had even divided and sold an important number of lots. On 24 July 1872 in a meeting held at Point Douglas, John Sutherland, Edmund L. Barber, Alexander M. Brown, Walter R. Bown, and William Gomez Fonseca were appointed trustees for the interests of twenty-five Point holders. Their task was to sell the whole Common, report the sales, and “return a true account of their act.”\textsuperscript{16} The majority of the claimants signed the petition and agreed to the sale of the whole common and to share the profits in equal parts, with the exception of Neil McDonald’s heirs who “should have a double share or portion in said Common.”\textsuperscript{17} McDonald had been one of the first settlers of Point Douglas and he had already appropriated several “common” lots since he settled in the area in 1827. Apparently, Point holders acknowledged McDonald’s rights as

\textsuperscript{14} Library and Archives Canada. Privy Council Office, series A-1-a, volume 331, Reel C-3311, Order-in-Council Number 1875-0257.

\textsuperscript{15} Canada. Statutes, An Act to amend and continue the Act 32 and 33 Victoria, Chapter 3; and to establish and provide for the Government of the Province of Manitoba, 26.

\textsuperscript{16} The information was extracted from the case known as Court of Queens’s Bench in Equity, McDonald et al. v. Fonseca et al. Register of Pleadings No. 1, Suit No. 333, 7 May 1880. The document was obtained from Barber’s fonds. Archives of Manitoba. Edmund L. Barber fonds. “In the Queen’s Bench.” MG 14 C66, Box 7 3002/3, 1880, 3.

\textsuperscript{17} Ibid., 5.
one of the first settlers and allowed his heirs a double share in a future sale, or, perhaps, they did not want to argue that exceptional concession because some of the Point holders had also appropriated Common lots, especially some that faced Main Street.\(^{18}\)

In 1870, the *Manitoba Act*, especially Section 32, had attempted to settle all land claims and to initiate a new organization of land tenure. Certainly, the process of quieting land titles was more complicated when dealing with the unclear definition of “common land.” On 30 October 1873 a Royal Commission was appointed to investigate almost two hundred claims for the commutation of rights of common and of cutting hay in the Parishes of St. Paul and St. Charles. The Commission recommended granting river lot owners the outer two miles they had used for several years. In case the hay lands were of less value or occupied by parks or under other claims, the Commission recommended to issue scrip “redeemable in unoccupied Government lands.”\(^{19}\) On 17 April 1874 an Order-in-Council approved the Commission’s Report and granted the titles with the exception of the St. Boniface and Point Douglas Commons which would be “referred to a special Commission composed of the three judges of the Court of Queen’s Bench.”\(^{20}\)

\(^{18}\) According to records, newcomers like Fonseca considered old settlers as “owners from tradition.” McDonald had been an occupant of the Common since 1827. See Archives of Manitoba. Court of Queen’s Bench in Equity. *Robert McDonald et al. v. William Gomez Fonseca et al.* “Examination of Mary McDonald.” B14 5 12, Box 108, ATG. 0014, Acc. G181, Pocket 403, 1885. It is interesting to note that Fonseca, apart of being one of the trustees of the Point holders, was one of the executors of Neil McDonald’s will in representation of their heirs. McDonald had had eleven children but only five were the beneficiaries of the will. The other element that called the attention was the fact that lot 12, beside Fonseca’s property, had largely been transformed into city lots by 1874 according to maps. See detail in Appendix 7.

\(^{19}\) Canada, *Royal Commission to Inquire into and Report upon Claims to Rights of Cutting Hay and Common in the Province of Manitoba*, Canadian Federal Royal Commission Reports, no. 8 (Ottawa, 1874).

There is no substantial information regarding the Point Douglas trustees’ activities during this period other than Fonseca’s involvement in politics as alderman of the City for the North Ward and John Sutherland as a senator. In May 1877, however, the Point holders and trustees met again. An Order-in-Council had “recommended a certain settlement of the claims preferred by the holders of lots at Point Douglas to the large tract of unoccupied land known as Point Douglas Common.”\textsuperscript{21} The OC established a grant based on an acre-for-acre entitlement as it was agreed in other parishes and recommended the issue of patents for 226.07 acres in the Common, the actual area at that moment of the Point Douglas. The offer was refused by the Point holders because they considered that their right of common and of cutting hay involved the whole Common (667 acres). If they accepted the offer, they would receive a smaller portion of the Common than they originally claimed. However, those who had already occupied the Common continued to do so and, most importantly, they also continued transferring their “occupancy” to other individuals. For instance, to raise money to develop part of the common, to make a survey, draw maps, and construct streets the Trustees had already sold 26 acres of the Common.\textsuperscript{22}

Fonseca, in the meantime, despite his position as one of the Trustees of the Point Douglas holders, understood in advance the terms under which the city would be developed. He foresaw the new profitable possibilities of the land market and, acting very quickly, he separated from the group of Point holders and trustees and claimed part of the


\textsuperscript{22} Library and Archives Canada. Privy Council Office, series A-1-a, volume 392, Reel C-3330, Order-in-Council Number 1880-1174.
Common as his own. His initial claim was for 160 acres, which corresponded to about ten chains of Lot 35 of the Common.  

23 Fonseca had disputed for a long time the possession of that land but after negotiations with the Land Office he agreed to claim only twenty-five acres. On 5 December 1879, he obtained, instead, a patent for seventeen acres. The land granted also included lots CDE and F strategically situated in Block 14, just beside McDonald’s lot No. 12 near Main Street. Fonseca obtained the patent signed and stamped by Surveyor General Col. Dennis who stated in the document that, according to evidences presented by Fonseca, “the said lands, and his claims to such grant having been duly investigated by us, found duly entitled thereto.”  

24 Fonseca’s patent opened the path for new claims before the Minister of the Interior. William Logan was Fonseca’s brother-in-law and shared with him some parts of the same lots. Also, since 1866, he was partner with Edmund L. Barber in the general store built on one of the lots.  

25 When Logan noticed the way Fonseca had obtained the patent, he also claimed a patent for lots CDE and F, but the Minister of the Interior refused his claim.  

26 Those who had political connections, on the other hand, exercised their influence in Ottawa to accelerate the process of securing property. On 1 June 1880, for instance, when John Schultz went to Ottawa to meet the Prime Minister, John

---

23 See Figure 1 in page 19.

24 See Manitoba, In the Supreme Court of Canada between William Gomez Fonseca and John Christian Schultz Appellants (Defendants) and Her Majesty’s Attorney-General for Canada (Winnipeg: McIntyre Bros., 1888), 246.

25 Ibid., 36.

26 Ibid., 17.
Sutherland took the opportunity to remind Macdonald about some personal interests in the Point Douglas. He wrote:

As Dr. Schultz is about leaving for Ottawa intending to see you personally on a matter in which he interests himself on my behalf regarding certain interests I hold in the Point Douglas Common and as I understand, the Dr. has forwarded to you [a memorial] the object of which is asking to place me on something of an equal footing with himself by you causing a Patent to issue to me for ten acres of land in Point Douglas Common immediately in rear of the portion lately patented to William Gomez Fonseca.27

Other claimants with lesser political connections, also, attempted to secure their claims before the Court.

As the city expanded, the interest in the real estate market increased. Moreover, the prospect of the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) main line in the city multiplied the value of city lots. Almost everyone who held property in Point Douglas or who had bought city lots in the Common attempted to secure a patent. Once the Point holders realized the conditions in which the trustees, especially Fonseca, had been managing their business and had obtained patents, they appeared before the Court to solve disputes. The heirs of the late Neil McDonald along with Jane Bruce, Charlotte Groat, and Thomas Lusted presented on 7 May 1880 a *Bill of Complaint* before the Court of Queen’s Bench in Equity defending their land holding rights on Point Douglas and the Point Douglas Common.28 A number of other prominent members of Point Douglas, on the other hand, appeared before the Court as Defendants and claimed rights to the same land.

---


28 *McDonald et al. v. Fonseca et al.*
Neil McDonald was born in Scotland and worked for the HBC from 1813 to 1827 when he retired from the Company, settled in Point Douglas and married Ann, one of Robert Logan’s daughters. McDonald died in 1871 leaving to his children Robert, Kenneth, Mary, William, and Jane “his share and interest in the Point Douglas.” At first sight, this case appeared to be mainly a family confrontation over land titles—McDonald’s heirs were family related to the defendants Fonseca, Barber, Alexander Logan, and Margaret Logan Fonseca—but this dispute certainly demonstrates the strategies used by the nascent bourgeoisie to secure property regardless their family connections. McDonald had long been established in the area and, according to the Bill of Complaint, he had a solid right to a share of the Common because he was “under the license and authority of the Hudson’s Bay Company in undisturbed occupancy and in actual and peaceable possession of that part of lot number 244 in the Parish of Saint John.” Some of the defendants’ shares in the Common, however, were more complicated to prove because they had sold, mortgaged, and conveyed land and titles in

29 Patrick Moore’s exploration of the life of Robert, McDonald’s second son, has helped to build the family relations in the Point Douglas case discussed in this chapter. See Patrick Moore “Archdeacon Robert McDonald and Gwich’in Literacy,” Anthropological Linguistics 49, no. 1 (Spring 2007): 29.

30 McDonald et al. v. Fonseca et al., 2. Kenneth McDonald became alderman in 1884 and, according to the press, he was the largest land holder in Ward 3. See “Mr. Kenneth McDonald,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 24 December 1883, 2.

31 Neil McDonald’s wife, Ann, was the daughter of Robert Logan and the sister of Alexander Logan, Barbara Logan Barber, and Thomas Logan. Fonseca’s wife, Margaret, was Thomas Logan’s daughter. The information about William Logan, involved also in this case, is rather ambiguous. Fonseca declared in documents that William was his brother-in-law; thus, son of Thomas Logan. Other sources suggest that he was son of Robert Logan and, hence, Barber’s brother-in-law. See Lilian Gibbons, “How Dr. Schultz Escaped from Jail,” Manitoba Pageant 4, no. 2 (January 1959), http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/pageant/04/schultzescape.shtml.

32 McDonald et al. v. Fonseca et al., 3.
the parish in operations after the HBC’s transfer to the Dominion, as it was shown in the 
*Bill of Complaint* presented by McDonald’s heirs and others (See Appendix 1).

Section 32(1) of the *Manitoba Act* clearly explained who could claim land titles: “All grants of land in freehold made by the Hudson’s Bay Company up to the eight day of March, in the year 1869, shall if required by the owner, be confirmed by grant from the Crown.” After March 1869 several transactions in real estate occurred and the buyers, concerned by Section 32 (1) of the *Manitoba Act*, claimed a share in the Common as well because, as Section 15 of the *Bill of Complaint* showed, “The owners of lots in Point Douglas in the foregoing paragraphs mentioned, became entitled to receive letters patent from the Crown confirming their respective rights in the said Point Douglas and Point Douglas Common.” The Queen’s Bench accepted their claims but the Point holders, the Common occupants and the new owners faced another problem. Since they were appointed,

Trustees have sold and conveyed a large portion of the said Common, and have received large sums of money therefore for which they have never accounted in any way to your complainants or any of the said parties entitled to such account, but have always refused, and neglected, and do still refuse and neglect to do so.

Fonseca, as the Attorney-General declared, had received a patent “as an act of grace” but his good luck did not go so far in this instance. The Queen’s Bench charged that he, Bown, John Sutherland, John Schultz, and John McTavish

---

33 *Manitoba Act*, 32-1.


35 Ibid., 5-25.

36 As Attorney-General A. Campbell declared in the appeal. See Manitoba, *In the Supreme Court of Canada*, 8.
[H]ave in fraud of the rights of the parties interested in the said common, secretly and with intent to defraud them of their rights therein, applied for and obtained a patent of land in the said Common in which the parties interested in the said common are entitled to share, by falsely representing himself to be entitled thereto in his own rights.37

The decision of the Court of Queen’s Bench went further indeed. The Court established that “the trustees may be restrained…from selling, disposing…or assuming to deal with the land in the said Common” and “that the Patents issued to the defendants William Gomez Fonseca, John C. Schultz and John McTavish may be declared to be void and ordered to be delivered up to be cancelled.”38

The government wanted to finish the case as soon as possible. If other settlers noticed the way Fonseca had obtained his land patent, it was possible that they would file a claim in the same terms. They too might claim to have occupied lots in unusual situations and “have gone into possession and made improvements since 15th July, 1870 on the said Common and…stand ready on similar information to assert their claims on similar grants.”39 The Queen’s Bench sent a clear message to the community. Even if the individuals involved in the disputes were part of the city’s most prominent persons, they had to be stopped or else it would be impossible to prevent other squatters from filing claims. The government was aware of that situation and wanted to settle the differences and to finish the case. In a Memorandum dated 21 June 1880, John A. Macdonald established a distribution on an acre-for-acre entitlement and the Point Douglas holders,

37 McDonald et al. v. Fonseca et al., 5.
38 Ibid., 7.
39 Manitoba, In the Supreme Court of Canada, 9.
this time, accepted the offer.\textsuperscript{40} Two years later, on 6 June 1883 a draw among the twenty-five Point holders distributed 887 city lots (see Appendix 1) that corresponded to about 224 acres of the Point Douglas Common.\textsuperscript{41} The Crown had already granted seventeen acres for the construction of the CPR station\textsuperscript{42} and reserved the rest for future endeavours. Sutherland, according to the results of the draw, obtained ninety-one city lots, which were about twenty acres, ten acres more than what he had earlier sought from Macdonald. The city lots were distributed unevenly all over the 224 acres reserved for the Point holders.

In 1872, the \textit{Manitoba Free Press} praised those who had arrived to be part of the “vast lottery of this territory.”\textsuperscript{43} The “lottery,” eventually, benefited a very few. Fonseca and Barber, who assisted during the draw as witnesses and representatives of the Point Douglas owners, obtained in the draw a significant number of city lots. Documents also suggested that they did not distribute the city lots obtained in the draft properly. In 1885 Neil McDonald’s daughter, Mary, complained that in July 1884 the Trustees had extended her the deed for only twelve city lots instead of 140 as the draft had established.\textsuperscript{44} The race to obtain city lots did not represent a way to accumulate

\textsuperscript{40} Library and Archives Canada. Privy Council Office, series A-1-a, volume 392, Reel C-3330, Order-in-Council Number 1880-1174.

\textsuperscript{41} According to draw held on 6 June 1883. Library and Archives Canada. Privy Council Office, series A-1-a, volume 433, Reel C-3344, Order-in-Council Number 1883-1321.


\textsuperscript{43} “Winnipeg, Size, Growth, and Development of the Metropolis of Manitoba and the North-West,” \textit{Manitoba Free Press}, 9 November 1872, 5.

\textsuperscript{44} “Examination of Mary McDonald,” 1885. The original documents found were in bad shape and unsorted. Moreover, dates, seals, and signatures in the majority of the documents were neatly cut. It was very difficult to follow the end of this case because it had different parties who appealed to the Queen’s Bench.
possession, but to transform them into a commodity which changed and increased its exchange value as the City expanded and improved.45 Certainly, Fonseca, Barber and others obtained the city lots in the Common when the wave of land speculation had already finished, but, nevertheless, they secured urban space in the most dynamic and valuable area of the city.46

The lottery certainly attempted to finish a long legal battle between the government and the Point holders, but Fonseca and William Logan continued the litigation for lots CDE and F in the Common. The Queen’s Bench decision that had favoured some of the Point holders in 1880 encouraged William Logan to present on 29 April 1882 another claim. He argued that the lots granted to Fonseca belonged to him as well and that he could present evidence of occupancy.47 The case reached the Supreme Court of Canada and both parties presented before the Court their arguments defending their rights to those lots. Fonseca was experiencing difficulties trying to collect evidence of occupancy and improvement48 but the case unveiled the strategy he had used to secure a patent. His relationship with John C. Schultz, by that time Member of Parliament, “lessened” the lack of evidences. As the documents revealed, Fonseca had promised

to the supreme Court of Canada in different periods, well beyond the scope of this thesis. However, as information showed, Mary’s brother, Kenneth was the principal land holder in Ward 3. That was probably consistent with the distribution of estates at that time; Kenneth was the primogeniture, and women obtained nothing or very little.


46 A brief look at the City of Winnipeg’s Tax Assessment Roll for the year 1883-84 shows that Fonseca, Sutherland, Schultz, his wife Agnes Schultz, Barber, Bown, and Bruce had obtained hundreds of city lots in the Common. See City of Winnipeg Archives and Records Control. Assessment Roll, Ward 5, 1884.

47 Manitoba, In the Supreme Court of Canada, 9.

48 Ibid., 8.
Schultz “that in case a patent of any portion of the said Common was granted under the said application and petition to the defendant Fonseca, he would convey one-half thereof to the defendant Schultz.” Undoubtedly, Fonseca had anticipated the success of Schultz’s influence in Ottawa to secure the patent.

The disputes and the uncertainties between parties not only related by business but related by family ties as well, showed how individuals tried to exploit the weakness of the state in order to secure personal benefits. Logan presented before the Supreme Court of Canada several evidences of how he had acquired, improved and sold those lots he was claiming to own. His attorney argued before the Court that “it may now fairly be asked by what title did Logan hold his property, build upon it, line upon it, mortgage upon it… He had no title at all?” When Surveyor General Dennis was asked about the exceptional circumstances in which those lots were granted to Fonseca and if he remembered why he had approved the petition for land, he said, “Certainly I don’t remember.” Schultz gave a similar response and declared that he did buy Fonseca’s half-interest and that he had acted on bona-fide. The Attorney-General of Canada declared, as the Manitoba Queen’s Bench had established earlier, that the Crown “in respect of those four lots, to have issued improvidently and through error, and in ignorance of the rights of the several persons mentioned in the information [the Court case], and that the patent may be set aside…and

49 Ibid., 6.
50 Ibid. 9.
51 Ibid.
52 Ibid., 15.
53 Ibid., 22.
declared absolutely null and void, and of no effect.”

Fonseca and Schultz, nevertheless, appealed both decisions and, ultimately, obtained the patents.

**Real Estate**

The disputes over urban land in the Point Douglas case showed the strategies that different actors used to secure property when real estate had become the central business of Winnipeg. Certainly, disputed land was not all located in the Point Douglas area. Court cases and appeals for improper issuing of patents or for inheritance claims covered almost all the province in the period studied in this thesis.

Randy R. Rostecki, for instance, explored the dispute over land titles in the Armstrong’s Point in the 1870s between Francis E. Cornish and Captain Joseph Hill, the first occupant. Although a few buildings had been constructed in the area, Armstrong’s Point was almost uninhabited prior to 1880.

The importance of the Point Douglas case, on the other hand, resides in

---


55 Fonseca and Schultz appealed several times with success and revoked the Queen’s Bench decision; their patents, at the end, remained valid. In 1895 an Order-in-Council established compensation to Eliza Mercer whose husband had bought parts of lots CDE and F to William Logan. The decision of this case prolonged for almost twenty years. See In the Supreme Court of Canada. *Appeal from the Court of Queen’s Bench for Manitoba between William Gomez Fonseca and John Christian Schultz, (Appellants) and Her Majesty’s Attorney-General for Canada, at and by the Relation of Eliza Mercer, Informant (Respondent).* The Case. (Winnipeg: Manitoba Free Press, 1888) and Library and Archives Canada. Privy Council Office, series A-1-a, volume 671, Reel C-3631, Order-in-Council Number 1895-0527.


that many of the members of the nascent bourgeoisie had established residence in the area and developed and transformed it into a marketable space ready to be commodified.

This pattern had been established earlier. Since the *Manitoba Act* was passed, two different views of urban development evolved in Winnipeg preparing for the emergence of the real estate market, the HBC land strategy and the development of the Point Douglas promoted by the growing business community. The division of the HBC Reserve in Upper Fort Garry into city lots attempted to follow a very well planned strategy in order to attract investors and newcomers. Newspapers articles, letters to the editor, pamphlets, booklets, and books promoted the opening up of the West for settlement and the Company soon climbed onto that wave of endless optimism characteristic of the times.58 In the spring of 1872 the Company announced the future sale of city lots in the Reserve. Donald Smith strategically postponed the sale for some time and on 27 July 1872 the first city lots in the Reserve were sold. Bannatyne bought the first lot for $1,000 and by the evening he had already sold it for $500 more. Other lots, said the *Manitoban*, “were again sold…at a still further advance.”59 The wave of speculation in city lots had already started.

By 1874, the Company’s lots had increased their value almost three times compared to the value of 1871, similar to lots in other areas, such as Bannatyne and

---


The Company’s sale strategy, however, was disputed by the *Manitoba Free Press*. They argued that the HBC had “retarded the growth of Winnipeg…holding their property at very high prices, and almost impossible terms of purchase for the majority.”

Even though the Company at that moment had not yet secured a land patent from the government, the improvement of the Reserve continued. On 15 October 1874, 200 building lots located on the Reserve or Lot No. 1 (See Figure 1) went to auction. The conditions of sale were very “liberal” and “extended over four years,” as the advertisement showed.

In 1874 Winnipeg had almost 2,000 inhabitants and it continued growing. The Point Douglas holders were in dispute over the ownership of the Common but the certainties of a rapid urban development increased their interest in improving the area. At a meeting held on 20 October 1874 Point Douglas residents resolved to set apart twelve acres of the Common to lay out a market “upon the condition that the Corporation plant…with trees and make other improvements.” As the city expanded availability of city lots within the areas of Point Douglas and the HBC Reserve became limited and, consequently, prices soared. The relatively empty space that once divided the domain of

---

60 “The Increase in Value,” *Daily Free Press* (Winnipeg), 7 July 1874, 6.

61 “Winnipeg, Size, Growth, and Development of the Metropolis of Manitoba and the North-West,” 5.

62 Selwood and Baril, 111.


64 Artibise, *Winnipeg: A Social History*, 130.

the Company from that of the old settlers soon disappeared and to the eyes of newcomers the city resembled a burgeoning place full of opportunities.

Those who had secured a city lot within the core area began building up stores, houses and tenements. Hotels, boarding houses and rental units soon became insufficient to accommodate demand as immigrants flooded the city in search for jobs or business opportunities. The real estate market expanded in such a magnitude that “it was estimated by the City Registrar that about $1,250,000 had been invested in urban real estate during 1880, averaging about $25,000 a week.” Partnership between local businessmen or individuals representing British and eastern investments firms opened offices in Winnipeg and invested in real estate and in the construction of new buildings. The Real Estate, Loan, and Debenture Company from Great Britain, for instance, invested about $500,000 in real estate. W. H. Lyon, Alexander Logan, H. S. Crotty, and R. J. Whitla, among other local investors created the “Great North-West” Joint Stock Building and Loan Society to erect affordable housing to accommodate the “influx of settlers to this city.” In 1881 and 1882 about 700 new buildings and stores were planned and built while others were still under construction. The rhythm of construction, however, lagged behind the real needs for dwellings. As new workers arrived in the city, the availability of houses became limited and in that way the price of rental units increased, so that accommodation in boarding became very expensive.

---

67 Steen and Boyce, 19-20.

For those individuals in search of quick revenues the HBC, as the main land holder in the city, offered endless opportunities. The Company asked the buyer only one fifth of the total price of the lot to initiate the sale and the rest would be paid once the transaction was completed. This procedure intensified sales in such a way that lots were sold several times before the last buyer secured a proper title.69 By 1882 the demand for city lots declined and so did the forthcoming payments. Once the second and third payment fell due, investors and lenders faced economic uncertainties and bankruptcies. The market soon collapsed. By 1885, the value of city property had fallen by 50 to 75 per cent and city lots sold at values below those of 1880.70

The Torrens System

The Point Douglas case demonstrated the difficulty the Canadian state faced trying to enforce legality and proper land tenure and ownership in the West prairie. Moreover, the methodology used to issue and transfer scrip, titles, and deeds during the real estate boom increasingly complicated the registration of land titles. Had Manitoba adopted the Torrens system, suggests Greg Taylor, the province would have prevented the chaotic administration of land tenure and titles as exemplified in the case highlighted in this chapter.71 Manitoba, like other places in the English-speaking world, continued to use British common law. Transfers and sales of land were guided by deed, a private document between the parties. Under this deed, the holder had to show his right to sell the land going back to previous holders and the investigation could go further until the


70 The Winnipeg Real Estate Register, March 1885, 1-2.
first legitimate owner, if needed. In Logan’s case, for instance, his lawyer had demonstrated how Logan had acquired and transferred his land, or at least he could present some proofs. Different was the case of Fonseca, who, having had difficulties in obtaining pertinent documentation, relied on Schultz and his political connection to obtain a land patent. As Taylor argues, “because the documents were in private hands, the potential for fraud and forgery was great.”

The Torrens system aimed to overcome this burden. Originated in South Australia in the 1850s to resolve the difficulties of land acquisition and transfer there, it was adopted in British North America in Vancouver Island in 1861 and it proved its effectiveness in reducing the bureaucracy and the cost of lawyers and encouraged anyone to buy and sell land. Under the common law, those who could afford lawyers were the most likely to engage in real estate operations. The Torrens system, in contrast, reduced the burdens and uncertainties of securing a solid land title and only demanded the payment of a fee for transaction to register the title with the intervention of a central authority managed by the state.

By the 1880s, in Canada only British Columbia used a limited version of the Torrens system. In other places, such as the North-West Territories, the system “sank without a trace.” In Ontario, however, the Canada Land Law Amendment Association

72 Ibid., 5-6.
73 Ibid., 6.
74 For a further explanation of the Torrens System, see Ibid., 3-13.
75 Ibid., 73.
(CLLAA) founded in March 1883 by Beverly Jones and J. H. Mason set the principles for the adoption of the Torrens in Eastern Canada. In Manitoba, the uncertainty of titles exacerbated the problems caused by the collapse of the real estate boom of 1880-82. The ensuing wave of bankruptcies and unpaid lots stimulated interest in the Torrens system and a more organized system to register land. Informed of the activities of the CLLAA in Ontario, F. B. Ross, a Winnipeg conveyancer and partner in the Western Canada Land and Saving Company, invited Jones to introduce the Association in Manitoba and to talk about the prospects of the Torrens system. Days later, in a meeting held at the Winnipeg Stock Exchange, the Manitoba branch of the Land Law Amendment Association was born. Real estate agents, lawyers, bankers, and land speculators sat in the first board that wrote the association’s constitution and also outlined the first draft of a bill regarding the Torrens system to be presented before Premier Norquay.

The identities of some of the members of the recently founded association explain the interest in the Torrens system. Charles J. Brydges was Land Commissioner of the HBC and had been lately receiving increasing pressure from the Company’s stockholders regarding the way he managed the sale of the land and his position, thus, was under scrutiny. Andrew Bannatyne had lost almost all his investments in land. A. W. Ross

76 Ibid., 74.
77 “Land Transfer Question,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 9 June 1883, 8.
made a fortune by speculating with land not only in the city but also in suburban lots.\textsuperscript{81} He had become one of the HBC’s principal debtors and was already in difficulties to collect payments he should receive from lesser speculators who had stopped meeting their instalment.\textsuperscript{82} The interest in the Torrens system, nevertheless, covered almost all the city’s elite which in one form or another were immersed in the wave of land speculation of 1881-82 and bound together both individual land entrepreneurs and corporate developers.

After an earlier setback, on March 1884, the association presented a modified bill to the Attorney-General who, nevertheless, considered that “it would be impossible to introduce the system and work it with any degree of satisfaction till the titles to land were quieted once in Manitoba.”\textsuperscript{83} A year later, on March 1885, a delegation headed by Charles J. Brydges, president of the association along with A. G. B. Bannatyne, Alderman Spencer, J. B. McKilligan, E. G. Conklin and F. B. Ross and other prominent businessmen and politicians lobbied the provincial legislature to urge the introduction of the bill.\textsuperscript{84} On 17 April 1885 the Legislature discussed the Bill and six months later the Torrens system was established under the Manitoba’s Real Property Act of 1885.\textsuperscript{85} The different fragments of the emergent bourgeoisie had successfully lobbied the provincial

\textsuperscript{81} David G. Burley, “Ross, Arthur Wellington,” in Dictionary of Canadian Biography Online (University of Toronto/Université Laval, 2000), http://www.biographi.ca/009004-119.01-e.php?&id_nbr=7036.

\textsuperscript{82} J. E. Rea, introduction to Brydges, The Letters of Charles John Brydges, 1883-1889, Hudson’s Bay Company Land Commissioner, lli.

\textsuperscript{83} “Important Legislation,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 26 March 1884, 3.

\textsuperscript{84} “The Torrens System,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 16 March 1885, 4.

\textsuperscript{85} Taylor, The Law of the Land, 140.
state and had guaranteed the tools needed to manage the commodification of land after
several years of uncertainties and land disputes.

**Conclusion**

The cases explored in this chapter can be analyzed as legal disputes between
parties to solve private issues, but more than legality inspired the ruling elite to contest
their personal interests in court. The Point Douglas case, more importantly, illustrates the
mechanisms of land appropriation and the tools utilized to obtain advantage in a period of
uncertainties and state formation in Canada. The change from a system of land tenure
based on “common” usage to another based on private property had to be resolved by
using the tools of the recently formed nation state. The management of these tools,
nevertheless, had to be defined by using the political balance and the relations with the
central political power in Ottawa.

By 1880, Winnipeg’s population had reached 8,000 inhabitants; however, a small
group of individuals related by family and commercial connections attempted to control
the public and private life of the city. For Artibise and Careless, these men represented a
particular breed of entrepreneurs: “city boosters,” who added a certain prairie
characteristic to their particular way of doing business. This “particularity,” though, was
similar to that practiced by the ruling elite of Adelaide in Australia, or Chicago, or later in
Calgary, Regina or Vancouver.⁸⁶ As we have seen in the case of Winnipeg, the names of
Fonseca, Logan, Barber, Schultz, Bannatyne, and Sutherland built a pool of common

---

interests based on family, economic, and political links. The majority of scholars have referred to them as “speculators”, making a distinction, perhaps, from those who increased their wealth doing business in a “correct way”, less speculatively. What the *McDonald v. Fonseca* case showed was that some among Winnipeg’s elite built a network of solidarity bound by a common interest in the appropriation of common land. The case also showed that the development of capitalism in Winnipeg set aside the initial family solidarity. Close family members such as Fonseca, Barber, or Logan and others with direct political connections, like Schultz and Sutherland, acting alone or in partnership tried to obtain benefits for themselves at the expense of the interests of those whom they represented as Trustees, even their own family members.

“booster” by promoting the expansion of towns with a defined “particularity”, similar to that that Artibise characterizes as “prairie particularity”.
Chapter 3

Class

In that busy and pulseful neighbourhood is the germ and epitome of iron-works, which will ere long grow to such dimensions and importance as to cloud the vicinity with its welcome smoke and furnish the “anvil chores” with its thousands of hammers to which this city will march to greatness and power.

Winnipeg Daily Sun, 24 November 1881

The economic uncertainties of Winnipeg in the spring of 1882 after the real estate bubble burst, saw an adjustment in the city’s economic structure. This became apparent in 1885 when the Board of Trade changed its composition. The new board elected reflected the economic interests of the most dynamic sector of the period, the wholesale business and the financial institutions.1 By 1885 the initial group of traders and entrepreneurs no longer dominated Winnipeg’s economic and political activities. Some had died, others had moved to other places, and others had retired from public scrutiny to enjoy the benefits obtained in previous years. Nonetheless, they had already spatially transformed the city and had initiated the formation of a class. Moreover, during Winnipeg’s formative years as a capitalist city, old settlers and newcomers started the city’s structural transformation that guaranteed the transition to industrial capitalism and

---

1 Kenneth McKenzie, a wholesale grocer was re-elected president and among the elected council were James Ashdown, R. J. Whitla, G. F. Galt, G. F. Stephens and S. A. D. Bertrand, who were agents of eastern companies, financiers, and wholesale businessmen. “The Board of Trade,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 4 February 1885, 1.
facilitated Winnipeg’s integration to the national economy. This chapter will discuss, first, the structural economic organization and development of Winnipeg after Confederation and second, how the changing relations of production in this transitional period organized and shaped the emergent bourgeoisie’s position as a ruling class.

Transition and Growth

The Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC), established in the North-West Territories and Rupert’s Land since 1670, held exclusive rights in the fur trade and in nearly every other economic activity for almost two hundred years. Aboriginal peoples, first, and then an increasing number of Métis, established a commercial relationship with the Company as suppliers of fur, robes and provisions. As they obtained expertise in the manufacture of leather, they became also suppliers of craft-produced articles. In this proto-industrial structure, Métis families increasingly became involved in more intense labour activities providing their fur products to the independent market.\(^1\) By mid-nineteenth century, however, the commercial equilibrium between the HBC and the different parties involved in the fur trade was flawed and unstable. For an increasing number of free traders, the HBC’s monopoly had become a restraint that limited more dynamic economic development, as the \textit{Nor’Wester}, for instance, argued.\(^2\) Similar concerns were raised by Ontario business people who had already considered the expansion of their investment to the West once the Hind expedition asserted the feasibility of a Western agrarian development.

At the time Manitoba entered Confederation the fur trade remained the principal economic activity and Winnipeg depended significantly on the variety of products

---

\(^2\) Ens, \textit{Homeland to Hinderland}, 6, 72-74.

\(^3\) “Preparing for the Spring Trade,” \textit{Nor’Wester}, 28 March 1860, 3.
arriving from London and eastern Canada via St. Paul. In 1869 the settlement constituted a loose group of buildings and a few stores (see Figure 3). As Alexander Begg recalled,

“we had no bank, no insurance office, no lawyers, only one doctor, no City Council, only one policeman, no taxes.” Apart from the HBC general store, the business community was composed of a small number of establishments: the general store of Andrew Bannatyne and Alexander Begg, Henry McKenney’s saw mill, Donaldson’s stationary store, the small general stores of William G. Fonseca and Edmund L. Barber, George

---

Emmerling’s hotel, and Monchamp’s bar.⁵ Among the eighteen business facilities, James Ashdown’s tin shop and Archibald Wright’s harness shop supplied the manufacture of the moment.⁶ In 1871 a brewery, a brick yard, a bakery, and a couple of harness shops were established and Winnipeg slowly began to show signs of growth.⁷ The construction of new buildings and the establishment of new businesses were detailed with precision in newspapers, booklets, and reports which described with a marked optimism the evolution of the village. In 1872 Winnipeg reached almost 1,500 inhabitants. The construction of 124 new buildings including dwellings, stores and warehouses, was described with detail by the *Manitoba Free Press*.⁸ In almost all publications the figures were anxiously compared with those of previous years to highlight the settlement’s evolution and improvements.

In 1874 Winnipeg had already formed its first municipal government and the thriving community seemed closer to realizing its promising future. It had 900 buildings, twenty-seven manufactures, and more than a hundred retail stores. The Merchant’s Bank had established its first branch in 1872 and the Ontario Bank opened in 1876, although it did not bring much capital.⁹ The importance of the emerging building industry can be observed by the number of suppliers established in this period. In 1874, among other business, there were four hardware stores, a marble workshop, three saw mills, six paint

---


⁶ Steen and Boyce, 10-11.

⁷ Ibid.


⁹ Archives of Manitoba. *Sixth Annual Report of the Winnipeg Board of Trade* (Winnipeg: Board of Trade, 1884), 7-8, MG 10 A2.
shops, two planning mills, and eight brick yards. The City Council approved a by-law enabling in 1874 the city to borrow $250,000 in order to initiate key infrastructural works; the most important were sewers, sidewalks, water works, street works and a market. The building industry had to supply the increasing demand for public works and at the same time had to build houses to provide accommodation for the incoming workers. In 1875 the city assessed properties for about $2,600,000 that corresponded to a population of 3,000, while other 2,000 persons were accounted as a mobile population. The following year the population had slightly increased but the property assessment showed a substantial improvement: $3,000,000.

Not only had the number of buildings increased, commercial activity experienced a significant change as well. The expansion of some retail and general store business into wholesale activities during this period explained the number of white-collar workers. Data extracted from the *Manitoba Directory* for the years 1876-77 showed that about 100 people worked as tellers, salesmen, and managers in the commercial area. Similarly, the officers working as public servants in the different departments of the federal, provincial

---

10 Elliot, 15-16.


12 The development of the construction industry experienced different forms of organization. While the construction of houses and buildings before the 1880s was predominantly made by skilled bricklayers and helpers, the expansion of public works in the same period demanded a crew of unskilled workers generally under the supervision of a contractor or sub-contractor. This pattern would change after the 1880s when industrial capitalism brought another work discipline and technology in the construction industry. See Gerry E. Berkowski, “A Tradition in Jeopardy: Building Trades Workers’ Responses to Industrial Capitalism in Winnipeg, 1880-1914” (M. A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1986).


and municipal governments had also increased.\textsuperscript{15} Certainly, the figures made available by directories and other publications were not precise nor complete, but help to understand the increasing importance of trades and professions in the expansion of the city. In the case of the construction workers the figures were probably more uncertain because of the mobile characteristic of the trade in this transitional period but the construction of new buildings and the expansion of public works brought an important number of journeymen to the city.\textsuperscript{16} As the Directory showed, more than a hundred labourers, seventy five carpenters and a number of plasterers and painters lived in Winnipeg in the period 1876-77.\textsuperscript{17}

In 1876 the frontier economy showed the first signs of industrialization. In June the Winnipeg Foundry and Machine Shops started advertising its services in the Manitoba Free Press, mainly dedicated to the repair of agricultural equipment.\textsuperscript{18} In October, the HBC mill leased to J. W. McLane was finished. A steam engine of 250 horse power ran the grinders with a capacity to process 1,350 bushels a day.\textsuperscript{19} In addition, a smaller mill, the Winnipeg City Mills, started business in the same period. Twelve

\textsuperscript{15} The figures showed in the Directory were not precise, indeed. According to the Directory’s editor, for instance, the HBC did not allow its employees to provide any information to the publication “regarding places of business, officers and departments.” See Manitoba Directory for 1876-77 (St. Boniface, Manitoba: LaRiviere and Gauvin, 1876).

\textsuperscript{16} See Berkowski, 26-30.

\textsuperscript{17} The official statistics of 1871 and 1881—the dates of both Federal Census—provide general information about the districts of Selkirk, Marquette or Lisgar. Winnipeg did not appear as a district alone. Directories’ information, on the other hand, was partial and sometimes incomplete or depended on the publishers’ decision. The information published in newspapers reflected, perhaps, the enthusiasm of the moment rather than the proper figures. It would be with the Manitoba Census of 1886 that the information about Winnipeg as a district can be interpreted with certain degree of reliability. Randy Rostecki has explained the difficulties of obtaining reliable information from that period, especially regarding the population of Winnipeg. See Rostecki “The Growth of Winnipeg,” 117-120.

\textsuperscript{18} “Winnipeg Foundry and Machine Shop,” Manitoba Free Press, 10 June 1876, 8.

\textsuperscript{19} “Winnipeg’s Wheat Grinder,” Manitoba Free Press, 7 October 1876, 2.
employees operated the new mill run by a 35 horse-power engine with a capacity to produce 200 sacks a day.\textsuperscript{20} In contrast to the small workshop and craft production, still widely predominant in Winnipeg, these bigger manufacturing facilities employed several workers who operated machines run by modern technology and by large steam engines.

The incorporation of these new industries initiated a course towards a steady modernization. The city had already been connected to other commercial centres by telegraph, a more efficient postal service and since the end of the 1850s by a steamboat route along the Red River. Even though steamboat operations accelerated to some extent the speed of doing business with the rest of the world, they had limited resources and were subject to weather conditions. For that reason, the business community eagerly discussed the construction of a railroad connection to the American railway. On 6 October 1877 the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) started the construction of the line that would connect Selkirk and St. Boniface with the international boundary and from there to the American line.\textsuperscript{21}

In October 1878 the Conservative Party won the federal election and John A. Macdonald was again Prime Minister. The election increased the interest in the transcontinental railroad and found Winnipeg’s business community actively engaged in the political discussions of the moment. In November a mass meeting demanded that the CPR main line should cross the Red River at Winnipeg, instead of at Selkirk as been planned.\textsuperscript{22} Certainly the railroad discussion and Macdonald’s promotion of the National

\textsuperscript{20} Begg and Nursey, Ten Years in Winnipeg, 137-138; “The Winnipeg City Mills,” Manitoba Free Press, 21 October 1876, 3.

\textsuperscript{21} “The Viceregal Visit,” Manitoba Free Press, 6 October 1877, 6.

\textsuperscript{22} “Railway Mass Meeting,” Manitoba Gazette, 16 November 1878, 3. See also Ruben Bellan, “Rails Across the Red - Selkirk or Winnipeg,” Manitoba Historical Society Transactions, no. 18, III (1961),
Policy intensified the interest in the development of the West. When the decision about the location of the CPR’s main line was taken, the arrival of an increasing number of immigrants searching for labour and business opportunities changed the geography of the small city. In 1879 about 16,000 immigrants arrived in the city; 2,000 of them were accommodated in the immigration sheds constructed by the government to provide limited housing facilities. The community was anxious in anticipation of the arrival of immigrants. Macdonald had promised the arrival of 25,000 immigrants, but in 1880 the numbers reflected a decrease of 4,000 from the numbers of the previous year. The Manitoba Free Press criticized the federal government for its bad immigration policy which, it claimed, had been “injurious to the interests of the North-West.” Regardless of this setback, the city continued growing in a steady pace and the property assessment testified that. By April 1880 the value of real estate and personal property had reached $4,000,000.

The expansion of the city became apparent with the increasing demand for imported goods and materials. Although partial and incomplete, the import and export figures published by the press reflected that dynamic. In 1871 the imports from the East were for the amount of $150,000. In 1880 these figures had increased to almost four millions and increasingly marked the integration of the West into the national and


23 Manitoba Free Press, 6 January 1880, 1.


international economy. A closer look at the items imported during 1879, for instance, reveals the pattern of growth. Groceries, dry goods, and settlers’ effects accounted for almost all the items imported in the period. In 1879, the import of capital goods did not represent a substantial change compared with those of previous years; however, in May 1880, the press’s monthly report showed a marked increase in import of machinery. In fact, it was the most important item, accounting for $103,722. This shift suggested that a new period of capital accumulation and economic growth had already been set in motion. The years 1880-82 showed a sensational growth in almost all the economic activities. Notably, at the top of the imported items, those related to the construction industry experienced a significant growth. Winnipeg imported iron and steel for $1,247,136 and wood for a million dollars.

The products of the fur trade had almost dominated the items exported until 1882. As United States Consul James W. Taylor reported, the export from Winnipeg to Britain in the period ending in June 1881 accounted for $250,383 where “all but $7,332…were undressed furs.” This pattern started to change. The production of first class wheat and other grains during the 1880s initiated the transformation of the Prairies into an agricultural export region. In 1880, the Banker’s Magazine estimated that the area under

26 “Increasing Commercial Importance of Manitoba,” The Trade Review, September 1881, 10. Gerald Friesen has followed U.S. Consul J. W. Taylor’s Reports on imports and exports and reaches a more complete understanding of the trade dynamic in the province during the period here analyzed. See Gerald Friesen, “Imports and Exports in the Manitoba Economy 1870-1890,” Manitoba History, no. 16 (Autumn 1988): 31-41. See also Appendix 4.


wheat in Manitoba would be two millions acres in 1881 and by 1883 four millions.\(^\text{30}\) Consul Taylor estimated that in 1885-86 Manitoba had exported through the American custom office more than a million bushels of different cereals, principally to eastern Canada.\(^\text{31}\) The agrarian production in the Winnipeg area was very limited indeed—the production occurred all over the province—but the city was the centre of the financial institutions of the West and as such it reflected the increase of the economic activity in different forms.\(^\text{32}\)

**Industry**

By 1880 industrial establishments in Winnipeg had augmented but had not significantly changed the mode of production. Small workshops and handicraft still dominated the industrial production; however, the number of employees in each industry had notably increased. A look at the *Directory* of 1882 shows that the majority of workers still performed skilled jobs such as woodworkers, blacksmiths, tinsmiths, or watchmakers in numerous small industrial establishments in the city.\(^\text{33}\) What would mark the difference was the establishment in 1881 of Vulcan Iron Works\(^\text{34}\) and the construction of the CPR shops in 1882, almost completed by the end of the year. These two industries brought to the city a new form of industrial organization in terms of technology and


\(^{32}\) Out of 22,882 persons dedicated to agricultural activities in Manitoba, only 329 lived in Winnipeg. See Canada. Dept. of Agriculture, *Census of Manitoba, 1885-6* (Ottawa: Maclean, Roger & Co., 1887), 106.

\(^{33}\) *Henderson's Winnipeg Manitoba, City Directory 1882* (Vancouver: Henderson Directories, 1882).

division of labour. Vulcan had incorporated several departments, each of them dedicated to different kind of works: the foundry, the machine shop, the boiler house, the pattern shop, the blacksmith shop, and the offices.\(^35\) Similarly, the CPR shops, yards, freight sheds, stores and offices housed different activities in different buildings and locations.\(^36\)

In addition to these two large industries, a number of small manufactories initiated operations during this period. According to the Census of 1885-86, the number of industrial establishments in the province had increased from those of 1881; however, as Table 1 shows, the number of workers had not significantly changed. Census data, nevertheless, suggests that the production process had experienced an important change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Industrial establishments in Manitoba 1881-1886(^37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. of establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hands employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yearly wages ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital invested ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of raw materials ($)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Value of production ($)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Canada. Dept. of Agriculture, *Census of Manitoba, 1885-6*.

Capital invested in different branches of industry had increased almost three times and the overall output value showed an increase of almost two times. This growth suggests that capital was used in the improvement of the means of production, the creation of new industries, and in the increasing mechanization. For instance, the number of flour mills rose from nineteen in 1881 to thirty-seven in 1885-86. Tin shops and iron works

\(^35\) "The Vulcan Iron Works," 5.


\(^37\) These figures are for the whole province but as the detail of industrial establishments in Table 7 (Appendix 4) shows, the majority of the industrial activity occurred in Winnipeg.
increased from eighteen to forty. Moreover, a great number of small industries not accounted in the previous census established in the period and added significant capital to Winnipeg’s industrial growth.38

The long economic depression that hit the world in the 1870s and 1880s demonstrated the fragility of the Western economy. Winnipeg was dramatically linked to the uncertainties of world capitalism and that particularly affected Winnipeg’s financial institutions. During the boom years of 1881-82 a considerable amount of speculative investment had arrived in Winnipeg. Once the crisis became apparent in the East, bankers withdrew money from Winnipeg to cover the losses in their headquarters in Montreal and Toronto, principally because investors were searching for more profitable places to put their money. The availability of capital in Winnipeg thus, experienced a serious reduction and creditors tightened their conditions for lending money locally.39

The crisis was strongly felt in the commercial activity and in the construction of buildings for speculative purposes, but it was experienced in almost all activities. By 1885 Winnipeg had completed the structural works necessary for the development of industrial capitalism. Street construction, a sewer system, water distribution, telegraph lines and railroads, among other developments, allowed the establishment of new factories, banks, and the construction of a dynamic commercial centre.

38 For a list of industries in 1885-86 see Appendix 6.

39 The Commercial complained about Manitoba’s dependence on eastern financiers and called for the formation of a local chartered bank which would defend Winnipeg’s capitalist interests. See “A Local Chartered Bank,” The Commercial (Winnipeg,) 16 January 1883, 308, and “Mr. C. S. Drummond,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 5 March 1883, 1.
**Class Structure**

The important economic transformations experienced in this transitional period helps to understand the dynamic process of class formation and consolidation in Winnipeg. The commodification of land placed some individuals in a position of privilege by augmenting their fortunes and extending their real estate interests. While some continued investing in real estate in different parts of the city or constructing buildings for rent, even after the real estate crisis of 1881-82, others transformed their investments into a more profitable business: loan and mortgages companies and private banking. The path followed by the members of the Winnipeg elite in these formative years was rather uneven but paramount in that period were those whom R. T. Naylor has defined as “the mercantile-financial entrepreneur[s].”

Investors, bankers, real estate agents, wholesalers, and agents of eastern firms established in this period in Winnipeg with endless optimism. Some of the old settlers and earlier newcomers who had previously established in Winnipeg as merchants and retailers understood the mechanism of capital circulation and reproduction. In association with recently arrived financiers and bankers founded investments, loans, and real estate firms by taking advantage of the enterprise enthusiasm of the 1880s. For instance, W. H. Lyon, Alexander Logan, T. Graham Philips, Henry S. Crotty, Robert J. Whitla, Richard W. Jameson, A. W. Murdoch, and P. H. Attwood founded the Great North-West Joint Stock Building and Loan Society with a nominal capital of $500,000. Lyon, Whitla and Murdoch were wholesale merchants while Logan and Crotty were land speculators and

---

agents.\textsuperscript{41} C. P. Brown, Minister of Public Works, along with C. Sweeney, manager of the Bank of Montreal, A. W. Ross, a real estate agent and land speculator and A. F. Eden, a partner in the dry-goods firm Stobart, Eden and Company, formed the Manitoba Mortgage and Investment Company, with a nominal capital of $2,500,000.\textsuperscript{42} The Equitable Loan Company founded by “some of the most prominent and wealthy men in Winnipeg” with a nominal capital of $2,000,000 started business in 1882.\textsuperscript{43} Other similar financial companies, the location of four chartered bank, and the establishment of six private banks, eight loan and investments companies, two insurance companies and twenty-four different loan companies gave the commercial district the appearance of a big finance capital.\textsuperscript{44} As the Trade Review confidently explained, “It is of incalculable advantage to our merchants that the chief money market of the country lies at its door.”\textsuperscript{45} Certainly, the nominal or authorized capital those firms were allowed to issue did not guarantee the success of the investment but reflected the increasing confidence in the real estate market.\textsuperscript{46}

Chartered and private banks, on the other hand, managed the influx of money coming from Great Britain and from the East and helped to expand, principally, the

\textsuperscript{41} Steen and Boyce, \textit{Winnipeg, Manitoba, and Her Industries}, 20.

\textsuperscript{42} \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun}, 23 November 1881, 2.

\textsuperscript{43} \textit{The Commercial (Winnipeg,)}, 3 October 1882, 5.


\textsuperscript{45} \textit{The Trade Review}, 15.

\textsuperscript{46} During this period local businessmen had taken advantage of the commodification of land and invested their profits in the operation of loan and mortgages companies which lent money on the security of land titles.
wholesale business. For the last years of the 1870s eastern wholesalers had overstocked by importing large quantities of products from British manufacturers and wholesalers.\textsuperscript{47} Commercial travellers of eastern firms, thus, were anxious to offer their products to Winnipeg’s merchants by taking advantage of the availability of capital and credit in the West. Moreover, the success of those sales promoted the establishment in the city of branches of Montreal and Toronto firms, as the \textit{Winnipeg Sun} reported.\textsuperscript{48} During the period 1880-1883 sixty wholesalers established in Winnipeg and supplied the West and over 170 retailers doing business in the city.\textsuperscript{49} Overall, reported \textit{The Commercial}, 751 firms or individuals were doing business in Winnipeg in 1882.\textsuperscript{50}

The expansion of business was also apparent in the increased imports of agricultural implements and machinery. In 1882 there were 9,500 plows and 2,900 harvesters imported.\textsuperscript{51} “One firm alone,” reported \textit{The Commercial}, “gave as their opening order 3,900 plows, 1,000 wagons, 400 McCormick reapers, 320 seeders, 320 hay rakes and 400 mowers.”\textsuperscript{52} Despite these impressive figures, there were no investors ready to establish agricultural machinery factories in the province.\textsuperscript{53} This was consistent with the Canadian class structure and economic necessities in the nineteenth century. As R. T.


\textsuperscript{49} \textit{Sixth Annual Report of the Winnipeg Board of Trade}, 10-14.

\textsuperscript{50} \textit{The Commercial} (Winnipeg,) 3 October 1882, 7.

\textsuperscript{51} “The Farm Machinery Supply,” \textit{The Commercial} (Winnipeg,) 3 October 1882, 10.

\textsuperscript{52} \textit{The Commercial} (Winnipeg,) 13 March 1883, 465.

\textsuperscript{53} The Farm Machinery Supply,” 10.
Naylor suggests, capital was available for a rapid turnover, principally, in the mercantile activity instead of being invested into the much longer process of industrialization.54

The economic achievement and success of the emerging bourgeoisie during the initial years of Winnipeg’s organization was based principally on the acquisition of land and the speculation in real property. Speculative investments had flooded the city and had marked also the pace of growth and development. The circulation of capital in this period was generated, principally, by the commercial activity in the wholesale business and speculative investments in real estate. However, another form of capital accumulation that had increasingly become an important element of the transitional period along with the arrival of speculative investments from Britain and the East helped to promote the expansion of business by utilizing the tools of industrial capitalism: in particular wage labour.

The Working Class

Labour relations in Winnipeg for the period after 1880 have been investigated in several studies.55 The period since Manitoba entered Confederation until the arrival of the CPR, on the other hand, has almost been neglected. Certainly the information available for this period is limited but it is important to note that politicians and the Winnipeg’s nascent bourgeoisie understood very soon the role labour would play in the consolidation


of the province. Among a number of acts, the first Legislature of Manitoba in May 1871 approved the Masters and Servants Act.\textsuperscript{56}

The act’s aim was to regulate labour relations and provide a legal framework consistent with what existed in the older provinces and what had regulated employment relations in the West prior to 1869. Manitoba was in a transitional stage where social and economic formations from the past—craftsmanship, fur trade, or commerce—would soon meet the structural transformation produced by the initial period of modern industrial capitalism.\textsuperscript{57} As such, the Act attempted to preserve the advantages that employers had enjoyed. However, as Bryan Palmer has noted about Toronto where the Act was effective earlier, “the class relations it tried to keep alive were a thing of the past.”\textsuperscript{58} In the case of Winnipeg, in 1870 labour relations were a thing of the future. The number of workers was very limited. “Boys can’t be got, nor girls, and mechanics of all kinds are at a premium,” said the \textit{Manitoban} and added “we must have some well organized system of immigration… to supply the actual poverty of the labour market.”\textsuperscript{59} Certainly, the commodification of land and speculative investments alone were not going to initiate the process of capital accumulation. The \textit{Manitoban} clearly understood the significance of capital accumulation based on wage labour.

The application of the Masters and Servants Act during the initial years of state organization and class consolidation in Winnipeg reflected the contradictions of a

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item \textsuperscript{57} For an account of the transitional period, see Maurice Dobb, \textit{Studies in the Development of Capitalism} (London: Taylor & Francis, 1963), 11-19.
\item \textsuperscript{59} “The Labour Market,” \textit{Manitoban and Northwest Herald}, 17 December 1870, 2.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
changing society which was still tied to the labour relations of the past, but pushed forward towards the dynamic scenario of industrial capitalism. The Act penalized workers who did not respect the contract with up to twenty dollars or thirty days in prison. The employer, on the other hand, among other considerations, had to pay the wages established by contract. Any complaint about contractual conditions had to be treated by the police court or by the Justice of the Peace. For a young labour market in a new and expanding society like Winnipeg, the Act established rigid labour relations that sooner or later would collapse. During Winnipeg’s pre-industrial period workers’ strategies to defend themselves against unfair employers relied on the interpretation of the Act, and more importantly, on the favourable disposition of the judge.

There were other instances of workers’ organization in the city since earlier times. For instance, skilled and literate workers established the Winnipeg Typographical Union in February 1873, but certainly that was a rare exception and this union dedicated itself in those years mostly to organize social events. On May 1876 a “Laborers’ Union” was formed, but there was no information about its activities. There was no substantial information regarding labour conflicts in Winnipeg in the following years. Information about strikes and riots in other parts of the world, however, was published frequently. Under the suggestive title “Communism in Chicago,” for instance, the *Manitoba Free Press* published a short article in May 1878. The article predicted a social revolution if the police were not armed properly to prevent riots provoked by workers’ demands. The

---


Manitoba Free Press was warning the emerging bourgeoisie that sooner or later Winnipeg’s workers might act in similar ways.

The construction of the Pembina Branch connecting Selkirk and Winnipeg with the American railway and other branches of the CPR transcontinental railroad brought to the province a mobile crew of workers from Ontario and from the United States. Most of them had elsewhere experienced the exploitative labour conditions of the trade and the initial forms of collective organization. That was the case, for instance, in one of the first strikes of the CPR construction crews. In May 1879 the crew of “Contract 15” at Cross Lake—78 miles East of Selkirk— went on strike. Their salary had been reduced which triggered a number of demands, from boarding, to food, to medical assistance. The strike also unveiled the contractual conditions and the form in which they received their payment. Men working in remote locations, for instance, had to travel to the contractor’s office at Cross Lake every two or three months to cash their cheques. One of the workers’ demands was that wages should be paid at location in cash and every month. The strike finished once the troops with dozens of volunteers arrived. None of their demands apart from the wages due were obtained. Fourth-fifths of the crew was fired or quit.63 But perhaps the detail that caught the attention of the press was that “the communistic red flag” was in the hand of one of the strikers, although, according to other workers, he “took no prominent part in the strike.”64 The conflict took place in a location distant from


64 “The Strike on ‘15’,” 1.
Winnipeg, but the bourgeoisie had already perceived a change in workers’ demands and, most importantly, the way they managed to organize collectively.

Railroad workers placed on remote locations were the vanguard of discontent. During this period they organized a number of strikes, principally on the Pembina Branch, called by the *Manitoba Free Press* “the Starving Railroad,” because of the low salaries it paid. In 1880 at least two strikes for higher salaries paralyzed the branch. Railway workers were paid $35 a month, while workers in Winnipeg, especially those who were in the construction trade, were paid from $2.50 to $5 a day. Even though there were still several individual cases for wages unpaid before the court in the initial period of Winnipeg’s industrialization, workers’ strategies had already changed. On October 1881 the workers at the CPR freight sheds went on strike for better wages. The following year the employees of the CPR locomotive department in Winnipeg paralyzed the workshop. The year 1882 would experience a number of strikes and attempts to strike to demand better wages, but this time, the movement had spread into other city’s trades. Post office employees, the city police, painters, and bricklayers attempted to

---


67 “Action for Wages,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 29 August 1884, 4; “Contractors Arrested,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 2 September 1884, 1. The information does not provide more details but the actions were more likely to be cases under the Mechanics’ Lien Act, instead of under the Masters and Servants Act.


obtain wage increases in a moment when the city experienced the most dynamic period of
growth.70

Workers, however, not only struck for wages. Still accustomed to the flexibility of
artisan work and the organization of craft shops production,71 workers contested the rigid
discipline of the clock and the check system. That was the case of the CPR strike at the
beginning of 1883.72 The company had established a new regime of time discipline which
obliged workers to walk long distances four times a day to the check office and then
return to the roundhouse where they performed their activities. Workers demanded that
the check point should be set at the entrance of the shops instead. Time not only
represented the synchronization of labour relations during the workday but also the
regimentation of workers’ lives under the necessities of the nascent industrial
capitalism.73

The collapse of the real estate market after 1882 provoked a crisis in the
construction industry. Contracts were stopped or delayed for better moments and
unemployment arose. Taking advantage of the availability of idle labour some contractors
who had re-started construction projects once the economy began to show signs of
recovery, attempted to reduce significantly workers’ wages.74 At the peak of the real
estate boom, for instance, bricklayers had obtained a wage of almost $6 a day. In 1883

70 “Strike in the Post Office,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 1 March 1882, 7; “The Painters’ Strike,” Winnipeg
Daily Sun, 29 June 1882, 4; “The Bricklayers,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 30 August 1882, 3; “The Police,”
Winnipeg Daily Sun, 30 August 1882, 2.

(December 1967): 73.


74 Berkowski, 24.
contractors were paying $4 a day and by 1884, when the industry re-established the rhythm of labour, they reduced the wages to $3.50. In May 1884 the stone cutters went on strike and by September the bricklayers did the same.\(^75\) The importance of the bricklayers’ strike was not only their demands—which somehow they managed to obtain, at least from some of the contractors—but the resolution they voted in the general meeting: they proposed to form a union and organize under the Knights of Labor.\(^76\)

The Knights were founded in Philadelphia in 1869 and by the 1880s had been well established in Ontario where they had organized a number of Local Assemblies (LA). During the 1880s about 450 LA were organized across Canada.\(^77\) The development and organization of Ontario’s working class was in this form directly related to the influence of the Knights.\(^78\) In Winnipeg the organization of the Knights did not come from Ontario but from St. Paul, Minnesota, where the District Assembly (DA) organized the North-West of America. In Winnipeg, railroad and telegraph workers were already organized within the different brotherhoods across the country and tailors, as John Hample asserts, had organized a union in 1882.\(^79\) The introduction of the Knights, however, signified the first attempt to organize collectively workers from other trades under the umbrella of a well established organization.


\(^78\) Ibid., 56.

\(^79\) By 1886 the Winnipeg Operative Tailors Union was organized under the Knights of Labor. See Hample, 105, 109.
This event also marked the birth of modern labour relations between workers and the bourgeoisie in Winnipeg. During this period workers had struck for better wages and better working conditions but, nonetheless, they were defeated in almost all their claims. The Knights, as Gregory Kealey and Bryan Palmer assert, “took the ambivalence of the past cultural context of working-class life and forced it into a movement culture of opposition.”80 As the American organizer said in the meeting held in Winnipeg in October 1884, the Knights promoted arbitration instead of strikes because “organization was the great remedy for social diseases.”81 The Knights did not promote arbitration as a result of a conscious program of class collaboration but because they had understood working-class weakness.82 The Knight’s task during this formative period was, especially, to get workers organized after several years of continuous defeats. The year 1884 witnessed the formation of a number of Local Assemblies and the Knights became very popular, especially among unskilled workers contracted by the City to expand the public works.83

Even though the Knights managed to organize about 200 Winnipeg workers in 1885—most probably unskilled— their presence in Winnipeg was short lived.84

---

80 Kealey and Palmer, 55.

81 “Knights of Labor,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 21 October 1884, 4.

82 Kealey and Palmer, 96.

83 For instance, in 1885 the City had cut all expenditures, including public works which were almost completed, and the Knights negotiated with city officials for the continuation of works in order to avoid a high rate of unemployment. See “Idle Workingmen,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 20 January 1885, 4.

84 The origin of the Knights in Winnipeg is debatable. Other than the few newspapers’ articles published at that time there is no substantial information to add. Similarly, the information about the groups of workers they represented is very vague. For instance, James Naylor says they represented unskilled workers. David Bercuson claims that one of the first groups was composed entirely by railroad workers, while Doug Smith asserts that the first group to join the Knights in Winnipeg were the telegraph workers. See Naylor, “The Labour Market and Capitalist Development in Winnipeg, 1880-1886,” 359; Bercuson, Confrontation at
Nevertheless, in 1885 Winnipeg’s working class had already advanced in the defence of their own interests founding their own class organizations that would persist in the years to come. The Knights had certainly left their particular imprint setting laws, structure and organization and helped to the development of what Kealey and Palmer have called the “institutional apparatus” of the working class.85

**Conclusion**

The organization of Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie after Confederation followed a series of stages according to the economic necessities of the moment and the historical conditions of production and of reproduction of capital. During the years since Manitoba entered Confederation until 1885 when the bourgeoisie had organized their class institutions and consolidated their economic and political power, a dynamic and transitional society emerged and moulded the conditions for permanent inequalities. Winnipeg’s working class attempted to fight back this condition utilizing the tools they found at hand or the lively experiences of other workers. While during the formative period workers utilized the questionable laws of the Masters and Servants Act, strikes and riots accompanied the transition to industrial capitalism. Certainly, they arrived late to the distribution of power and their organizations, with dissimilar effectiveness, would consolidate as a conscious class only at the end of the century.

Class, as E. P. Thompson has defined it, is an historical construction, a relationship moulded “when some men…feel and articulate the identity of their interests as between themselves and against other men whose interests are different from (and

---

usually opposed to) theirs."\textsuperscript{86} Winnipeg’s nascent bourgeoisie understood much earlier the class character of the evolution of the new province and its main city. During the initial years they attempted to regulate the class relations using the tools of the recently formed state. The new economic conditions formed during the transition to industrial capitalism established a new pattern of workers’ exploitation. During the boom years, the labour market experienced a sustained growth and workers managed to obtain important wage increases. However, the world depression of the 1880s, dramatically felt in Winnipeg, created thousands of what Ernest Mandel, following Marx, has described as new unemployed.\textsuperscript{87} In this period Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie had acquired the tools to discipline workers and to organize society based upon their own needs. By 1885 Winnipeg’s ruling class had consolidated power covering every aspects of the city’s life and it was well prepared to face the economic transformation of an industrial society.


Chapter 4

Institutional Organization

We are ruled by a Council appointed by the Hudson’s Bay Co. and consisting of company servants and other residents here. It combines both executive and legislative in itself, and collects revenue by a four percent duty on imports, and spends it where it likes, sits with closed doors, and keeps its own secrets. There is also a judge who is paid by the company and rules accordingly.

James H. Ashdown, 26 August 1868

The organization and consolidation of the bourgeoisie as the ruling class in Winnipeg cannot be explained only through the changing relations of production and the profits produced by the circulation of capital and goods. As mentioned in the previous chapters, the nascent bourgeoisie had to organize their own civic and political institutions, and through them, create the conditions for the arrival of capital. In the case of Winnipeg, the most dynamic faction of the elite after Confederation—old settlers, landowners, merchants and newcomers—organized, consolidated, and shaped the City Council as the fundamental institution to exercise power and to guarantee an investment climate. In 1879-80, the undefined character of the initial group of money makers and pioneers became more unambiguous and real estate agents, speculators, and insurance

agents managed to dominate the City Council. During the boom years of 1881-82 the Council was still controlled by a small group of land owners and speculators but, as immigrants arrived in the city, a new commercial sector, formed mostly by small merchants and newcomers, expanded its economic and political influence. In this period, the partnership between land speculators and newcomers ready to make money quickly organized the City Council as a means to obtain personal economic benefits and to dispense public funds without control. In reaction to what many saw as economic mismanagement, after 1883 the Council was closely scrutinized by a Property Owners’ Association which in alliance with wholesalers, financiers and commercial agents within the Board of Trade, managed to elect its own candidates to the new Council of 1885. This dual relationship between the City Council and the Board of Trade and between old and new money would mark the political discussions of the period and set the agenda for the organization of Winnipeg as a capital city.²

The creation of a major city—the lay out of streets, the construction of government buildings, and the extension of other public works—was of paramount importance in this first stage because the city would be the place where the different factions of the emerging bourgeoisie could organize their institutions and through them exercise power. The organization of these institutions certainly did not materialize according to a particular or independent project of the Winnipeg elite as a distinctive regional phenomenon, as Alan Artibise has suggested.³ Rather, the elite devised


Winnipeg by having in mind a particular understanding of the “liberal order”, which continued in the West the expansion of what Ian McKay has called the “Canadian project”⁴: capitalism and private property. This chapter aims to complete the general ideas that furnished the triad of accumulation/class/institutions in Winnipeg’s transition to industrial capitalism. As such it will explore the initial forms of institutional organization and class hegemony from 1870 until 1885.

**The “Liberal Order”**

The ideological justification for the construction of the Canadian state followed what Ian McKay has called the duality of liberalism/illiberalism.⁵ This tension was certainly present in the origins of Winnipeg and would mark the political formation of the province and the city in the 1870s. Precisely, the comment young James Ashdown sent to his family concerning the form of government he had found in Winnipeg in 1868 illustrated the tensions a newcomer perceived in the organization of the settlement.⁶ What Ashdown noticed had already been discussed for several years by *Nor’Wester* editors William Coldwell and William Buckingham. When they arrived in the Red River settlement late in 1859, along with a press, typographers and eastern advertisers, Coldwell and Buckingham also brought with them the liberal agenda that would give later an ideological foundation to the new province.⁷ In the introductory issue before arriving in the settlement they announced that

---

⁵ Ibid., 629-630.
⁶ See the epigraph in this chapter.
⁷ The first issue was self-explanatory of the ideological program the editors aimed to pursue. See “The Nor’Wester,” *Nor’Wester*, 28 December 1859, 1, 4. See also Aileen Garland, “The Nor’Wester and the
Their programme was based on the illusive ideas of a free market and the ineluctable expansion of capitalism in the West. The Nor’Wester’s arrival meant the advent of liberalism through an aggressive campaign promoting in the West their particular understanding of the Victorian ideas of unlimited progress, democracy and capitalism.

These ideas had hardly had the opportunity to move further indeed. After Louis Riel’s resistance of 1869-70, the liberals, as Ian McKay has suggested, paid the historic price for their dominance offering some concessions to the Métis and the French-speaking population. The balanced composition of the new provincial state not only reflected the unsolved tension between “liberalism-illiberalism” but also almost neglected the interests of the most important population, Winnipeg. Only two representatives of the still small but nevertheless the largest settlement of the province, Robert A. Davis and Donald Smith, sat in the legislature in the years 1871-74.

It is important to note this situation in order to understand the tension between the province and its future capital, Winnipeg. The recently organized province offered good prospects to those who were seeking open business opportunities with the prospects of fast economic profits. The distribution of land in this period, as this thesis has showed,

---

8 William Buckingham and William Coldwell, “The First Newspaper at Red River. Prospectus of ‘The Nor’-Wester,’ a Journal to be Published at Fort Garry, Red River Territory,” Nor’Wester, 22 August 1859, 1.

9 McKay, “The Liberal Order,” 635.
had become a key element that provided an unparalleled business dynamic. In these circumstances, however, the results of the political organization of the province offered Winnipeggers insufficient possibilities to properly control the city’s growth and expansion and, more importantly, to control its territorial limits, which had imprecise boundaries. Certainly the definition of the city limits was necessary to regulate the land market and to organize the city’s future according to the goal and principle of liberal capitalism: private property. The potential benefits of a new civic organization independent of the Province’s decisions would promote better business opportunities and, as Artibise has explained, a tax system and by-laws to control and organize the expansion of the city.  

Incorporation

The presence in the legislature of individuals with links to the Métis and the French-speaking population and others, especially Donald Smith, with close links to the Hudson Bay’s Company (HBC) created the conditions for an unusual political climate among some members of the town’s Anglo-Saxon population. Any provincial initiative was taken as an action against the interest of Winnipeg and was contested. For instance, the province’s contribution of $500 to the St. Boniface hospital opened a discussion for the construction of a hospital in Winnipeg, instead of funding one located in a French

---


11 During the sessions of the First Legislative Assembly in February 1872, Edward Hay asked if the Chief of Police had been instructed by the government to prosecute Riel and associates and demanded the province to accelerate the process to “apprehend these parties.” See “Parliamentary,” *Manitoba Liberal*, 1 March 1872, 1. The perception that the Province was doing nothing to apprehend Riel revealed the feelings of some members of the Anglo-Saxon population of Winnipeg that the province was defending French interests.
Furthermore, this discussion in the pages of the *Manitoba Free Press* and elsewhere, for example, started a political movement which was another excuse to demand the incorporation of Winnipeg.13

The press as an active political actor was more than apparent since the *Nor’Wester’s* establishment in 1859. The paper, for instance, had been the promoter of different political discussions, especially against the HBC’s interests. Following a similar path, in January 1872 a new and short-lived weekly edited by Alexander Begg, the *Manitoba Trade Review*, initiated a campaign to incorporate Winnipeg.14 Other publications soon followed suit and took sides between different interests regarding the incorporation of the city. While the *Liberal*, and later the *Free Press*, sided with those promoting incorporation, the *Manitoban*, as it had normally done, aligned with the interest of the provincial government and, as some argued, supported the HBC position.15 It would not be surprising then that among the most dynamic sector of the village—merchants, small industrialists and artisans—a group of settlers organized a movement to achieve the incorporation of Winnipeg. On 10 February 1872, William Gomez Fonseca, John C. Schultz, William F. Luxton, George D. McVicar, and a few others initiated the discussion about the limits of the future city and elected representatives to negotiate the incorporation of the city with the Legislature.16

---

12 Ibid., 1.
14 Begg and Nursey, *Ten Years in Winnipeg*, 52.
This movement started intense debates in the months to come and the press extensively reflected those controversies. For the *Manitoban*, the incorporation of the city was unnecessary because the Province had almost covered all the aspects demanded by the people: the lay out of streets and the provision of water. Moreover, they argued, incorporation would result in an unnecessary increase of taxes without any guarantee of future improvements.\(^{17}\) The *Liberal*, the principal supporter of incorporation, argued that the increase in taxes would result in an improvement of the city through more extensive public works which would, eventually increase property values. The revenues obtained, they added, could be used to improve the city instead of constructing bridges somewhere in the province.\(^{18}\) The debate continued for several months. After almost a year of discussion the *Manitoban* disregarded the benefits of incorporation and continued arguing that the interest in the incorporation of Winnipeg was a petty idea promoted by a pair of residents of Point Douglas pursuing a public job.\(^{19}\)

The response to this accusation came in January 1873 when a massive meeting demanded the organization of the city. An enthusiastic Gilbert McMicken argued that Ontario municipal legislation should be used as an example to write a draft of the Bill of Incorporation. Among other considerations, McMicken emphasized that incorporation would improve the sanitary conditions of the city and secure much needed fire control.\(^{20}\) The first draft included the qualifications required for participation in the future

\(^{17}\) “Incorporation,” *Manitoban and Northwest Herald*, 8 April 1872, 2.

\(^{18}\) “Incorporation,” *Manitoba Liberal*, 13 April 1872, 2.

\(^{19}\) “Incorporation,” *Manitoban and Northwest Herald*, 14 December 1872, 2.

\(^{20}\) “A Mass Meeting. Incorporation of Winnipeg. Lively Discussion,” *Manitoba Free Press*, 4 January 1873, 8. The organization of proper fire protection was of paramount importance. A city protected from fire would bring insurance companies and investors, a necessity to expand the city and attract more capital.
municipal government, including the value of real estate ownership needed to run as
candidate or to vote.21 The number of electoral sections generated intense debates. While
some argued that the entire city needed only a single ward, others demanded that the city
should be divided into four wards with three aldermen representing each one.22

The Bill was presented before the Assembly to be considered in the deliberations
held on 7 March 1873, but after three readings the Assembly returned the draft to the
citizens’ committee to change a number of points, namely those which dealt with
taxation, licenses, and the power of the future corporation to borrow money.23 The
committee was outraged about the Assembly’s decision. A new modified draft, however,
had obtained the support of about 200 taxpayers and after long deliberations they
accepted to present it under the recently approved Municipal Act.24 Nevertheless, the
draft could not be treated in that session and the city consequently was not incorporated.
The Toronto Globe accused the HBC of obstructing the passing of the Bill. So did the
Manitoba Free Press, which remarked that “the Hudson’s Bay Company has them,
evidently, too much under its thumb to allow a chance for the faintest hope for anything


The division into wards was very important in terms of contesting power. The elite not only lived in the
core area of the town, but also they held properties in other places less populated. If they did not succeed in
getting elected in one place, they could try being elected in other areas less populated where they held real
estate. See also Alfred Thomas Phillips, “Development of Municipal Institutions in Manitoba to 1886” (M.

23 “Incorporation Meeting,” Manitoban and Northwest Herald, 8 March 1873, 3.

24 “Incorporation,” Manitoba Free Press, 15 March 1873, 5. See also “An Act Respecting Municipalities,”
Manitoban and Northwest Herald, 15 March 1873, 3; “Incorporation under the Municipalities Act,”
Manitoban and Northwest Herald, 15 March 1873, 2.
not exactly in accord with the interests of that body.” Donald Smith, who represented Winnipeg in the Assembly and also was a prominent HBC officer and the Manitoban experienced a hard time trying to justify this setback. The controversies over the Bill had a violent twist as well when C. J. Bird, the Speaker of the Assembly, was attacked by a group of men who tarred him. The Manitoban suggested that the attack was a reaction to the Assembly’s decision not to incorporate Winnipeg in that session.

Winnipeg had lost its opportunity to be incorporated until the opening of the next legislative session in November 1873. In October, the citizens’ committee met again and discussed the same draft presented before. The people, this time, felt confident that the Assembly would pass the Bill. Even the Manitoban was cautious and expectant. The only financial concession they demanded from the province was that of licenses, and this point was not changed from the previous draft. The future corporation, in exchange, would take charge of the maintenance of bridges, streets, and drains within the city limits. When the committee presented the draft to the Attorney General, he promised them that the Bill would be treated the first day of session. On 8 November 1873 the Legislative Assembly passed the Bill of Incorporation, which received royal assent.


26 Donald Smith wrote several letters to the newspapers’ editors to justify his action. His excuses did not convince the Manitoba Free Press. See “Hon. Mr. Smith’s Letter,” Manitoba Free Press, 15 March 1873, 4; “Mr. Smith on the Press,” Manitoba Free Press, 15 March 1873, 4; “Letter from Hon. Donald A. Smith,” Manitoba Free Press, 15 March 1873, 4.

27 “Dastardly Assault,” Manitoban and Northwest Herald, 8 March 1873, 3.


29 Artibise, Winnipeg: A Social History, 18.
During the following weeks, the incorporated city witnessed the enthusiasm of vibrant political activity. James Ashdown, Andrew Bannatyne, C. W. Kennedy, Francis E. Cornish, G. McMicken, and William F. Luxton and a few others showed some intention of running for mayor. Another important group of businessmen nominated one another as candidates for aldermen for the four wards. Eventually Luxton and Cornish ran for mayor. Luxton was the editor of the *Manitoba Free Press* and he made extensive use of the paper’s pages to launch his campaign against Cornish. He accused Cornish of being the HBC candidate and his newspaper dedicated a number of pages to unveil Cornish’s past in London, Ontario, where he had been mayor. In the end, and despite Luxton’s efforts, Cornish, a “genial and colourful figure,” won the first election for mayor on 5 January 1874. Cornish had been one of the most firm opponents of the HBC’s rule but, as Luxton had bitterly argued, he completely changed his position. As Alexander Begg suggested, he won the election thanks to the strong support of the HBC. Other prominent city businessmen were also elected as the first aldermen; among them, Fonseca, Ashdown, and Alexander Logan would afterward enjoy an active political life.

The new Council met for the first time late in January 1874. Certainly they had an immense task ahead. After the routine inauguration speeches and presentations, several

---


33 See Begg and Nursey, *Ten Years in Winnipeg*, 95.
members were elected to form the different committees which would handle the City’s
day-to-day operations. By-law No. 1 was passed electing the auditors and before closing
the deliberations the members of the committees of Finance, Printing, Board of Works,
Market, Fire and Water, Assessment, as well as City clerks, were nominated and
elected.\textsuperscript{34} The City’s initial bureaucratic structure had already been set. For the following
months the different committees collected information and reported to Council about
minor operational issues and recommended some initial works to be initiated as soon as
possible. Tenders were accepted for a number of small public works and the provision of
lumber. The acquisition of a proper system of water supply and fire prevention for
$40,000 needed, however, the approval of the Province.\textsuperscript{35}

\textbf{Municipal Control, Finance and Public Works}

Winnipeg was struggling to find a way to finance the expansion of public works.
Despite the “splendid opportunities for capitalists”, as the \textit{Manitoban} promoted in its
pages,\textsuperscript{36} private capital was not arriving and the city relied only on the limited revenue
from property taxes and licences. The City attempted to deal with the fire protection issue
by finding and drilling a flowing well, but that was certainly insufficient.\textsuperscript{37} By October
1874 a group of persons who had obtained experience in other places preventing fires had
organized a “Hook and Ladder Company” and a “Hose and Engine Company” which

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{34}“The City Council,” \textit{Manitoban and Northwest Herald}, 24 January 1874, 2 and “The City Council,”
\textit{Manitoba Free Press}, 24 January 1874, 5. Alfred Philips has illustrated the similarities between the Act of
Incorporation of Ontario’s cities and that of Winnipeg, particularly, the methodology to elect its members

\textsuperscript{35}“City Council,” \textit{Manitoba Free Press}, 2 May 1874, 8.


\end{flushright}
provided a volunteer brigade to the City. Despite that effort, the brigades’ work was very limited because the City was still negotiating the purchase of a steam engine fire protection.\textsuperscript{38} The estimate for a proper fire protection had already climbed to about $100,000 and the \textit{Free Press} suggested that the City would pass a by-law to issue debentures to cover that cost.\textsuperscript{39}

Public works had not experienced significant progress during 1874 and the City’s revenues, certainly, were not able to cover the necessities promised during the electoral campaign. The city then raised extra income through a re-assessment of property values in order to collect more taxes.\textsuperscript{40} That, nevertheless, was not enough and by September the Council considered how to raise $250,000 to complete the public works. The next session a by-law authorized the issuance of a twenty-year debenture, paying six per cent interest annually, for the construction of sewers, the purchase of a fire engine, the construction of water works, the establishment of a market house, the widening, improving, and opening of streets and the construction of bridges and sidewalks.\textsuperscript{41} By the end of 1874 the much promised fire engine had been acquired and was ready to use. The insurance companies, speculated the \textit{Nor’Wester}, should then decrease the rates and increase their services.\textsuperscript{42}

The importance of fire control in an expanding city was of critical importance to attract capital. The experience of the Great Fire in Chicago in 1871 was never far from

\textsuperscript{38} “Fire Companies and Protection,” \textit{Manitoba Free Press}, 3 October 1874, 4. See also Artibise, \textit{Winnipeg: A Social History}, 208.

\textsuperscript{39} “Fire Protection,” 4.

\textsuperscript{40} “Citizens, Beware!” \textit{Nor’Wester}, 3 August 1874, 2.

\textsuperscript{41} “By Law No,” \textit{Manitoba Free Press}, 3 October 1874, 7.

\textsuperscript{42} “Town and Vecinity,” \textit{Nor’Wester}, 21 December 1874, 3.
mind. For that reason, a proper system to protect Winnipeg from fire would attract more insurance companies, lower the insurance rates and encourage capitalists to invest in the city. For that reason, a proper system to protect Winnipeg from fire would attract more insurance companies, lower the insurance rates and encourage capitalists to invest in the city.\textsuperscript{43} Cities had to offer the settings needed to attract investors and, in this way, generate the conditions for the production and reproduction of capital. The organizational form cities adopted during the nineteenth century did not necessarily follow a pre-established plan, but neither had they followed an autonomous course. Public works expansion in Winnipeg followed patterns similar to other North American cities which had already been developed in previous years, like Chicago, Toronto, Cincinnati, or St. Paul. The central question was who would finance the spatial transformation of the city and how the money would be used for that endeavour? Winnipeg, as Artibise has described it, “was established by businessmen, for business purposes, and businesses were its first and natural leaders.”\textsuperscript{44} The leadership of the city, however, did not follow a calm, straight course. The business community was not a homogenous unit chasing the same purposes and strategies, as Artibise seems to suggest. Not all the members of the business community got involved in politics; neither did all politicians succeed in business.

By 1875, the control of the city’s key committees, and in fact the control of the City, was in the hands of a group of aldermen dubbed by the press as the “Notorious Seven.” Led by W. G. Fonseca, aldermen Willoughby Clark, Dugald Sinclair, John R. Cameron, Matthew Davis, John Hackett and Alexander McMicken obtained the control of the committees of Finance, Assessment, Fire and Water, Police, Market and the most

\textsuperscript{43} “Fire Companies and Protection,” 4.

\textsuperscript{44} Artibise, \textit{Winnipeg: A Social History}, 25.
important, the Board of Works. During this period a number of irregularities raised accusations of corruption, bribery and cronyism among some members of the City Council. For instance, the tender process to allocate the sewer contract was full of abnormalities. The company that obtained the contract was the one which offered the highest tender, and the press suggested that the other contenders were paid $1,000 each to retire their offers.

Not only had the tender process presented irregularities, but the authorization to sell the city bonds provoked another controversy between the community and the council. G. W. Simpson, the Montreal agent in charge of the operation, had intended to sell the city bonds in Montreal but, there, local capitalists did not show interest in buying them. Simpson then travelled to London where he managed to sell all the bonds at eighty per cent of their face value and at a six per cent interest rate. The city had no need to sell all the bonds at once because the public works required would take time to complete. Simpson’s actions, criticized the press, had cost the city money and, moreover, it had to begin to pay interest on all the bonds even though their sale had not been necessary. After the discount, the city obtained about $180,000 in ready cash. The Bank of Montreal offered an attractive interest of seven per cent if the City invested $100,000 in its stock, but the funds were instead deposited in the Merchants’ Bank at a lower interest. Duncan MacArthur, the local manager of the Merchants’ Bank, had been, along with Donald Smith and Gilbert McMicken, one of the Council’s advisors in this investment. This

45 “The Seven,” Nor’Wester, 9 August 1875, 2; “City Council,” Nor’Wester, 9 August 1875, 2.

negotiation, said the *Manitoba Free Press*, was the demonstration that “incapacity and corruption are rapidly doing their work for Winnipeg.”⁴⁷

These accusations, however, did not deter the Council from continuing with similar practices. The construction of the market building in 1875 provoked similar controversies. Not only the tender process was full of irregularities, but also the final price changed according to the necessities of the contractor and the changing construction timetable. The original price of $22,000 was, according to the contractor, nominal, and the City knew that and approved it. Later, a schedule had been attached to the original contract outlining the modifications due to “unexpected extras.” The final cost would reach almost $43,000. Moreover, to add more suspicion, Thomas Inglis, the architect who had made the plans and primary assessment for the contractor, had been hired by the city to oversee the construction.⁴⁸

The press was outraged about these methods and regularly demanded aldermen to take ethical responsibility in the management of public funds. The press sought capitalist development under the liberal premises of the free market. The dilemmas of capitalism in this formative stage in Winnipeg, however, were not solved by the Smithian “magic invisible hand”, but, on the contrary, by the intervention of the municipal state to benefit a group of persons under dubious circumstances. By September 1877 the funds from the first debenture were almost exhausted. The council proposed to raise an extra $25,000 by

---


debentures to improve the drainage system and other minor works,\(^49\) but the proposal was defeated.\(^50\) The following months, nevertheless, the main occupation of the city was the discussion about the construction and extension of the railroad lines and stations.\(^51\)

The Civic election in January 1879 reflected that interest. The *Manitoba Gazette* warned the people: “Ratepayers of Winnipeg. Beware of railroad sharpers. Vote for honest men who will look to your interest.”\(^52\) It was uncertain who the “honest men” were; nonetheless, Alexander Logan was elected mayor. Late in April 1879, he led a delegation of politicians and businessmen to Ottawa to discuss the extension of the CPR line to Winnipeg and the construction of a bridge across the Red River with the Minister of Public Works Sir Charles Tupper. The government promised to finance the railroad while the city would be in charge of constructing the bridge.\(^53\) In August, the Council put in consideration “a by law to authorize the issue of debentures to the extent of $200,000 to pay for the construction of a Railway and Traffic Bridge across the Red River at Winnipeg.”\(^54\) Encouraged by the successful negotiation Mayor Logan had carried out in Ottawa, in December 1879 a group of people nominated him to run for Mayor


\(^{50}\) Begg and Nursey, *Ten Years in Winnipeg*, 169.


\(^{52}\) “Ratepayers,” *Manitoba Gazette*, 10 September 1884, 2.


\(^{54}\) “Law,” *Winnipeg Daily Times*, 9 August 1879.
Logan easily won against Arthur Eden. The Council, save for a few aldermen, remained almost the same. In January 1880, the City published the call for tenders for the construction of “a combined Railway and Traffic Bridge across the Red River at or near Point Douglas.” The location of the bridge signified a triumph for Point Douglas residents and real estate speculators who had utilized their influence to put the City Council to work on their behalf. Shortly afterwards, the construction of the CPR station, workshops, and yards in the area initiated a fast and definite transformation. The optimism the railroad news brought to Winnipeg made headlines all over the East and, as Charles N. Bell recalled, “the knowledge that the population and commerce of the city was extending rapidly caused thousands of people to seek investments in Winnipeg properties.”

Logan did not run in the next election. The negotiations with Ottawa for the extension of the railroad and the construction of the bridge were taking more time than expected. In 1881, William G. Fonseca presented himself to run for Mayor and he promised: “I will do all in my power to facilitate the construction of traffic bridges across the Red and Assiniboine rivers; the erection of water and gas works on a proper footing; the construction of street railways, and the development of the city generally.” Despite his effort, political experience, and press campaign, Fonseca was easily defeated by Elias

---


56 W. G. Fonseca—again alderman— along with A. Logan, Conklin, Mark Fortune, Samuel Jackson, Alloway, and More had made fortunes in real estate endeavours prior to the boom.


58 Bell, “The Great Winnipeg Boom,” 32.

G. Conklin, a partner in the real estate firm Conklin and Fortune. The aldermanic turn
over was important too. The new Council was formed by seven new aldermen, although,
the structure of power remained the same. Aldermen Alexander McMicken, Robert
Strang and Albert Monkman representing finance and insurance companies joined forces
in the new Council with the real estate interest represented by Mayor Conklin and
Alderman Fortune.\(^60\)

The dynamics of land and real property speculation distracted the public attention
from city politics and, in the absence of sustained public interest, the Council gave the
impression of being a closed private organization managed by a selected group of people
who represented the real estate business. During the boom years of 1881-82 the Council
dispensed public money without control and there was also evidence that the collection of
taxes was well behind the estimates for the year. For instance, the retiring Finance
Committee of 1881 reported to the new council in January 1882 that there were still
uncollected taxes of about $46,000.\(^61\)

Anticipating future problems, Alderman George M. Wilson launched in
December 1882 a campaign to review the whole municipal system. Wilson had settled in
Winnipeg in 1878 and was a newcomer to politics. Representing the South Ward, he had
been elected for the first time in 1881 and, soon, he obtained control of the Finance
Committee.\(^62\) Wilson proposed a by-law that included a number of modifications to the

---

\(^60\) Biographical information extracted from directories, dictionaries and newspaper clips. See also Steen and
Boyce, *Winnipeg, Manitoba, and Her Industries*, 25.


\(^62\) Wilson was a partner in the firm Haslam and Wilson—dealers in agricultural machinery—until 1881
when he left the company and opened his own business. See *Henderson's Directory of the City of Winnipeg*
(Winnipeg: James Weidman, 1880), 27; “Alderman George Wilson,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 24 December
1883, 2. Business people during this promissory period engaged in a variety of endeavours. Probably, as
The operation of the city which the press enthusiastically called “a civic revolution.” The proposal aimed at bringing more transparency to municipal organization and to the highly criticized tender process and contract system. Wilson wanted to create an executive committee to manage all the financial affairs of the city and to restrain and control the expenditures in moments when the city was going to issue debentures for $1,000,000.

Wilson’s project produced results. Within the optimistic prospect of a property assessment of about $40,000,000 in 1882, the City had already collected $100,000 in taxes and another $100,000 was in the process of being paid. In addition, the City announced a plan to reduce expenditures. The principal targets were the reduction of officers’ salaries and the removal of some positions within the municipal bureaucracy. This movement, nevertheless, did not conceal the same dubious practices of the past. An important contract to provide lumber for the city was given to John G. Macdonald, one of the city’s most important contractors. Macdonald’s tender had been the highest one and although he did not even own a lumber yard, the council considered that because he was one of the city’s major taxpayers he deserved the contract.

David Spector has suggested, Wilson was also a saloon owner; nevertheless, Spector was not able to present any evidence to prove that statement. See David Spector, “The 1884 Financial Scandals and Establishment of Business Government in Winnipeg,” *Prairie Forum* 2, no. 2 (November 1977): 168.

---


64 Ibid. and “By-Law No. 199,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 2 December 1882, 3.


67 Macdonald was going to bring the lumber from Duluth, Minnesota, and some aldermen argued that the council should support local lumbermen instead of giving the contract to a contractor who was buying the lumber elsewhere. See “Council Condemned,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 10 March 1883, 8; “Lumber Contract!,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 10 March 1883, 8; “Popular Opinion!” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 12 March 1883, 5. Macdonald, according to the *Sun*, paid $1,000 in taxes in 1882. See “Our Tax-Payers,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 29 December 1882, 12.
At this point in the city expansion, the procedures used to confer the contracts had become entrenched. The City’s political situation, on the other hand, was more uncertain. Alexander McMicken had been elected Mayor in December 1882 but for several days after the election, a number of aldermen refused to accept the results arguing that nobody had voted in Ward 1.\textsuperscript{68} The City had just annexed Fort Rouge as a new electoral district and that generated confusion. The uncertainties of a legal political representation raised concerns among bankers and financiers. As one worried banker told the \textit{Times}, “the bonds of the city could not be negotiated until the mechanism of the council was completed.”\textsuperscript{69} That year the number of wards had increased to six and the Council was represented by eighteen aldermen. The key Finance Committee was controlled by Wilson, who in some instances functioned as acting-Mayor. After long discussions, the Council came to terms and accepted the election results on 8 January.\textsuperscript{70} The outcome was not very optimistic for Mayor McMicken who received an indebted City. Almost all the taxes collected in 1882 went to pay advances already given by banks and to pay the interests accrued by debentures.

By January 1883 the City had a negative balance of $34,000.\textsuperscript{71} Winnipeg needed urgently to sort out its financial problems. Despite the opposition of some aldermen, in March 1883 Wilson and Mayor McMicken, in an unusual movement, travelled to New York to sell personally $1,250,000 in city bonds. Their trip was not very successful. They


\textsuperscript{71} “Winnipeg’s Taxes,” \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun}, 2 December 1882, 1.
had managed to secure part of the money, but market speculation forced them to sell the bonds at a lower rate than expected.\textsuperscript{72} To add more difficulties, once they returned from New York, they learned that the different committees had approved a number of public works in different wards and had already spent $518,000 in contracts, almost $150,000 more than the expected annual income by taxes.\textsuperscript{73}

**The Sinking Fund**

Certainly, at this rate the City would be in bankruptcy very soon. Once the optimism provoked by the real estate boom had finished, the business community realized that during this period they had dangerously distracted their attention from public matters. If their private business were touched by the crisis, no less important were the City’s administrative problems. What set the alarm off was the management of the different sinking funds the City had organized for the repayment of the principal of the debentures issued during these years. Concerned about financial mismanagement, in May 1883 a Property Owners’ Association was formed; C. J. Brydges was president and Charles E. Hamilton, the future Mayor, secretary.\textsuperscript{74} The group demanded the Council a number of responses about the latter financial mismanagements and they also recommended several modifications to the City’s charter to be presented for discussion in the following Legislative Assembly. Their demands were straightforward: the council should be dissolved and a new election for mayor and aldermen should be called soon. In


\textsuperscript{73} “Economical Council,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 20 March 1883, 8.

\textsuperscript{74} “Property Holders’ Association,” *Winnipeg Daily Times*, 29 May 1883. Among the association’s members was noteworthy the presence of Joseph Mulholland, James Cameron, James Ashdown, J. B. Spencer, J. Aikins, and A. F. Eden. See “The City Property Owners,” *Winnipeg Daily Sun*, 29 May 1883, 3.
addition, their project included the reduction of the number of aldermen from eighteen to twelve.\textsuperscript{75} The key modification they sought was that the council should be limited to a legislative role and the executive decisions should be taken by a committee formed by the mayor, the treasurer and the commissioner of works chosen in a general election “irrespective of wards.”\textsuperscript{76}

The Property Owners’ Association realized that while they had concentrated on their own business, a group of ambitious ward politicians had obtained political control of the City and had undermined the principles of the “liberal project.” For instance, the key committees of the Council of 1883—Finance and Public Works— and in fact, the control of the City, were controlled by Alderman Wilson and a group of liquor manufacturers, and small merchants who had generously dispensed public funds in their various wards to guarantee their re-election.\textsuperscript{77} What put the Council under public scrutiny again was the allocation of the money from the sinking fund for dubious private use. Every surplus the city obtained from its taxes or licences was set aside and deposited in the sinking fund. The goal was to invest these funds at rates that would enable the City to retire its bonded debt. However, instead of being invested in productive endeavours, the City decided to ride the wave of property speculation and invested the funds in real estate mortgages. Once the boom had finished, as the \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun} noted, the City continued

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{75} In 1883 the city wards had been extended to six and consequently there were eighteen aldermen. The following years the number of wards remained the same but aldermen were reduced to two for each ward.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{76} “The City Property Owners,” 3. “The Property Owners,” \textit{Winnipeg Daily Times}, 29 May 1883. See also Artibise, \textit{Winnipeg: A Social History}, 46-47. Choosing an executive committee in a one district election would increase the possibilities of electing candidates from the commercial area where most of the prominent businessmen lived.}

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{77} Spector, “The 1884 Financial Scandals,” 168-169.}
managing the business as usual.\textsuperscript{78} Moreover, the Finance Committee had invested money from the sinking funds in mortgages to politicians and public servants. For example, among other prominent persons, former Attorney-General Clarke had obtained a loan of $12,000 to buy a house in “Fort Rouge valued by the city valuator at $24,000.”\textsuperscript{79}

The City’s operations needed urgently a full revision of its practices. In January 1884, the attempt to appoint an auditor to review the City’s books found an unusual delay, in part due to Alderman George Wilson’s complaints.\textsuperscript{80} By the end of the month news leaked to the press that the “chamberlain’s books were in a very bad state—so bad in fact, that the auditors could not commence their work until they were rewritten.”\textsuperscript{81} The problems arose in June 1884 when the special audit unveiled a number of irregularities in the City’s books. Records misplaced or not registered in the books, transfers of money without proper records and other serious mismanagements characterized the City’s everyday practices.\textsuperscript{82}

It was not a strange circumstance then that Alderman Wilson attempted to obstruct the start of the investigation. A secret meeting of a sub-committee chaired by Alderman McCreary, formed on an ad-hoc basis to investigate the Finance committee, discussed in detail what the press had already unveiled. Alderman Wilson, using his power as chairman of the Finance Committee, had utilized, along with Commissioners

\textsuperscript{78} “The Sinking Fund,” \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun}, 19 August 1884, 2.

\textsuperscript{79} “Loaning the City’s Cash,” \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun}, 3 December 1883, 8.


\textsuperscript{81} “A Nice Little Sensation,” \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun}, 29 January 1884, 4.

\textsuperscript{82} “The Special Audit,” \textit{Winnipeg Daily Sun}, 17 June 1884, 4.
John McDonald and Thomas Renwick, $4,000 from the sinking fund to fund mortgages for friends and relatives. The operation, mediated by the intervention of Chamberlain H. M. Drummond and City Solicitor Edward M. Wood, benefited J. J. Johnston, a former city inspector, Thomas Parr, former city engineer, and Alderman Wilson’s wife. After further investigation, however, the mayor instructed the Merchants’ Bank “not to pay out any of the money, as it belonged to the city.”83

Certainly, those were not the only irregularities in which the finance committee and the city solicitor were involved. More information was available to the press days later. It seemed that none of the sinking funds titles were correctly registered and that a considerable amount of money had been stolen in the transfer from the account in the Bank of Montreal to the new account in the Merchants’ Bank.84 Alderman Wilson was arrested in connection with the fraud and later acquitted but, nevertheless, he was forced to resign as chairman of the Finance Committee.85 Solicitor Wood, in the meantime, escaped to the United States shortly before an arrest warrant was issued in connection with the loan to Wilson’s wife. Regardless of the sinking fund’s irregular management and public scandal, the Council did not make any considerable change to its administration.86 In September 1884, the Winnipeg Daily Sun encouraged the business


84 “Disclosures!” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 23 August 1884, 4; “Where Will it End?” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 9 September 1884, 4.

85 “Arrested,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 10 September 1884, 4. This was an important defeat for the small group of aldermen who controlled the City. Alderman Wilson, in fact, as the Auditor revealed later, had managed to be named acting-Mayor and as such controlled the City at his will. See “Revelations,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 17 December 1884, 4.

community to take a more active role in municipal politics. They said that the Council had been managed by a group of politicians that were “bankrupt boomsters, and others again unstable and shady persons who would never be chosen by sensible men as the guardians of a private trust.” And they added, “The merchants and large property-owners, who have something at stake, must lend a hand in the work of rehabilitation and reform or we may bid farewell to the bright prospects of future greatness the city once enjoyed.”

The Board of Trade

The business community which had followed the later events closely decided to follow the newspaper recommendation by acting decisively through its main organization, the Board of Trade. Since early times the Board had been an important organizer of the city’s social and political life. The idea for the organization of a Board of Trade came at about the same time as that of the incorporation of the City and as such it resulted in a controversial movement in which different factions of the emerging bourgeoisie disputed power. In February 1873 John Christian Schultz organized a meeting to discuss the incorporation of a Board of Trade. In the same month, Andrew Bannatyne applied for the incorporation of a “Provincial” Board of Trade, whose aim would be to represent the general merchants of the province and all of those who wanted to be part of it. Winnipeg was still not incorporated, stated an amused Alexander Begg, but the city had already not one, but two Boards of Trade.

87 “Municipal Reform,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 10 September 1884, 2.
88 “The Board of Trade Question,” Manitoban and Northwest Herald, 22 February 1873, 2.
89 “Provincial Board of Trade,” Manitoba Free Press, 22 February 1873, 5.
90 Begg and Nursey, Ten Years in Winnipeg, 78.
The influence of both Boards during these initial years was rather limited. After a few meetings called to deal with specific issues—the Pembina railroad station and a few other public works—the activities of both Boards of Trade faded and with it information in the newspapers. In December 1878, however, the different factions of the small business community had apparently come to terms. Old disputes had been left behind and “a committee was appointed to make the preliminary arrangements and secure a charter” to revitalize the organization, reported the *Manitoba Daily Free Press*. Among the prominent businessmen who went to Bannatyne’s store to organize the Board were “Alderman Ashdown, Alloway (of Alloway and Champion, bankers), Eden (of Stobart and Eden, now specializing in dry goods, wholesale and retail), and W. H. Lyon (who now ran a leading wholesale grocery business).”

Once the emerging bourgeoisie realized the need to form a solid business organization to represent their interests at large, the Board of Trade increased its collaboration with the City Council and both bodies regularly reported to each other in matters of common interest. The influence of the Board in city politics, however, was limited, although some members of the Board of Trade had been members of the Council

---


93 Careless, “The Development of the Winnipeg Business Community,” 247. In 1878 these individuals were well positioned as an emergent class. From all of them, William Alloway was perhaps the individual who represented better the transitional period. He had made a fortune buying and selling land in the first half of the 1870s and used the profits to establish a loan and finance company in partnership with Henry Champion. See Peter Lowe, “All Western Dollars,” *MHS Transactions*, 3 (1945), http://www.mhs.mb.ca/docs/transactions/3/westerndollars.shtml.
in different periods. The Board met to discuss timely issues related to their members’
common business concerns, for instance, railroad freight rates, fire protection or the
navigation of the Red River, but it appeared they had no solid plans for the future. The
Board did not even have an office or paid officers to deal with day-to-day operations.
Meetings were held in the City Hall and the Board paid the City’s caretaker an extra
amount to assist them to set up the room for the deliberations. During the boom years
businessmen attended to private endeavours and the Board had great difficulty even to
attract members to annual general meetings.

Things seemed to change after the boom. In 1883 the newly elected president, C.
J. Brydges, acknowledged the importance of the Board and suggested that its members
should make an extra effort to increase the membership from 65 to 100. This meeting,
moreover, marked an important difference for the development of the Board of Trade and
its political influence. Among the businessmen accepted to the new Board was James E.
Steen, the publisher of The Commercial. Steen had arrived from Montreal in 1882 and
in partnership with James Boyce started the publication which would give an ideological
framework to the new business community associated with the most dynamic sectors of
Winnipeg’s economy at that moment: wholesalers, financiers, and commercial agents. In

94 Among other founding members of the Board of Trade was remarkable the presence of James Ashdown,
had been aldermen in the initial period of the city organization.

95 “City and Province,” Manitoba Daily Free Press, 31 January 1883, 2. In 1884 they held several meetings
at the Historical and Scientific Society location.

96 For instance, the attendance of the AGM of 1882 was so insufficient that two members had to leave and
tried to convince other members to attend and reach, in this form, the numbers required to start the meeting.
See “Board of Trade,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 11 January 1882, 5.

97 “City and Province,” 2.

98 Ibid.
a short time Steen became the Secretary and Treasurer of the Board of Trade and, in fact, the most prominent person within the organization. Steen’s professionalism and organizational skills oriented a rather disperse class and transformed the Board into an influential organization.

Steen had been in the city for roughly three months but he had already realized the irrelevant importance the local business community paid to its own organization. The Board, said Steen, “has been a purely ornamental concern… [and] even the annual meeting for the election of officers for the ensuing years has been forgotten.” He considered instead that “a Board of Trade in this city should be thoroughly aggressive in its policy, and its officers should be ever watchful to see where the influence of the Board could be made to tell in the interests of trade.” And he continued, “When the next annual meeting takes place therefore…it is to be hoped that new life will be infused into it, and that officers will be selected, who will keep the board the moving power in all matters of commercial progress.”99 The interests of the Board extended beyond the “commercial progress.” The City’s financial mismanagements during 1884 led the Board to get directly involved in city politics for the first time.

Late in October 1884, the Board of Trade organized a well-attended meeting widely publicized by the press.100 Its objective was the nomination of candidates for the upcoming City election in December. The Board had received the support of a great number of Winnipeggers beyond the business community who had seen the necessity of a radical change in city politics. As The Commercial editorialized, “It is to be hoped that

99 “A Board of Trade,” The Commercial (Winnipeg), 16 January 1883, 309.

100 “The Ball Opened,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 30 October 1884, 4.
some effort will be made this winter to elect a city council, the majority of whom will be from our leading men of trade, and we hope that men of that class will see that it is their duty to undertake the guidance of civic affairs when they are called upon to do so.”

In fact, different factions of the business community had always been represented in the Council since the city incorporation. What was now at stake in this crucial time, however, was that another faction of the business elite representing other economic interests started to dispute political power when the city was changing its economic structure. That was certainly the case when the citizens’ convention nominated Charles E. Hamilton for mayor. The young lawyer and rather inexperienced candidate was a partner in the law firm of Aikins, Culver and Hamilton. He had no direct connections with the Board of Trade, but that did not prevent him from receiving wide support from citizens, the business community, and the press. The Winnipeg Daily endorsed Hamilton’s candidacy “because he is pledged by every means in his power to restore confidence in the city abroad, so as to bring foreign capital, and to help develop the city.”

And that was the key question, indeed. The incumbents, in reality, had previously secured external funding, but the City’s state of affairs would probably make lenders

101 “Civic Honors,” The Commercial (Winnipeg), 14 October 1884, 49.


103 Don Nerbas has identified the changing condition of Winnipeg’s business community in the 1880s. See Don Nerbas, “Wealth and Privilege,” 46-47.

104 “A Chapter of History,” Winnipeg Daily Sun January, 24 January 1885, 1. Hamilton was a junior partner in the firm, but, if he did not have a direct connection to the Board, James A. M. Aikins, the senior partner and original owner of the firm was an active member as the press reported. See “Winnipeg Board of Trade,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 16 January 1884, 5.

105 “The Mayoralty,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 6 December 1884, 2.
more reluctant to extend credit if the old council remained in power. The nomination of Hamilton and of other new aldermanic candidates uncontaminated by day-to-day involvement in city politics would boost the City’s reputation abroad. That became apparent in the City election of 8 December 1884, when the “Citizens’ Ticket” led by Hamilton obtained a majority of 467 votes against the list of the incumbents led by former alderman and mayor, Elias G. Conklin. The “Ticket” also won in the majority of the wards.106

The new Council was formed by newcomers to politics and represented a variety of professions and occupations, perhaps not quite different than the occupations of those represented in the old councils.107 What marked the difference were not individuals or their professions but the economic and political program they aimed advanced. The honest and unsullied members of the new council represented the needs of the Board at that moment. As The Commercial, the house organ of the Board of Trade, exultantly reported the day after the election, “Not only will we profit therefore in a civic sense, but our whole machinery of business may be expected to move more freely for the future, and be lubricated by a free flow of foreign capital into the city and surrounding country.”108

---


107 Save for Stuart McDonald and Stewart Mulvey who were members in the previous Council, newcomers to politics filled the Council of 1885. Heber Archibald, a lawyer; G. H. Campbell, a CPR and immigration agent; G. F. Carruthers, H. S. Crotty, G. R. Crowe and Alfred Pearson representing the trade and real estate business and other newcomers to politics like T. G. Phillips, Thomas Ryan, George Spencer and George Young completed the aldermanic positions in the new Council. As I argued before, it was not the professions which characterized this Council, but the way they had changed the composition of the different committees. No longer was the city controlled by two or three aldermen managing key committees almost without intervention of the Mayor. This new Council, instead, gave a higher degree of power to Mayor Hamilton. See “Get Down to Work,” Winnipeg Daily Sun, 5 January 1885, 4.

Conclusion

The organization of Winnipeg as the space of negotiation and confrontation of the different factions of the emergent bourgeoisie showed a class in its making. The historiography of Winnipeg, according to Artibise and Careless, describes the business “elite” as a solid bloc, almost without contradictions, who advanced in the development of the city by chasing the modern dream of unlimited progress, while augmenting their fortunes and helping to build an important city. As this chapter has showed, instead, the distribution of power changed according to the necessities of the moment and, as such, different factions of the nascent bourgeoisie managed to control the municipal government at various times.

While the old settlers and recently arrived entrepreneurs set the conditions for the incorporation of Winnipeg and the formation of the municipal government in the 1870s, the following years another group with diverse interests managed to control the City Council and its key Finance and Works committees. In so doing, they did not care much about the formalities of proper, efficient government; instead, they expanded public works in ways suited to the real estate interests of some members of the business community who were enjoying the speculative climate of 1881-82. In this period, despite the press complaints and ethical campaigns, few paid attention of the City’s debt. Winnipeg was growing rapidly and that helped to promote the city. The humble prairie town of small wooden frame buildings had developed extraordinarily and public buildings with stone façades, paved streets, a fire protection system, water supply, and even electric illumination109 welcomed new immigrants and investors. The city, however,

had expanded by assuming a heavy debt. By 1883 the city was indebted in the amount of $1,900,000. Compared with other cities this was almost triple the per capita debt.\textsuperscript{110} For instance, Toronto with a population of 100,000 had a debt ratio of $9.50 per person a year and Hamilton a ratio of $7.50. Winnipeg, on the other hand, with a population of 20,000 had indebted its inhabitants by $22 per person a year.\textsuperscript{111} 

The involvement of the Board of Trade in city politics late in 1884 certainly helped to reformulate the political agenda of the business community in the years to come. The short period from 1870 to 1885 marked the emergence of Winnipeg’s key institutions which gave a political framework to the city under the premises of nineteenth-century liberal democracy. Liberalism, however, had its flaws and limitations. By 1884 liberal democracy was checked and the members of the nascent bourgeoisie exercised their influence and negotiated power through the political involvement of their principal organization, the Board of Trade. The success of the slate of candidates promoted by the Board returned credibility to city politics and created conditions for an institutional re-organization that closed a period of mismanagement, cronyism and corruption. The organization and management of the Sinking Fund was now in the hands of Hamilton and the newly appointed Trustees, Duncan MacArthur, manager of the Merchants’ Bank, and Alderman G. F. Carruthers, a successful real estate businessman

\textsuperscript{110} Artibise, \textit{Winnipeg: A Social History}, 43.

and future president of the Board of Trade. Mayor Hamilton soon was called to occupy the seat of the Province’s Attorney-General and in this position he was responsible of introducing the Torrens system in Manitoba in 1885. Not only had Hamilton appeared as the maker of proper municipal government but he also ended the uncertainties of land ownership and tenure.


Conclusion

The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles.

Marx and Engels, *The Communist Manifesto*

This study followed the growth and evolution of Winnipeg from 1870 to 1885. From a national perspective, these dates are key moments in the organization of the Canadian nation state and the consolidation of the British-Canadian bourgeoisie. Louis Riel’s resistance of 1869-70 resulted in the formation of the Province of Manitoba and also signalled the traumatic dispersal of the Métis farther into the North-West. In 1885, after the defeat of the North-West Rebellion and the arrival of the Canadian Pacific Railway (C. P. R.) in British Columbia, the organization of the Canadian nation state had finished a first stage of expansion and consolidation by connecting the country from coast to coast.

Winnipeg, situated in the middle of this new transcontinental state, consolidated its position as the wholesale centre of the West and had initiated a fast transition to industrial capitalism. During a short period, the small village had consistently grown and had incorporated all the components of a modern nineteenth-century capitalist city. Certainly, this growth was not a straight, steady process; it followed the uncertainties provoked by the consolidation of capitalism in a new region which slowly became linked
to the vicissitudes of the national and international economy. This thesis has identified three central elements that explain the consolidation of the bourgeoisie as the dominant class in Winnipeg. Firstly, it discussed the importance of transforming the common space into private property. Second, it analyzed the structure and economic formation of new a capitalist class and, third, it described the methodology used by the ruling elite to acquire power and wealth.

After Confederation, the growing village had not yet defined its boundaries. The dispute to configure the limits of a new city showed the particular interest between two different actors: the Hudson’s Bay Company (HBC) and the group of old settlers and newcomers. The HBC attempted to centralize its political power in the new province by laying out a land scheme within the limits of the emerging urban space it had recently obtained after the surrender of Rupert’s Land to the Crown. The Company’s reserve in Upper Fort Garry thus became a space of political pressure once lots were set aside and offered to the province for the construction of government buildings.

This decision was challenged by the residents of Point Douglas who had already appropriated an extended area of the Point Douglas Common and had even divided and sold significant number of lots. The appropriation of the undefined area that separated Point Douglas from the Commons thus became a commodified space. Its strategic location experienced an important change and as merchants established stores and other businesses, the area promised significant development opportunities during the real estate speculation of 1881-82. In this dispute for the territorial and economic hegemony and control of the urban space, some members of the emerging bourgeoisie obtained many
city lots by using political connections in Ottawa. This was a successful path to fortune and privilege.

This was an era of debt, overspending, and corruption in municipal government. The historiography of Winnipeg has paid scant attention to the expansion and development of public works, save for those scholarly works related to the establishment of the CPR, namely the construction of bridges. The manner in which public works were offered to contractors characterized a period of expansion and lax control. Nevertheless, the mechanism used to sell city bonds, along with other financial mismanagements in the administration of the city, did not matter much to those who were making enormous profits in the real estate market. They cared little that those who controlled the City Council in the first years of the 1880s were a group of petty politicians and money makers. Problems emerged when this group of “speculative loafers, [l]oquacious idlers and pretentious dead beats,” as The Commercial described them,\(^1\) became an obstacle to the development of the city in moments of economic uncertainty. This situation was serious because the economic crisis had sent some speculators into bankruptcy. Those who had gambled their fortunes during the real estate boom fell victim first, and then the crisis hit small merchants and retailers who were heavily indebted to wholesalers and banks.

In sum, the 1880s acted as a turning point in the evolution of Winnipeg and in the consolidation of a capitalist society. Winnipeg was experiencing a period of important growth and that was reflected in the construction of a significant number of public and private buildings and in the establishment of an increasing number of industries. The fur trade, however, still dominated the economy of the region, although its economic

---

\(^1\) “Civic Honors,” The Commercial (Winnipeg), 14 October 1884, 48.
importance was being overtaken by agricultural businesses and wheat production. The increasing industrialization of agricultural production demanded the work of mechanics and the establishment of new industries. The arrival of the CPR and the construction of workshops, depots, and yards attracted other kinds of industries that initiated the move towards industrialization and the division of labour.

By 1885 Winnipeg had already completed the public works necessary to attract investors and immigrants and so the city increased its importance as a capitalist centre. Investors attracted by the spectacular conditions of growth of the 1880s, had located in the city and increased the availability of capital to promote investments. Also, capital attracted important companies from Montreal, Toronto, and London, which opened branches in Winnipeg and boosted the development of the wholesale industry. These companies found in the new developed towns and cities of the West a place to allocate the surplus of their overstocked inventories. Certainly, the consequences of the economic crisis of 1882 disrupted this economic scheme when a significant number of retailers were forced out of business. Some wholesalers who were more solidly positioned could better face the crisis, and even emerged in better condition in the long run. However, those whose businesses were seriously affected were forced to retire from the market leaving the city with a number of bankruptcies.

In the middle of this crisis another faction of Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie—the commercial elite—understood that to keep the economic control of the city they might need to also obtain political control. During the days of real estate speculation of the 1880s, this emerging bourgeoisie had been dedicated to their own business, paying scant attention to issues of municipal politics not directly related to their business. The crisis
transformed this faction of the bourgeoisie from a rather passive agent into a scrutinizer of the system of municipal government. Winnipeg’s bourgeoisie through its main organization, the Board of Trade, presented a new political program according to their own class interest. This movement, therefore, put in power a group of new politicians directly related to the interests of the Board of Trade and to the most prominent economic actors of the period: wholesalers and financiers. Winnipeg, in this way, finished the year 1885 managed by a new class of politicians homogenously constituted according to the interests of the dominant economic sectors.

This thesis demonstrated how the conquest of space on the frontier and its urbanization took Winnipeg from a small village to the most important city of the Canadian West. It also showed how the bourgeoisie developed and the local state was consolidated. Some other important elements, however, were set aside of the historical narrative. For instance, limited attention was given to problems of gender, ethnicity, and religion. These elements are important but the attention here was focused primarily on Winnipeg’s economic and political development. The formation of the city was essentially an economic task and as such economics were dominant in the formation of classes and in the formation of the provincial and municipal governments.

This study has contributed to the discussion about the importance of land appropriation and ownership during Winnipeg’s formative years. The commodification of land permitted the formation of a dominant class and contributed a territorial framework to the initial cycle of capitalist accumulation in a new space. The dispute over ownership of that space extended throughout this period and framed the discussion about the importance of urban development under the premises of liberalism and private property.
In this period the consolidation of the bourgeoisie as a dominant class in Winnipeg was directly related to the appropriation and the management of urban territory. The acquisition of land, the formation of classes and the consolidation of the state were all ways of acquiring hegemonic dominance in Winnipeg.
Table 2
Distribution of lots in the Point Douglas (1869-1883)\(^1\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lot No.</th>
<th>Holders up to 8 March 1869(^2)</th>
<th>Transfer date</th>
<th>New Holders after 8 March 1869</th>
<th>City Lots Granted (June 1883)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Neil McDonald</td>
<td>May 1870 (Will)</td>
<td>McDonald’s heirs</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Bovette’s Family</td>
<td>April 1872</td>
<td>Two chains to Alexander Taché</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>McTavish</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>McKinney</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>W. G. Fonseca</td>
<td>Sept. 1872</td>
<td>Austin to Gallagher to Charles Radiger</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>E. L. Barber</td>
<td>May 1872 and Sept 1872</td>
<td>One half to: Alexander Brown</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One quarter to: Walter Bown(^3)</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>One quarter to: John C. Schultz</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>John Sutherland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>George Groat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>W. G. Fonseca</td>
<td>Sep 1872</td>
<td>Margaret Logan Fonseca. She then conveyed 6 acres to Schultz</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>E. L. Barber</td>
<td>Sep 1872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>John Sutherland (in process of buying)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>John Bruce</td>
<td>March 1876</td>
<td>Manitoba Brick and Pottery Co.</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Thomas Lusted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Henry Johnston</td>
<td>April 1872</td>
<td>John Schultz, except two chains.</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^1\) Extracted from *the Bill of Complain* and from OC No. 1883-1321.

\(^2\) The date refers to *Manitoba Act 32-1*.

\(^3\) Bown was Schultz’s secretary and he usually made business in Schultz’s name.
Table 3
Residences planned, in progress and finished in Winnipeg 1881-1882

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Area</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Contractor</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
<td>W. F. Alloway</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Sutherland Bros</td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>C. J. Brydges</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>J. J. Johnstone</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Garry</td>
<td>Jas. A. Graham</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>B. C. Kenway</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Blackmore and</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterton &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBC Reserve</td>
<td>Capt. Donaldson</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Cadham</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Osborne</td>
<td>F. H. Brydges</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>H. M. Howell</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>B. C. Kenway</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterton &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. N. Ruttans</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>McNichol</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hon. D. A. Smith</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>C. M. Jones</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Thos. McCrossan</td>
<td>Dwelling (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ed. Leacock</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>W. H. Lyon</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Mrs. Varden</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>Dr. J. S. Lynch</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>J. B. Morache</td>
<td>5,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Mark Fortune</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Point Douglas</td>
<td>Alex. Brown</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Brown &amp; Rutherford</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Broadway</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Geo. Brown</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jemina</td>
<td>Dwelling (8)</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assiniboine</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ross and Ellen</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Dwelling (4)</td>
<td>Wm. McDonald</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Chesterton &amp;</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>R. A. Rutan</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>McNichol</td>
<td>3,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>George</td>
<td>Residence 2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>3,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McMicken</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>J. Brown</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Kennedy</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. James Ward</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Argyle</td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Parry</td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Young</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Col. Smith</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Isabel</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. Mary's</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>J. B. Morache</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>R. B. Watson</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>McDonald</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jemina</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jemina</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Remarks</td>
<td>Value</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Bieber</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex. McEntyre</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Sharpe</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>George McPhillips</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Ferguson</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Farley</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. H. Weldon</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McComb &amp; Baily</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. H. Hutton</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Dean</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Emslie</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Wood</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Edwin scarlett</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aikins &amp; Montgomery</td>
<td>Cottages (2)</td>
<td>R. B. Watson</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. McNee</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Cullen</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. P. Johnston</td>
<td>House and Stable</td>
<td>J. J. Johnston</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. Farley</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Hill</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. L. Drewry</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snyder and Anderson</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. W. Sharp</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Banning</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. W. Ross</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jas. Flanagan</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. V. C. Pinkham</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. R. Fulthorpe</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Olds</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Swinford</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,400</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J. B. Ferguson</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>A. S. Lynch</td>
<td>1,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H. Woods</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rev. T. Argue</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Simms</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mrs. Linklater</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. McLeod</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chas. Robinson</td>
<td>Dwelling (4)</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dr. Sybourge</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Sparrow</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W. A. Shepperd</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wm. Brittlebank</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Jones</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>950</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fred. Mould</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Byron Johnson</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geo. Cauchon</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKever Bros</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Martin</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samuel Luff</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos. Perkins</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thos. Clouterhard</td>
<td>Cottage</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G. F. Carruthers</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street/Area</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Contractor/Arch</td>
<td>Cost $</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euclid</td>
<td>Hadekes</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>Geo. Brown</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillie</td>
<td>Mr. Hunter</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Thos. McCrossan</td>
<td>Dwelling (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dagmar</td>
<td>Thos. McCrossan</td>
<td>Dwelling</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>Thos. McCrossan</td>
<td>Dwelling (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$294,840</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4**
Public buildings planned, in progress and constructed in Winnipeg 1881-1882

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Area</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Contractor/Arch</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>110,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>Barber, Bowes and Barber</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Mary's Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court House</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. B. Wickindon</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Church</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pt Douglas Ave</td>
<td>Ogilvie Milling Co</td>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>Chesterton &amp; McNichol</td>
<td>35,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provincial Jail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterton &amp; McNichol</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Hospital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoba College</td>
<td></td>
<td>Club</td>
<td>A. P. Cameron</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Margaret</td>
<td>Christ Church</td>
<td>Brick Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>11,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Ward</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>8,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. John's Col.</td>
<td>Rev. S. P. Mathewson</td>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. James</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>St. John's College</td>
<td>Addition</td>
<td>1,220</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>499,520</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5**
Commercial buildings planned, in progress and constructed in Winnipeg 1881-1882

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street/Area</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Contractor/Arch</th>
<th>Cost $</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>HBC</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>B. C. Kenway</td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Gerrie and Co.</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td></td>
<td>Other Buildings</td>
<td></td>
<td>100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Gerrie and Co.</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>75,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td></td>
<td>Whol. Build.</td>
<td>65,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main and Bannatyne</td>
<td>Bird Estate</td>
<td>Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage and</td>
<td>Fred McKenzie</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>Barber, Bowes and Barber</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess and</td>
<td>R. Gerrie (Cross &amp; Terrat)</td>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupert</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Dundee Investment Co.</td>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>Barber, Bowes and Barber</td>
<td>22,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Montreal Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>B. C. Kenway</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main and Thistle</td>
<td>Capt. Donaldson</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>Blackmore and Cadham</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Gerrie and Co.</td>
<td>Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>18,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Ontario Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bank</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>H. Swinford Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Terrance</td>
<td>17,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Bishop and Skeleton Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>Store and Ware.</td>
<td>16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main and Post</td>
<td>Merchants Bank Bank</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wm. Muir</td>
<td>13,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>Morris Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saul and Hurler</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main and</td>
<td>Dann &amp; Robson Block</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lyons and Kelly</td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Gerrie and Co. Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams and</td>
<td>Gerrie and Co. Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td>T. Foulds Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Daily Free Press Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Street</td>
<td>J. R. Clement Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main and</td>
<td>Walter James Stores and Off.</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>F. Patche Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>McCoskie and Co.</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>J. H. Brock Terrance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main and</td>
<td>G. F. Carruthers Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>G. Melvin</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>G. F. Caruethers Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Ennis</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donald</td>
<td>Dundee Investment Co. Villas</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>John Nevias Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>G. F. Carruthers Stores and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Offices (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Geo. Melvin</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>Boyle Bros Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>C. L. Drewry</td>
<td>5,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>C. L. Drewry</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hargrave</td>
<td>F. G. H. Brock Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>V. Taranto</td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>V. Taranto Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td>Wilson &amp; Blyth Stables</td>
<td></td>
<td>B. C. Kenway</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Church</td>
<td>Boyle Bros Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>Bell and Mckenzie</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bannatyne</td>
<td>Andrew Strang Tenement</td>
<td></td>
<td>Patterson and McComb</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td>Thibautaudeau Bross Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inns &amp; Burke</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>M. Fortune Building</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Stalker and Hutchings Ws Hale/Harness Mnf.</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Geo. M. Vicar Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td>Gerrie and Co. Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hotel Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td>Tait and Co. Stables</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort</td>
<td>V. Taranto Hotel</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Ennis</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>C. W. Sharp Terrace</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McDermot</td>
<td>Thomas Hendry Cottage (5)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Middleton and Tiffin</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td>Mr. Colquohoun Addition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>James Ross Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princess</td>
<td>M. Fortune Stores</td>
<td></td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North West Investment Co Cottage (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chesterton &amp; McNichol</td>
<td>1,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td>W. M. Eagan Store</td>
<td></td>
<td>J. Ennis</td>
<td>1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>Geo. Webb</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>J. J. Johnston</td>
<td>BlkSmith-</td>
<td>J. J. Johnston</td>
<td>1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Carriage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garry</td>
<td>Mr. Webb</td>
<td>Stable</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>D. Sprague</td>
<td>Stables</td>
<td>Macklin</td>
<td>1,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thistle</td>
<td>Jas. Flanagan</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young</td>
<td>H. T. Shelton</td>
<td>Tenement</td>
<td>1,100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H. N. Ruttans</td>
<td>Stables</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>North West</td>
<td>Addition office</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Navigation Co</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Turner and McKeand</td>
<td>Renovation</td>
<td>800</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market</td>
<td>A. Hains, Son and</td>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Manning and Co.</td>
<td>Office</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Jas. Lyster</td>
<td>Red Ball Store</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main</td>
<td>Alloway and</td>
<td>Offices</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notre Dame</td>
<td>R. Bathgate</td>
<td>Coach Houses</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Railroad</td>
<td>R. Horstone</td>
<td>Store</td>
<td>William Brydon</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scotchish Manitoba</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>964,750</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 6**  
The economic reports of J. W. Taylor: imports into prairie Canada (or Winnipeg district) 1871-1887

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>To 30 June</th>
<th>From E. Cda.</th>
<th>From U.S.A.</th>
<th>From Gr. Br.</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>From B.C.</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>412,104</td>
<td>323,059</td>
<td>652,016</td>
<td>26,406</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,413,585</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>322,064</td>
<td>441,198</td>
<td>510,199</td>
<td>14,696</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,029,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>605,997</td>
<td>781,277</td>
<td>1,024,620</td>
<td>12,096</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,853,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>637,774</td>
<td>780,317</td>
<td>441,107</td>
<td>6,481</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,865,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>582,964</td>
<td>940,187</td>
<td>776,570</td>
<td>18,669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,318,390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>664,489</td>
<td>808,332</td>
<td>400,888</td>
<td>5,600</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,876,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>1,374,311</td>
<td>769,792</td>
<td>389,499</td>
<td>11,727</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2,545,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>2,266,088</td>
<td>839,499</td>
<td>335,324</td>
<td>21,464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,462,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>3,599,980</td>
<td>833,983</td>
<td>393,698</td>
<td>10,007</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4,837,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881</td>
<td>5,351,665</td>
<td>1,496,986</td>
<td>503,937</td>
<td>10,052</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,362,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1882</td>
<td>11,034,830</td>
<td>4,506,920</td>
<td>618,805</td>
<td>39,219</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16,199,772</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1883</td>
<td>14,197,077</td>
<td>8,495,985</td>
<td>1,539,240</td>
<td>59,265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>24,291,767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>7,098,538</td>
<td>4,439,819</td>
<td>1,174,707</td>
<td>71,735</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12,784,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3,661,814</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>4,724,566 est.</td>
<td>2,362,283</td>
<td>635,003</td>
<td></td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>7,820,959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1887</td>
<td>5,450,280</td>
<td>2,735,140</td>
<td>841,751</td>
<td>28,925</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,157,843</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>printing</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>140,500</td>
<td>97,800</td>
<td>54,600</td>
<td>238,000</td>
<td>1,789</td>
<td>14,267</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flour mill</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>342,000</td>
<td>65,800</td>
<td>787,000</td>
<td>1,062,500</td>
<td>9,403</td>
<td>52,425</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tailoring</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>63,450</td>
<td>41,600</td>
<td>72,850</td>
<td>126,700</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,531</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>foundries</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>311,500</td>
<td>39,415</td>
<td>153,600</td>
<td>260,900</td>
<td>3,034</td>
<td>22,628</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tin/sheet</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>80,400</td>
<td>61,850</td>
<td>85,475</td>
<td>317,900</td>
<td>4,024</td>
<td>10,034</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>breweries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>153,500</td>
<td>30,340</td>
<td>52,830</td>
<td>231,200</td>
<td>4,919</td>
<td>21,147</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>book binding</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>64,000</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>3,086</td>
<td>11,500</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sash/door</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>67,000</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>1,143</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saw mills</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carriage makg.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>30,100</td>
<td>20,100</td>
<td>18,800</td>
<td>48,000</td>
<td>1,548</td>
<td>1,820</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>saddle/harness</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>59,500</td>
<td>27,250</td>
<td>66,500</td>
<td>115,000</td>
<td>3,833</td>
<td>7,083</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stone cutting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>1,310</td>
<td>4,250</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>carpenters</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13,680</td>
<td>18,875</td>
<td>20,700</td>
<td>53,200</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td>2,271</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biscuit</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>18,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>1,520</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dress making</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17,275</td>
<td>4,820</td>
<td>22,125</td>
<td>31,297</td>
<td>1,565</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>photography</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>29,500</td>
<td>10,900</td>
<td>10,850</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>2,472</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bakeries</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14,300</td>
<td>10,430</td>
<td>23,400</td>
<td>46,200</td>
<td>2,432</td>
<td>3,093</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tent making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boots</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9,325</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>14,930</td>
<td>32,050</td>
<td>2,003</td>
<td>802</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>furriers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>7,300</td>
<td>55,000</td>
<td>87,000</td>
<td>5,438</td>
<td>12,350</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brick making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>667</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blacksmith</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6,900</td>
<td>6,700</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>18,500</td>
<td>1,423</td>
<td>1,248</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jewellers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>24,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>planning mill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23,000</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>4,167</td>
<td>12,500</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gas work</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>335,936</td>
<td>8,791</td>
<td>11,650</td>
<td>29,865</td>
<td>3,318</td>
<td>9,424</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chemical</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8,800</td>
<td>6,150</td>
<td>10,100</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,375</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cabinet makg.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>3,600</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>20,500</td>
<td>2,278</td>
<td>3,467</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aer. water</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>1,700</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>44,000</td>
<td>4,889</td>
<td>14,400</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry</td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Price</td>
<td>Profit</td>
<td>Capital</td>
<td>Debt</td>
<td>Stock</td>
<td>Reserve</td>
<td>Rate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tanneries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>30,600</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>30,200</td>
<td>3,775</td>
<td>6,100</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carving</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>2,900</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,050</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil Mill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90,000</td>
<td>2,850</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>38,000</td>
<td>6,333</td>
<td>10,150</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coffee</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broom Making</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>7,500</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbed Wire</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td>2,387</td>
<td>977</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithography</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,400</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paper Bag Mfg</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cigar Factory</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>4,950</td>
<td>1,238</td>
<td>1,675</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confectionery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>840</td>
<td>1,250</td>
<td>6,600</td>
<td>1,650</td>
<td>2,255</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,450</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinegar</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>6,400</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gunsmith</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>3,100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pump Factory</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>1,125</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boat Building</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baking Powd.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5,500</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pict. Framing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>1,150</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** 140 1,070 2,134,716 593,461 1,746,360 3,368,124 3,148 6,448 41

Figure 4
Distribution of river lots in Winnipeg in 1874

Appendix 6

Figure 5
Layout of city lots and streets in the Common in 1876

The shaded area shows that by 1876 an important extension of the Point Douglas Common had already been divided. Detail extracted from Parr, Plan of the City of Winnipeg and its Vicinity.
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