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Preface

The purpose of this report is to present a comprehensive land use history of the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, in Winnipeg, Manitoba. Throughout more than two centuries, this site has played a key role in the historical evolution of Winnipeg and Western Canada. Structures ranging from fur trade posts, riverboat warehouses, and railway terminal facilities, have all made an appearance near the junction. Moreover, the "Forks" of the Red and Assiniboine has served various societies and cultures as a meeting place, temporary encampment, garden plot, trading rendezvous, driving park and a railway marshalling yard. Some of these uses figure prominently in the history of the West, while others naturally are of less significance.

The probabilities of uncovering physical evidence and remains of these various uses and accompanying structures vary greatly. Undoubtedly some will be easily traced, while others are probably—either buried deep beneath land fill or carried away by the waters of the Red River.

In order to trace the physical evolution of this site, and assess the historical significance of the activities carried out there, a comprehensive examination of the entire historic period is needed. It is for this ambitious object that this report is directed. In addition, this study is intended to serve as a guide for future archaeological digs. As precisely as the historical documents would allow, the location and characteristics of every structure and land useage were presented.

The time frame of this study, and the wide variety of
uses to which the junction has been subjected posed numerous logistical and methodological problems in the production of this report. Moreover, some phases of the site's history abound with relevant material, while other periods are almost void of information. Unfortunately, the abundance of documentation did not necessarily coincide with the more significant historical phases. Some periods, such as the pre-contact, and early French occupation are extremely deficient in documentation, while others, such as the more recent railway era, contains so much information that it became difficult to integrate it all into the report.

The methodology employed to overcome these logistical problems was straightforward. The entire 250 year period was broken down into nine phases of varying lengths. The divisions between these phases or chapters were set arbitrarily. They were, however, based on two pre-requisites: the availability of data, and historical significance. For each chapter a separate historical narrative and interpretive conclusion was produced. Furthermore, the evolution of each of these phases is depicted graphically by the inclusion of a site plan of the junction. Each chapter also includes a collection of contemporary maps, plans, paintings or photographs of the junction which will assist to illustrate the chronological development of the site.
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Introduction

Almost every phase of Western Canada's colourful history is represented, in some way, at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. From the very onset of human habitation and travel in the area and subsequently, throughout all the major phases of Western Canadian history, the "Forks" of the Red and Assiniboine has been a meeting place of special importance. Despite this prominence, an ever present anomaly stands out when one assesses the history of the junction. How is it that a site, so vigorously contested for throughout most of the historic period, has now become a classic example of socio-economic under-utilization? From the earliest recorded inhabitants of this area through the exploration and the fur trade era, the Red River Settlement period and into the early urbanization phase, the land adjacent to the Forks was a very attractive and sought after property. After 1875, however, this site gradually lost much of its appeal until, during the last half century the junction has come to be an area on the fringe of Winnipeg's main urban corridor of development.

An explanation for this phenomenon was put forward by historian W.L. Morton before the American Historical Association in Chicago in 1950. In this essay entitled "The Significance of site in the Settlement of the American and Canadian Wests," Morton developed two major premises. Firstly, "...that the Settlement of the west was in a large measure a competition for site," and secondly "...that the absolute significance of site is most pronounced in primitive society and becomes progressively less so as society grows more complex."^1 The Forks
of the Red and Assiniboine, the history of which is more than familiar to Morton, provides an excellent case study to examine this thesis. Throughout the pre-contact, fur trade and early settlement eras, competition for control of the advantageously situated property at the Forks was keen. After 1875, however, the introduction of a more sophisticated technology in terms of transportation, communication, and urban development (and numerous other factors including politics), made it possible for alternative sites to challenge the supremacy of the Forks. In Winnipeg, site was no longer the sole determinant of the profitability of an enterprise. From 1875 to the present, the owners of this valuable property have had a difficult time attracting any industrial or commercial activity. In fact, the city of Winnipeg, which had its genesis at the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine, grew and developed away from the Forks. The background and events that contributed to this phenomenon will form a major portion of this study.

The period prior to 1875, at the Forks, was characterized by a continual struggle for its possession. The importance of the Forks to all its pre-1875 inhabitants was derived from the close interaction of geography and human endeavour. The pre-contact aboriginal societies as well as those who succeeded them, relied heavily on key water oriented transportation routes. The Forks of the Red and Assiniboine provided ready access to large and varied tracts of territory. It was its geographic significance, therefore, which elevated the junction to a prominent position.

Certain key sites were of great importance to the life and lifestyle of the aboriginal tribes.

The well-being, if not the survival of a band depended on assembly at one or another of given kinds of places at given seasons. The fall fishery and the Buffalo Hunt, the rice gathering and the sugar making, the trading voyage, and the dispersal to the winter trapping grounds gave some
rhythm to the movement of the bands of the Plains and the Woods Indians.2

The economy of the fur trade era, involving the French 1731-1763, the Canadian and Nor'Westers 1766-1821, and the Hudson's Bay Company from 1821-1871, also placed a heavy dependence on "site." The trade of the Montréal based Northwest Company serves as a good example. The great distance and the difficulty of the voyage to and from the West from Montreal, combined with the shortness of the navigation season in the inland waters, meant that trade and provisioning posts had to be chosen with great care. The success of the operation rested on an orderly, efficient and quick transfer of goods. Consequently, the geographic advantages of certain sites over others had to be exploited, and they were.

After 1875, the relative importance of site in the development of Winnipeg diminished. This is not to say that geographic position was not important, but merely that other more complex factors played an increasingly large role. The introduction of more efficient and cheaper transportation, for instance, played a key role in this transformation. There were other determinants as well, and these will be discussed in detail later in this report. It is sufficient at this juncture to emphasize the important distinction that existed between the pre and post urban eras.

The historical significance of the Forks, therefore, is primarily concentrated in the pre-1875 era when its prominence was closely linked to its strategic geographic position. The country about the lower course of the Red River is a transitional zone that borders on three distinct geographic and vegetation regions. The Red and Assiniboine Rivers, along with their tributaries, provide ready access to all these regions. The Great Plains of North America stretch out to the south and west. The coniferous forests of the Canadian shield border on the north and east and the parkland belt commences a short distance to the north west. Each of these
regions, with their accompanying vegetation and climatic characteristics, dictated diverse life patterns for its inhabitants. Due to these transitional qualities, the Forks was the domain of diverse peoples and cultures, as well as a place where these cultures would interact and at times, come into conflict.

This interrelationship between geography and history is a central theme in Canadian history. Much of the historiography of Canada, and Western Canada in particular, is an examination of the interaction of man and his environment. This theme is evident, whether one is examining the career of La Vérendrye in the 18th century, or the struggle of scientific dry land agriculture on the prairies in the 20th century. Therefore, a history of the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers, and more specifically a land use history, requires a comprehensive description of the physical setting.

**Historiography**
The existing literature dealing specifically with the history of the Forks is primarily confined to a small collection of published articles that attempt to pinpoint the location and construction dates of the various 18th and 19th century fur trade forts. In order to comprehend the historical significance of the Forks, a more inclusive and more analytical approach is necessary. Little attention has been placed on the era prior to the arrival of the French explorers, or, for that matter, the period after the decline of the fur trade. Moreover, the existing historiography varies greatly, both in quality and consistency.

The literature touching upon the Red and Assiniboine Junction is also wanting in interpretive quality. Although the writers trace its historical significance to the Forks' advantageous geographic position in relation to the fur trade, they do not develop this thesis fully. Others have merely
attributed the significance of the Forks to the fact that it was the predecessor to the City of Winnipeg, or have concerned themselves with the structural evolution of the site without attempting to place its development into comprehensive analytical context.

There are three outstanding examples in Western Canadian Historiography where the connection between history and geography has been made. Throughout all of his works, historian W.L. Morton has placed a heavy emphasis on the geographic influence on Canadian History. His essay "The Significance of Site in the Settlement of the American and Canadian Wests," clearly emphasizes this connection. Fellow historian, Arthur Silver Morton, also believed that a knowledge of the geographic or physical setting was crucial to an understanding of Western Canadian history. He began his monumental study, A History of the Canadian West to 1870-71, with a chapter devoted to the geographic and climatic zones that comprised the region. More recently, historical geographer Arthur J. Ray, in his important revisionist work Indians in the Fur Trade, also placed considerable emphasis upon the Indian's interrelationship with his physical environment.

The majority of the historical writing focussing upon the historical development of the Forks and the city of Winnipeg is more limited in its interpretations than those of the two Mortons and Ray. It is best represented by an article published in the Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada, and three which appeared in the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba Transactions. George Bryce, one of Manitoba's pioneer historians, presented a paper to the Royal Society of Canada in 1885, shortly after the dismantling of Upper Fort Garry. The premise to his article was established in the introductory paragraph:

Five forts around which gather the most interesting events connected with the history of Rupert's Land and the Canadian Northwest were erected within what is not the limits of the City of Winnipeg.
Bryce then proceeded to unveil a series of facts and occurrences relating to the establishment of Forts Rouge, Gibraltar, the Original Fort Garry, and Upper Fort Garry. He did not attempt to resolve the question of why there were so many forts built at this river junction.

In 1927, the then president of the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, Charles Napier Bell, again addressed this same topic in an address to the society entitled "The Old Forts of Winnipeg." Bell also neglected to examine the underlying reasons for the erection of so many forts at the junction. Subsequently, the society's patient members heard two papers read by William Douglas titled "The Forks Becomes a City" and "New Light on the Old Forts of Winnipeg." Douglas set out the terms of reference in his first paper. Who, he asked, were the first white men to gaze upon the site of Winnipeg? The efforts of Douglas, like those of Bryce and Bell, failed to tie the historical evolution of Winnipeg, to the geographic significance of the site. Antoine Champagne, in his Nouvelles Etudes sur les La Vérendrye: Et Les Postes de L'Ouest, is the most recent addition to the list of works concerned with the establishment of forts at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine. Champagne's work, which is restricted to the French Period in Western Canada (1731-1763), also failed to examine the connection between fur trade posts and geographic site. Aside from this serious lack of interpretation, most of these works also contain numerous factual errors, particularly with relation to the dates of construction for these various establishments erected at the Forks and their respective locations.

It is appropriate, at this juncture, to examine these studies in light of the sources used, the methodology employed and some of the conclusion reached. In most cases their conclusions concerning the establishments erected at the Forks are similar. The major exception was the controversy surrounding the location of Fort Rouge. Bryce and Champagne, relying
on cartographic evidence, placed Fort Rouge on the south bank of the Assiniboine River. C.N. Bell and William Douglas argued that Fort Rouge was probably situated on the north bank of the same river. A.S. Morton was inconclusive.8

Bryce, in his 1885 article "The Five Forts of Winnipeg" relied heavily on the five maps from the La Vérendrye period which had been deposited in the French Archives in Paris. As he did not examine La Vérendrye's Journals, his dating of the construction of Fort Rouge in 1736 and his conclusions concerning its builder are incorrect. Fifteen years later, in his The Remarkable History of the Hudson's Bay Company,9 Bryce had examined the La Vérendrye Journals and corrected the construction date of Fort Rouge to 1738. He still maintained, however, that Fort Rouge was built on the south side of the Assiniboine. As to the subsequent forts, Bryce based his conclusions on interviews with Red River "old timers," and on personal recollection. Once again, he was mistaken in his claim that the dismantled Fort Gibraltar was never rebuilt. Later evidence will show that it was. Moreover, his placing of the construction of the original Fort Gibraltar at 1806 was at least four years off the mark. He did not cite his sources for this conclusion, or for that matter, for the majority of his conclusions. His statements on the last Fort Garry, however, must be considered closely as they were based primarily on personal recollection.

Charles Napier Bell's 1927 article "The Old Forts of Winnipeg,"10 was an improvement on Bryce's work. Bell also examined the documents relating to the French Period, but, unlike Bryce, he used the La Vérendrye maps in conjunction with the published La Vérendrye Journals.11 By relying on these Journals, Bell correctly placed the construction date of Fort Rouge at 1738, and accurately stated that it was built under the direction of Monsieur de Lamarque, not by the more famous La Vérendrye. More importantly, Bell was the first to question
the traditional site of Fort Rouge. He was convinced that it was situated on the north bank. The basic premise of his argument was that the south bank of the Assiniboine was considerably lower than the north and consequently more liable to spring flooding. Secondly, there was the fact that the north side of the Assiniboine subsequently was chosen by everyone who established themselves at the Forks, including the North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company. His final argument, and the one that convinced him to argue in favour of the north bank location, was based on evidence drawn from Alexander Henry's journals, which Bell had uncovered in the Parliamentary Library at Ottawa in 1887. Henry wrote:

Upon this spot, in the time of the French there was a trading establishment, traces of which are still to be seen where the chimneys and cellars stood.12

Bell was convinced that these "traces" were undoubtedly those of Fort Rouge, and that Henry was on the north bank of the Assiniboine at the time of his writing. The cartographic evidence from the La Vérendrye period which placed Fort Rouge on the south bank was dismissed by Bell as careless and inaccurate renderings by the draftsman. Bell concluded:

An impartial study of the ascertained facts must convince any student that Lamarque built the Fort Rouge post, that it was in existence for probably only one winter, and that it was on the north bank of the Assiniboine River at the Forks.13

With regard to the later forts, Bell again provided more detail than Bryce. He referred to the journals of Saint Pierre,14 La Vérendrye's successor, and in particular, St-Pierre's reference to wintering at the Forks in 1752-1753. Bell also noted for the first time that a Mr. Dorion wintered at the Forks in 1803-04. As to the construction of the first North West Company fort at the Forks, Bell relied on the testimony of John McDonald of Garth, published in L.R. Masson's Les Bourgeois de la Compagnie du Nord-Ouest.15 McDonald claimed
to have erected Fort Gibraltar at the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine in 1807. It is at this juncture that Bell displays some inconsistency. He had relied heavily on Alexander Henry's journal to "prove" that Fort Rouge was erected on the north bank of the Assiniboine. Had he pursued this same thoroughness in his examination of Fort Gibraltar, he certainly would have reached the conclusion that Fort Gibraltar could not have been erected in 1807, as McDonald claimed. Henry remained in charge of the Red River district until the autumn of 1808, and Fort Gibraltar did not exist when he departed.

Bell allegedly visited the traditional site of Fort Gibraltar in 1871 with Corporal Sam Steele. They walked, Bell wrote, "a few hundred yards from Fort Garry" and there "plainly to be seen very near of the edge of the bank were recognizable hollows representing cellars...[and other evidence that suggested]...chimneys." Bell's conclusions concerning the location and structural details of the two Fort Garrys (1822-35 and 1835-82) were based, as were Bryce's, on personal recollection and interviews with long time residents.

Arthur Silver Morton, perhaps the most prominent historian of the Canadian fur trade, also focussed his attention on the forts at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine. He wisely resisted entering the controversy surrounding the location of Fort Rouge, simply stating that the French Fort was established at the Forks of the Red River. In his work discussing the exploration of the Red River and the West by the Canadians after the conquest, Morton returned to the history of the Forks. In a paper presented to the Royal Society of Canada in 1937 entitled "Forrest Oakes, Charles Boyer, Joseph Fulton, and Peter Pangman in the North West 1765-1793," Morton provided fresh insight into the re-establishment of the fur trade in the west after 1763. His identification of Forrest Oakes' residence on the Red River, near Selkirk from 1766 to 1768, is of particular importance.
William Douglas, in two papers presented to the Historical and Scientific Society of Manitoba, has produced the most detailed and thorough work on the establishment of fur trade forts at the junction. While Douglas agreed with Bell that Fort Rouge was probably located on the north bank of the Assiniboine, he corrected Bell's statement concerning the construction date of the initial Fort Gibraltar to 1810 rather than 1907. Douglas' two papers, however, are primarily devoted to the 1812-21 conflict between the fur trade and the struggling Red River Settlement. Central to his study, and not surprisingly the major primary source for his work, were the Selkirk Papers.

The most recent study to deal specifically with the establishment of fur trade posts at the Forks is Antoine Champagne's Nouvelles Etudes sur les La Vérendryes; Et Les Postes de l'Ouest, published in 1968. Champagne's work is the most exhaustive study on the French regime in the West. He carefully analyzed La Vérendrye's Journals as well as the correspondence of his superiors in Québec City and Paris in conjunction with all the relevant maps of the period. Champagne did not support the argument of Bell and Douglas which placed Fort Rouge on the north side of the Assiniboine. Furthermore, Champagne did not dismiss the cartographic evidence. It was, he suggested, the only contemporary evidence which gave any indication as to Fort Rouge's location. The cellar remains and other tell-tale evidence discovered on the north bank by Henry, he speculated, could well have been left by St-Pierre in 1752-53, or by Boyer and Bruce in 1781-82.

In summary then, it is clear that the historiography on the Forks is narrowly focussed on the fur trade era. Furthermore, these works contain numerous and serious discrepancies in fact and interpretation which must be resolved. As well as a need for more detailed documentation on the pre-contact period and the early urban era, a comprehensive synthesis is
required to fuse the interpretive qualities exhibited by W. L. Morton and Arthur Ray with the specific structural and land use evolution of the Forks.

The Physiography of the Red-Assiniboine River System

The main stream of the Red River originates in Lake Traverse, about 500 miles south of its outlet into Lake Winnipeg. The Red has a fairly uniform, continual descent northward averaging less than one-half foot per mile. Its watershed includes the broad, flat and fertile plains that were at one time the bed of glacial Lake Agassiz. The river channel varies in depth from 20 to 50 feet, and meanders freely and frequently about its entire course, but nowhere does it depart more than four miles on one side or the other from its general northward course. The valley bottom rises gradually at a rate of about two or three feet per mile for the first 10 miles to the east and west of the river.

Numerous tributaries flow into the Red River from both the east and west. The more important of these tributaries in the American section of its course are the Otter Tail and Bois de Sioux Rivers near Wahpeton, North Dakota, the Wild Rice and Sheyenne Rivers near Fargo, and the Red Lake River at Grand Forks. Below Grand Forks, the Snake River, the Park River and Two Rivers enter the Red. The Pembina River joins the Red near the international boundary. In Manitoba, the major tributaries are the Roseau, the Rat, the La Salle and the Seine Rivers. The Assiniboine River, the largest of all, enters the Red from the west at the heart of the city of Winnipeg. The Red's tributaries have a fairly rapid descent into the valley, where their slopes are reduced to little more than that of the Red.

The drainage basin of the Assiniboine includes the prairies of east central Saskatchewan and South Western Manitoba, and part of the parkland country of West Central Manitoba.
Most of the runoff of the Assiniboine emanates from this smaller northern portion of its drainage basin which includes the southern slopes of Riding Mountain and Nut Mountain. The Assiniboine upstream from Portage la Prairie flows through a deep scenic valley, while downstream from Portage to Winnipeg, the river has formed an alluvial plain. The entire drainage basin of the Red-Assiniboine system is 111,000 square miles of which 48,000 is attributed to the main stream of the Red, and 63,000 to the Assiniboine. The Assinibione, while draining a considerably larger area, contributes only 30 per cent of the Red's water volume below the Forks.

The land immediately adjacent to the junction of the Red and Assiniboine can be divided into three basic components. The first parcel is that area east of the Red River opposite the mouth of the Assiniboine, now part of Saint-Boniface. The second is the narrow pointed projection of land on the south side of the Assiniboine on the west bank of the Red River, formerly known as St-Boniface West, and now part of Fort Rouge. And finally, there is that piece of property situated west of the Red and north of the Assiniboine, now occupied by the Canadian National Railway's East yards. The elevation of the river banks are approximately 20 to 25 feet above late summer water levels. The banks on the east side of the Red River are somewhat lower. The riverbank vegetation near the Red/Assiniboine junction, and indeed throughout most of their urban courses, has changed considerably from the pre-settlement era. The earliest descriptions of the pre-settlement vegetation and topography are those recorded by the early fur traders of the North West Company. Alexander Henry, the younger, who first passed by the junction in August 1800, left the following description:

The beach along this river [Assiniboine] being black mud, the last rain turned it into a kind of mortar that adheres to the feet like tar, so that in every step we raise several pounds of it, and everything that touches it receives a share.
The S. side of the Assiniboine, particularly near the forks, is a woody country, overgrown with poplars so thickly as scarcely to allow a man to pass on foot; this extends some miles W., when the wood is intersected by small meadows. The woody country continues S. up Red River to Rivièrre la Sale. On the E. side of the Red the land is low, overgrown with poplars and willows, frequently intersected by marshes, stagnant ponds, and small rivulets. The banks are covered on both sides with willows, which grow so thick and close as scarcely to admit going through; adjoining these is commonly a second bank of no great height. This is covered with very large wood such as liard, bois blanc, elm, ash, and oak; some of these trees are of enormous size.24

Henry's description of the Forks was verified by that of another Nor'Wester, Daniel Williams Harmon, who recorded his impressions of the site in his journal for 1805:

The Forks or where the Upper [Assiniboine] and Lower Red River form a junction—and hereabouts the country appears to have a richer soil than at any other place, I have observed in this part of the world—and is covered with oak, Basswood, Elm, Poplar and Birch, etc., also here are Red Plums, and Grapes...25

The trees lining the banks of the Red and Assiniboine extended back in varying distances ranging from a few yards to a mile or more. Beyond these belts of forest, a prairie, consisting of long grasses and small clumps of shrubs and bush, commenced. Miles Macdonnell, who led the first contingent of Selkirk Settlers to the Red River in 1812, left the following appealing, if not overly romantic description of his first sight on the lands bordering the confluence of the Red and Assiniboine:

After leaving the river bank [we] entered a fine plain as level as a bowling green covered with a fine sward of grass, knee high, here and there a clump of wood as if planted for ornament by the hand of man, partridges rising before us in conveys each side of the patch, ducks and geese fly about us. The plain extended close to the Forks, which we reached at 2 o'clock p.m.26
As would be expected, it was the era after the commencement of permanent European settlement (1810-1815), that saw the largest and most profound alteration to the land adjacent to the Forks. Agriculture, and the constant demand for firewood and building materials, compounded by a lack of suitable means of transport, dictated the extensive harvest and denuding of the tree lined banks of both rivers near the Forks. By the late 1850s, the date of the earliest photograph of the site [1858 Hime Photograph], the absence of tree growth is readily evident.

Since 1810 three main activities have influenced the natural appearance of the Red/Assiniboine Junction. These include:

1) the ongoing alteration of the junction caused by frequent spring flooding and accompanying ice erosion, followed by a rapid decline of water levels which causes large pieces of the river banks to fall away.

2) Man's agricultural and architectural pursuits (principally in the period 1836-59).

3) the establishment of railway facilities, which necessitated substantial contour and grade modifications including both excavation and fill.
The Forks of the Red and Assiniboine, due to its transitional geographic position and its accessibility, emerged early in the pre-contact period as a point where diverse native groups assembled. In the era prior to European contact, the Assiniboine, the Western Cree, the Ojibwa and to a lesser extent, the Sioux, all considered the Forks as their own territory. In historic terms, the original inhabitants of this area were the Assiniboine. These Siouan speaking people were at one time a part of the Sioux nation. Perhaps as early as 1640, A.J. Ray contends, and certainly by the 1670s, the Assiniboine were a distinct group living apart from their former kin. This separation was confirmed and enhanced after the European fur trade was established on the shores of Hudson Bay after 1670. After their split with the Sioux the "...tribal territory of the Assiniboine reached from the vicinity of Rainy Lake on the Southeast to the valley of the Saskatchewan in the Northwest." The fur trade, with its guns, metal goods, and other materials, linked the Assiniboine, out of necessity and convenience, with their northern neighbours, the Cree. From the 17th century on, the Assiniboine and Cree formed trading alliances and united war parties. They were frequently seen together, and when La Vérendrye first entered the region in the 18th century, he consulted and negotiated with both tribes. The Cree and Assiniboine may well have considered the area about the Forks as "their own territory" during the late 18th century. It was, nevertheless, a disputed region. The Assiniboine and their Cree allies were continually at war with
Figure 1. Tribal Distributions in the Prairie West, ca. 1765.
Figure 2. Tribal Distributions 1821.
Figure 3. Tribal Distributions 1860.
their southern neighbours, the Sioux. From 1670 to 1870, Cree and Assiniboine war parties regularly ventured into Sioux territory. Similarly, the Sioux would enter the domain of the Assiniboine and make war on the inhabitants. Netley Creek, or more properly Rivière aux Morts, which flows into the Red a few miles north of the Forks, takes its ominous French name from a massacre of a large camp of Assiniboine and their allies by a band of Sioux warriors. These recurring and reciprocal raids reinforced the Forks' role as a transitional or border land:

The raiding parties into Sioux territories were sufficient to thwart Sioux attempts to expand northward, but did not enable the Assiniboines to secure a solid foothold on south-eastern Manitoba, and the Upper Red River valley above the Forks remained a no-man's land.

Geographer Arthur Ray's interpretation that the Forks was an area bordering on a no-man's land, may help to explain why the Assiniboine insisted that La Vérendrye establish a fort at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine rivers. A fortified post at the junction would solidify the Assiniboine's hold on that territory.

Following the departure of the French from the West after 1760, the various Indian tribes continued to compete for the area about the Forks. In 1800, when Alexander Henry first arrived at the Forks, he discovered that the new residents, the Saulteaux (Ojibwa) were greatly alarmed about an impending Sioux invasion.

The [the Saulteaux] were certainly in a state of great alarm when we arrived at the Forks, and had even made a sort of entrenchment by digging deep holes in the ground several yards long for the safety of their women and children...

The wintering grounds, hunting areas, and "own territories" of the various Indian tribes shifted dramatically and continuously during the early post contact period. These shifts can be attributed to numerous influences. Ray suggests that
the influence of the fur trade was predominant. Diamond Jenness, a prominent anthropologist, attributed these constant shifts to wars and foreign diseases, especially smallpox. Whatever the reasons, the Assiniboine and Western Cree had begun to vacate the Lake Winnipeg and Lower Red River region by the late 18th century.

The Saulteaux, part of the Ojibwa nation, moved westward into the territories vacated by the Assiniboine and Cree. It was with the Saulteaux that Alexander Henry traded on the Red River at the turn of the century. John Tanner, a white man kidnapped by the Ojibwa during his youth, and who subsequently spent some 30 years travelling with them reported that they "...found great numbers of Ojjibbwass and Ottawwaws encamped" at the Forks when he first passed by there. Historical geographer, John Warkentin, dated Tanner's arrival at Red River just prior to 1800. Like the Assiniboine and Cree who preceded them, the Saulteaux did not control the Forks outright. Tanner recalled that the mouth of the Assiniboine was "...a place much frequented by the Sioux war parties, where they lie concealed and fire upon such as are passing."

During the historic period of Indian possession the Forks was a no-man's land or war zone. Its transitional qualities and accessibility made it a desirable and strategic site, but at the same time brought about conflict and war. It is this characteristic, more than any other, which best represents the pre-contact and early post contact history of the Forks.

The identification of physical remains or artifacts from the periodical occupation of the Forks by the various aboriginal tribes may be possible. Despite Ray's theory that the Forks was a no-man's land, there are numerous documented accounts of the Forks' periodic occupation by the Assiniboine, Cree and Saulteaux. In February 1737, La Vérendrye, on the occasion of his first visit to the Red River, was informed that two villages of Assiniboines were situated at the great
Forks of the Red River. In March 1737, during a French-Indian council at Fort Maurepas near the mouth of the Red River, an Assiniboine chief promised that they would form a village at the Forks if the French would erect a post there. This suggests that the Assiniboine occupation of the Forks prior to 1737 was not continual or permanent. When La Vérendrye returned to the west and the Red River in September 1738, he reported that "10 cabins of Crees" were encamped at the Forks awaiting his arrival. Apparently, the Assiniboine moved up the Assiniboine River a short distance.

After the fall of the French regime in Canada and the consequent brief abandonment of the west by the fur trade, recorded visitations to the Forks are scarce until the 1790s. Consequently documentation of Indian activity and occupation at the Forks during this period is almost non-existent. In 1793, John McDonnell, a fur trader outfitted from Montreal, twice passed by the Forks. In May, on his way up the Assiniboine, he noted that the Forks "...as well as Rivière aux Morts, is a favourite Indian encampment." On his return in September he again noted that "At the Forks we found two lodges of Indians who have a moose deer killed not far off."

During the first decade of the 19th century, and prior to the establishment of Fort Gibraltar by the North West Company, the Forks continued as a periodic Indian encampment. Harassment from the Sioux prevented the Saulteaux, like their Cree and Assiniboine predecessors, from establishing permanent occupation. Alexander Henry and John Tanner both mentioned that the Saulteaux were in a state of alarm over a possible Sioux attack when they passed by the Forks in 1800.

Following the establishment of Fort Gibraltar at the Forks in 1810-11, and the subsequent fur trade and colonial establishments by the Hudson's Bay Company after 1812, the area was continually visited by Indians on trading expeditions. The Saulteaux took permanent possession of a small area on the
lower Red River near its mouth, and were, in fact, the "local" Indians of the Red River Settlement. The Forks, however, had passed from Indian control to the broader ramifications of the fur trade. Nevertheless, an Indian presence remained at the Forks after the commencement of the Canadian and Hudson's Bay Company fur trade. There is some evidence to suggest that a small area near the Forks was used as a Saulteaux burying ground. Reverend John West of the Church Missionary Society noted on August 1821 that the Saulteaux "in burying their dead at the Forks, the axe, the kettle, and the property of the deceased are put into the grave with the corpse..."

In summary, these accounts suggest that various Indian tribes frequented the Forks throughout the early post contact period. There is, however, no evidence to suggest an occupation of a permanent nature. The presence of the Sioux a short distance to the south, and their continuous harassment of the Assiniboine, Cree and Saulteaux who resided, for varying periods, in the Lower Red River region, made the Forks an impractical site for a permanent village. This fact may explain the dirth of artifact findings at the Forks during an archaeological survey of the area in 1968-69. The survey failed to identify any recognizable aboriginal encampments in the immediate area of the Red/Assiniboine junction.
The French regime in North America, principally through the efforts of Jacques de Noyon, had progressed as far west as the Lake of the Woods by 1688. De Noyan's venture, however, was an exception to the general Southwest expansion of the French, who were attracted to the lucrative trade potential offered by the Mississippi River valley. De Noyan's exploits were not duplicated until 1730 when a concerted attempt was made by the French to explore the far west in their search for the western sea.

The 1731 appointment of Pierre Gaultier de Varennes, Sieur de La Vérendrye as commandant of the Western posts re-kindled French interest in the interior of North America, west and north of Lake Superior. La Vérendrye and his successors eventually established and maintained a network of posts through an area extending from the Lake of the Woods to the forks of the North and South Saskatchewan rivers. It was during La Vérendrye's period of command that the first "Fort" or trading post was established at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine rivers.

The only documentary evidence to deal specifically with the La Vérendrye period in Western Canada (1731-1744), and, in particular, his activities in and about the Red River, are the journals, letters, memoirs, and maps produced by him or under his authorization. Lawrence J. Burpee assembled, edited, translated and published a comprehensive collection of these documents for the Champlain Society in 1927. These journals and correspondence provide an adequate but incomplete narration of La Vérendrye's activities in the West. They
also effectively convey the atmosphere in which he had to perform. While he was placed under constant pressure from the authorities in Québec and Paris to push ahead with the search for the Western Sea, he was also hampered by the lack of government financial assistance. Furthermore, he and his associates confronted a hostile physical environment and, at times, unfriendly Indians. In June 1736, for instance, he received the news of the death of his nephew and draftsman La Jemeraye. Three weeks later he heard that 21 members of his party, including one of his sons, had been massacred on an island in the Lake of the Woods, just west of his post, Fort St-Charles.

As comprehensive accounts of his journeys and explorations, the La Vérendrye journals are disappointing. La Vérendrye was simply not inclined towards a meticulous record of his travels and experiences. More relevant to this study, the journals contain little information on the Forks of the Red River and the establishment of a fort there. The first French establishment on the Red River was not at the Forks but near the mouth of the Red. The order for its establishment was issued by La Vérendrye in May 1734, and in all likelihood it was erected that summer. In June 1735, La Vérendrye's second son wrote to M. Beauharnois in Québec informing him that "I have erected a fort at Lake Winnipeg (Oyunipigon) five leagues up the Red River, on a fine point commanding a distant view." The fort and the river bear the name of Maurepas. The elder La Vérendrye's intention to proceed to Lake Winnipeg in 1736 was stymied by the news of the massacre of 21 of his party in June 1736. Thus it was early in 1737 before he left Fort St-Charles for the Red River and Lake Winnipeg. The route taken was not the familiar Winnipeg River route outlined by La Jemeraye and Jean Baptiste Gaultier (La Vérendrye's son) in 1733. Instead he chose to proceed over a short passage (Savanne) to the Upper waters of the Roseau River, which flowed
into the Red near Pembina. From there, he proceeded down the Red to Fort Maurepas. It was not until February 1737 that the eldest La Vérendrye first saw the Red River and the Forks. Upon his arrival at Fort Maurepas, La Vérendrye recorded:

...the Cree had been waiting for me for a long time. We settled upon the fourth of March as the date of the Council, because time was requested to notify two villages of the Assiniboines (Assiniboils) situated at the great fork of the Red River, which is the place to which I have proposed to transfer Fort Maurepas in order to facilitate navigation and commerce. Clearly, La Vérendrye recognized the navigational and commercial advantages of the junction immediately after entering the Red River region.

An account of the Council (March 4, 1737) between La Vérendrye and the Chiefs of the Assiniboine and Cree is recorded in the journal. The Cree spokesman wanted La Vérendrye to allow one of his sons to go and live among the Cree, and also asked that a French fort be established at the north "end of Lake Winnipeg." His address was followed by a lengthy speech by the Assiniboine representative who expressed his regret that the small pox outbreak of the previous year had prevented the proposed transfer of Fort Maurepas to the Fork of the Red and Assiniboine. He hoped that the promise would be carried out this year, and added that his tribe would offer all the help in their power for that purpose. Furthermore, "...they would form a village at the spot in order to reside permanently near the fort." The Forks, he concluded, was an easy place to live by hunting and fishing.

Following the Council, La Vérendrye decided to return to Québec. He set out across the southeast portion of Lake Winnipeg, up its east shore to the mouth of the Winnipeg River, and then eastward to Fort St-Charles. From there he took the accustomed route to Québec, in order to report to the Governor. Accompanying his 1737 report was a map of the recently explored
territory (see figure 4). Of the 12 maps attributed to La Vérendrye and his associates, this is the only one that situated a fort on the north bank of the Assiniboine River at the Forks. All other maps which indicate the existence of a post at the Forks place it on the south bank (see figures 5-7). The explanation for this discrepancy is self-evident when the 1737 map is used in conjunction with the journals.

La Vérendrye's route to the Red River and Lake Winnipeg in 1737 followed the Savanne Portage - Roseau River route. Evidence extracted from the journals indicates that La Vérendrye planned to move Fort Maurepas from the mouth of the Red River to the junction of the Red and Assiniboine. Consequently, the notation, "Fort abandonné..." on the 1737 map (figure 4), refers to the intended abandonment of Fort Maurepas at the mouth of the Red. Furthermore, the notation that Fort Maurepas was situated at the Forks represented La Vérendrye's intended move of the post to that site. Apparently, when planning this new fort, he imagined a location on the north bank of the Assiniboine. La Vérendrye, however, did not establish the fort at the Forks (Fort Rouge).

Upon La Vérendrye's arrival in Québec in the late summer of 1737, he found that his lack of progress in the search of the Western Sea was coming under fierce criticism. Comte de Maurepas, La Vérendrye's superior, complained to Chevalier de Beaulharnois that he was "...considerably surprised at the little progress that officer has made..." La Vérendrye had been on the verge of entering the Lake Winnipeg region as early as 1732-33, but it was not until 1737 that he actually reached the area. While this criticism of La Vérendrye's progress may have had some justification, La Vérendrye did have good reasons to support his lack of success. The massacre of 21 men at the Lake of the Woods certainly proved to be a setback. There was also the factor of poor financial support from the Crown. Despite the criticism, La Vérendrye's superiors encouraged him to get on with the task at hand.
La Vérendrye set out westward once again, reaching the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine on September 24, 1738. There he"...found ten cabins of Cree, including two war chiefs," awaiting him, "with a large quantity of meat...") They begged him to stay and he obliged them by remaining two days. On the 26th his party proceeded up the Assiniboine in canoes, while he walked along the north bank for a distance of 35 or 40 leagues. At a point east of present day Portage la Prairie, he decided to halt and build wintering quarters. There, in the process of constructing Fort la Reine, La Vérendrye was joined by M. de la Marque, who had journeyed to Fort la Reine via Fort Maurepas and the Forks. De la Marque, it appears from the context of the journal, and from Burpee's biographical note, was a trader "interested in the commercial side" of La Vérendrye's expedition. He explained to La Vérendrye the deployment of the men left behind at the other establishments, and later informed him that:

he had brought M. de Louvrière to the fork with two canoes to build a fort there for the convenience of the people on the Red River. I [La Vérendrye] thought that was alright provided the savages are notified of it."

The La Vérendrye expedition continued to push westward. Establishments were erected to the northwest at Fort Dauphin and Pasquia (The Pas). They also journeyed southwest to the Mandan Country and beyond. They were perhaps the first Europeans to see the Rocky Mountains from the east. The Forks of the Red River, meanwhile, never warranted comment in La Vérendrye's journal again. An abridged memorandum prepared by La Vérendrye's sons in 1749, and appended to the published journals, mentions that a fort established at the "Forks of the river of the Assiniboine" had been abandoned, owing to its proximity to forts la Reine and Maurepas.

A french presence in the west continued after the retirement and subsequent death of Pierre Gaultier de Varennes, Sieur de La Vérendrye. He was replaced by the Sieur de
Noyelles who in turn was followed by Jacques Repentigny Legardeur de Saint-Pierre. The combined contribution of these men pale in comparison to La Vérendrye, as neither man possessed his aptitude, experience or determination. St-Pierre did leave a journal of his activities during his two year stint in the west (1751-52) which was published by Dominion Archivist, Douglas Brymner in The Report on the Canadian Archives for 1886. St-Pierre's journal is anything but clear and concise. Dates in most cases were either wrong or left out altogether. It does, however, suggest that St-Pierre may well have spent the winter of 1752-53 at the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine rivers. Following a conflict with some Assiniboine Indians at Fort la Reine in the summer of 1752, the Indians returned to the vacant Fort la Reine and burned it to the ground. On St-Pierre's return from Grand Portage he was informed of Fort la Reine's destruction:

...on my return was on the [fork?] at the Red River where I was compelled to winter having learned that four days after leaving [Fort la Reine the] Indians has set it afire.

St-Pierre's apparent wintering at the Forks in 1752-53 was the final French occupation at the junction. There is no indication of the length of St-Pierre's stay or the extent of his establishment.

One major question, therefore, remains with regard to the French occupation of the Forks. Where exactly was Fort Rouge? George Bryce and Antoine Champagne placed Fort Rouge on the south bank of the Assiniboine, while C.N. Bell and William Douglas placed it on the north bank. Bell summed up his argument in one extremely long sentence, which in the main coincided with Douglas' arguments.

.....to anyone cognizant of the topography of the land on both sides of the Assiniboine River at the Forks (the south side being relatively very low, subject to spring floods, heavily covered with willows and small trees and quite open to attack by the fierce and hostile Sioux...while the north bank was and still is much higher, and
in fact the edge of a larger prairie [and] extending both north and west, with a shallow line of timber reaching from the banks of both streams) common sense would dictate that the side to build was on the north bank, which naturally and inevitably afterwards was chosen by the French, and British traders for camping ground and building site purposes.20

The evidence supporting Bell's "common sense" approach is open to criticism. First his statement concerning the "relatively very low" elevation of the south bank is exaggerated, if not inaccurate. Bell made no allowance for the substantial grade alterations to both the north and south sides of the River during the construction of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba, and Canadian Northern Railway terminals at the Forks. Railway plans dating as early as 1888 reveal very little difference between the natural elevations of the north and south banks.21 Bell's statement concerning the comparative vegetations of the opposing river banks is again misleading. He cites Alexander Henry's 1800 description as his source. Henry did note, in fact, that the south side of the Assiniboine was so thickly overgrown "as scarcely to allow a man to pass on foot..."22 Here again, Bell exhibited a lack of thorough research. Had he continued his examination of the journal he would have seen Henry's description of the banks of the Red River, which indicated that they too were shrouded in tree growth.

The banks are covered on both sides with willows, which grow so thick and close as scarcely to admit going through...23

Moreover, Bell interpreted Henry's discovery of building remains, which Henry dated back to the French regime, as additional proof that Fort Rouge was situated on the north bank of the Assiniboine. Conceivably, these remains could be the remnants of St-Pierre's 1752-53 wintering at the Forks, or those of subsequent visitors such as Boyer and Bruce in 1781-1872.24
Bell's claim that all subsequent establishments erected at the Fork's were located on the north bank cannot be disputed. La Vérendrye, moreover, contemplated the transfer of his Fort Maurepas to the north side of the Assiniboine at the Forks in 1737. It was not La Vérendrye, however, but a M. Louvière who erected the first French fort at the Forks. Consequently, La Vérendrye's intention was not met.

Bell's disregard for the cartographic evidence, which clearly indicated that Fort Rouge was located on the south bank, is inexplicable. Granted, the orientation and detail of large bodies of water and land masses were in many cases faulty. These errors, however, were attributed to the fact that the draftsmen, in most cases, saw only fragments of the whole territory. Their field of vision usually extended only a few hundred yards from the water routes. The rest of the information contained in their maps was usually extracted from evidence provided by the Indians. The courses of the travelled rivers, and their intersections with other streams and lakes were in most cases accurately depicted. Moreover, the locations of the numerous other French posts depicted on their maps have not been questioned. Why then could Bell or anyone else ignore the cartographic evidence which pinpoints the site of Fort Rouge? The most probable site of Fort Rouge was, therefore, on the south side of the Assiniboine at the Forks.
The 35 years following the end of the French regime in Canada witnessed a gradual re-establishment of the Canadian based fur trade in the west. During this period the Forks played a relatively insignificant role. From 1800 on, however, the Forks' significance as a key fur trade rendezvous and transportation centre escalated. For a brief period after the cession, the fur trade of the Northwest was left to the Hudson's Bay Company with their trading posts or "factories" situated along the coasts of Hudson and James Bay. French posts on the Lake of the Woods and Rainy Lake remained in operation until perhaps 1759. Those on the Saskatchewan may have been abandoned as early as 1758, and most probably by 1760. Fort la Reine on the Assiniboine was still in operation during the winter of 1757-58, but by 1761, the last vestige of the old regime had left. Joseph Waggoner of the Hudson's Bay Company reported in 1761, "...that he had passed two French houses, but there was not a Frenchman to be seen." For all intents and purposes, a major French presence in the western interior had ended by 1760-61.

The Hudson's Bay Company's monopoly situation did not last long. The French fur trade, which stretched from Québec and Montréal to the Saskatchewan, had been a profitable enterprise. This fact did not escape the English and American colonial merchants who descended on Montréal and Québec to take advantage of the business opportunities. As early as the summer of 1761, these English merchants outfitted traders and voyageurs destined for the country above James Bay. The
Pontiac conspiracy [an Indian uprising] impeded progress temporarily but the Montréal based traders or "Pedlars" as the Hudson's Bay Company's servants termed them, managed to reach Lake Winnipeg by 1766, and perhaps as early as 1765. The new English speaking capitalists relied heavily on the experience and manpower of the previous regime. The only real difference between the old and new was the change in proprietorship.

The intervening decades between 1763 and 1784 is a period in the history of the fur trade almost void of documentation. The newly established trading firms from Montréal were small and for the most part, they had little direct influence on the whole trade. A.S. Morton, in his examination of this period, noted that the Lower Red River region was one of the first places to be re-established by the Montrealers. Forrest Oakes, he asserted "...was the first English trader from Montréal on the Red River [and] ...he occupied a post on the Red River near Dynevor Manitoba from 1766 to 1768."

The Montrealers' penetration of the western interior and their occupation of strategic sites along the fur trade water routes (especially those near the mouth of the Saskatchewan River) alarmed the Hudson's Bay Company. By 1773-74, their impact on the fur returns at the coastal factories was sufficient to spur the Hudson's Bay Company to alter their trading policy and practices drastically. Instead of concentrating all their posts on the shores of the Bay, they too would establish inland posts. Their first venture, in 1774, was at Cumberland House on the Lower Saskatchewan. This decision sparked the beginning of a long, and at times violent struggle between the Hudson's Bay Company and the Pedlars. The initial battle ground was primarily concentrated in the Saskatchewan and Assiniboine River country. The Red River, and particularly the vicinity of the Forks, was largely left alone. The upper reaches of the Assiniboine, with its proximity to rich provisioning grounds and furs, was
a more attractive location. This should not suggest that the Forks was totally ignored by the Pedlars or the Hudson's Bay Company. William Tomison of the Hudson's Bay Company wintered in the vicinity of Lake Winnipeg in 1767-68 and he apparently passed by the Forks the ensuing spring. Forrest Oakes, a Canadian fur trader, frequented the Red River area from 1766-1768, and he undoubtedly passed by the Forks during that period. Louis Nolin told Alexander Ross that he first came to the Red River in 1776. In summary then, the Lower Red River, in the period immediately after the resurgence of the Montréal based fur trade (1765-70) was one of the first areas to be exploited. The more lucrative fur bearing and provisioning regions of the Saskatchewan and Upper Assiniboine rivers, however, soon drew the trade further to the northwest. The Lower Red River region and the Forks thereafter decreased in importance and became merely a meeting place or temporary encampment.

When a number of the Montreal based trading firms banded together in 1789 to form the original North West Company, the Red River Department of this loosely organized company "...was more precisely an Assiniboine department." A.S. Morton, W.S. Wallace and E.E. Rich, all authoritative writers on the Canadian fur trade, agree that the Lower Red River held little interest or importance for the Nor'Westers during the last two decades of the 18th century. Their energies during this period lay in the Upper Assiniboine and Qu'Appelle River valleys. This began to change by the late 1790s. The Hudson's Bay Company, as well as the new North West Company, "XY" Company and some American based concerns, all initiated a more vigorous and competitive campaign in the Assiniboine country after 1790. This increased competition required the use of every possible provision and fur trade site. Also the North West Company's extension into the Athabasca placed additional dependence upon southern provision posts. The critical region in this regard was the long stretch between the wild
rice country of the Winnipeg River region to the mouth of the Saskatchewan River. The boat brigades for this voyage had to be equipped with portable, reliable and nutritious provisions before crossing Lake Winnipeg. As pemmican was the staple food of the fur trade brigade, the pemmican provisioning posts of the Assiniboine and Qu'Appelle regions gained prominence.

In 1793, a concerted effort to tap the resources of the Assiniboine and Upper Red River was initiated by both the North West and Hudson's Bay Companies. Donald Mackay and James Sutherland of the HBC were outfitted from Albany, while the Nor'Westers, represented by John McDonnell and Cuthbert Grant, ventured into the Red River area via Lake Winnipeg. Mackay and his men reportedly encountered the Canadians en route. On September 6, 1793 the Hudson's Bay men arrived at the Forks of the Red when they met "...Mr. Grant and all his canoes [who] was waiting, for some flesh from some Indians." On their return to Albany, after wintering at Brandon House on the Assiniboine, Mackay again encountered the Nor'Westers at the Forks. We "...came to the Forks where Oumarry was campt. waiting for Mr. Culbert [sic] Grant...and we deposited 200 lb. Beat meat and fat on the south side of the river." Competition for furs and provisions escalated in the Red/Assiniboine region throughout the remaining years of the 18th century. By 1794-95, there were 21 posts on the Assiniboine.

The outset of the 19th century coincided with the arrival of Alexander Henry the younger, a North West Company "bourgeois" who recorded more comprehensive information on the Red River generally and the Forks in particular. Henry's arrival on the Red River in August 1800 represented the first permanent occupation of the Lower Red River since French times. Henry's activities in the Red River country (with his headquarters at Pembina) from 1800 to 1808, are recorded in his published journal, meticulously edited by Elliott Coues in 1897. A reading of these journals reveals that the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine attained increased importance during Henry's
presence in the district. From August 1800 to his departure in August 1808, Henry stopped at the Forks on no less than 20 separate occasions.

The North West Company's Assiniboine brigade from the Qu'Appelle, Swan and Assiniboine rivers, would meet the Red River brigade from Pembina at the Forks. They met twice a year, in late May or early June on their way to Fort William, and again in the latter part of August on their return trip inland. Similarly, the Hudson's Bay Company's people from Brandon House and Pembina also paused at the Forks on their way out to and from Fort Albany. It became customary early in the 19th century for the two opposing concerns to converse and spend time together at the Forks. Henry made numerous references to this particular type of activity. On this first visit to the Forks in 1800, he wrote:

At twelve o'clock, five HBC boats from Albany factory, or rather Martin's falls arrived. Robert Goodwin, master, assisted by Mr. Brown; they put ashore and remained with us until four o'clock.15

The atmosphere of these meetings was cordial and sometimes jovial. Henry noted in June 1806 that while visiting with J. Mackenzie of the HBC at the Forks, they played "with drum fife etc. and drank out a ten gallon keg of brandy."16

While the Forks became a rendezvous and an important link in the provisioning chain of the fur trade during the first decade of the 19th century, no permanent buildings were erected there. There is an indication that a small wintering accommodation was erected for a Mr. Louis Dorion in 1803,17 but its size and permanency could not have been large. When Henry reached the Forks in January 1804, he found that "...Mr. Dorion was starving, and making no packs."18 Daniel Williams Harmon, who passed by the junction in June 1805, made numerous references to the Forks in his journal, but he made no mention of any establishment or residence.19 W.L. Morton, however, contends that early in the 19th century a few Canadian freemen
"...turned to farming in their retirement at the Forks of the Red..."  

Henry's residence in the Red River department ended in August 1808. His replacement, Daniel McKenzie, retained possession of the North West Company's Red River headquarters at Pembina until sometime in 1809. William Douglas claims that it was the hostile Sioux near Pembina who forced the Nor' Westers to abandon their fort and move northward to the Forks:

The Saulteaux and Crees of Red River have massacred forty Sioux out of four hundred who were coming to attack my old quarters [Pembina]. I am not sorry for this. [John] Wills must be on his guard, there is danger. He must absolutely remove the fort to some other quarter.

Apparently it was John Wills, McKenzie's successor, who built the first North West Company establishment at the Forks. Construction of the first Fort Gibraltar began in the summer of 1810, and continued through to the following winter. Peter Fidler's "Account of the Red River District," prepared for the Hudson's Bay Company in 1819, provides further documentation on the construction of the first Fort Gibraltar. The North West Company's post "...at the Forks, of the Red and Assiniboine on the left bank was first built in 1811..."

The exact location of the first Fort Gibraltar is unknown. Contemporary accounts simply record that the North West Company establishment was situated at the Forks, on the north bank of the Assiniboine. Jean Baptiste Roi, a long time resident of Red River, testifying in 1820 in connection with the many court cases which arose from the early conflicts at Red River, recalled that the "...North West fort [was] fifteen paces from the adjacent shore." Colin Robertson, a Hudson's Bay Company officer, noted that the original Fort Gibraltar was "...built on the Forks of the Two Rivers, a delightful situation..."  

Robertson, who occupied Fort Gibraltar for the Hudson's Bay Company from March to June 1816, made a number of interesting
observations concerning the North West Company's fort at the Forks:

Examined Gibraltar this morning, it is certainly in an excellent state of defence; it has two good bastions at the two angles of the Square, and the square is formed with oak palisades; eighteen feet in height, and proof against musketry, this is not only a strong place but very comfortable lodgings...²⁹

Roi's 1820 testimony expanded Robertson's description.

It was a fort of wooden picketing, made of oak trees split in two, which formed its enclosure. Within the said enclosure were built the house of the partner (64' in length), two houses for the men (36' and 28' respectively), a store (32') two hangards or stores, a blacksmith's shop, and a stable; there was also an ice-house with a watch tower [guertie] over it.³⁰

The first Fort Gibraltar was dismantled and burnt in June 1816 by Colonial Governor Robert Semple during the tense period immediately prior to the battle of Seven Oaks. Thus, the possibility of finding substantial remains of the original North West Company's Fort Gibraltar (1810-1816), is minimal considering the vague evidence concerning its exact location and its total destruction in 1816. Archaeological investigation, however, might uncover possible remains.
The years 1812-21 were characterized at the Forks by conflict and violence. The major reason for this violence is attributable to the conflicting ambitions and interests of two men; the prominent fur trader, Sir Alexander Mackenzie and the equally famous colonizer, Thomas Douglas, the Fifth Earl of Selkirk.

When Alexander Mackenzie returned to Montreal in 1799, after his remarkable overland journeys to the Arctic and Pacific Oceans for the North West Company, he carried with him the conviction that the only practical trade route to the Athabasca and Pacific Slope was through Hudson Bay. The immense distance and difficulties in transport from Montreal to the far flung fur regions of the Athabasca and beyond made the Montreal based fur trade unattractive and increasingly unprofitable. Mackenzie believed that in order for these rich fur regions to be exploited, it must be accomplished via the Bay. Furthermore, the existence of Montreal based middlemen or agents could be eliminated if a direct London to Hudson Bay route could be established. Mackenzie had several options by which to accomplish his goal. He could negotiate an access or right of way passage with the Hudson's Bay Company. Failing that, a controlling interest in the chartered Hudson's Bay Company could be purchased or, ideally, the two major companies, the North West Company and the Hudson's Bay Company, could be united into one monopoly, based in England. Mackenzie's belief was shared by other fur trade capitalists. Prior to the amalgamation of the North West Company and Mackenzie's short lived "XY" Company, the Hudson's Bay Company received
rights of passage proposals from both Mackenzie and Duncan MacGillvray of the North West Company. Following the amalgamation of the two Canadian companies in 1804, the reinforced North West Company intended to follow up on MacGillvray's and Mackenzie's plans. As the Hudson's Bay Company saw no advantage in these proposals, the negotiations proceeded slowly and eventually collapsed.

The Hudson's Bay Company entered the 19th century in a difficult financial situation. The rising costs of fur trade goods, increased competition from the North Westers, reduced prices in an uncertain European market, and a small proportion of the total trade, all combined to place the Company in a poor position. Consequently, in 1801, the annual dividend was reduced to four per cent from six per cent. By 1806, the Company found that it owed £25,000 to three members of the committee and a further £17,000 to the Bank of England. In 1809, no dividend was paid to the shareholders.

It was at this crucial juncture in the history of the Hudson's Bay Company that Thomas Douglas, the Fifth Earl of Selkirk, became interested. Selkirk, a wealthy Scottish peer, had dabbled in a variety of ventures. The quintessential British Imperialist, by the last decade of the 18th century Selkirk had begun to focus his attention and energy on the plight of the highland Scots. Selkirk believed that a massive migration of these destitute people to British North America was a solution to their plight. Early in the 19th century, he established two colonies in North America, one on Prince Edward Island, and the other near Lake St-Clair in Upper Canada. In 1803, Selkirk arrived in North America for the first time to visit the sites of his two colonies and to witness first hand the societies of the United States and the Canadas. Arriving at Montreal near the end of his excursion, he met with the leading figures of the Canadian fur trade. For two weeks he availed himself of their hospitality, principally at the famous Beaver Club of Montreal. While there,
Selkirk met numerous Canadian fur trade capitalists including the MacGillvray's Mactavishes, and most importantly, Sir Alexander Mackenzie. Mackenzie's recently published book, besides containing his observations on the fur trade in North America, concluded by calling for a union of the British fur trade companies. Stirred by Mackenzie's views on the possibilities of the Northwest, Selkirk decided to send a memorial to Lord Hobart, the Colonial Secretary, regarding the possibility of setting up an Irish colony near the Red River.

The nature and extent of the relationship that developed between Mackenzie and Selkirk is difficult if not impossible to ascertain clearly. Prior to 1808, there is no record of any written communication between the two. Selkirk, during the early period (1803-1808) may have sympathized with Mackenzie's imperialist plans for the re-organization of the fur trade. In turn, Mackenzie, through his writings and his conversation with Selkirk, may have encouraged Selkirk's interest in a possible colonization attempt in the North West. Mackenzie, like Selkirk, was an imperialist and this common philosophical thread may have acted as a catalyst to their friendship. In any event, by 1808 some sort of informal partnership existed between the two men. The economic hard times of the Hudson's Bay Company, which led to the decline of the market price for the company's stocks after 1807, provided them with the opportunity they both were looking for. In the stock transfer books of the Hudson's Bay Company, Alexander Mackenzie first appeared on July 6, 1808, when he purchased £800 of stock in the Company. The next two folios record Lord Selkirk's purchase of two groups of stock totalling £1234. On November 17, 1808, Mackenzie transferred £600 of his recently purchased stock to Selkirk. In March 1809, Selkirk purchased a further £2250.

In the summer of 1809, Andrew Wedderburn, Selkirk's brother-in-law, first made his appearance in the stock book.
By January 1810, his purchases totalled £4500 of Hudson's Bay Company stock. John Halkett, also a brother-in-law of Wedderburn's, commenced to buy Hudson's Bay Company shares and by September 1809 he held £3717 worth. Andrew Wedderburn's 1810 purchase was the last stock transaction involving these four men, or any other prominent fur trade individual, prior to the presentation of Wedderburn's famous retrenchment scheme to the committee in the spring of 1810.

The prevailing interpretation surrounding the 1810 reorganization scheme and its effect on the relationship of Mackenzie and Selkirk is shared by E.E. Rich and A.S. Morton. Both of these scholars agreed that the plan for an agricultural colony on the Red River, which formed a part of Wedderburn's proposal, was contrary to the interests of the Nor'Westers. It inevitably shattered the relationship between Mackenzie and Selkirk. This interpretation is oversimplified if not inaccurate. Mackenzie and the other Nor'Westers undoubtedly knew of Selkirk's grand colonization scheme well before 1810. Prior to that juncture, Selkirk was widely known for his colonization attempts in British North America. Furthermore, the establishment of an agricultural colony at the Red River did not necessarily have to be injurious to the North West Company's fur trade. The surplus produce from the colony conceivably could go to both companies. Therefore, it was not the prospect of the colony which upset Mackenzie and the Nor'Westers. The break between Mackenzie and Selkirk must be attributed to something else. Although the dirth of documentation relevant to this perplexing problem makes it difficult to ascertain exactly what happened, a logical and probable scenario can be formulated.

Firstly, it must be assumed that the nature of the agreement or understanding of 1808 between the two men was an informal one. Selkirk, it appears, agreed to purchase shares of the Hudson's Bay Company for both himself and Alexander
Mackenzie, as Mackenzie's known association with the North West Company made direct purchase difficult and it may have caused some alarm amongst possible sellers. Mackenzie, it should be remembered, was interested in buying into the Hudson's Bay Company so he could gain an access route into Hudson Bay. Selkirk, on the other hand, undoubtedly saw the Hudson's Bay Company as an instrument to promote his colonization scheme. Moreover, both Mackenzie and Selkirk, during 1808 at least, believed that certain provisions of the Hudson's Bay Company charter stood in the way of their own particular goals. The duration of the agreement was at least six months, extending from the date of Mackenzie's first known letter to Selkirk in June 1808, to November 1808 when Mackenzie sold £600 of Hudson's Bay Company stock to Selkirk.

It is very likely that Selkirk's growing association with his wife's brother (Andrew Wedderburn), and Wedderburn's decision to buy into the Hudson's Bay Company in June 1809, turned Selkirk away from his former association with Mackenzie. With Wedderburn's other brother-in-law John Halkett becoming active in the Company in August 1809, it became clear to Selkirk that he could achieve the necessary control of the Hudson's Bay Company without Mackenzie. Wedderburn's radical reorganization scheme did not auger well with the North West Company. Unlike the direction of the previous committee (1805) under George Hyde Woolaston which called for a withdrawal from the fur trade, Wedderburn's scheme promoted a redoubling of the effort. Moreover, the assumption of control of the committee by Selkirk's relatives and the granting of a large tract of land near the Red River to Selkirk (in 1811) did not sit well with Mackenzie. He undoubtedly felt that he had been duped. Alexander Mackenzie's dream of gaining control of the Hudson's Bay Company, apparently so possible in 1808, was shattered by Lord Selkirk, the very man that he had confided in.

This complex association between Mackenzie and Lord
Selkirk did not end in 1811. Following the adoption of Wedderburn's new system by the Hudson's Bay Company, Lord Selkirk renewed his purchases of Hudson's Bay Company stock. In a one month period from June 19, 1811 to July 15, 1811, Selkirk bought nearly £18,000 of Hudson's Bay Company stock. By July 1811, Selkirk and his family connections were certainly the most dominant force in the Hudson's Bay Company. In January 1812, however, a most curious and inexplicable event is recorded in the Hudson's Bay Company transfer book. A total of £4522 in stock was transferred by Andrew Wedderburn and John Halkett to Alexander Mackenzie for a total consideration of ten shillings.

In the summer of 1811, amidst this antagonistic and confusing power struggle, the first contingent of Selkirk's settlers, under Captain Miles Macdonnell, sailed from Stromness for York Factory, en route to the Red River. A late start from Stromness, occasioned by delay tactics employed by the Nor' Westers, prevented Macdonnell and his party from proceeding to the Red River in the fall of 1811. Consequently, the Selkirk Settlers spent an unpleasant winter on the shores of Hudson Bay. It was not until August 30, 1812 that Macdonnell and his settlers reached the Red River. After a quick inspection of the country, Macdonnell chose the first expanse of prairie on the west bank of the Red, a mile below the recently erected North West Company post, Fort Gibraltar. A.S. Morton described the site of the original Fort Douglas:

Its site was at the base of point Douglas where the band of the river which formed the point began. It faced upwards towards the Forks and the North West Company's Fort Gibraltar.

The lateness of the season prevented Macdonnell from commencing building operations at Fort Douglas, so he and his followers continued on up the Red River to the Hudson's Bay Company's post at Pembina.

After reaching Pembina, Macdonnell began to associate freely with his cousin Alexander Macdonnell, who ironically
headed the North West Company's operations in Red River. In fact, shortly after arriving at Pembina, Miles Macdonnell actually moved into the North West post.26 The captain's socializing with the Nor'Westers annoyed the Hudson's Bay Company's chief trader at Pembina, Hugh Heney.27 Throughout the winter of 1812 Macdonnell and Heney squabbled continually. Macdonnell's unco-operative attitude toward the Hudson's Bay Company may well have resulted from his uncomfortable stay at the Hudson's Bay Company's York Factory during the previous winter. Macdonnell's quarrel with Heney and the Hudson's Bay Company at the very outset of the colonization expedition proved to be an injudicious move. Following the arrival of Duncan Cameron at Pembina in February 1813, the once cordial relations between the settlers and the North West Company also began to deteriorate. Within two years of their arrival, Macdonnell and his followers no longer could depend on the fur trade companies for support. A further problem was the captain's aloofness from the rest of his followers.28 In short, due largely to Macdonnell's volatile behaviour, the Red River settlement experienced a very inauspicious start.

In May 1813, both the Hudson's Bay Company and the Kildonan settlers prepared to move north to the Forks. On May 16, 1813, Hugh Heney wrote in his journal that:

Messrs. Bartenois and McLeod with a party went off this day for the purpose of building a house at the Forks of Red River, at which place Mr. Heney intends leaving the remains of this year and a party during the summer.29

Macdonnell left Pembina a day or so later, reaching the Fork of the Red at 7:00 p.m. on May 18th. He noted that "Mr. McLeod and Bostonais [sic] are building here for the H.B. Coy order of Mr. Heney..."30 When Heney arrived at the Forks on the 24th of May he assisted McLeod and Bartenois with the building of the new Hudson's Bay Company post. The site of this first Hudson's Bay Company post at the Forks was on the east bank of the Red River opposite the Forks. Macdonnell noted on May 22 that "he...crossed the River to where the H.B.C. men
are at work." Peter Fidler's remarks also confirms the fact that the original Hudson Bay Company post at the Forks was on the east bank of the Red. Just prior to the removal of the Hudson Bay Company post in 1814, Fidler noted that it was "...nearly opposite the Canadian House (Gibraltar) at the Forks." The significance of the location of the Hudson's Bay Company's post or house in 1813 emphasizes the conscious separation that existed between the Hudson's Bay Company and the colony. It also conveys the impression that in 1813 the Nor'Westers were not seen as a major threat to the colony, or if they were, the Hudson's Bay Company's Red River servants were not overly concerned.

Macdonnell chose the site of the colonial establishment, Fort Douglas, in August 1812, immediately after his first arrival at Red River. It was not until May 1813, however, that a concerted start was made on the fort. Macdonnell actively partook in the supervision of the building operations at Fort Douglas from May 1813 to July 1813, at which time he departed for York Factory to meet the next contingent of settlers. Prior to his departure, timber had been prepared for building and the sites of the proposed structures had been traced on the ground. A trench for the pickets or stockades was also started. Macdonnell returned to Red River from York Factory on October 8, 1813, without the next group of settlers, who had been forced to land at Churchill.

The incomplete state of Fort Douglas, and the comparatively easy procurement of plains provisions at Pembina, induced the main body of settlers once again to spend the winter at Pembina. A few workers remained at Fort Douglas to continue the construction of the fort. When Macdonnell returned to the Forks in February 1814, he was able to take up quarters in the recently finished "New House." The other settlers returned to the Forks in May 1814 in order to continue the construction of Fort Douglas and prepare the land for seed. On July 25, 1814, Macdonnell again set off for York Factory, leaving Hudson's Bay Company servant Peter Fidler
of Brandon House in charge of the fort. Fidler supervised the ongoing construction of Fort Douglas:

In the course of three months, in the summer of 1814, when Captain Macdonnell was absent from Red River, Mr. Fidler being left in charge, performed a good deal of business, he built a convenient farm house, with barn stable cow house, sheep house, and hog sty and inclosed [sic] the whole within a strong fence of stockades 3 1/2 chains square. He built also the walls of a Government House two stories 64 x 22 feet a detached kitchen 23 feet x 17 feet a neat dwelling house, 23 x 16 (christened the "Château"). He make [sic] two kilns of charcoal 15 tons of hay broke up 2 1/2 acres of land and secured all the crops.36

After his return to the Red River, Macdonnell drafted and issued a proclamation which prohibited the export of pemmican and other provisions from the district of Assiniboia.37 Macdonnell, ignoring the Red River's provisioning role in the fur trade, believed that the continued export of pemmican from the district would threaten the well-being of the settlement. To the Nor'Westers this proclamation, and therefore the settlement, now posed a real and substantial threat to the existence of their trade.

The situation did not improve during the next year. Duncan Cameron, the officer in charge of the North West Company's Fort Gibraltar, promoted a systematic plan of opposition to the Selkirk colony. He spread rumours throughout the settlement of an impending Indian Attack. At the same time he provided a liberal supply of hospitality and liquor, coupled with a promise to relocate in Canada for any Selkirk settler willing to go.38 This plan obviously had a demoralizing impact upon the morale of the settlement as numerous settlers accepted the Nor'Westers offer and moved east.

In addition to this resettlement offer, Cameron believed that a show of strength was necessary. He went as far as to the colony on several occasions. Governor Macdonnell responded by preparing Fort Douglas for a possible assault: Had our two Iron swivels mounted on field carriages.
These and 4 wall pieces comprise our heavier guns - fired several discharges from the whole at the river bank to try their effect and let the enemy know that we have such things.  

The North West Company's threats, combined with their promise of a free passage to Canada and the general hardships of life at Red River, persuaded many settlers to join the ranks of the Nor'Westers. When Peter Fidler returned to Fort Douglas in May 1815 after a winter at Brandon House, he was surprised to note "...that nearly all the settlers that have come to the country these last two years had gone over to the Canadian House." As desertions continued, the odds mounted against the survival of the colony.

On the 11th of June 1815, the Nor'Westers, assisted by nearly 60 local Métis, began to fire on Fort Douglas and the Hudson's Bay Company's trading house, which had been moved near to Fort Douglas "...at the junction of the creek and the river...just south of the Fort." (see figure 12). During the skirmish three settlers and one Hudson's Bay Company servant were wounded. On June 13 Fidler and Macdonnell tried to consolidate the defences in Fort Douglas. All remaining men were placed in one house. So as not to afford the enemy cover, they pulled down the dilapidated block house, part of the dwelling house, and apparently the Hudson's Bay Company trading house. As they faced a well armed and organized force, the collapse of Fort Douglas appeared imminent.

Nine days after the initial confrontation, Miles Macdonnell was arrested and taken to Montreal by Sir Alexander Mackenzie, who had just arrived at Red River. On the 23 of June, Fidler and the remaining colonists were forced to leave the Red River. Four Hudson's Bay Company servants, under the supervision of John McLeod, remained behind to look after the Company's affairs and affects. On June 28, the entire settlement, including Fort Douglas, was destroyed:

...thirteen buildings which had been erected at much labour and expense [sic] by the colonists and the servants of the Hudson's Bay Company and
which were that morning entire, not one was to be seen but the blacksmith's shop.46

As Macdonnell proceeded to Montreal under the custody of his captors, he met Colin Robertson at Lake of the Woods, and informed him about the events at Red River. Robertson proceeded directly to Red River where he viewed the ruined colony.47 He then proceeded after the remaining Selkirk settlers, overtaking them at Jack River (near Norway House) at the North end of Lake Winnipeg. Obviously a persuasive man, he convinced them to return to Red River to try again.

Upon Robertson's return to Red River with the settlers in August 1815, he discovered that Mr. MacLeod of the Hudson's Bay Company had commenced to build a house 100 yards from the ruined establishment. Robertson decided to build along side him:

> It is my intention [he wrote] to build a Fort on this point, as it is well situated for a place of defence, and has a beautiful prospect of the plains and commands two angles of the River. Mr. McLeod has got up the shell of a house, and I have sent-off men to square logs for other buildings.48

Building operations at the second Fort Douglas continued through to the winter of 1816. By January 1816, a large house, a store, a barn and stables had been completed and a start was made on a Bastion.49

Duncan Cameron's Nor'Westers continued to threaten the re-established colony. In March 1816, Colin Robertson decided that it was time for the Hudson's Bay Company and the settlers to take the offensive rather than wait for the Nor'Westers to repeat their actions of 1815. On St. Patrick's day 1816, Robertson led a contingent of colonists and Hudson's Bay Company servants to Fort Gibraltar, and caught its inhabitants by surprise:

> At half past six I had them under arms...When I got half way to Gibraltar I halted my men and communicated to Messrs. McLean, Holt and Burke the form of attack; that I should lead the van [guard] and enter Cameron's hall, that Mr. McLean should
attack the men's house on the right and Mr. Burke that on the left. As we approached the Dogs gave the alarm, I then quickened my pace and ordered Mr. McLean to follow, I came up to the small wicket in the large Gate, just as the guard was attempting to shut it, this I forced, my faithful servant followed me and in a few minutes the Fort was ours. The enemy was taken so completely by surprise that they had not time to fly to their Arms; and to our astonishment we found their numbers nearly doubled ours.

Four days later, Robertson entered a description of the captured Fort Gibraltar into his diary:

Examined Gibraltar this morning, it is certainly in an excellent state of defence; it had two good bastions at the two angles of the square, and the square is formed with oak Palisades; eighteen feet in height, and proof against musketry, this is not only a strong place, but very comfortable lodgings...

Shortly after the capture of Gibraltar, Robertson interrupted a North West Company mail packet only to discover that the Nor'Westers and their allies, the Métis, were planning to attack the colony in the spring of 1816. Robertson and Governor Robert Semple (Macdonnell's replacement) had been feuding with each other throughout the winter, but temporarily put aside their differences and began to make preparations for the defence of the colony. They originally planned to defend both Forts Douglas and Gibraltar, but in late May Robertson decided "...to throw both Forts into one..." The defence of two forts was impractical.

Accordingly, on the 11th of June 1816, "...Governor Semple went with a party, to bring it [Fort Gibraltar] to the ground; and bring the stockades to be put round Fort Douglas." Those portions of Gibraltar that could not be incorporated into Fort Douglas were burned:

...the greater part of the N.W. Co. house and buildings and stockades were pulled down and conveyed to Fort Douglas. The colonial Establishment, and the remainder burnt—part of the stockades were put up and 2 good Bastions erected for the protection of the place.

Fort Douglas also received additional fortifications from Fort
Daer at Pembina during the spring of 1816 when its main Bastion was rafted down to the Forks. 60

A week later the dismantling and burning of Fort Gibraltar on June 11, 1816, an armed group of Nor'Westers and Métis appeared on the plains north-west of Fort Douglas. Recruited from throughout the north-west, these Métis and North West Company servants followed the course of the Assiniboine to the fork of that river in what is now St. James. While riding across the plain about a mile behind the fort, they were spotted from the lookout post at Fort Douglas. Governor Semple rashly and imprudently decided to leave the relative safety of the fort to confront Cuthbert Grant and the Métis party. During the ensuing Battle of Seven Oaks, 20 men, including Governor Semple, fell dead before the guns of the Métis. 61 Three days later, the surviving colonists were once more forced to leave the Red River. The Nor'Westers remained triumphantly in possession of Fort Douglas.

When Lord Selkirk arrived in Canada in the autumn of 1815, 62 he immediately heard about the destruction of the colony the previous June. He prepared to lead a force to Red River. It was almost a whole year, however, before he mustered a regiment of disbanded Des Meurons soldiers and by July 1816 they had only progressed as far as Sault Ste-Marie. While there, Selkirk learned of the Seven Oaks Massacre. Having decided to retaliate, his first action was to seize the North West Company's depot at Fort William in August 1816.

In December he despatched Captain D.D. D'Orsonnens of the Des Meurons regiment and the recently liberated Miles Macdonnell with 28 men on a mission to Red River. Their goal was to re-capture Fort Douglas. Leaving Rainy Lake on December 10, 1816, and braving the intense cold of mid-winter, they trudged across the Savanne Portage to the Roseau River, and on to Red River. 63 After a short detour to Pembina, they set off north across the plains, reaching the Assiniboine River a few miles upstream from the Forks on January 9, 1817.
The next morning they quietly approached the occupied Fort Douglas and took it by surprise, "Mr. McLellan and most of his men were taken before they had time to put on their trousers." With Fort Douglas reclaimed by Macdonnell and D'Orsonnens, the colonists returned to the colony from Lake Winnipeg.

Lord Selkirk finally reached his Red River settlement in July 1817. He "found his colony reconstituted and the fields promising an abundant harvest." In the meantime, the Nor'Westers, after this eviction from Fort Douglas, set up a temporary camp a short distance up the Assiniboine from the Forks.

The conflict and controversy surrounding the Seven Oaks Massacre and Selkirk's capture of Fort William finally provoked action in Canada. In 1817, William B. Coltman, a Québec merchant, was appointed to investigate the problems and issue a report. The major provision of Coltman's report called for the restitution of all property. Consequently, the North West Company began to rebuild Fort Gibraltar near the site of the original one at the Forks.

From 1817 to the amalgamation of the Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Company in 1821, construction and renovation continued at both Fort Douglas and the new Fort Gibraltar. In 1819, Peter Fidler gave a valuable account of the progress made at Fort Gibraltar:

...they have enclosed the whole with excellent sawn oak piquets 14 feet above ground set very close together like a continued wall about 100 feet square. Their large dwelling house is not yet built but to be this summer a Mr. McKenzie a young clerk is master there this winter with about 4 or 6 men.

Similarly, Captain Matthey reported to Lord Selkirk in September 1818 that "...3 Carpenters Cochoran at the Head are finished and temporarily covering a farm house 50 x 25 feet."

It is uncertain whether the Hudson's Bay Company maintained a separate trading post or house outside the stockades of
Fort Douglas during the period 1817-1821. Mr. MacLeod of the
Hudson's Bay Company remained at Red River after the disper­
sal of the settlement in 1815. When Colin Robertson returned
to Red River in August 1815, MacLeod had started to build a
house. The building may have served as the Company's trading
post after 1815, but whether it was within the stockades of
Fort Douglas is not known. To confuse the matter even more,
there is evidence to suggest that James Bird established a
trading house at Red River for the Hudson's Bay Company in
1817. The location of this post or, whether in fact it
was even built, is also unknown.

In 1819, Peter Fidler, while discussing the Hudson's Bay
Company's situation at the Red River, outlined the need for
a trading post at the Forks:

At present [he wrote] it seems necessary to have
a trading post at the Forks where 5 or even 4 men
are sufficient to winter at after the necessary
buildings are erected which are now in a fair way
of being soon.71

Fidler's statement indicates that the Hudson's Bay Company
did not have a separate trading establishment at Red River from
1815 to 1819. Furthermore, his reference to the erection of
a new post may be the illusive "Fidler's Fort," referred to
by C.N. Bell and others.72 Bell, relying on the testimony of
an old Selkirk settler, Donald Murray, placed Fidler's Fort
"...between what is now McDermot Ave. and Notre Dame Street
East (Pioneer) but perhaps nearer Notre Dame than the other...
a few hundred yards from the Red River."73

In any event, by 1822 there were clearly three separate
establishments at Red River. In May of that year, the recen­
tly appointed Hudson's Bay Company Governor of Rupert's Land,
George Simpson, wrote to Andrew Wedderburn-Colvile in London.
Part of his letter included a description of the various
forts at Red River:

Fort Douglas assumed [a] more respectable appear­
ance than it did when I was last there. There
is a good dwelling house and the offices are
sufficient for any purpose at present.—The Company's place here is of a piece with other old Establishments, filthy, irregular, and ruinous I am therefore getting the new North West Fort in order so as to move into it next Fall. There is a good frame of a Dwelling House already up. The situation is preferable to ours, exactly opposite the Forks of the River and in order to commemorate Mr. [Nicholas] Garry's visit I have taken the liberty of christening it after him, Fort Garry.74

The actual christening of Fort Garry happened in 1821, as Reverend John West noted in his Journal on November 9, 1821, that the old North West Company fort "...is now called Fort Garry."75

An extensive 1822 description of Fort Douglas is available in the Selkirk Papers. A complete building and property inventory of Selkirk's Red River property was prepared for the executors of his estate in England. A synopsis of this extensive document (see Appendix A) reveals that Fort Douglas was 132 feet long at its river side, and 155 wide. It contained seven buildings termed houses, one barn, one stable, an ice house, potatoe house, a grist mill, and 2 bastions.

In summary, then, the period 1810-21 at the Forks was a particularly hectic one. No less than six establishments were erected during this time. These included the two Fort Gibraltars (1810 and 1817), the two Fort Douglas' (1813 and 1815), and the two or perhaps three Hudson's Bay Company trading posts of 1813, 1815 and Fidler's 1819 fort. The burning and destruction of the original Fort Douglas in 1815 and the first Fort Gibraltar in 1816, characterise vividly the conflicting organizations and personalities in Red River during this period.

There exists a possibility of uncovering the remains of some of these establishments. Portions of the rebuilt Fort Gibraltar of 1817 (eventually changed to Fort Garry) adjacent to the Forks, survived until 1852 and recovery of some evidence may be possible. Also, evidence of the rebuilt Fort Douglas
near the intersection of Robert and George streets in the relatively undeveloped region of Point Douglas, may be retrievable.
The death of Lord Selkirk in the spring of 1820 opened the way for a negotiated peace between the Hudson's Bay Company and the North West Company. Eleven months later, in March 1821, the two companies merged. This amalgamation dictated a consolidation policy in the fur trade of the Northwest. It eliminated the need for the duplication of posts and manpower that had existed previously throughout Rupert's Land. Now, unlike former years when two rival posts competed for the same market, one was sufficient. In short, the new amalgamated Hudson's Bay Company was to experience the economic joys of prosperity.

The reduction and consolidation of manpower and posts after 1821 had a particularly dramatic impact on the Red River Settlement. Redundant servants of the Company and their families were encouraged to retire and re-locate to take up agricultural pursuits at Red River. In March 1822, the Governor and Committee in London wrote in length to George Simpson endorsing the re-settlement policy:

We understand that there are an immense number of women and children supported at the different trading posts some belonging to the men still in the service and others who have been left by their fathers unprotected and a burden on the trade.

It seems to be a serious consideration how these people are to be disposed of. It is both dangerous and expensive to support a numerous population of this description in an uneducated and savage condition, and it would be impossible and inexpedient to encourage and allow them to collect together in different parts of the country, where they could
not be under any proper superintendence. The Establishment of clergymen and schools at the Red River Settlement where means of religious instruction and education will be afforded them, and where they will be under a Police and Government by the Establishment of magistrates under the Act passed last session of Parliament points out the proper mode of disposing of this numerous class of persons.¹

Thus a new phase in the history of the Red River Settlement began after 1821. The first decade after the amalgamation can be characterized as a building or development period, during which the administrative, social, religious, educational and economic institutions of the community took form.

The establishment of the Church of England under the auspices of the Church Missionary Society,² and the growth of the Roman Catholic Church under Bishop Juliopolis, were both evident in the 1820s. Agriculture, despite numerous setbacks, also was established on a more permanent footing in the decade after 1821. Similarly, governmental administration, limited as it was,³ was initiated under the reluctant guidance of the Hudson's Bay Company.

On the other hand, the lure of the plains, the less structured life of the fur trade, and the camaraderie of the buffalo hunt continued to have a strong pull on the Métis of the Red River.⁴ In 1821, in fact, the majority of the Red River Métis resided at Pembina as it was closer to the buffalo herds. It was not until 1823 that they were persuaded to move closer to the Settlement.⁵ After the move, some of the Métis settled near the Roman Catholic mission at St. Boniface, but the majority congregated at White Horse Plains; a settlement dispersed along the Assiniboine River several miles above the Forks.

In the years after 1821, the Red River Settlement did not fit the homogenous mould first envisaged by Lord Selkirk in 1810-11. The Red River Settlement had attracted rather a curious mixture of peoples scattered along two river banks. Selkirk's Kildonan Scot's formed one portion situated on
river lot farms along the west bank of the Red a few miles north of the Forks. On the opposite side of the Red at St. Boniface, a small French Canadian community took shape after 1818. With the addition of a few of the Pembina Métis in 1822-23 that parish began to flourish. When the Métis Settlement at White Horse Plains, fifteen miles west of the Forks on the Assiniboine, came into existence after 1822, the make-up of this scattered river front community approached its final form. At the centre of this far flung settlement was the Hudson's Bay Company's major establishment at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine.

The diversity of this community, set hundreds of miles away from any other, was one of the major factors in its uniqueness. On the other hand, its isolation and total dependency on the Hudson's Bay Company caused serious problems. As early as 1822, Governor Simpson was well aware of the challenges posed by the Red River Settlement. In a letter to Andrew Colvile he gave a colourful but devastating description of the colony which revealed as much about Simpson's conservative outlook toward society as it did about the Settlement itself:

Take the colony all in all, and it is certainly an extraordinary place, the Great Folks would cut each others throats if they could with safety; there is nothing like a Social feeling among them and the best Friends to Day are the bittrest enemies tomorrow. Among the lower ends it is much the same. They have a certain feeling of pride independence and equality among them which is subvertive of good order for society. They are opposed to each other in little factions and every man in the colony looks to his Arms along for Safety and protection...
I could [Simpson concluded] fill up a Doz. more sheets with the scandal and chit chat of this place.6

With its charter, its monopoly and its economic might, the Hudson's Bay Company was the dominant influence in the Red River Settlement. Accordingly, the Company's Fort Garry
at the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine became the administrative centre and focal point of the settlement. In 1821, however, there were still three separate establishments near the Forks and the consolidation of the Hudson's Bay Company in its corporate sense was not yet mirrored in Red River. This consolidation process at Red River, in terms of physical structures, was a slow confusing process.

In May 1822, Simpson conveyed his decision to London to move the Hudson's Bay Company's Red River operations into the old North West Company's rebuilt Fort Gibraltar. While the advantages for the move had first been noted by Nicholas Garry in August 1821, several months later James Hargrave, a clerk at Red River, noted that the poor state of the Hudson's Bay Company's trading establishment had necessitated the move:

The building in the old Fort of the Hudson Bay Co. are in a decayed and ruinous condition; the dwelling house can furnish accommodations for only two Gentlemen, here is only building for the purpose of a provision and wholesale store, a retail and Indian shop—and even that is in such a dilapidated state as to be penetrated by every shower that falls.—The dwelling-house for the men are hovels...

Three days later, Hargrave recorded that a retail shop was being fitted up in the old North West Fort, recently christened Fort Garry. A new two storey dwelling house was also initiated and on September 25, Hargrave recorded the removal of the trade goods from the old Hudson's Bay Company trading post into the new Fort Garry. The construction of the new Fort Garry dwelling house continued throughout the remainder of 1822 and into the new year. When the lower flat of the house was finished on January 11, 1823, Messrs. Clarke and McMurray moved into it from their quarters in the old Hudson's Bay Company establishment. Reverend John West took possession of their former quarters in the old fort. Eventually, the entire old HBC post was turned over to Reverend West for his quarters and school house. West, however, remained only
a few months in Red River. Upon his departure, the old Hudson Bay Company (hereafter cited as HBC) post, turned school house, fell rapidly into ruin.

While consideration of the fur trade operations in the settlement were straightforward and relatively uneventful, the colonial and administrative functions were not as smooth. The Hudson's Bay Company, in fact and practice, ran and administered the Red River Settlement between 1821 and 1836. The nominal authority, however, rested in the hands of the executors of the Selkirk Estate. This distinction was merely legal and theoretical, as the principal executor of the estate was Andrew Colvile, a leading member of the Hudson's Bay Company Committee. For some reason, likely attributable to the public image in England and in Red River, the Company and George Simpson believed that this control should not be an overt one. Consequently, "autonomous" Governors of the District of Assiniboia were appointed, and they resided in a separate colonial establishment at Fort Douglas.

In August 1822, the Governor of the Colony, Captain Andrew Bulger, complained to Andrew Colvile about the state of Fort Douglas and his private residence there:

As to what is styled "Fort Douglas," it is well situated, though there is a better position for a Fort about 200 yards higher up, on the land which Mr. Pritchard gave up. But as to the fort itself, it is, as Mr. Halkett can tell you, the most filthy miserable place imaginable. It is by at least 25 feet too small, and the stockades for the most part are rotten, and tumbling down. The buildings except one are mere log huts, very old, and so full of holes as to be perfectly inhabitable. The only one that is of value is the one that is called the New House, but even this is nothing more than a shell of a badly built log house.  

Obviously, Bulger was not content with his situation at Red River. He concluded his letter with a call for the erection of a new fort.

In June 1823, Simpson complained to Andrew Colvile that Captain Bulger had taken to drink. In Simpson's opinion, Bulger
simply was ill equipped to handle Red River. Before a replacement was suggested, however, Bulger had offered his resignation to the London Committee and a successor, Robert Parker Pelly, was appointed as the new Governor of Assiniboia. The actual accommodation arrangements were left in Simpson's care. He was free to authorize either the repair of the dwelling house at Fort Douglas, or to prepare rooms for Pelly at Fort Garry. Simpson, in turn, delegated Chief Factor Donald Mackenzie to make the arrangements for Governor Pelly's reception.

The Governor's house at Fort Douglas, recently vacated by Bulger, was in too deteriorated a state to afford suitable accommodation for Governor Pelly and his family. Simpson, therefore, made over his own personal rooms at Fort Garry to Pelly.

By November 1823, numerous circumstances convinced Simpson that a radical change in the arrangement of the forts at Red River was necessary. He explained his reasons to Andrew Colvile:

...at Fort Douglas it is unnecessary to have more than one or two clerks and a couple of men servants but on this scale in its present situation it would not be safe either from troublesome Indians or Settlers. I have therefore recommended to Governor Pelly that it [Fort Douglas] should be removed close to Fort Garry, the East side of our Fort to form the west side of Fort Douglas so as merely to be separated by the stockades with a private entrance between them and thus situated they will always be a protection to each other; the removal will not be attended with much additional expense as Fort Douglas is now in a ruinous state and we have a sufficient number of men [Brigade tripmen] to finish the work before embarkation.

Simpson's decision to move Fort Douglas alongside the Hudson's Bay Company's Fort Garry must have raised a few questions in London, as Simpson felt compelled once again to point out the reasons for the move in May 1824:

The buildings at Fort Douglas were in a ruinous
state, and could not have stood another year, the main house rotten to the foundation and tottering, so much so, that it was necessary to fit up a temporary dwelling for Governor Pelly, which although small was the most comfortable in the colony, he would have been welcome to our quarters [at] Fort Garry but they were worse than his own, the thermometer being 20 degrees below zero in my bedroom repeatedly during the winter, it therefore became necessary to erect a new fort altogether. The site of the old Fort Douglas is upwards of a mile from Fort Garry, and as both establishments must be in constant communication, and that according to the system now adopted, the compliment of people will not be one fourth of what it had been, I considered it advisable...[therefore] that the two forts should be under the protection of the same bastions, and that the same range of picketing should enclose them...

... The [existing] range of buildings with the addition of one other store, will answer every purpose for both concerns.22

Fort Garry, had become one fort with two names. In June 1825, the unoccupied old Fort Douglas, including approximately 100 acres of land and a wind grist mill, was sold to Robert Logan, a Red River settler, for the sum of L400 sterling.23

The addition of the Colonial buildings to the establishment of Fort Garry in 1824, comprised only a part of the alterations to Fort Garry that year. In June, shortly after the arrival of Governor Pelly and family, Simpson became alarmed at the growing discontent of the Des Meurons Soldiers. He and Pelly both believed that these "malcontents" were determined to attack Fort Garry.24 As a precautionary measure, all the valuable property and arms were placed in safe keeping in Fort Garry. Besides repairing the fort's pickets, wooden bastions were planned for the north25 and east26 angles of the fort. A "large new store"27 was also added to the site.

The winter of 1825-26 was particularly severe at Red River. Francis Heron reported ominously in the Fort Garry Journal on February 11, 1826 that the "...snow round the fort was as high as the pickets and twice as much on the plains as at any time last winter..."28 The ensuing spring
proved to be disastrous for the settlement, and particularly for the recently renovated Fort Garry and adjoining Fort Douglas. Flood waters of an unprecedented height inundated the Red River valley. Hudson Bay Company clerk Francis Heron recorded a vivid account of the flood and its impact on the forts. On May 13 and 14, at the peak of the flood, he penned two particularly descriptive scenes.

May 13.

The forts now stand like a castle of romance in the midst of an ocean of deep contending currents. The waters extending for at least a mile behind them, and they are thereby only approached by boats and canoes. Mr. McKenzie with the few hands he keeps with him in the forts are obliged to live in the highest stories of the highest houses. The pickets and the chimneys of the houses are falling daily as well as the plastering on the walls, and even the houses themselves begin to totter on their foundations.29

...-

May 14.

Our new Block House, on the front side of the fort, the best in Rupert's Land, built last summer, was this morning carried off in an instant with part of the picketing. It fell with a crash like thunder, as if to extinguish our hopes for the safety of the remaining buildings—the chimneys of the houses are nearly all fallen, and the shattered walls of the buildings also begin to give way to the overpowering force of the current—The houses rock to and fro like a ship at sea, every joint opens, every beam bends.30

The Red did not recede to within its banks until late June 1826. When the HBC servants finally returned, the fort was "...a complete pile of ruins."31 In August, McKenzie reported that the flood had been exceedingly thorough in its destructive force but enough remained of the buildings of the two establishments to salvage a fort complex.32

The flood of 1826 was the final disaster for many less determined Red River settlers. When the flood waters receded, 243 settlers, principally the Des Meurons and Swiss, moved to the United States and another 60 went east to Canada.33
Fort Garry continued to deteriorate after the 1826 flood, in spite of ongoing repairs. Simpson, increasingly disenchanted with its condition and location, decided in July 1830 to abandon the site altogether. Characteristically, he informed the London Committee well after the move was underway:

The Establishment of Fort Garry is in a very dilapidated state, so much so as to be scarcely habitable, and lies so low that we are every successive spring apprehensive that it will be carried away by high water at the breaking up of the ice. It is moreover very disadvantageously situated, being about 45 miles from the Lake and 18 miles above the rapids. I therefore determined last fall on abandoning the Establishment altogether and instead of wasting time and money in temporary repairs of tottering wooden buildings, to set about erecting a good solid comfortable Establishment at once of stone and lime in such a situation to be entirely out of reach of high water...

Simpson hoped to move to the new establishment by the autumn of 1832. The buildings went well and by the winter of 1832-33, the Simpson's were housed in the recently constructed "Big House" at Lower Fort Garry.

Upon its construction, Lower Fort Garry assumed the role of the administrative headquarters of the Northern Department. The abandonment of the "Forks," however, was not total. The Company continued to operate a sales shop there for the settlers. The sales shop business was transferred into the old Government House which had been erected for Governor Pelly in 1824. Simpson had failed to recognize that the Forks had become the economic centre of the Red River Settlement; the settlers and farmers simply were not prepared to travel the additional 20 miles to the Lower Fort in order to dispose of their produce and procure merchandise. Alexander Christie, who assumed the charge of Assiniboia after Simpson's departure in 1833, found it time-consuming and bothersome to commute regularly between the two establishments. Consequently, in
1834 Christie convinced Simpson that old Fort Garry should be re-established as the administrative centre for the Red River district. The new Fort Garry at the Forks [Upper Fort Garry] would also be constructed of stone. From the outset, it was quite apparent that Simpson and Christie did not agree on the relative importance of the two forts. Christie emphatically believed that the Upper Fort should be re-established at its central location as the administrative centre of the settlement if not the fur trade operations of the Northern Department. Simpson, however, as late as 1838, still envisioned the lower fort as a major company establishment in Red River even though he did admit the need for the fort at the Forks:

The lower fort I consider will in due time become the principal engagement for, farming, warehousing, holding Courts and Councils etc. It will therefore be necessary to make it a place of some strength and of greater extent than the Upper Establishment.

The debate between them continued, and in April 1845, Christie felt compelled to write a lengthy note on the subject to Simpson:

We shall endeavour to...get the accommodation at the lower Establishment enlarged and fitted up, in the best possible manner—I perfectly concur in opinion, that lower Fort Garry is the most suitable place for your headquarters, the situation is much more retired, and consequently less liable to interruption than here, - but this retirement can only be experienced in the absence of the several commissioned Gentlemen, - as well as others, who may have any immediate occupation, - and for this reason, permit me to recommend that the several Gentlemen reside here,, merely going down when their individual presence may be required, in this way the actual meeting of the Northern Department council could be held at the Lower Fort or this place..., but as regards the Assiniboia council the new Court house here, is for several reasons the most favourable...

While preparations for the construction of Upper Fort Garry began in the winter of 1834-35 the actual building continued until 1837. In June 1836, Simpson urged Christie
to get "...on with the Buildings, walls and bastions, likewise the jail, as expeditiously as possible." The Upper Fort was still not completed in July 1837, but Simpson expressed his hope that it would be soon. In February 1838, Simpson still had not heard of the fort's completion but he presumed that "...the Buildings at the Forks were nearly completed," and he urged Christie to finish up quickly and then proceed to put the Lower Fort in a "defensive state."

In March 1836, the Governor and Committee of the Hudson's Bay Company announced to Simpson that the executors of the Selkirk estate had reconveyed the proprietorship of the District of Assiniboia to the Hudson's Bay Company. In the same letter, the Committee informed Simpson that it was their intention to establish an agricultural establishment in the Red River Settlement:

It is highly desirable to establish an Export trade from the settlement, as a source of revenue from England, and as the country appears to be well adapted for rearing sheep and Black Cattle, and for the growth of Flax and Hemp...we have therefore determined on establishing a farm on a large scale.

Captain G.M. Cary and a number of farm servants were to be sent out by the next ship. The most eligible site for the farm, they believed, was the "...low grounds on each side of the New Establishment at the Forks." In June, Simpson informed Chief Factor Christie of the Committee's decision and authorized him to make the necessary preparations at the Forks. Captain Cary and his people were to be housed for the first winter in the Old Establishment of Fort Garry.

The Experimental farm at the Forks was not a successful venture. During its relatively short existence it was subject to ridicule by some of the Red River's more critical personalities. Alexander Ross, Red River's resident historian, wrote that at the Forks of the Red and Assiniboine "...a grand establishment ...[with] a full supply of the most costly implements was set up by the Company." Nevertheless, he
continued, the farm after two full years of operation only had 20 acres under cultivation. In 1841, George Simpson, recognizing that the Experimental Farm scheme was not proving successful, reported:

The experimental Farm, which has not been productive of the benefits that were expected when it was established although attended with considerable outlay has been abandoned. Mr. Cary and the servants have been permitted to retire.

He concluded his report on the farm by noting that the Company had agreed to lease Cary's portion of the farm for £20 per season. The approximate location of the farm is evident in E.M. Hopkin's sketch of the Red River Settlement in 1848 (see Figure 23).

The re-establishment of Fort Garry and the choice of the Forks as the site for the experimental farm reflected the continued and increased importance of this site in relation to the settlement as a whole. In 1837, its role was further enhanced by the Council of Assiniboia's decision to erect a Court House and Jail at the Forks. Moreover, the London Committee of the Company agreed that the Forks was "...the most central point of the settlement."

The failure of the experimental farm in 1841 was partly attributable to the inherent weaknesses of the Red River Settlement. Isolated from the outside world, hundred of miles from any other community or market, the settlement had no alternative but to be tied wholly to the fur trade and the Hudson's Bay Company. As the fur trade offered only limited, frequently seasonal employment and only a small market for the surplus of the farm and the buffalo hunt, any hope of advancement or ambition for the offspring of the retired fur traders in the settlement, was stymied. The only avenue left, therefore, was private trading, "...and the private trading at once encountered the commercial monopoly of the Hudson's Bay Company."
that arose between the Company and some half-breed free traders, Francis Heron penned a condemnation of these English half-breeds:

...English half breeds have taken much umbrage at the late search for furs, which they consider an infringement upon their liberty and independence as natives. They affirm that by birth they are sovereign lords and masters of the soil, and consequently not subordinate to the laws and regulations of the place, like the Whites; whereas on the other hand, when occasion requires they claim as settlers, the same privileges on the European part of the Community.55

Prior to 1844, however, the private trade in furs at Red River was not a serious problem for the company. The only way ambitious young men such as Andrew McDermot and James Sinclair could dispose of the furs they collected was through the Company. Therefore, the company did not lose anything. W.L. Morton's assessment of the pre-1849 private trade in Red River concluded that:

In short, some petty traders traded for furs, and this was tolerated, but not publicly approved, by the Company's officers. Such a discreet trade in furs might be tolerated, might even be useful to the Company, but only so as the furs were sold by the traders to the Company.56

In 1844, however, Norman W. Kittson established an outpost at Pembina just south of the International boundary.57 The half-breeds of Red River could now choose their markets. In most instances, the prices and the wider selection of goods offered by Kittson, encouraged these private traders to do business at Pembina. The Hudson's Bay Company's representatives in Red River quickly perceived the danger of this new trade and acted promptly. On January 19, 1845, Alexander Christie persuaded the council of Assiniboia to pass certain regulations to govern this international trade.58 James Sinclair and Andrew McDermot, the principal concerns in the private trade, staunchly opposed Christie's measures. Sinclair, in particular, did his best not to co-operate.

When George Simpson arrived in the settlement in June 1845,
he was immediately called upon to mediate the dispute. Naturally he shared Christie's apprehensions about the private trade, and he immediately began to act in collaboration with the Company officer. Maximum limits were drawn on the amounts and types of imports from the United States. Furthermore, licences would be required by all private traders. "All the power of the Company was now being used to strangle the free trade which had flared up since 1843." Unfortunately for the Company, these measures did not work. Sinclair and McDermot were determined to carry on. On New Year's Eve 1845, Christie wrote to Simpson, admitting defeat. The only method that could conceivably prevent the prosecution of this trade was the forcible seizure of furs. And this would only be possible with an effective police force or a "body of disciplined troops in the settlement." The free trade dispute continued to plague Red River. Free traders such as Sinclair and McDermot were convinced their economic well being and future could only be achieved through the private trade in furs. To the contrary, Simpson and Christie believed that the Company's charter and, therefore, the essence of the Company, was threatened. The authority of the Company, both in its position as a commercial monopoly and as a government, was being challenged. Simpson, according to W.L. Morton, was now prepared to use every means to crush this conspiracy. Events divorced from the realm of the Hudson's Bay Company provided Simpson with the opportunity to halt this "free trade conspiracy."

By the 1840s, the westward expansion of the American frontier had reached the Oregon Country as the southern portion of that jointly held British-American territory had begun to be settled with American citizens. The Hudson's Bay Company, who had posts in Oregon, had recognized the inevitability of the loss of the southern Oregon and had consequently prepared to remove north of the Columbia River. By 1844, however, the "Texas Purchase" and the growth of the "Manifest Destiny"
movement in the United States threatened even the Columbia River boundary. The threat of a possible military confrontation between the United States and Great Britain over the "Oregon Question" necessitated the sending of a British military reconnaissance team to North America to survey the situation. It was on this premise that Governor George Simpson seized as a pretext for obtaining for Red River that force of disciplined troops which Christie had informed him was indispensable, if a stop was to be put to the illicit trade. Simpson did his best to conceal the real purpose of his call for troops, from both the settlers at Red River and the Imperial Government in London. In July 1845, Simpson wrote to Lord Metcalfe, the Governor General of Canada, pointing out the defenseless state of the British frontier along the American boundary in comparison to the string of American posts throughout the American mid-west. In December, he corresponded with Metcalfe's successor, Earl Cathcart, asking for his support for the sending of troops to Red River. In his opinion, the Red River Settlement was in particular danger and the sending of regular troops would help to counteract the American influence. This rationale camouflaged the real reasons behind Simpson's request for troops. In a letter to Chief Factor Donald Ross at Norway House, he revealed the real reason:

If we succeed in getting a garrison established at Red River, we shall be able to put down the illicit trade and keep the settlers in order; but nothing, must be said about it until we are quite certain of it.

The Duke of Wellington, the Commander in chief of Her Majesty's armed forces, was not overjoyed about the prospect of sending troops to Red River. If British regulars were to be sent, they would have to be quartered in a properly constructed defense establishment capable of holding off any American attack. The fur trade forts of Upper and Lower Fort Garry would not suffice. The Duke's resistance to the Red River
expedition was finally overcome. In June 1846, 307 officers and men of the Sixth Regiment of Foot, 28 officers and men of the Royal Artillery, and one Sargeant and 11 men of the Royal Sappers and Miners, set sail for York Factory. They were accompanied by two members of the Royal Engineers, Captain Andrew Beatty and Captain Hampden Moody, who were to prepare a report on the defense of the two Fort Garrys.

Prior to the arrival of the troops at Red River in September 1846, the necessary arrangements for their accommodation had to be completed. Simpson first informed Chief Factor Christie in December 1845 of the imminent arrival of British troops to reside at Red River:

It will be necessary, moreover, that you make arrangements for carrying on the work of the Lower Fort in the spring, so as to get the wall and bastions finished before the arrival of the troops, as it is proposed to make over that establishment to the Government.

Christie, however, did not agree with Simpson with respect to the quartering of the troops. The Upper Fort, he maintained, was far more preferable. "Timely arrangements," could be made there with the addition of one or two buildings. Lieutenants Warre and Vavasour, the two officers who had been sent out on an inspection mission of British territory and defenses in connection with the Oregon Question, agreed with Christie that the Upper Fort was the more desirable location of the two establishments. They believed the Upper Fort could afford sufficient accommodation for 300 men if all the buildings were given over to the troops. Furthermore, they suggested that the storehouses along the western wall of the fort could be converted into barracks with only minor alterations. These alterations included the addition of chimneys to each end of the buildings and insulation to the walls. The Lower Fort, on the other hand, could only accommodate 200 men and it was more disadvantageously situated.

The summer of 1846 was an unfortunate one for the Red River Settlement. An influenza epidemic had cut drastically
into the labour supply and consequently it was only with great difficulty that Christie managed to muster enough hands to man the York Factory boat brigades and to renovate Upper Fort Garry. Furthermore, the alterations planned for Upper Fort Garry became more extensive than first contemplated:

[the]...alterations are to be an extent that you could not have imagined before leaving here, it now appears, the second floors must be taken out of the Stores..., so that no wheat can be stored above the troops, and God only knows where I am to find room for the removal of 3 to 4,000 Bushels of this valuable article...

Obviously, Christie overcame these obstacles because when Simpson returned to Red River in September 1846, he reported to the Governor and Committee "...that the arrangements for the accommodation of the troops were in a state of great forwardness than Cd. have been expected."

The arrival of the troops at Red River in 1846, and all the inspections and reports concerning the housing and quartering of them, resulted in a number of excellent, if at times conflicting descriptions of Upper Fort Garry. In 1846, George Simpson described Upper Fort Garry as a quadrangle measuring 240' x 250' with 15 foot stone walls and four bastions at the corners. Lieutenants Warre and Vavasour of the Royal Engineers, passed by Fort Garry in June 1845 and again in May 1946. Between the two of them they left three written descriptions, one oil painting (see figure 13) and one sketch (see figure 14) of the fort and environs. Lieutenant Vavasour recorded the following description:

Upper Fort Garry is similar to the lower fort, but of smaller dimensions, being 80 yards square, (240'), the circular towers are 18 feet in diameter, and contain four small guns, two on the basement, and two on the upper storey. The buildings in the interior are all of wood. The wall is 15 feet high, but not loopholed; it has a gallery to enable men to fire over it. The fort is situated on the left bank of the Assiniboine River 250 yards from its junction with Red River...
The only discrepancy between Simpson's and Vavasour's description is in the total size of the fort (240' x 250' as compared to 240' square).

In May 1846, enroute to Montreal, Vavasour and his companion H.J. Warre passed by Upper Fort Garry. Warre described in his journal that Fort Garry "...consists of a very large dwelling House—5 or 6 large stores or warehouses; a magazine well, etc. Surrounded by high stone walls and flanked by round stone towers..." Lieutenants Warre and Vavasour's final report on the defenses of British North West America contains the most detailed and most accurate description of Upper Fort Garry in 1845-46. An analysis of their report reveals that the fort itself measured 324 feet by 264 feet. At each of the four corners were two circular two storied towers or bastions, 24 feet in diameter. The stone walls that enclosed the fort were 13 feet high and three feet thick. Inside the enclosure were a number of wooden buildings, including three large frame houses, 70 feet by 30 feet, one two-storied dwelling house with a basement 70 feet by 35 feet, two dwelling houses two stories high, 42 feet by 24 feet. The fort could accommodate an estimated 250 soldiers. At the time of their inspection, the Hudson's Bay Company had 12 men residing in Upper Fort Garry as well as 45 horses in stables at the site.

After the arrival of the regular troops in September 1846, they took up quarters in both Upper and Lower Fort Garry. The contingent at the Lower Fort consisted of all the Royal Sappers and Miners (12 men) and one and one-half companies of the Sixth Regiment of Foot. Colonel J.F. Crofton retained his headquarters at the Upper Fort with 28 officers and men of the Royal Artillery along with the remaining one and one-half companies of the Sixth Regiment. The accommodation provided at Upper Fort Garry for the military was described by Crofton:

The Barracks were made from the store rooms of the Company and are about 70 feet by 36 feet.
There are 2 of these dimensions, having a second floor. These 4 large rooms are divided off into 4, with Sergeant's rooms boarded up. The Guard Room is in one of the Round Bastions. In another Bastion is to be the Engineer's office and store, and in the 3rd is a sutler's shop; and in the 4th a magazine. The Hospital is outside the Fort, in a building formerly the Gaol.\(^8\)

As Crofton's building dimensions do not coincide with Warre's and Vavasour's, it is difficult to ascertain which buildings were used for the barracks. As Warre and Vavasour were trained engineers, their dimensions supposedly were more accurate.

The agreement reached between the Hudson's Bay Company and the Imperial Government with regard to the troops sent to Red River was an ambiguous one. The division of costs, for instance, was not settled before the troops left England.\(^8\) Moreover, George Simpson viewed the Duke of Wellington's ambitious plans for the strengthening of the fortifications at Red River with some apprehension. Simpson believed that the heavy costs of these works would fall eventually on the Company.\(^8\) Captain Beatty of the Royal Engineers estimated the total costs of the proposed works at £80,000, while Colonel Crofton anticipated a cost of £120,000.\(^8\) Captain Beatty was eager to initiate the work, but Simpson did his best to stall the construction. Aside from the enormous costs involved, Simpson believed the ambitious plans were unnecessary:

> Either of the Forts or both of them can I believe, be rendered perfectly efficient against anything but heavy Artillery, and such means of attack could not be conveyed hither from the United States without our receiving sufficient warning to enable us to cut off the invading party en route.\(^8\)

Simpson's persistent requests to Beatty finally had the desired effect. In July 1847, Simpson reported to the Governor and Committed that preparatory work on the major works had stopped.\(^8\)

The arrival of the troops at Red River in September, 1846 had an immediate impact. Open opposition to the Company by
the traders and Métis were submerged at least temporarily. Furthermore, the troops created an increased demand for country provisions, agricultural surplus, and transport, providing a temporary windfall of employment opportunities. There is little doubt that the winter of 1846-47 at Red River was an eventful and prosperous one. 87

By the beginning of 1847, it had become increasingly obvious that the supposed threat of an American attack on Red River had dissipated. Because the heavy expenses of retaining troops at Red River could no longer be justified by Simpson and the Hudson's Bay Company, the Imperial Government decided to recall the troops in June 1847. 88 The lateness of the season, and the length of time it took to convey the decision to Red River, made it impossible for the troops to depart that year. They were forced to remain one more winter in Red River.

Despite the expense, the Hudson's Bay Company appealed the Government's decision to withdraw the troops. This appeal, as well as their plea for a replacement garrison, was rejected. The Duke of Wellington refused to send more regular troops to Red River. The War Office, however, eventually agreed to send a contingent of "Chelsea Hospital Out Pensioners." 89 This group of military settlers and their families, intended to replace the regular troops, consisted of 56 men, 42 women, and 57 children. They arrived at Fort Garry in mid-September 1848 under the command of Major William B. Caldwell, who also carried with him a commission from the Hudson's Bay Company to serve as the Governor of Assiniboia. 90 After spending the first winter within the walls of Upper Fort Garry, the pensioners were to take up small farming lots within a short distance of the fort.

This much smaller contingent made the arrangements for the accommodation easier for the Company. In July 1848, Simpson wrote to Christie detailing the accommodation arrangements:

That portion of the Upper Fort now occupied by the garrison will afford sufficient accommodation for the
whole party; you will therefore, be pleased to get
them quartered there in the meantime, placing the
main house, furnished as it is, at the disposal of
Major Caldwell, for the accommodation of himself
and family and Shd, he require the use of the old
gaol as a guard house or for any other military
purpose, you will perhaps put him in possession
of it.91

To the Company's disadvantage, these pensioner replacements
did not adequately fill the vacuum left by the departure of
the regular troops. Simpson complained to London that he
regretted:

...very much to have to state that the Pensioner
Corps does not provide to be so efficient or well
conducted a force as was expected...Their disor-
derly and intemperate habits are without parallel.
Scenes of drunkenness and riot are frequently wit-
nessed...(within the walls of Fort Garry).92

These pensioners, he continued, "instead of aiding in the main-
tenance of peace...[are] found the most turbulent and dangerous
members of the disaffected party."93

As the Free Traders of Red River certainly did not inter-
pret these pensioners as a deterrent to their trade, the pri-
IVATE trade in furs escalated once again. The Company's posi-
tion continued to deteriorate throughout 1848 and 1849. By
the spring of 1849, Christie's replacement, Chief Factor John
Ballenden, decided in concert with Governor Caldwell and
Recorder Adam Thom that the Free Trade movement must be
challenged in Court. On May 17, 1849, Guillaume Sayer was
brought before the quarterly Court of Assiniboia on a charge
of private trading in contradiction to the charter of the
Hudson's Bay Company.94 Sayer was found guilty of the charge,
but the potential military threat of his Métis brethren made
the implementation of a sentence impossible. Sayer, conse-
quently, was allowed to leave the court house a free man. The
Métis and private traders naturally viewed this as a victory
and justification for private and free trade. The Hudson's
Bay Company, on the other hand, saw the guilty verdict as a
vindication of the Company's charter. In short then, the
result was a compromise.

More importantly, the Sayer trial symbolized the end of the second phase of the Red River Settlement's history.\(^9\) This period was characterized by a monopolistic fur trade and a subordinate colony. Economic activity, as well as social and political institutions, were established in Red River under the guidance and sole direction of the Company. When the evolving community appeared to drift away from the course charted by the commercial institution, the Company's overseas Governor, George Simpson, cleverly persuaded the Imperial Government to send troops to the settlement for the sole purpose of maintaining order, and restraining the free trade movement. In the end, however, the diversity of the settlement, the independence and armed strength of the Métis and free traders, coupled with the inability of the Company to retain a permanent military presence, effectively broke the domination of the Company's control over the settlement.

During this period, the Forks grew in importance as the Company approached its peak of influence in 1848-49. Upper Fort Garry at the Forks became the economic and social centre of the settlement, despite Simpson's wish that the Lower Fort should assume that role.

Graphic representations of the Forks increase in terms of quantity and quality during this time period. An examination of these documents reveal concise and valuable information on the structural and land use evolution of the site. For example, a meticulous scaling of three separate plans (see figure 14 and 19 and a restricted microfilm copy of a British war office plan) reveals that the site of the first Fort Garry was approximately 1,000 feet from Upper Fort Garry's south-east bastion. More concisely, the war office plan (1845-46) situated the "old block house" 962.5 feet from the south-east bastion of the Upper Fort Garry. Lieutenant H.J. Warre either estimated or measured this same distance as
350 yards or 1,050 feet (see figure 14).

Captain Hampden Moody of the Royal Engineers, in an accurate plan of the site (see figure 19), situated the original Fort Garry (or the rebuilt Fort Gibraltar) 990 feet from this same control point. More importantly, Moody's plan of the Forks and vicinity pinpoints the situations and characteristics of every notable structure and feature. Note, for instance, the detail provided concerning the first Fort Garry complex and adjacent structures. Also consider his depictions of the remaining non Hudson Bay Company structures north of the Forks. Included among these are: Andrew McDermot's house and mill, Alexander Ross' house and Robert Logan's property at Point Douglas which encompassed the site of the colonial Fort Douglas.

Supplementing these fairly detailed plans are the artistic but relatively accurate view of Fort Garry produced by H.J. Warre in 1845 (figure 13); the sketches from the George Finlay Collection (see figures 15-18). Of particular value is Finlay's sketch of the Forks (figure 15) which provides a good visual impression of the relative situations of the original Fort Garry and the later Upper Fort Garry. Note also, figure 16, which is the only known view of Upper Fort Garry's north wall prior to its enlargement in 1853.
In several ways, Red River was a unique society. A heterogeneous collection of some five thousand people situated hundreds of miles from anywhere, Red River owed its very existence to the trade in furs and its close link to the Hudson's Bay Company. All its institutions, including social, economic, and government functions were initiated and directed by the Company.

In 1850, Red River was comprised of five main groups. The remnants of the Selkirk settlers were located in Kildonan near Frog Plain, near where Governor Semple clashed with Métis and Nor'Westers in 1816. They were Gaelic speaking, Presbyterian in faith, farmers by occupation, and ethnocentric by custom. Opposite the Forks on the east bank of the Red River, in what was later to become St. Boniface, resided the second major component of Red River society. These were the French speaking Catholic Canadians, originally from Lower Canada. Associated with this French-Catholic nucleus was the Métis community at White Horse Plains. These Métis, or mixed blood descendants of French Canadian voyageurs and Indian women, formed the largest single racial community at Red River. For the most part, they were devout Catholics, and attached to St. Boniface and Bishop Taché by both language and religion. In terms of occupation or livelihood, they depended to a large extent on the returns of the buffalo hunt. They relied to a lesser degree on the fisheries at lakes Winnipeg and Manitoba, and on small scale agriculture. Many "bois-brulés" also found seasonal employment as boatmen for the Hudson's Bay Company.
or became active in the private trade of furs.

The third major group in the community was the Orcadian and country-born settlements at St. Paul's and St. Andrew's, north of Kildonan. Here the retired servants of the Hudson's Bay Company resided with their Indian wives and mixed-blood offspring. Like the Kildonan Scots they practised agriculture but on a smaller and less successful scale. As many of the retired servants had accumulated substantial savings from long time service in the Company, their solid and stately homes were the most substantial in Red River. North of St. Andrew's parish, and the Lower Fort, was the Cree Indian Settlement of St. Peter's. This group, along with the Saulteaux outposts at Baie St-Paul on the Assiniboine, formed the Indian segment of Red River Society.

The most dominant factor in Red River society remained the influential Hudson's Bay Company. In 1850 the fur trade was still the only substantial commercial enterprise in the settlement and it would remain so for at least another two decades. The Hudson's Bay Company, therefore, with its pre-eminence in the fur trade and its proprietor rights on the soil was the dominant and at times a stifling influence in the Settlement. The centre of the Company's operations in Red River was Upper Fort Garry:

The Upper Fort was the centre of the fur trade of the Red River District and a depot of "country provisions" and trade goods for the northern districts and the settlement itself. It was also the seat of government for the settlement, or more precisely speaking, the District of Assiniboia, the region within a radius of sixty miles from the Fort. As such, it was the residence of the Governor of Assiniboia, and of the Chief Factor in charge of the Red River District.²

Red River society and particularly the last twenty years of its history, has come under the attention and analysis of numerous scholars. Interpretations of the settlement and the reason behind its demise in 1870 vary greatly. Historians unanimously agree that the uprising or resistance of 1869-70
was the climax to a long and ongoing process. George F.G. Stanley and Frits Pannekoek, for instance, imply that the uprising was inevitable. Stanley's *Birth of Western Canada*, the first scholarly analysis of the Riel Rebellion, drew parallels between the Red River experience and those of South Africa, New Zealand and other parts of North America. The expanding frontiers of white civilization into native non-white territories has led to friction and wars. In Red River, he contended that the half-breeds "...were unfitted to compete with the Whites in the competitive individualism of white civilization, or to share with them the duties and responsibilities of citizenship. They did not want to be civilized, they only wanted to survive."³ Pannekoek, on the other hand, viewed Red River as a "...brittle society whose parts were mutually antagonistic." Moreover, the Anglican clergy, in their attempt to transform Red River society into an "English rural parish," inadvertently precipitated the steady deterioration of the settlement. By 1869-70, "old Red River was spent," and it was fortunate that Canadian annexation came when it did."⁴

W.L. Morton viewed Red River during the period after 1850 as a society that was in temporary equilibrium. This "informal and slovenly balance"⁵ which existed in the settlement between Company and private trader and Company and colonist was only broken, he argued, by the coming of the Upper Canadians after 1857. Furthermore, Morton took exception to Stanley's frontier approach. "Red River," he wrote, was not a frontier but an "island of civilization in the wilderness."⁶

If an armed uprising was not inevitable after 1850, radical change certainly was. There were a number of external and internal influences that came to bear after 1850, and especially after 1856-57, that made an alteration in the Red River Settlement inevitable.

The approaching American frontier in general and the
growth of the city of St. Paul, Minnesota, in particular, had a large and direct influence on the Red River Settlement after 1850. The private trade in furs, which had been a thorn in the side of the company in the 1840s, continued through the 1850s. The growing metropolis of St. Paul and the resulting wider selection of trade goods strengthened the already extensive Red River - St. Paul trade route. By 1855, a regular monthly mail run from Red River to Pembina and then on to St. Paul. By the late 1850s, even the Hudson's Bay Company began to depend on the overland St. Paul route. By 1862, the London Committee considered the St. Paul route "so completely established that it must be considered as one of the ordinary means of introducing supplies into the territory."

In addition to the approaching American frontier, the ascendancy of economic liberalism in England and North America in the mid 19th century placed chartered monopoly companies such as the Hudson's Bay Company in an unfavourable public light. In 1857, the parliamentary license granting the Hudson's Bay Company exclusive trading rights in North America was approaching its termination date. The Company naturally sought a renewal. This opportunity was seized by the opponents of the charter as a change to criticize the Company. The public criticism led to the formation of a select committee of the British House of Commons to look into the affairs of the Hudson's Bay Company's operations in British North America. The most notable conclusion reached by the Committee was that an equitable arrangement should be reached whereby the Red River and Saskatchewan districts would be transferred to the jurisdiction of Canada. More relevant to this study, the Committee's conclusions drew outside attention to the Red River Settlement. An outgrowth of this renewed British interest in the Northwest was the Palliser Expedition of 1857.

Further reflections of the new found interest in the Northwest of North America was the increased number of visitors and "English gentlemen hunters" who sailed to North America
to hunt its exotic animals. Among those who journeyed to the west and partook of the hospitality at Fort Garry's mess were the Earl of Southesk, Lord Grosvenor, Lord Robert Cavendish, Mr. H. Seymour M.P., and Sir Francis Sykes. The arrival of these new visitors at Fort Garry provoked comment. The writer of the Fort Garry Journal noted in June of 1858, that five of these gentlemen were then "loafing about the establishment." 

Increased interest in the Northwest also arose in Canada. In 1856, a group of Upper Canadians led by Phillip Vankoughnet and Allan Macdonnell persuaded the Toronto Board of Trade to support their plan for the incorporation of the Northwest into Canada. Their interest in the Northwest was primarily a commercial one.

Similar to the situation in England which had increased awareness of the Northwest and brought about the Palliser Expedition, the growing interest in Canada prompted the formation of the Hind and Dawson expedition in 1857. It was increasingly obvious that the isolated Settlement along the banks of the Red and Assiniboine was slowly beginning to feel the impact of the new industrial society. This new external pressure created strains on the already troubled society of Red River, and in order for Red River to become compatible with the "modern world" it would have to undergo changes.

Within the Settlement itself, there were a number of problems creating strains on the Settlement and its diverse society. Perhaps the most serious was the Settlement's continued dependence on the fur trade and the Hudson's Bay Company. Compounding this situation was the Settlement's isolation, which made it difficult if not impossible for the dissatisfied inhabitants to go elsewhere. Secondly, although Red River was predominantly a mixed-blood community, this majority did not govern the Settlement nor direct its destiny. The elite of Red River was chosen for the most part from the
English speaking and white segment of the colony. Furthermore, the selection of the councillors of Assiniboia was made by George Simpson and naturally enough a sympathetic view of the Hudson's Bay Company's interests was a pre-requisite for selection. The half-breeds of Red River, and particularly the Métis, had little influence upon the decision making process at Red River. Unpopular moves on the part of the Company or the Council of Assiniboia were met with armed resistance or a show of force. After 1849, the Company's ability to maintain order or to carry out sentences, lessened. For example, John Desmarais, a Métis, was found guilty of murdering an Indian within the walls of Fort Garry in the summer of 1866. He was sentenced to hang by the Court of Assiniboia. Chief Factor and Governor of Assiniboia, William Mactavish, however, decided to commute the sentence. "It would be, [he wrote] inexpedient to carry out the sentence in opposition to the desires of a very large section of the community." Similarly, sentences passed on other prominent individuals in the community such as Rev. G.O. Corbett could not be carried out.

There were other strains on the old order of Red River. The steady decline of the buffalo herds made the future prosperity of Métis society uncertain. For those in Red River who depended on agriculture for subsistence the rapid increase in population coupled with the declining availability of prime river lot farm property forced a number of settlers westward to Portage la Prairie in 1853-54.

The third phase of the Red River Settlement's history commenced in 1852 when yet another major flood devastated the upper reaches of the Settlement. At the Forks, Fort Garry was particularly susceptible to the full impact of the rampaging ice and water. Although the maximum height of the flood waters was 18 inches to two feet below that of 1826, the more advanced state of the Settlement made the damage more substantial. Within the walls of the fort itself the water was "knee deep
all over." On the main floor of the Chief Factor's house, the water was one foot deep and on the store floor, 13 inches. Amazingly, permanent damage to the fort was minimal. A large quantity of wooden fencing or picketing which enclosed the adjacent Fort Garry farm was carried away. More importantly, the flood swept away or, at least, severely damaged the last remnants of the first Fort Garry. On May 11 and 12, Dr. William Cowan remarked on three occasions in his journal that the "old bastion on the point" was in danger of falling down. The old Fort Garry, after its abandonment in 1853, had been used by Captain Cary as a centre for the short-lived Experimental Farm project and after 1848, some of the Chelsea Pensioners resided in some of the more preserved buildings (see figures 19, 20, 27). There is an indication that at least one of the damaged buildings "at the point" occupied by the pensioners was repaired after the 1852 flood.

There were other changes and alterations made to the fort and adjacent area in the period after 1850 aside from those brought about by the flood of 1852. The increased demand placed on the facilities at Upper Fort Garry by the Hudson's Bay Company, the Council of Assiniboia and the Pensioner Corps, necessitated an enlargement of the fort. The construction of two large stone storehouses, to the rear or north of the fort's walls, was planned for as early as 1849. In 1853, the walls of the fort were extended north to enclose the site of the new stores. Unlike the original walls, which were entirely made of stone, the northern extension was of large oak timbers. Chief Factor John Black wrote to George Simpson in November 1853, describing these new walls and other developments at the fort:

I am glad to say that our wooden wall is now finished so that we are once more able to shut the gate at night which is a great security. The stone gateway with a bastion over it and an arch in front is also nearly complete, and I think
you will like the appearance of the place altogether. In a year or so more, if the place were not to be again turned upside down by Pensioners or something of that kind, the Fort might be put into a perfect state of repair.\textsuperscript{27}

Unfortunately, the enlargements and alterations to the Fort in 1853-54 are not well documented in the Archives of the Hudson's Bay Company. Governor Simpson's inward and outward correspondence contains only scattered references to the fort. Simpson's input to the planning of the renovations and enlargement was, apparently, informal and general in nature. In August 1854, Chief Factor John Ballenden reported to Simpson that the work "chalked out"\textsuperscript{28} by Simpson was now finished. When the "new office" was covered in and Mr. and Mrs. Clouston's "habitation" was ready, he let a contract for the construction of Major Caldwell's stable. Also in 1854, the two new stores planned by Chief Factor Christie in 1849 were finally built.\textsuperscript{29} John Black described the location of these new stores as being "next [to] our dwelling house." Furthermore, the all stone construction planned by Christie was modified. The buildings rested on stone foundations, but the buildings themselves were wood.\textsuperscript{30}

The mid 1850s also witnessed the disappearance of the buffalo herds from the vicinity of the Settlement. As a result, the Métis hunting parties were forced to travel many miles to the southwest in order to encounter the herds. It was common Métis practice by the 1850s to cross the 49th parallel while chasing the herds. In September 1856, while hunting buffalo in American territory, the Red River hunters met a company of United States Calvary under the command of Colonel C.F. Smith. The Colonel delivered a proclamation to the Métis directing them to cease hunting buffalo on the American side of the boundary. This information was relayed to Red River and ultimately to George Simpson in Montreal. At this juncture Simpson was agitated about the movement in Canada concerning the possible annexation of Rupert's Land.
The news of the American threat, as it had in 1846, presented him with an opportunity to use external and unconnected problems to serve the Company's interests. He immediately wrote to the Governor and Committee in London requesting them to urge the Imperial Government to send regular troops to Red River once again. The pretext of the Company's argument to secure the troops formed the conclusion of his letter:

The military occupation of the frontier by the United States is a matter which affects British interests at large, and I trust that representation on the subject to Her Majesty's Government may go towards inducing them to form at Red River the nucleus of a military force [regulars] which may serve as a counterpoise to the growing influence of the United States in the North West Territories.

The real reason for his request was camouflaged. Hudson's Bay Company Governor, John Shepherd, in a letter to the Colonial Secretary Henry Labouchere in March 1857, cleverly linked the American threat to the political disturbances in Canada which called for the Canadian annexation of Rupert's Land. Shepherd concluded his letter to Labouchere with a warning that the "...whole country may soon be involved in conflagration and bloodshed..." Unlike the difficulties experienced with the Company's request of 1846, the Colonial and Foreign offices received the request favourably. In April, Simpson reported to John Clouston at Upper Fort Garry that there was "...every probability of a small detachment of troops being stationed at Fort Garry this season."

Clouston and his successor, William Mactavish, were ordered to prepare the fort for the troops:

The whole of the main house at Fort Garry to be given up as officers quarters, and a part of the third store, adjoining those already made over to the soldiers. Dr. Bunn to be placed in the front house say the two rooms forming the wing on the west side, with access from the front. The Inner communication between the wing and the main house to be filled up.
arrangements for the troops at the fort:

Two large two-storey buildings and a part of a third formerly occupied by the 6th Regt. are set apart for the soldiers quarters and the hospital; one of the bastions will be used as a guardroom, and another as a prison. The upper part of the latter serving for tailors and shoemakers. Warehouses and bins and other outdoor accommodation will be erected immediately. The main dwelling house which is a large roomy building has been entirely given up to the officers. Mr. Johnson who at present occupied it will remove to a smaller dwelling alongside.\textsuperscript{35}

Major George Seton, the commanding officer of the Royal Canadian Rifles, did not share Simpson's opinion with regard to the accommodation provided at Fort Garry. He wanted additional space\textsuperscript{36} and Simpson complied.\textsuperscript{37} Moreover, Major Seton did not see the necessity for regular troops at Red River. He contended that only a few policemen were required. The expected trouble at Red River, Seton believed "...existed only in the imagination of those members of the Company, who don't reside in their territory."\textsuperscript{38} Seton's observations proved remarkably accurate, because, in fact, it was a policing role that Simpson intended for these troops.

The preparations of the barracks at Fort Garry continued throughout the summer of 1857. In late August, William Mactavish reported to George Simpson that "...the quarters for the troops are nearly prepared."\textsuperscript{39} The Royal Canadian Rifles arrived at Fort Garry via York Factory, on October 12 and 13, 1857. On the 21st of that month, Sir George wrote the Governor of Assiniboia, F.G. Johnson, in connection with the troops:

I hope the troops are by this time safely quartered at Fort Garry and that their presence serves to prevent unnecessary agitation and to keep certain mischievous persons on their guard.\textsuperscript{40}

Soon after his arrival, Major Seton expressed dissatisfaction with his situation at Red River and his accommodation. The lack of privacy, particularly for married officers, annoyed him.
He wrote to Simpson in Montreal:

You are not perhaps aware that this house although perhaps a good enough one for a Family (in Red River) is not suited as a Barrack - with the exception of my room and the mess room. The appointments are small, dark and ill contrived; and what would prevent a married officer living in the house, even supposing he could put up with the one or two very small rooms allotted to him, is the fact that every word, and every sound even the splashing of water is distinctly heard from room to room - decency would utterly forbid any lady living under these circumstances in a house full of single men.41

It is not surprising that in the same letter the major announced that it was his intention to be relieved from his post.

The daily routine of the troops and the Company servants at Fort Garry during the period of the Royal Canadian Rifles occupation is well documented in the Fort Garry Journal of 1858-60. Although mundane in nature, these activities reflect the land use at the junction. Firewood was collected and piled, gardens (likely outside the fort's walls) were dug and harvested, and minor alterations were made to the various buildings. Aside from the general renovation of the stores into barracks, the only special consideration for the troops in terms of construction was the erection of a urinal42 and a few outbuildings such as stables and cook houses.43 The 1858-60 Fort Garry Journal also reveals that a new "workshop" was erected in the fort. Unfortunately, the size and location of this new structure was not identified.44

The increased utilization and demand on Fort Garry's structural resources during the 1850s necessitated the construction of a number of new buildings. In 1853, the enclosed area of the fort was approximately doubled. By 1857, however, the new construction at Upper Fort Garry provoked Simpson to warn Chief Factor Mactavish that any proposal for additional construction should be analyzed carefully. The Upper Fort, he wrote, was "...already dangerously overcrowded."45 Simpson
dreaded the prospect of fire, and he knew that if one broke out in the crowded confines of Fort Garry all could be lost. In May 1860, Fort Garry narrowly escaped total destruction. On the 12th Instant a fire broke out in the upper roof of the Ice House of this Establishment,...I fear the whole Establishment would have been burned,...if instead of the low roof of the Icehouse one of the stores had taken fire.46

The Hudson's Bay Company's increasing reliance on the St. Paul route for the introduction of goods into the Northwest further enhanced the importance of Fort Garry and the demands placed on its facilities. Despite the unpredictable and often hostile Sioux who resided in the intervening territory, the Fort Garry - St. Paul route held obvious advantages over the York Factory brigade route.47 Brigade work had become increasingly less popular for the seasonal employees at Red River and in 1863, the York Factory brigades mutinied at Norway House.48 Similarly, the Mackenzie River brigade failed in 1865. This breakdown is another example of the Hudson's Bay Company declining influence in the Settlement, and the loss of confidence in the Company's administration now being expressed by the citizens of Red River.

With the additional dependency on the St. Paul route, Fort Garry's role as a major transhipment centre or depot expanded. This escalating pressure on Fort Garry, along with those placed on it by the growing settlement and the Royal Canadian Rifles, persuaded Chief Factor William Mactavish to erect additional storehouses at the fort. In January 1860, Simpson approved Mactavish's plan to build a "...store and a granary one on each side of the garden..."49 This indicates that they were the two most northerly warehouses, one on each side of the mess building (see figure 28). Preparations for the new store began in January 1860, when Mactavish wrote to Chief Trader William Lane at White Horse Plains asking him to procure the necessary timber for the store. Included in this letter was a list of the required timber to be prepared.50
Lane apparently busied himself throughout the remainder of the winter procuring the timber. Contracts were let to local people to collect the timber from the wooded banks of the Assiniboine near White Horse Plains. When the ice went out of the Assiniboine, they rafted their wood down to the Forks. By the second week of May, Mactavish became impatient, and he urged Land to "Hurry down the squared timber as I am very anxious to commence our new store." The first timber raft, belonging to a Mr. Gonville, arrived on May 11, and they continued at intervals until the final order carried by Mr. Bouvier was landed on May 21. The construction of the new store continued through the summer of 1860 and by September the three-storey structure neared completion. All that remained to be done was some interior finishing.

A second and slightly larger store was also erected the ensuing winter. There is also indication that yet another warehouse was erected at Fort Garry during the early 1860s. The probable construction date of this warehouse was 1861, as Governor A.G. Dallas informed London Secretary Thomas Fraser in June 1862 that a large three storey warehouse had been built the previous year.

In August 1861, the Royal Canadian Rifles left Red River. The withdrawal of the troops from the fort enabled the Company to transform the barracks back into storehouses. This additional storage space, combined with the additions to the fort through 1859-1861, relieved the pressure for new storage facilities at Fort Garry. In April 1863, Mactavish informed his Chief timber provider, William Lane, that "...in the present state of affairs [he did not]...feel inclined to add to our buildings." Moreover, there is no evidence of any additional construction at Fort Garry from 1862 to 1869. Regardless, any building activity during this period would be difficult to trace. There are no Fort Garry Journals after 1860, and Mactavish's private letter book ends in 1864. A perusal of the local newspaper The Nor'Wester also failed to uncover
any indication of construction at Fort Garry during the last half of the 1860s. Furthermore, the correspondence of Governor A.G. Dallas (1862-1864), and the inward letters of William Mactavish to London prior to 1870, do not reveal any evidence of building activity at the fort or any description of land use activity.

The nature of Mactavish's and Dallas' correspondence during the last few years preceding the uprising of 1869-70 vividly reflects the rapid transformation of Red River society. Any semblance of order that existed in the settlement vanished. Gaol sentences passed by the court of Assiniboia were ignored, and in two instances, (Corbett and Schultz), the convicted were forcefully liberated by mobs. As mentioned previously, the boat brigades to York Factory and the Saskatchewan and Athabasca Districts broke down. In November 1868 Mactavish declared them complete failures. \(^5\) \(^8\) In the settlement, the recently established Nor'Wester newspaper openly criticized the Hudson's Bay Company and its form of administration and control over the country. Andrew Bannatyne, a prominent private trader in Red River, recognized the deterioration of Red River society, and in a letter to Edward Ellice in July 1863, he wrote:

Old Red River is going to the devil faster than ever and God only knows what is to become of it if the English Government or some other friendly soul does not take us by the hand. \(^5\) \(^9\)

The Forks; and the Red River Resistance of 1869-70

The resistance of the Red River Métis to the transfer of the Northwest to the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada was the climax of its 50 year history. The background events and repercussions of the Red River resistance, have been studied in great detail by numerous scholars. Consequently, interpretations exist as to the cause and significance of the resistance.
W.L. Morton's introduction to Alexander Begg's Red River Journal and other Documents, in conjunction with his introduction to The London Inward Correspondence of Eden Colvile, represents the most comprehensive analysis of this crucial period in Canadian history. In conveying the moods and attitudes of the various segments in Red River, Morton managed to place the Resistance in a broader and more comprehensive context.

The Métis feared that the Red River valley would be filled by an influx of Protestant, English speaking Canadians if they were legally and politically absorbed by Canada. Furthermore, they believed that the Canadian Party in Red River, led by Dr. John Christian Schultz, would become "...the Chief power and... established favourite in the new order." It was this apprehension more than anything else that explains the cause of armed resistance. The people of Red River, the Métis included, realized that a change in their lifestyle was inevitable by the mid 1860s. It was the proposed nature and direction of this alteration that alarmed them.

The small Canadian Party in Red River was the most vocal and demonstrative group advocating change in the settlement. Their aggressiveness and arrogance alienated a large segment of the community, and in fact brought about a very unlikely union—the Métis and the Company. In October 1869, the Métis organized a "National Committee" led by John Bruce and Louis Riel. This Committee was determined to have influence over the direction of the new order. On October 30, the Canadian appointed Lieutenant Governor William McDougall, a former Canadian minister of Public Works and an avowed annexationist, reached the frontier at Pembina. There he was met by a deputation of Métis sent by the National Committee to inform that he could not cross the boundary. The resistance had begun.

Three days later, on November 2, an armed group of Métis numbering somewhere between 100 and 200 approached Upper
Fort Garry from the south, under the wooded cover of the south banks of the Assiniboine. In small groups, they quietly crossed the River and snuck into the upguarded enclosure. In a matter of minutes, the fort was seized without a shot being fired.

The taking of Fort Garry was crucial to the success of the resistance. Its stores and warehouses contained large caches of provisions to sustain the uprising. Moreover, its stone walls, bastions, cannon, rifles and ammunition could provide a sufficient deterrent to any counter-revolution. The cash-box of the Hudson's Bay Company could also be used to finance the resistance, if the need arose.

The capture of the fort was also symbolic. Fort Garry was the centre of the settlement, the seat of the government and the nucleus of the Hudson's Bay Company's operations in Red River. Like all revolutions, uprisings or coups, a "winter palace" or "bastille" had to be taken, to complete it. Here again, the significance of the Forks and Upper Fort Garry, was emphasized.

As the sequence of events that formed the resistance unfolded throughout the remainder of 1869 and into 1870, Fort Garry became its focal point. Riel seized the three-storey mess building which faced the Assiniboine River gate, and transformed it into his "Government House." The keys to all the stores, shops and warehouses were forcefully taken and the new occupants helped themselves to the Hudson's Bay Company's goods. All the Company servants were expelled from the fort, while the commissioned officers, including Gov. William Mactavish, Chief Factor Cowan, and Chief Accountant J.H. McTavish, remained within the establishment. The Métis occupation of Fort Garry meant the establishment was a very crowded place. A perusal of the accounts of that winter, especially Alexander Begg's Red River Journal, reveals that the most characteristic feature of the resistance was the preponderance of arrests and detentions. Seemingly everyone within a 50
mile radius of the fort was at one time or another a prisoner at Fort Garry.

On January 19 and 20, 1870, Fort Garry was the scene of a giant mass meeting. Upwards of a thousand people crowded into the southern half of the enclosure of the fort to hear the Canadian position concerning annexation presented by Chief Factor Donald A. Smith of Montreal. W.L. Morton recorded this description of the gathering:

They packed the southern half of the great enclosure and faced the gallery of the large mess building which was situated midway between the south and north gates. On the gallery stood Smith, Riel, Thibault, de Salaberry, Bishop Machray, Father Ritchot and other important people.63

Smith's appeal was effective and for a short time it appeared that he had swayed a number of people over to the Canadian viewpoint. His impact was only temporary. By the evening of the 19th Riel had regained firm control of the resistance.

Riel and his followers remained in possession of Fort Garry for the duration of the winter, and well into the summer of 1870. The activity at Fort Garry during its occupation by the Métis was not entirely devoted to the stade and serious. On the evening of January 21, 1870, for example, a great dance was held in the mess building at Fort Garry.64 Obviously by April the excited atmosphere of Red River had dissipated and the daily routines which characterized life in the settlement had reappeared. On April 6, J.H. McTavish requested the Provisional Government to return the Upper floor of the "public office building" to the company.65 On April 8, the company commenced to take an inventory of the remaining goods in the fort in preparation for the resumption of business.66

While the tense atmosphere in Red River may have lessened and the crisis stage passed, the excitement brought about by the killing of Orangeman Thomas Scott in March 1870, continued to rage in Canada. Military retaliation against the French-
Roman Catholic Rebels at Red River was called for throughout much of English-Protestant Canada. In military and government circles the sending of troops to Red River was seen as a method of re-establishing order and stability, and to show in real terms an Imperial and Canadian presence. British regular troops and Canadian volunteer militia prepared to leave for Red River in the spring of 1870. The first battalion of Royal Rifles formed the nucleus of the force, supplemented by two battalions of militia, one each from Québec and Ontario. Colonel Garnet Wolseley commanded the joint expedition.

It was late August 1870 before the military force reached the mouth of the Red River. On August 23, Wolseley and his troops reached the Lower Fort. At that point, he mustered his troops and slowly proceeded up the Red River to the Forks. A miserable march it was, as a steady rain throughout the night turned the banks of the Red into a sea of mud. Wolseley had hoped to take Fort Garry in the evening of the 23rd but the weather forced a delay. Before dawn on August 24 his force approached Upper Fort Garry. Wolseley knew that Riel still resided in the fort and that an armed guard still patrolled the walls. Consequently, he was prepared for a fight. At the last possible moment Riel was called away from his breakfast by J.G. Stewart and warned of Fort Garry's imminent attack. R.H. Buller, a member of the Canadian contingent, recorded his impressions of the disappointing capture of Fort Garry.

Fort Garry itself is an enclosure of about 4 acres the front and half each side walls being stone the back and other half of the side walls wood. There are 10 stone bastions--4 corner ones, two to each gate and one in the centre of each side. It is a strong structure and as Riel had plenty of guns, rifles and ammunition he might have made a very considerable...[opponent]. I wish he had. It does so disgust one to have to come all this way to play God Save the Queen.

Riel just evaded the troops. Leaving by the south gate of the fort, he had crossed by ferry to St-Boniface as the troops approached from the north.
With the arrival of the troops in Red River and their occupation of Fort Garry, the fort once again assumed a military role. The remainder of the facilities and buildings within the fort's walls were also used extensively by both the Company and the Government of Canada. J.J. Hargrave, William Mactavish's personal secretary and an officer of the Hudson's Bay Company, wrote to retired Chief Factor Cowan in December 1870, detailing the new arrangements within the fort:

Our fort is much crowded just now. Governor Archibald and family live in one half of Governor Mactavish's old house and Mr. [Donald A.] Smith and Judge Johnson occupy the other. The volunteer officers live in your old house [mess building]. About 300 men inhabit [John] Balsillie's old building and the two others in line with it. [J.H.] McTavish lives where Magnus Linklater did and we mess there. Balsillie lives where Burdick did. Henry Moncrief keeps the Winnipeg Store. James Anderson lives in the men's house and the men live outside the Fort. Anderson has charge of the depot. Balsillie [is the] accountant. Ramsay and I are in the office. MacKenzie, Armit, and Mr. Lenneigham from Fort William ... are in the stores and warehouses.72

For an excellent description of Fort Garry's interior in ca. 1870, see Appendix C.

Fort Garry then, continued to play a prominent role after 1870. It served as a physical reminder of the old society of Red River, but at the same time had within its walls the agents and movers of the New Canadian Order.
VII The Junction in Decline: 1870-1880

The admission of the new Province of Manitoba into the Canadian Confederation in 1870 is the most important milestone in the history of the Forks. During the 1870s, the old order of Red River was transformed into a new Canadian framework. Evidence of this transformation was apparent in almost every field of human activity be it economic, political or social. By 1880, Manitoba was inexorably linked to Canada. This is not to say that the transition was complete by 1880, but merely that the forms and precedents were firmly set in place during the 1870s. This transition was evident to even the most casual observer. J.J. Hargrave, William Mactavish's former private secretary, and a commissioned officer of the Company, wrote in 1872 that "old Red River is passing away, and new Manitoba is coming on stage."\(^1\)

The approach of the railroad, and with it the land speculator, the Ontario farmer, and Canadian institutions, all combined to influence the "new" society of Manitoba. Chester Martin, one of Manitoba's early historians, was one of the first to analyze the post 1870 transition.

...this veritable transformation was the result of appropriate rather than organic growth [and] it left many of the old forces latent and inarticulate...\(^2\)

The transition of the Red River settlement from a heterogeneous community controlled by the Company to a "Canadianized" Manitoba was partly a result of the growing dominance and metropolitan influence being exerted by the city of Montreal over an increasingly larger proportion of Canada.

At the beginning of the decade the Hudson's Bay Company
retained a considerable if diminished role in Manitoba. By 1880, this influence had lessened considerably. Correspondingly, Upper Fort Garry, the centre of the Company's operations, went from being the nucleus of the settlement in 1870 to a mere collection of tottering old buildings by 1880. The Hudson's Bay Company abandoned the fort and sold the property in 1872 and by 1885 almost all of the fort was demolished (see figure 57). The site and its adjacent land, for 60 years the most valuable property in the settlement, by 1880 was on the economic fringe of the growing city of Winnipeg. The series of events that led to this drastic and permanent change in the importance of the junction forms the basis of the ensuing chapter.

The arrival of Colonel Wolseley and the subsequent hurried departure of Louis Riel formed the last act in the 1869-70 scenario. From this point forward, the political atmosphere in Manitoba calmed down. The attainment of economic prosperity became the dominant goal in the new province. A small and short lived economic boom materialized in Manitoba in 1871-72, symbolized by an increase in immigration plus a flurry of building activity. Unfortunately, a few hundred new arrivals could not cure the basic economic ills that Manitoba inherited from the old order of Red River. What the new Province of Manitoba and the emerging city of Winnipeg needed was a railroad connection, and this was not achieved until December 1878.

During the early 1870s, nonetheless, the residents of Manitoba and the eastern visitors who had an interest in the province, had good reason to believe that a railway connection was only a few short years or even months away. The Dominion Government's Pacific Railway Act of 1872, as well as the steady northward advance of the American railway network, justified their expectations. Speculation of almost every sort and competition for site became common place. Two of the
earliest and most bitter contestants emerging in this com­
cer and merchant interests who were pursuing business possi­
ibilities north of Fort Garry in the embryonic village of
Winnipeg. These "Winnipegers" wanted the future city to
be centered north of the Hudson's Bay Company's property or
reserve. A growing community, of course, meant escalating
land and business revenues. If this growth could be channelled
to their holdings, handsome profits might result. Consequen­
tly, the possession of centrally located and accessible build­
ing sites was essential. In the opinion of the business
community, there were three potential areas possessing
these qualities. These included Point Douglas (near the old
site of Fort Douglas), the town of Winnipeg, and Fort Garry.

In 1870, it appeared that the area immediately adjacent
to Upper Fort Garry was the most likely centre for the future
city. The "Upper Fort Garry Reserve" was originally identified
by the Deed of Surrender as a ten acre parcel. Through in­
tense negotiations with the Federal Government, Donald A. Smith,
the Company representative, had enlarged it to 500. Smith
argued that the Chelsea Pensioner's lots (1848-55) and Major
Caldwell's property, all of which surrounded Upper Fort Garry,
were reconveyed to the Company at the time of their departure. This 500 acre reserve (see figure 29) possessed a number of
obvious natural and practical advantages. One must not forget
that the reserve surrounding the fort itself was still the
centre of the settlement during the early 1870s. Fort Garry
was the seat of the provincial government, the headquarters
of the Tenth Canadian Military District, and the headquarters
of the Hudson's Bay Company's Northern Department. The fur
trade was still the largest industry in the Northwest in the
1870s and the Hudson's Bay Company was by far the largest con­
cern in the trade.

As the Company's representatives were fully aware of the
potential of the reserve, they promptly had the reserve surveyed
and laid into lots. Donald A. Smith articulated the advantages of surveying the reserve in a letter to London Secretary, William Armit, in September 1871. The land, he wrote, should be laid out with the least possible delay; "The effect of delay might be materially to decrease the value of the property, by causing people to erect buildings to the north... [of the reserve]." In short, the Hudson's Bay Company possessed numerous advantages over its Winnipeg competitors. They had a contiguous, 500 acre, surveyed parcel ready for auction by the summer of 1872.

It is obvious to anyone familiar with the modern city of Winnipeg that the "centre" of the City is at Portage Avenue and Main Street, approximately one-half mile north of the Upper Fort Garry site. What caused the centre of the settlement to be shifted northward so dramatically?

The fierce competition for site in Winnipeg became entangled with the political scene of the province and to a lesser extent the Dominion. Thus, the factors that decided the profitability of a piece of property in the period after 1870, unlike the earlier periods, were more than geographic. The contest in Winnipeg was interpreted by the liberal press as a fight between the private entrepreneur and their economic liberalism versus the "monopolists," the Hudson's Bay Company. The 500 acre reserve was among the first issues to come under attack by the press:

Between the town of Winnipeg and Fort Garry is a stretch of high and dry prairie land containing about 600 acres, situated at the confluence of the Red River and the Assiniboine, with the great highway of the province converging to it. The plain it is believed, will be the site of the future metropolis of the North-West. Of this the Hudson's Bay Company at the time of the transfer of the country were only allowed 10 acres round their fort as a reserve... And now it appears that by some underhanded means the 10 acres in the original grant has been transformed into 500.

This editorial was, according to Donald A. Smith, part of a
campaign which was designed to "...compell the Government to cancel the Order In Council by which the property in question was granted to the Company." Smith identified the principal instigator as Dr. John Schultz.

The Company's numerous advantages with regard to the reserve were gradually wittled away. Firstly, the Company's patent or legal title to the reserve was not received until June 5, 1873. This in itself would not have been a serious problem had it not been for the fact that the Company, acting under Smith's advice, auctioned off 85 lots in July 1872. Without the patent, the Hudson's Bay Company could not legally press for defaulted installments on the lots. This problem was compounded by the presence of "squatters" who established themselves on portions of the reserve, principally in the area adjacent to the Forks known locally as the "flats." Without the patent the squatters could not be evicted.

The delay in receipt of the patent was attributed to a number of causes. In December 1872, J.S. Dennis, the Surveyor General, wrote to Smith telling him that the delay was due to the "...surveyors not having sent forward, as requested, a proper description of the tract by metes bounds." In April 1873, Smith informed Mr. Armit in London that the Deputy Minister responsible for issuing the patent was unwell and consequently the patent issue had to wait his recovery. Both these excuses lack credibility. The delay, in fact, may well be linked to political pressure.

The Company's prices and conditions attached to the building lots on the reserve worked to the detriment of the Company in the long run. In July 1872, after the completion of the survey, the Company offered a selected number of prime building lots, some of which fronted on Main Street. The prices obtained at this first auction "...reached amounts that no previous calculation had supposed possible." The actual prices ranged from $1,750 (Lot 1, block 1) to a low of $300 for some of the back lots. The Manitoba Gazette and
Trade Review calculated the average price of $1,126 while Donald Smith reported to the Governor and Committee that 85 lots were sold for $72,000, or an average price of $847 per lot. The conditions attached to the purchases called for a down payment of 1/5th of the total value, and a seven per cent interest charge on the outstanding balance. Furthermore, the purchaser was to erect a building valued at no less than $2,000 on those lots fronting Main Street, and $1,500 for those facing other thoroughfares. Prominent Winnipegers such as A.G.B. Bannatyne purchased lots at this initial auction. Bannatyne bought eight lots for a total of $8,150. While this sale brought an immediate financial return to the Company, it also strengthened the resolve of the opposition land owners against the Hudson's Bay Company's "attempted monopoly."

The determination of the Winnipeg business community to stop the Hudson's Bay Company's attempted return to monopoly manifested itself in a number of ways. Alexander Begg, a prominent Winnipeg merchant, and publisher of the Gazette and Trade Review, committed himself to the sum of $2,000 for two lots at the July 1872 auction. Begg never paid for these lots, and they were eventually re-possessed by the Company. Begg's action was designed to tie up and keep two valuable lots vacant. The "Incorporation" movement in Winnipeg exercised even a more profound impact on the fortunes of the Hudson's Bay reserve. Initiated by a group of Winnipeg businesses, the stated purpose of the movement was to bring about laws and regulations that would govern public works and services. These included fire and police protection as well as sewer, street, and sidewalk construction. In order for these measures to be financed, bonds and loans had to be floated and an incorporated community was necessary to secure these loans. Subsequent actions by the city proved that the instigators of the movement had ulterior motives.
The Incorporation movement began in 1872, and by March 1873 it had reached the floor of the Provincial Legislature. Unfortunately for its promoters, legislative approval was stalled until the next session before it was passed. Mr. Luxton of the Manitoba Free Press quickly identified the obstacle that prevented the bill's initial passage:

Thus after all the agitation about incorporation the public meetings held, the study and labour in getting up the bill, the trouble and expense in getting it into the House, its promoters find it unceremoniously kicked out through the influence of Mr. Donald A. Smith for the Hudson's Bay Company.19

Smith, who represented the riding of Winnipeg - St. John in the provincial legislature, responded to this criticism in a letter to The Manitoban on March 15, 1873. He stated that he and the Company did not oppose the principle of incorporation, only the details of the particular bill. He was in favour of an act similar to that which governed the incorporation of communities in the province of Ontario. When the next session of the Manitoba legislature met in the autumn of 1873, a new Incorporation bill was one of the first to be presented. To the detriment of the Company's position, Donald A. Smith was absent from his seat in the House. He was informed of the proceedings by J.H. McTavish, the member for St-Vital, and a fellow Company officer;

The Local Legislature met and adjourned during the past week and among others passed the act of Incorporation of the City of Winnipeg. On the opening of the Session, Attorney General Clarke secured the support of Mr. Hay, and his friends by a promise of a revision of the Electoral Divisions which would cut off several French members and replace them by English. Thus backed by Mr. Clarke determined to court the popularity of the crowd by rushing through the bill of Incorporation, in the exact form they wished it. Though not so crushing on the property holders as the "Peoples Bill" of last year. There yet remains much to improve which could not be touched while you were absent from the House and the other party so strong.20
The Hudson's Bay Company, if one can believe Smith, did not actually oppose the principle of incorporation, as they believed it to be inevitable. They did, however, oppose its terms and timing as a premature development for Winnipeg. Winnipeg's population in 1873-74 numbered only 3,700, of which only a small minority were large property holders. Consequently, city taxes, which were based on real estate assessments, were carried largely by the Company and a few other large land holders. Moreover, as large Winnipeg property owners controlled City Hall, they effectively squeezed the Company out of municipal development plans.

The Company and the ambitious Winnipegers also competed over the sites for the proposed Federal Government buildings for the community. These buildings and the business attached to them drew considerable traffic to the area, thereby enhancing real estate values. Both the Hudson's Bay Company and the Winnipeg business community, therefore, lobbied extensively in order to obtain them. Initially, the Hudson's Bay Company, due largely to Donald Smith's political influence in Ottawa, induced the Federal Government to locate the Customs House, Dominion Lands Office, the Government Immigration sheds and the Post Office on their reserve. The placing of all these buildings on the HBC reserve provoked criticism in the press. Predictably, Alexander Begg's Manitoba Gazette and Trade Review was the most vocal:

...We are...much opposed as ever to having the cold shoulder given to the present town of Winnipeg, by the erection of all the Government buildings on the Reserve and making Fort Garry, as it were, the hub of the town.

By June 1873, shifting political influences alter their initial intentions. The site for the new post office was shifted "...considerably to the north and almost directly opposite to the strips of land in possession of Dr. Schultz." A similar attempt to have the Immigration sheds moved also failed.
In April and May 1872, R.A. Davis and John Norquay, both future Manitoba premiers, and D. O'Donnell wrote to the minister of Public Works to ask him to shift the sheds from their site near the junction of the Red and Assiniboine. The location of these sheds upstream from the city, they argued, would foul the waters of the Red River and endanger the population of the city. Gilbert McMicken, Manitoba's first Immigration Agent, and in 1872, a sympathizer for the interests of the Hudson's Bay Company, was responsible for choosing the site of the sheds. In May 1872, he informed the minister of Public Works that the site for the sheds was finalized and that "...the parties who objected [to the choice] are laughed at."  

The need for temporary accommodation for immigrants arose early in Winnipeg's history. The influx of new settlers to Manitoba in 1871-72 strained the existing commercial accommodation facilities. Responding to the serious situation, McMicken wrote to the department of Public Works stressing the immediate need for immigrant accommodation. In March 1872, the Chief Architect was commissioned to prepare plans and specifications for the proposed sheds, accompanied by a cost estimate (see Appendix B). On March 15, 1872, $9,000 was placed in the supplementary Estimates by an Order in Council to cover the projected expenditure. Ten days later James McKay was authorized to place calls for tender in the local Winnipeg newspapers. Initially the construction contract was awarded to the firm of Garner and Elwood for $1,800 but they proved incompetent to finish the work and the second lowest tender ($2,945), submitted by John H. Bell, was accepted. The pressing need for some sort of shelter dictated immediate construction and, in July 1872 "temporary sheds" valued at $600, were erected at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers.

By the end of August 1872, the permanent sheds were com-
The Manitoba Gazette and Trade Review gave a brief description of the building to its readers:

This shed, situated at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers has been completed and is a good substantial looking building, containing a number of rooms having separate entrances, and just comfortable enough for a temporary residence without giving any inducement for a prolonged stay, as is often the case in some instances. The cook houses are detached from the main building, so that there is no danger from fire. The interior of the shed is nicely whitewashed and the outside is painted a stone colour. The whole design is good and the arrangement as perfect as possible.  

Construction of a second shed was authorized on September 20, 1872. While there is little information on the design or specifications of the second shed, one might assume that it was probably similar to the first one. G.B. Elliott described the Fort Garry Immigration sheds in 1876. They were, he wrote, situated "...near the mouth of the Assiniboine..." The buildings comprised "...two separate ranges, capable of accommodating four or five hundred persons."  

Prior to the completion of the Canadian Pacific Railway's Pembina Branch to Winnipeg in December 1878, and the arrival of the mainline in 1881, almost all immigrant traffic to Manitoba arrived by river boat. The Government immigration sheds at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine near the river boat landings was the first residence for many of Manitoba's early immigrants. Europeans, principally Mennonites, Icelanders and Russian Jews, as well as Canadians from the eastern provinces, all used these sheds until they were demolished in 1885. Living conditions in the sheds were far from ideal, and the last residents of the sheds, the Russian Jews, experienced considerable hardships during their stay in the winter of 1883-84. The sickness and hunger that prevailed throughout the group was compounded by the cramped and squalid quarters provided by the sheds. The one storey wooden building which measured 180' x 121', was divided into 30 compartments.
where 25 families were crowded into rooms measuring 10' x 12'. A Manitoba Free Press reporter visited the sheds and reported on the plight of the inhabitants:

In one cabin...a child lay dying of bronchitis brought on by exposure. The supply of fuel is about exhausted and [the family] had spent their last penny for board some days before. All the families had been without bread or anything else to eat for two and a half days.

The securing of the sheds on the reserve was nonetheless beneficial to the Company's interest during the 1870s. The early Canadian and Mennonite immigrants to Manitoba, unlike the Russian Jews, were relatively well off and many of their initial purchases were made at the Hudson's Bay Company's retail store at Fort Garry.

The federal government's military presence in Manitoba from 1870 to 1879 was also centred at Fort Garry. Their station of the Forks further enhanced the importance of Fort Garry and the value of the adjacent property. The money the Company received from the rent of their buildings to the military was also substantial. During the period of the military occupation of Fort Garry (August 24, 1870 to January 1879), approximately nine Company buildings were appropriated for military purposes. These nine buildings included:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Officers Quarters and Mess Room</td>
<td>$1,500 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. South East Barracks</td>
<td>1,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Stone Barracks</td>
<td>1,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Western Barracks</td>
<td>1,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Outside Barracks</td>
<td>1,000 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Hospital</td>
<td>750 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 3 stone bastions each $400</td>
<td>1,200 per year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The annual rent for the military use of Fort Garry exceeded $7,000, yet another handsome stipend for the Hudson's Bay Company.

By late 1873, the military had finished the construction of their own barracks to be known as Fort Osborne Barracks. They were situated west of the Fort along the Assiniboine, near the present Great West Life Building in Winnipeg. On January 16, 1874 all but one barrack building, the "stone barracks" and a small outbuilding, were returned to the Company. Immediately prior to the final departure of the troops from the fort, a fire broke out in the fort bakery which almost resulted in the total destruction of the fort. The Manitoban, for January 7, 1874, carried a brief account of the fire accompanied by a letter of thanks from J.H. McTavish to Lt. Colonel Osborne Smith for his part in extinguishing the blaze. An interesting account of the Lieutenant Colonel's role at the fire scene was also entered into the Batallion Order Book.

Lt. Colonel Osborne Smith being on the spot ordered all civilians except those immediately connected with the Hudson's Bay Company's service outside of that part originally occupied by the troops, as the number of men under command was sufficient for the ... [emergency]. No doubt this decision was promoted to a great extent by the fact of a great number of citizens present a strong antagonistic feeling towards the company in so much that it was quite apparent that instead of attempting to arrest the flames, obstacles were being placed in the way of men willing to work.

What is quite apparent from this extract, and of particular importance to this study, is the extent of the hostility that many Winnipegers held towards the Hudson's Bay Company in the 1870s.

Aside from the military presence of the Federal Government at Fort Garry, the fort was also the residence of Manitoba's Lieutenant Governors from 1870 to 1883 (fig. 42),
as it had been for the Governors of Assiniboia that preceded them. This fact is significant to this study in two ways: firstly, it reflects the continuity that existed in the transition of the old Order or Red River into the New Manitoba Order. And, secondly, it clearly reflected the continued influence of the Hudson's Bay Company on Manitoba during the first decade of its existence.

The occupation of Fort Garry by the military and the Lieutenant Governor was a mixed blessing for the Company. In general terms, it gave the fort a higher profile than it would have enjoyed if they had resided elsewhere. Furthermore, the rent of the building provided a healthy and steady rental income. By June 1873, $36,885.98 was expended by the Dominion Government for barrack accommodation and the Lieutenant Governor's residence. The rental of such a large space, however, put the Company in a difficult position. Commissioner J.A. Grahame who arrived in Winnipeg in 1874 to oversee the fur trade and general business of the Company, complained of the arrangements at Fort Garry:

...the building rented to the Canadian Government [in 1870-71] at Fort Garry were much required for our business I am told, which suffered for the want of them, so much that a warehouse had to be erected outside of the Fort [see figures 36-37] at the expense of the trade, and in outfit 1872 and 1873 the same difficulty continued for want of room to carry on the business, so much so that I remarked to you in my last letter that a portion of our Importations are in the open Fort yard.

... As for the House occupied by the Lt. Governor the lease affected by Mr. Smith had blocked it up for six years to come, and will necessitate the building of an office outside the Fort, there not being a corner in it [the Fort] where there is room for one.

The Hudson's Bay Company's use of Fort Garry and the surrounding reserve altered during the 1870s. Partly as a result of lack of space within the walls, and also due to
a change in perception of their environment, the Company erected a number of structures outside the walls of the fort. Furthermore, throughout the decade the walls of the fort were gradually dismantled to be replaced either by wooden fencing or left empty (see figures 45-56).

Prior to 1870, the property surrounding Fort Garry was for the most part left vacant, except for a few occupations. The most notable was the Experimental Farm project (1836-1841). Also, in some early depictions of Fort Garry, a few outbuildings such as stables or byres are evident (see figures 31-37). After 1870, the Company used the reserve more extensively. In September 1870, a contract was awarded to the firm of Dahl and Elwood to erect a 15' x 20' slaughter house on the banks of the Assiniboine above Fort Garry. In the summer of 1872, J.H. McTavish and Donald Smith embarked on an ambitious program to utilize the adjacent reserve. They commissioned the erection of thirteen cottages on the HBC reserve west of the fort. These were located along the Assiniboine on the Old Chelsea Pensioner lots. In addition, a steamboat warehouse, 100' x 60', was built on the levee of the Assiniboine southeast of the fort near its confluence with the Red. The large warehouse initially built in 1872 was moved 120 feet further back from the Assiniboine River in 1877-78. The task of moving the structure obviously was not an easy one as the Manitoba Weekly Free Press detailed at the time of the move:

The raising of the Hudson's Bay Company's number 4 warehouse from nigh the water to the top of the bank is at last completed, -- a task by no means a slight one, and thoroughly well done. The building a massive heavily timbered structure, of 100 feet by 60 feet, was raised 12½ feet and then moved back 120 feet to where it now stands. The actual removal occupied only a little over a day, while the force employed was ten men, and 500 pieces of squared timber were required in the cribs. After being put in position a tunnel of 18 feet in width and 11 feet in depth was cut in the solid earth, a distance of 91 feet, terminating in a square room [or hole] a 150 cut in the
bank immediately under the centre of the building, of 34 feet by 31 feet. From here the goods are hoisted to any of three floors above,...

McTavish explained the reasons behind the building's construction in a letter to the Hudson's Bay Company Secretary, William Armit:

The cottages were considered by the Chief Commissioner and myself as a very paying speculation in themselves, while being built above Fort Garry on the land purchased by the Trade from the Pensioners they tended to counteract the strenuous efforts made by the people of Winnipeg to keep the rising town away from Fort Garry and increase the value of the Company's land in the vicinity to the profit of the shareholders at Home as well as the trade in general.

The erection of the warehouse on the levee at Fort Garry, was a necessity for our own transport business apart from the profit arising therefrom on outside work.

Had we not put these buildings up the Customs House authorities would have induced other parties to do so opposite Winnipeg where we would have been obliged to enter our goods there at heavy cash disbursement for storage and expense of teaming, besides which all the steamboat and other business would have been carried half a mile away from us and left the fort in an isolated position where it would have been useless to continue carrying on any sort of general business.

The decision to build the warehouses was undoubtedly a good one. Although the cost of construction totalled $17,500, the Company realized a net profit of $10,187.28 on the warehouse operations in one season. The cottage construction experiment, however, proved less successful. In May 1876 H.H. Grahame informed the London Board that a sum of $1,922 was outstanding on uncollected rent from the cottages. Grahame believed that the construction of the cottages was a mistake from the outset. The main objective, to draw the city towards Fort Garry, did not materialize, leaving the Company with an expensive white elephant. Besides unpaid rents, the city assessed the buildings at $23,700 for tax
purposes. 51

Despite their problems with the cottage experiment, the
Hudson's Bay Company continued to expand near the Forks. They
erected the Fort Garry grist mill in 1874. This complex was
situated beside the riverboat warehouses at an initial con-
struction cost of $27,522. 52 (see figure 52).

The fort itself also went through a number of major al-
terations during this period. As the archives of the Company
contain little documentation on this aspect of the fort's
history, the bulk of the information for this period was ob-
tained from the local newspapers and photographs of the his-
toric establishment. In August 1871, the Manitoban noted that
the Hudson's Bay Company renovated their retail store at Fort
Garry:

The entrance to the store, which used to be through
the inside of the Fort, will now be from Winnipeg
road [Main Street]. A handsome front has been
constructed on the north wall, and when finished
the whole will present a very fine appearance. 53
(see figures 38-39).

This alteration is another example of the Hudson's Bay Company's
realization that they had to modify their operations, (in
this case their retail trade) to fit in with the evolving
community.

By the mid 1870s, some of the older structures in the
fort had begun to deteriorate. In July 1874, a floor in one
of the bastions gave way, sending the rifles and ammunition
stored there tumbling into the cellar. 54 In February 1875,
the "Sergeant's mess room" 55 was pulled down, followed in
April by the "old officers' quarters." 56 Furthermore, the
stone walls that encircled the southern half of the fort were
dismantled during the 1870s (probably 1873-74), and replaced
with wooden fencing. 57 Some of these stones were utilized in
the foundations of the Hudson's Bay Company's office buildings
erected on Main Street in 1874.

The purpose of these modifications to the fort and the
erection of the warehouses, grist mill and associated buildings during the early 1870s at the south end of the Company's reserve is clear. It was an attempt to direct the development of the city of Winnipeg towards their property. Throughout the 1870s, Donald A. Smith and his Hudson's Bay Company associates in Winnipeg continually adopted schemes with this object in mind. Their plan even included an attempt to persuade the city of Winnipeg, whose incorporation they had tried to prevent, to establish some of their buildings on the reserve. They offered the city two free lots on the condition that the council chambers and Police cells be located there. Needless to say, the offer was refused emphatically.  

The Company, meanwhile, did score some measure of success in its attempt to secure the sites for the Provincial Government buildings. Lieutenant Governor Adams Archibald was fully informed about the generous land grant offers made by the Hudson's Bay Company to the Federal Government. Eventually, Archibald approached Donald Smith with a proposition which would see the Hudson's Bay Company "grant" the province 100 acres of their reserve for government purposes. Smith did not think that the accompanying benefits, which Archibald claimed would accrue to the Company, warranted so large a grant. After consulting with Prime Minister Macdonald, he managed to have the grant reduced to 50 acres. The fifty acres selected were located at the south western portion of the reserve east of the intersection of Colony Creek and the Assiniboine River. The provincial legislature building is now centred on this grant.

If Smith and the Hudson's Bay Company harboured any apprehensions concerning the incorporation of the city of Winnipeg, they were realized during the late summer and ensuing autumn of 1875. At the regular meeting of the Winnipeg City Council on August 30, 1875, a communication from the Hudson's Bay Company was read aloud. It informed them that
the Company had applied for a restraining order against the city in order to stop the city's grading of the Portage Road. This communication signalled the beginning of a crucial legal battle which was to have a far reaching impact on the development of the city, and the role played in that development by the Hudson's Bay Company.

The background of the dispute can be traced back to the era of the Red River Settlement. In the period 1962-63, the Red River community was a scattered settlement stretching along the banks of the Red and Assiniboine rivers. The majority of the population lived between the two Fort Garrys on river lot farms. Gradually, settlers began to establish themselves west along the Assiniboine in the parishes of St. James, St. Charles, Headingly, White Horse Plains, and as far west as Portage la Prairie. Communication and transport between these various communities followed trails along the Assiniboine of which the most important was the Assiniboine or Portage road. It commenced at a point on the main Red River Highway between Drever and McKenny's lots (at Portage Avenue and Main Street), and then ran in a south westerly direction towards the Assiniboine River. In 1864, a dispute arose between Drever and McKenny over the actual line of the road. The dispute came to the attention of the Council of Assiniboia on July 15, 1864, and was settled at the meeting of November 3, 1864. In summary, the decision called for the road to remain where it was. Mr. Drever's encroaching buildings would be allowed to remain for a maximum of 18 years, at which time they and all other obstructions would have to be removed. Following this decision, Bridge and Ferry Chairman, Dr. William Cowan, in cooperation with Governor Mactavish, personally set the course of the road and then instructed the Red River Surveyor Roger Goulet to mark the boundaries. The road was to be two chains (132 feet) wide. Besides the road design, the council sanctioned a small amount of grading and general upkeep for the trail.
In 1870, under the terms of the Deed of Surrender and a subsequent Order In Council, the Hudson's Bay Company retained 500 acres around their post at Upper Fort Garry. This reserve was surveyed and laid out into lots in 1872. A plan of the survey was then registered and deposited in the Land Titles office. "In the survey no attention was paid to the road in question." (Portage Road). According to the Hudson's Bay Survey, the main east-west thoroughfare was to be Broadway, approximately one-half mile to the south of the old Portage Road. In August 1875, the city, without notice to the Company, laid out and graded a street two chains in width, following the course of the Portage trail delineated by the Council of Assiniboia in 1864. The city's action compelled the Company to apply for the restraining order. When the case eventually came before Chief Justice Wood of the Manitoba Court of Queen's Bench in October 1875, John Balsillie wrote to Donald Smith concerning the case and its probable outcome:

That the decision here will be against the Company is a foregone conclusion. John Fraser Road Master, Roger Goulet Surveyor, and James McKay and other officers of the Council of Assiniboia all agree that such a road was officially recognized and that Governor McTavish [sic] personally defined the boundary.62

Smith was irate. He was adamant that the Council of Assiniboia did not have the legal right to dispose of the Company's land. The real reason for his anger, however, was monetary not legal:

We always claimed for the Company that Garry [Main] and Broadway fulfilled all the conditions required from the Company as roadway,[and] it certainly would greatly enhance the value of the property at Fort Garry to have it remain so...63

Justice Wood ruled in favour of the city. The significance of this decision is considerable. In Vaughan's 1872 survey of the Hudson's Bay reserve, the corner of Broadway and Main Street formed the major intersection for
the east-west and the north-south thoroughfares. The position of the Company's fort, at the south west corner of this intersection, and the Pacific Hotel at the north west corner, of which, incidentally, Smith, McTavish and J.J. Hargrave, all Hudson's Bay Company officers were part owners, placed the established company and its leading Manitoba officers in an advantageous position. Furthermore, the Provincial Government grant at the western end of the reserve on Broadway would guarantee a certain amount of east-west traffic. All these advantages were lost when Wood's decision effectively declared Portage Avenue and Main Street the major intersection in the city.

Two recent students of this controversy, John Selwood and Evelyn Baril, argued that the 1872 Vaughan survey of the reserve "... reflected an isolationistic attitude to the rest of the settlement; little care was taken to bring it into conformity with the layout and plans of other property owners, or notice taken of existing buildings and trails."64 This recent analysis of the Hudson's Bay Company's land policy requires further elaboration. The actions of the Company throughout the 1870s, of which the survey was part, reflected a concerted attempt by the Hudson's Bay Company to channel and force development of Winnipeg on their reserve. By the use of political pressure, economic power, and geographic advantage, the Company had done its utmost to bring about the development of Winnipeg on their own property.

The Company's failure to accomplish this objective is attributable to three major errors. Firstly, they demanded artificially high prices for their lots, thereby forcing the less affluent newcomers to Manitoba to locate elsewhere. This policy also strengthened the determination of their Winnipeg competitors north of the reserve. Secondly, the 1872 survey ignored the Portage Road. The repercussions of this have
already been discussed. The reasons why Smith and his associates planned the survey the way they did must be attributed to either a lack of knowledge of the settlement's history or to an arrogant attitude on their part. They seemingly believed that they could act as they pleased without any consideration for the city's position.

Finally, and perhaps of most importance, the Company took an antagonistic position with the city's political and commercial infrastructure. Their opposition to the incorporation movement in 1783, and the use of political pressure to obtain federal buildings and other advantages, angered the private business of Winnipeg. In short, it strengthened their resolve against the Company. Moreover, had Smith, McTavish and the London directors of the Company followed a more co-operative line, Winnipeg would not have been divided into two camps. The Company's actions in Winnipeg during the 1870s lent credence to the claim that it was trying to retain its monopoly position beyond the 1870 transition.

The Company's competitive and indeed greedy policy resulted in its Winnipeg reserve lying vacant and unused for years. The end result was that by 1880, the commercial centre of the city had been established a full one-half mile north of the old fort. When the Winnipeg real estate boom of 1881-82 took off, it was the "Winnipeg" property owners who benefitted to the greatest extent, not the traditional power brokers of the Hudson's Bay Company.

The northern and western portions of the Company's reserve, however, eventually proved profitable to the concern once the city began to expand. The south eastern portion, adjacent to the junction of the Red and Assiniboine, and the sites of the former Fort Gibraltar and the two Fort Garrys, remained on the economic fringe of Winnipeg.

The photographic and cartographic record of the forks during the decade of the 1870s is excellent. For example, there are numerous views of the exterior of Fort Garry,
principally its south and east fences. As well, there is an invaluable 1878 collection of photographs of the fort's interior.

In addition to those photographs of the fort, there are a series of views of the Forks which convey the evolution of the site during the 1870s. When examining these views, particular attention should be given to the situation of the warehouses and mill structures adjacent to the Forks. In all probability, they will coincide with the supposed sites of the two Fort Gibraltares and the original Fort Garry.
VIII The Junction 1880-1908, Urbanization and Railways

The land policies instituted by the Hudson's Bay Company in Winnipeg during the 1870s influenced the development of the city well into the 20th century. Twenty-five years after the incorporation of the city, in 1874, the south eastern portion of the Hudson's Bay Company's Fort Garry reserve, immediately adjacent to the Forks, remained on the economic fringe of Winnipeg.

The administration of the Hudson's Bay Company's land affairs changed hands in 1879. Donald A. Smith, the Company's first land commissioner, resigned his position in that year. He was replaced by Charles J. Brydges of Montreal, the former manager of the Grand Trunk Railway. Brydges, a proven and competent administrator, was a man of independent spirit and ambition. He cultivated numerous business and political contacts prior to his appointment and his entry into the ranks of the Hudson's Bay Company augured well for its future.

Upon Brydges' arrival in Winnipeg in May 1879 to assume his duties as land commissioner, he quickly surveyed the situation and began to formulate solutions concerning the re-organization of the Company's land policies in Winnipeg and the West. As far as Winnipeg was concerned, he "...was surprised to see the south or Hudson's Bay side of town, so much less prosperous to all appearance than the part north of it." He placed much of the blame for this situation on Donald A. Smith's policy of "exclusiveness." The Company, he concluded, must start to identify with the place, and encourage a positive community relationship with the people who lived there. Brydges' attitude was a refreshing change from that of his predecessor.
Nevertheless, his placement of all the blame on Smith's shoulders was exaggerated. The conflict between the Hudson's Bay Company and the Winnipegers was a deep seeded one, and one that dated back to at least the early 1860s. The conflict between the Company's interest and the Winnipegers in the 1870s, was, in part, a continuation of the earlier tension. While Smith and McTavish's administration during the 1870s did not foster reconciliation, Brydges' initial assessment was an astute one and contributed to a better community and Company rapport.

The lack of sales in the Upper Fort Garry reserve from 1872 to 1879 and, in fact, throughout the community was primarily attributable to the generally slow economic growth of the city. The world-wide recession of 1873-78 had a devastating impact upon capital and investment expansion throughout North America and particularly in risky frontier ventures. Furthermore, the lack of a railway connection left Winnipeg in an isolated and economically disadvantaged position. Any criticism, therefore, of Donald Smith's administration of the Company's land policies in Manitoba must be tempered by the economic restraints of the period.

Charles Brydges' new plans for the development of the Company's real estate in Winnipeg were in fact not fundamentally different from Smith's. His ambitious plans for the Company, which called for the dismantling of Fort Garry and the erection of a new retail store, were simply refinements of Smith's policies. Both men attempted to draw the developing city southward. Brydges' initial criticism of Smith's "exclusiveness" policy was suppressed shortly after he began to deal with the Winnipeg business community. In November 1879, while attempting to persuade the Federal Government and the city to agree on a railway crossing of the Red River near Fort Garry, Brydges was forced to admit failure, explaining to Mr. Armit that he had little influence with "the ring of
land speculators" that controlled City Hall.

The Company's and Brydges' continuing attempt to lure the city toward their property during the late 1870s and early 1880s proved futile. The contest for the centre of the city in November 1873, plus the loss sustained in the Portage Avenue controversy, combined to dictate Portage and Main as the future city centre. Another important consideration was the defeat of Alexander Mackenzie's Liberal administration in Ottawa in 1878, which effectively ended the Hudson's Bay Company's influence in the nation's capital. Mackenzie, throughout his term in office, was sympathetic to the interests of the Hudson's Bay Company, as represented to him by Donald Smith, the member for Winnipeg, and an ardent Mackenzie supporter.

The influence of the conservative interests in Winnipeg, led by Dr. Schultz, the M.P. for Lisgar, J.H. Ashdown and Alexander Logan, increased after the defeat of the Liberals. In order to maintain the economic security of Winnipeg and promote their vested interests, these men had to persuade the Federal Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway to route the CPR mainline through Winnipeg. As early as 1877, Mackenzie's Liberal administration indicated that the CPR mainline would cross the Red River at Selkirk, some 30 miles north of Winnipeg. The conservative element in Winnipeg, and indeed most of the city's populace, wanted this decision reversed. Furthermore, they wanted the CPR to establish their western region shops in Winnipeg. As early as April 1879, the lobbying activities of the Winnipegers was beginning to have some positive impact. Charles Tupper, the Minister of railways, announced his support for a Winnipeg Crossing. Brydges, however, as early as June 1879 believed that the railway crossing would be near the Hudson's Bay Company's lower Fort Garry, twenty miles north of Winnipeg. In fact, neither Brydges nor the Winnipegers could speak with any certainty as
the final decision on the Red River crossing was yet to be reached.

During this period of indecision, the Winnipeg business community took to the offensive. The city floated a $300,000 bridge construction bond to finance the building of a railway and traffic bridge across the Red River at Point Douglas. The city's Louise Bridge project, in fact, was initiated as early as November 1878.

In the meantime, the Hudson's Bay Company also considered the erection of a bridge that would link the St-Boniface station of the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway with Winnipeg via Provencher and Broadway. Donald Smith agreed to such a bridge proposal as early as January 1878, and urged J.H. McTavish to press for a provincial charter for the bridge. McTavish failed in his attempt to obtain a provincial charter, which seriously delayed the proposed project. It was not until 1880 that they obtained a Dominion charter. By that time the city of Winnipeg's Louise Bridge was in the course of construction. In short, the Company's bridge project was but another chapter in their history of failures during the 1870s.

In Brydges' new scheme for Winnipeg, there was no place for Upper Fort Garry. The fort, in his opinion, was a harbinger of the fur trade, it was old and dilapidated, poorly situated, and it could not adequately service the expanding retail trade. More importantly, in the summer of 1879, Brydges believed that he would succeed in his attempt to convince the Federal Government to place the CPR mainline crossing at or near Broadway on the Company's reserve. As he envisaged it, after crossing the Red, the mainline would continue westward over the site of the old fort. Consequently, there could be no delay in the abandonment and dismantling of Upper Fort Garry. Brydges, however, had over-estimated his influence in Ottawa, while at the same time, under-estimated the influence of the Winnipeg business elite. By November 1879, the Winnipeg group
had convinced the Federal Government to approve the construction of the Louise Bridge.

In summary, Brydges activities in 1879 indicate that he had a simple yet integrated scheme for the development of the Hudson's Bay reserve in Winnipeg. A CPR crossing of the Red River at Broadway, the dismantling of Fort Garry, the straightening of Main Street, and the erection of a new retail store would combine to draw the city southward. In actual fact, his scheme was flawed. His belief that he could attain the railway crossing at Broadway, which was the major component of his scheme, was nothing short of an illusion. This belief reflects his lack of political astuteness as well as his lack of awareness concerning the competitive nature of the Winnipeg real estate environment prior to his arrival. Moreover, he completely under-estimated the lobbying strength of the Winnipegers.

The other components of Brydges' plan were sound. By 1879, Upper Fort Garry had deteriorated significantly. Brydges viewed the place as a liability to the Company's interests in the city, and fur trade commissioner J.A. Grahame initially agreed in his assessment. In Brydges' opinion, the dismantling of the fort was especially urgent during the summer of 1879, as the railway crossing issue had not yet been finalized. As the summer turned into autumn and the possibility of obtaining the Upper Fort Garry crossing lessened, Grahame's initial support for the fort's destruction waivered. Grahame and the commissioned officers associated with the fur trade aspect of the Company's business, viewed with justifiable suspicion the projected outlay of large sums of money needed for the construction of new railway premises.15

J.H. McTavish, the Chief Factor in charge of the retail store in Winnipeg, was also wary of the project and further objected to the proposed site of the new retail building at Main and York Avenue. A more preferable location, he believed, would be at the north east corner of the existing fort or at the angular piece of property formed by the inter-
section of Main Street, Fort Street and Portage Avenue. By the end of the year, however, both McTavish and Grahame had backed away from their opposition to Brydges' scheme. In retrospect, their opposition was probably linked to their unwillingness to accept change. Both men had spent decades in the Company's service prior to 1879, and Brydges' seemingly radical schemes were unquestionably difficult to accept for the old fur traders still active in the Hudson's Bay Company.

By 1880, the construction of the Louise Bridge and the Hudson's Bay Company's failure to obtain the CPR crossing removed the urgency to dismantle and abandon Fort Garry. A more leisurely evacuation of the fort was in order. This fact accounts for the difficulty in pinpointing the exact departure date of the Hudson's Bay Company from the fort. The new retail store opened in October 1881. Therefore, one can safely assume that the old store in the fort was closed shortly prior to October 1881. On the last of October 1881, the Winnipeg Daily Times noted that the mess at Fort Garry had been terminated and from that time forward, employees must board out. The actual abandonment of the fort, in fact, was a reaction to external influences, rather than a planned policy decision reached by the Company.

The establishment of the CPR and its shops in Winnipeg triggered a real estate boom in late 1881. This sixteen month boom, which collapsed in April 1882, was a remarkable phenomenon. The Winnipeg boom was railway inspired and had its precedents in the United States in such cities as Chicago and St. Paul. Nevertheless, the magnitude and intensity of the Winnipeg experience was startling.

The Hudson's Bay Company, like most of the large land holders in the city, reaped handsome profits from the sale of city lots during the boom period. The northern and western portion of their reserve sold particularly well. The southwestern portion, which comprised the old Fort Garry property
and the area adjacent to the Forks, remained unsaleable. Early in 1882, however, enticed by the completion of the Broadway Bridge, the demand for these Hudson's Bay lots increased. In February, Brydges received a firm offer for the fort property from Sedley Blanchard, a Winnipeg lawyer and speculator. In December 1883, Brydges in a letter to Armit, recounted the events which led to the sale of the fort property:

The Fort Garry property was never supposed to be of much value owing to its great distance from the business centre. It is only at its south end 200 feet from the Assiniboine, where it was divided into lots there were hardly any enquiries made about them until Mr. [Sedley] Blanchard said to me that he would make me an offer for the whole block on behalf of some parties whom he was acting. He had been a very large operator in real estate in his capacity as an agent for parties who have employed him to invest for them.

... He made several offers for the property all of which I declined and I found no other parties prepared to touch it. After a good deal of negotiation he finally agreed to the price which I had fixed [280,000] and bought. He paid $56,000 being the first instalment.\(^1\)

With the sale of the fort property the company was forced to either move or demolish the buildings. On February 23, 1882, Brydges informed his fur trade counterpart, J.A. Grahame, to prepare for the fort's abandonment. He advised Grahame that any buildings he wished to retain should be moved prior to spring to avoid soft and muddy conditions.\(^2\) Grahame had already made arrangements for the removal of some of the fort's buildings prior to Brydges' notifications of sale. In January Grahame informed the Governor and Commissioner that:

In order to vacate the Fort and utilize the existing buildings for storehouses and Grannaries I have contracted for the removal of four of the best preserved at a cost of $5,471 to ground adjacent to our Selkirk mill, thereby relinquishing to the Land Department the site of the
largest portion of the Fort, and opening Main Street to the Assiniboine bridge.\(^{21}\)

A large building from within the fort was also moved in April 1882, to a site adjoining the grist mill near the Forks.\(^{22}\)

In April 1882, the Winnipeg boom collapsed. During the boom, speculation was extravagant if not absurd. Millions of dollars were committed to the purchase of city property, in many cases buyers only paid a first installment on their properties. The Hudson's Bay Company, for example, received only the first installment of $56,000 on the $280,000 total purchase price of the Fort Garry lots. This situation of over-estimated buyers was duplicated throughout the city. The only way land speculators could hope to realize profits and avoid paying the balance on the lots was through a rapid turnover of properties. A late spring in 1882, accompanied by a Red River flood and a consequent severance of outside rail communication, effectively haulted the boom.\(^{23}\) In an attempt to minimize losses, land speculators immediately disposed of their properties, or defaulted on their installments. Land values plummeted. The Fort Garry property and the Company's property east of Main Street, commonly known as the "flats," were particularly affected. Part of the recently erected Broadway Bridge was swept away by the ice and high water, and a large area between the Red River and Main Street was flooded. The numerous shanties and tents that were situated on these "flats" were washed away.\(^{24}\)

The flood of 1882, and the subsequent end of the boom, had a devastating impact upon the Hudson's Bay Company property of the junction. Two and one half years later, Brydges, while reflecting on the flood's effects, noted that "...no sales are at present possible at any price—no buildings have been erected and the land will only become saleable for warehouses or factories when a railway connection is provided."\(^{25}\) Furthermore, the prospect of collecting the outstanding installments due for the lots previously sold was a total writeoff.
The Winnipeg real estate market remained sluggish throughout the rest of the 1880s. Brydges tried in vain to sell the junction property but there was no demand whatsoever for it. The Hudson's Bay Company maintained a small presence there with their grist mill and a few scattered old warehouses along the banks of the Assiniboine which dated back to the river boat days of the 1860s and 1870s. (see figures 59 and 60).

The Company's inability to dispose of the "flats" property soon made it a haven for Winnipeg's poor and destitute. The old Government immigrant sheds erected in 1872 became the nucleus for a number of crudely built shanties that sprang up along the banks of the rivers (see figure 61). In August 1884, the *Manitoba Free Press* drew its readers' attention to the condition of these buildings and their inhabitants:

> The attention of the City Health officers is called to the fact that there are a number of shanties infected with diphteria in the vicinity of the immigrant sheds. One child has died and another has been removed. The shanties are said to be in a shockingly overcrowded condition.26

These shanties on the HBC flats also served as the so-called "disorderly houses" of Winnipeg during the mid-1880s, and the local papers recorded a number of police raids on them.27

The Forks, therefore, also bears the dubious distinction of being the site of one of Winnipeg's earliest slums.

**Railways**

The lack of a direct railway link to the rest of Canada or the United States was the major deterrent to Manitoba's economic growth during the 1870s. The completion of the Pembina Branch of the Canadian Pacific Railway in December 1878 finally brought the long needed railway connection. The route of the St. Paul Pacific and Manitoba ran along the east bank of the Red River between St-Boniface and the international border,
where it connected with the American railway network, to provide a direct route to St. Paul and thence to Chicago and the east. This line was Manitoba's only rail connection until the arrival of the main Canadian east-west line of the CPR in 1881.

The agreement between the Federal Government and the Canadian Pacific Railway syndicate, which incidentally was the same group that promoted the St. Paul Pacific and Manitoba, included George Stephen, R. Angus, J.J. Hill, and Donald Smith. It was made public in October 1880. The 15th clause of the agreement or the so-called "monopoly clause," forbade the construction of any railway running south or southwest of the CPR mainline towards the U.S. boundary. Moreover, no line could be built within fifteen miles of the 49th parallel. The purpose of this clause was to guarantee the financial success of the CPR. As part of the conditions tied to the charter agreement, the railway company agreed to construct the mainline entirely through Canadian territory, which necessitated building north of the Great Lakes. Because this area of Northern Ontario was rugged, wild and sparsely settled, this section would remain costly and unprofitable. In return for this all Canadian route, the syndicate obtained the monopoly clause. The CPR feared that if this clause was not included in the agreement, American lines would connect with local Manitoba lines and tap profitable traffic. Furthermore, had this situation developed, it would have gone against the spirit of John A. Macdonald's "National Policy." In short, clause 15 was inserted in the charter to force an east-west traffic flow over the CPR's all Canadian route. This provision would guarantee Canadian control of the railway transportation system in the west as well as ensure the solvency of the CPR.

The end of the Winnipeg boom in 1882 and the poor harvest, bred discontent and pessimism in Manitoba. Much of this discontent was directed towards the CPR, and, in particular,
the monopoly clause of its charter. The poor harvest, declining grain prices coincided with arbitrary and high freight rates imposed by the railway. As farmers clamoured for relief, they began to advocate the admission of competitive railways into the province. The CPR and the Federal Government, however, were determined to retain the monopoly clause in spite of the rising discontent in Manitoba. Accordingly, the Federal Government decided to disallow a number of provincially chartered railways in Manitoba.29

Manitoba's Conservative administration under Premier John Norquay initially supported the Federal Government's stand. By 1886, however, the succession of railway disallowances made opposition in Manitoba to the Federal Government's stand all but unanimous. Norquay, in the face of public pressure, changed his position. In 1887, Norquay's government decided to charter the Red River Valley Railway which, upon completion, would connect Winnipeg with the international border along the west bank of the Red. The Red River Valley Railway, moreover, was considered by the province as a "public Work" and thus non-disallowable by the Federal Government.30 The Provincial Government's determination to build the road was countered by a corresponding intransigent position by the CPR. CPR president George Stephen threatened the province and the city of Winnipeg with the possible removal of the railway's shops from the city.31 Despite this corporate threat, the province went ahead quickly with its railway. On July 2, 1887, Norquay turned the first sod of the line.32 Two weeks later, the Federal Government announced the disallowance of Manitoba's Red River Valley Railway Act and the amended Public Works Act. Despite the disallowance work continued on the road.

Ultimately, financial problems rather than Federal disallowance delayed the Red River Valley Railway. As the province could not finance the construction through its own revenues, Premier Norquay ventured into the British bond
market to seek investment funds. Macdonald, realizing the province's crying need for funding, wrote to his influential London banker friend, John Rose, in June 1887, asking him to quash any Manitoban attempts to float loans on the London market. Macdonald's influence and the reluctance of the London Financial Community to invest in such a troubled project spelled failure for Norquay. Norquay's London fiasco led to his electoral defeat in 1888.

The new liberal premier, Thomas Greenway, rode to victory on a strong provincial rights platform. He was determined to break the CPR monopoly clause and, if necessary, fight any federal disallowance. In the midst of the controversy, Hudson's Bay Company London Secretary, William Armit, cautioned Charles Brydges to avoid any involvement:

Looking to the relations between the Dominion and Local Governments the board are anxious that the Company should not be committed to any scheme as regards a terminus for the proposed railway... The London Board knew of Brydges' desire for a railway terminus on the "flats" and they wisely cautioned him to avoid jeopardizing any relationships between the Company and the Federal Government.

The turmoil that surrounded the monopoly question throughout the 1880s began to hurt the financial position and the reputation of the CPR. As early as May 1887, leading men within the railway's organization realized that the unyielding monopoly stance was a mistake. In November 1887, the CPR's pressing need for additional funds forced Stephen into a more compromising position. He informed Macdonald that $15,000,000 was needed by the railway in 1888. If the Federal Government provided the necessary relief they could dispense with the monopoly clause. The final surrender of the monopoly clause did not come rapidly. It was not until April 1888 that Greenway received assurance from Macdonald that Federal Disallowance of the Red River Valley Railway would cease.
With this assurance Greenway and his government renewed their plans for the completion of the line and its operation. Their plan called for a government built and owned line from Winnipeg to the international boundary. This line would then be available to any and all American railway companies wishing to enter the province. This plan was never realized. The only way in which any American road would agree to enter the province was if they could acquire exclusive running rights. Henry Villard, the Northern Pacific Railway president, was the only railway operator willing to come to terms with the Manitoba government but he did not have full support of the Northern Pacific Railway board of directors. To circumvent this problem, he formed a separate company named the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company. The N.P. and M., therefore, initially had only a tenuous link with the N.P.R. Villard's railway company received its provincial charter in September 1888.

In the meantime, Hudson's Bay Company land commissioner, Charles Brydges, maintained a close watch over the Red River Valley Railway developments. A few days after it became clear that the Federal Government would not oppose the line's completion, Brydges wrote to Premier Greenway:

I see a good deal of discussion going on in the newspapers about the site in Winnipeg for the terminus of the RRV Railway. I write a line to say that I shall be ready to discuss with you at any time you are in a position to do so the question of a grant for right of way and station grounds on the HBCo's land between Main Street and the Red River.

After the agreement between the Provincial Government and the Northern Pacific and Manitoba was finalized, Brydges wasted little time in making a similar offer to the railway company. Brydges agreed to secure for the railway without cost "...a large tract of land suitable for yard purposes, shopgrounds, etc., comprising about 24 acres." Brydges conveyed the initial and tentative agreement to J.W. Kendrick
on August 27, 1888. He offered to give the railway "...the land on what is known as the flats, from the Assiniboine River to Water St., east of Christie Street and 150 feet up to the east side of Wesley Street." The Hudson's Bay Company, however, would retain a clear access to their mill property on the bank of the Assiniboine River. The next day, Kendrick wrote to J.M. Graham, the local manager of the railway, to inform him that the arrangements between the Hudson's Bay Company and the railway were close to completion. He concluded his letter by cautioning Graham to remain quiet about the proposed site of the N.P. & M. station, as it could jeopardize the Hudson's Bay Company deal.

It was September 20, 1888, before Brydges informed his London Board that an agreement had been reached between the Company and the railway. According to Brydges, the Hudson's Bay Company would sell twenty acres of the Fort Garry reserve to the railway for a nominal price of $10,000. Included in the sale was the land between Christie Street from the Assiniboine River to the Red River, and 150 feet from Christie to Wesley Street (see figure 62). In other words the Company sold a narrow crescent-shaped piece of land that ran along the north bank of the Assiniboine, to its junction with the Red, and then along the west bank of the Red as far as the foot of Water Street and, from that point, a 150 foot wide strip of land along the northern limit of Water Street to Main Street.

In Brydges' opinion, the agreement was a good one for the Company. The land sold to the railway was the "least valuable part of the flats," and the Company still retained all the available building lots between Main Street and the Red River. In fact, Brydges noted, the Company had already sold lots at good prices as a direct result of the agreement, where in three months previously these lots had been utterly unsaleable. In conclusion, Brydges happily informed Armit that all "...this is going to make a wonderful difference to
On October 4, 1888, Brydges informed Armit that the railway company had recently purchased the Wesley Hall property at the corner of Main and Water Streets; and intended to situate their passenger and general offices there. The train shed and freight shed were to be built by the railway company behind the main office, parallel to Water Street. The round house and workshops would be erected between Christie Street and the Red River.

Instead of the expected favourable reply from London, Brydges was chastised for his actions. Armit was adamant that Brydges had acted in "direct opposition" to his instructions. The lant grant was not to exceed ten acres, and Brydges had no authority to grant twenty. Furthermore, the Board would neither "give nor sell for the Railway any land north of Broadway." Reluctantly, Brydges wrote and informed N.P. & M. president James McNaught, of the Company's non-approval of the deal.

Brydges was hurt and angered at his Company's rebuke of his actions. In a series of lengthy letters to the board, he defended his decisions. Firstly, he had believed that the Board supported the idea of a railway terminus on the Company's property. As early as 1879, the subject of placing railway facilities at the junction had arisen. In order to secure these terminal facilities, Brydges had to keep in mind that influential people from Winnipeg's north and west ends were also offering free land grants as well as money as inducements to the railway company and the Provincial Government. If the terminals were placed at either the west or north ends of the city no benefit whatsoever would accrue to the Hudson's Bay Company. Moreover, Brydges argued he had felt compelled to convey additional property in addition to the ten acre parcel for a reasonable price as ten acres was simply not sufficient. As to the restriction on selling the Company's lands north of Broadway, Brydges maintained that
this restriction was never conveyed to him before October 1888. In short, the Board's protests were incomprehensible to Brydges. By November 1888, his letters to London reflected his anger:

During the last 9 years, lands of the value of upwards of $5,000,000 have been sold here;... we have also made gifts of lands ... amounting to probably 1,000 acres ... [for railway, etc.] In all these cases the main object has been to increase the value of adjoining lands which are for sale. This is precisely what has been done here.

Then I understand objection is raised to selling north of Broadway. No such restriction was ever previously referred to and as our business is to sell our lands, no such idea ever occurred to me.

In the present case the land from River [St.] to Wesley Street south of Broadway, would be simply useless for a railway terminus. It contains but little more than 10 acres which is not sufficient...

Armit replied abruptly to Brydges' several letters in December 1888, informing him that his explanations were not satisfactory, and that Brydges had no right to bind the Hudson's Bay Company to a contract without prior authorization.

Armit concluded his letter by asking Brydges to attempt to retain control of a portion of the river frontage. Brydges considered this last request absurd as the era of the steamboat had passed by.

On January 17, 1889, Armit notified Brydges that a re-organization of the Company's land department was being considered by the Board. Part of the plan called for a "...reduction to the emoluments of..." the land commissioner's office.

Charles J. Brydges did not live to witness the contemplated re-organization of his department. He died on February 17, 1889, of an apparent heart attack, while attending a board meeting of the Winnipeg General Hospital. As his death left the Northern Pacific negotiations in limbo, the task fell to his predecessor, Donald A. Smith, who had risen to the
governorship of the Company.

Smith informed N.P. & M. president McNaught that the Hudson's Bay Company was willing to accept the main provisions of the initial agreement with one exception. The Hudson's Bay Company wanted to retain "...a considerable portion of the land fronting the Red River." McNaught agreed to release three lots in Block 1 of the reserve, lots 156, 157, 158 situated at the foot of Broadway on its north side (these lot numbers refer to a survey of the reserve. See figure 62). Smith was not satisfied. After considerable negotiation, the Hudson's Bay Company were able to retain all of lots 155-162 and parts of lots 177, 178 and 179. This enabled them to retain their desired river frontage, providing a valuable access to the Broadway Bridge. Provision was also made in the final agreement to accommodate the Hudson's Bay Company's warehouse and mill property along the Assiniboine.

In addition to the Hudson's Bay Company property, the Northern Pacific and Manitoba supplemented their terminal property with the acquisition of the former Water and Main streets. The purchase price for this one lot alone was more than six times that paid for all the HBC purchases—$62,725.80.

While the negotiations between the Hudson's Bay Company and the N.P. & M. were ongoing (they were not concluded until January 1, 1890), the railway went ahead with the construction of its railway facilities on the flats. The local Winnipeg newspapers documented the progress of the railway into Winnipeg. The construction period was divided into two phases: the immediate and temporary program of late 1888, and the more permanent one during 1889.

In 1888, the Provincial Government of Manitoba and its citizens were anxious to gain an alternative railway connection not associated with the CPR. The monopoly clause and the disallowance powers of the Federal Government had fore-
stalled all their previous attempts. Consequently, the
N.P. & M. was confronted with an impatient Provincial
Government, which insisted on a number of tight completion
and operating deadlines.\textsuperscript{57} In consequence, a temporary bridge
across the Assiniboine was built in six days.\textsuperscript{58} As well, the
railway erected a number of temporary frame buildings on
their terminal grounds on the flats. Temporary space for
the general office and ticket office was secured in the
Wesley Hall Block. Moreover, a two stall frame engine house
was put up near the Broadway Bridge.\textsuperscript{59} The only permanent
buildings erected during the 1888 construction season was a
freight shed. It was situated beside the northern limit of
the Company's property, along Water Street. This freight
shed, with extensions, still stands and is used by the
Canadian National Railways as Freight shed no. 1. Completed
on December 11, 1888, Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway
construction superintendent, J. Woodman, described the shed
in 1890 as a structure 236 feet by 94 feet. The posts that
supported the trusses were set on masonry piers and the roof
and sides were covered with corrugated galvanized iron.\textsuperscript{60}
The shed was erected by the Winnipeg contracting firm of
Rourke and Cass for a total sum of $12,000. In general, the
temporary 1888 construction program was initiated in order
that actual railway operations could commence as soon as
possible. Freight deliveries were received prior to the
actual completion of the line as indicated by shipment of
ten kegs of beer on September 25, 1888.\textsuperscript{61} Passenger service
from Winnipeg to St. Paul began on October 20, 1888.\textsuperscript{62}

The 1889 construction season was a busy one for the railway.
They built an office building, a repair shop and engine
house complex complete with turntable, as well as a number of
smaller structures which included a tool house and coal shed.
The office building was situated along Water Street west of
the freight shed and behind the future site of the Manitoba
Hotel (see figure 64). Part of this structure still stands,
and is used by Century Motors Ltd. The machine shop, blacksmith's shop, engine house and round house together formed one large building. This predominantly brick building was built by the contracting firm of Rourke and Cass and was completed in late 1889. This structure, minus the turntable which was appended to the north end of the building still stands and is currently used by the Bridge and Building Department of the CNR. Its location and dimensions are evident in figure 65. Less substantial buildings, including "an oil house" opposite lot 197, and a "coal shed" on the north half of lot 183 were also erected by the railway company in 1889.

Before the railway company could utilize the "flats" for railway purposes, they considerably altered the grade elevation and contours of the site. Some 15,000 cubic yards were graded in the Winnipeg terminal property alone. In 1888, Brydges reported that the railway company planned to raise their grounds "about four feet." During the actual grading process, the Manitoba Free Press commented that about 100 men were levelling the yards with gravel obtained from 100 railway cars daily. This substantial disturbance to the grounds adjacent to the Forks undoubtedly effected the remains of previous structures and activities. In fact, while the flats were being prepared, two human skeletons, one of them "at the mouth" of the Assiniboine and another somewhere on the flats, were unearthed.

From the outset, the Hudson's Bay Company hoped that the establishment of a railway terminal on their reserve near the junction would enhance the value of their surrounding property. Within weeks of the initial agreement with the railway company, Brydges reported sales worth $12,000 on property adjoining the railway lands. Brydges was optimistic that within two or three years the Hudson's Bay Company would realize a very considerably sum for the property near the railway yards. Brydges' successor as administrator on the
Company's land affairs, J.A. Lawson, did not share his optimism. In March 1889, he reported to Donald Smith that a proposal to convert the unsold property into a park and recreation ground had been presented to him by the Winnipeg Street Railway Company. There were 11.57 acres available between Broadway and Assiniboine Avenue, east of Main. Lawson recommended acceptance of the proposal because there was no prospect of an alternative offer. Furthermore, the rental monies would offset the $1,330 annual tax bill.  

For no apparent reason, Lawson's recommendation was shelved and there was no further correspondence on the subject until 1893. In the meantime, the property between Broadway and Assiniboine east of Main remained vacant. In June 1893, Chief Commissioner Clarence C. Chipman re-introduced the park and recreation ground proposal. A number of influential Winnipegers, including Hugh John Macdonald, were prepared to lease the property from the Hudson's Bay Company if the Company would develop it as a "park and recreation ground." The Company agreed to expend $2,500 for the erection of a grand stand and for the preparation of the grounds. In return the Hudson's Bay Company would receive an annual rent of $2,000 and ten per cent of the profits after two years. In June 1894, Chipman reported that construction on the grand stand was underway, and the park would be in operation that summer. The location of the park was on the same property mentioned by Lawson in 1889 and it is clearly represented in figure 68. The two storey frame grand stand was situated on the east side of Main Street near its intersection with Assiniboine Avenue (see figure 69). It remained in operation until September 1906 when it was burned to the ground. The cause of the fire was attributed to the careless use of matches by "tramps and vagrants" who frequented the area.

The Hudson's Bay Company retained ownership of a considerable proportion of their reserve east of Main Street
well into the 20th century. In addition to the 11½ acres leased for park grounds, the Company's flour milling operations on the Assiniboine encompassed some 3.64 acres. The mill remained active until 1907, when it was sold. The milling business was an important if relatively small aspect of the Hudson's Bay Company's general trade throughout much of the latter 19th century. In 1874, as part of the Company's attempt to draw business south towards Fort Garry, they erected a steam powered grist mill on the Assiniboine east of the fort. The complex was renovated and modernized in 1881, and again in 1885. An 1890 inventory of the mill property revealed that the complex consisted of the mill itself which was a three and one-half storey building measuring 57' x 37' (see figures 60 and 70). Also included in the complex was a one storey engine room, 26' x 43', a 37' x 61' branshed, four flour warehouses, two which were of frame construction 30' x 60', two and one-half storeys high, and two of log, 30' x 70', also two and one-half storeys. By 1890, a 4,500 bushel elevator, 30' x 103', was situated immediately to the north of the mill. A small one storey office building 12' x 24' adjoined the elevator. In 1890, the Company assessed the value of the operation at $108,276.12. In 1906, one year prior to its sale and demolition, the mill and elevator complex consisted of nine buildings, with the original mill building and the "lean to" the only surviving structures from 1890. A detailed plan with accompanying building descriptions of the site were prepared for the Company in order to meet fire insurance regulations. The plan and building descriptions of the Fort Garry mill complex are worthy of inclusion in this report. (also see figure 71). The Fort Garry Mill and its property were sold to the Canadian North Railway Company in 1907 for $180,000. The continued expansion of the existing railway facilities was the major development characteristic of the junction site after 1888. Soon after the arrival of the Northern
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Stories</th>
<th>Material</th>
<th>Roof</th>
<th>Chimneys</th>
<th>Heating</th>
<th>Light</th>
<th>Meas.</th>
<th>Fire Protection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>Frame, Iron Clad</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>30'x69'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elevator</td>
<td>2½</td>
<td>Frame, Iron Clad</td>
<td>Metal</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>32'x50'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mill</td>
<td>3½</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Shingles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>36'x58'</td>
<td>Hose &amp; Water on each floor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed Storage</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Tar, felt gravel</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>30'x60'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Shingles</td>
<td>Iron Smoke stack</td>
<td>Steam</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>44'x50'</td>
<td>Pump &amp; hose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Track Warehouse</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frame, Iron Clad</td>
<td>Tar, felt</td>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>Hot water</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>64'x175'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage Warehouse</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Frame, cement clad</td>
<td>Tar, felt gravel</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>40'x100'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Shingles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>Elec.</td>
<td>30'x54'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lean To</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Frame</td>
<td>Shingles</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12'x24'</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Pacific and Manitoba Railway in Winnipeg, in 1888, the climate for railway expansion deteriorated. At the time when western railways in both Canada and the United States failed the N.P. & M.'s parent company, the Northern Pacific Railway, went into receivership in 1897. Even the powerful CPR faced financial difficulties. A reflection of these hard times is the fact that not one mile of new tract was laid in Western Canada from 1893 to 1896. In Manitoba, however, there remained a need for railway branch line and trunk line expansion. Unfortunately, none of the operating lines in the province were prepared or able to risk the investment necessary for new construction.

In 1895, Donald Mann and William Mackenzie, both successful railway construction contractors for the CPR, formed a partnership and purchased the dormant charter of the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company. Subsequently, they consolidated other charters and obtained operating privileges over existing lines. This process was the beginning of the Canadian Northern Railway, which was officially formed in 1898, when the Lake Manitoba Railway and Canal Company amalgamated with the Winnipeg Great Northern Railway and Steamship Co. It received a Federal Charter in July 1899.

Meanwhile, as the Canadian Northern Railway took form and grew, the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway faltered and fell into receivership. From 1891 to 1901 the N.P. & M. Railway accumulated a total operating deficit of $766,276.70. This operating deficit, confirmed with an annual $300,000 interest payment on the railroad's bond issue, was an enormous drain on the present company. By 1897, the management of the NPR clearly wanted to sell its Manitoba subsidiary. The Canadian Pacific Railway was the first to express interest in purchasing the N.P. & M. This sale, however, could not transpire because one of the provisions of the N.P. & M. provincial charter forbade any sale or operating agreement
between the CPR and the N.P. & M. In 1900, the management
of the NPR approached the Manitoba government for relief.

The government found itself in an awkward position.
The N.P. & M. had been created by means of a government ini-
tiative to provide an alternative railway to the Canadian
Pacific. Just as the government's creation was in real danger
of collapse, Mackenzie and Mann's recently formed Canadian
Northern Railway provided an attractive and feasible solution.
The Canadian Northern was willing to purchase the N.P. & M.
if the Manitoba Government would guarantee an issue of con-
struction bonds for a proposed route from Winnipeg to Port
Arthur. The province concurred to the conditions and a for-
mal agreement was reached between the Canadian Northern and
the Manitoba Government. The agreement was a lease arrange-
ment with an option to purchase:

The lease was made in the first place by the
Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway Company,
the Winnipeg Transfer Railway Company, and the
Waskada and North Eastern Railway Company to
Her Majesty the Queen, representing the
Province of Manitoba. The province of Manitoba
[subsequently] assigned the lease to the
Canadian Northern Railway Company upon cer-
tain conditions.85

Clause 13 of the agreement allowed for an option to purchase
the assessed value of the railway for $7,000,000. The
Canadian Northern exercised the option.86 Included in the
transaction was the Winnipeg terminal property of the N.P.
& M., near the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers.

A little more than a year after acquiring the Winnipeg
terminal property, the Canadian Northern Railway approached
the Hudson's Bay Company's Chief Commissioner, C.C. Chipman,
with a view to purchasing additional property adjacent to the
yards. The prospect of selling the remaining lots of the
HBC reserve appealed to Chipman:

From the Hudson's Bay Company's standpoint, it
is difficult to conceive anything which would
tend so much to enhance the value of the
Company's property in the neighbourhood, both buildings and land. The activity in values of town lots, which has been a principal feature in the business of the city, during the past year, has been very largely limited to frontage on Central and North Main Street, Portage Avenue and the North end of the City. If the sale of this property is completed the south end should have a full share of this prosperity...  

Chipman believed that the Hudson's Bay Company was in an advantageous position with respect to the sale, "No area [in Winnipeg] of this extent can be obtained so convenient to the Main Street and centre of traffic." Similar to previous sales in that quarter consumated by his predecessors, Chipman believed that the sale to the railway company would enhance the value of the Company's adjacent property and business operations.

On November 7, 1902, Chipman submitted a memorandum to the Hudson's Bay Company's Governor and Committee outlining the proposed terms of sale. An area comprising approximately 24 acres was to be conveyed to the railway company, for a total consideration of $350,000. The terms of payment called for an initial $50,000 down payment, with the balance spread over 20 equal annual installments, with a five per cent interest charge. In addition to the monetary consideration, the railway company promised to erect its new passenger station and office building within three years of sale, with the centre of the station no further north than Broadway. The transfer of the property was concluded on January 1, 1903.

In August 1905, Chipman again wrote to the Governor and Committee of the HBC in connection with the Canadian Northern terminals in Winnipeg. Canadian Northern president William Mackenzie had requested to be relieved from some of the covenants attached to the 1903 sale. In particular, the Canadian Northern and its partner, the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, wanted to erect their proposed "Union Station" at Main and Water Streets instead of Broadway and Main. The
Governor and Committee, however, naturally preferred the Broadway and Main site, and they were not prepared to relax any of the conditions. They obtained legal opinions as to the validity of the covenant. Two prominent English lawyers, Sir Robert Finlay K.C. and S.A.T. Rowlatt, in a joint opinion, agreed that the railway was legally bound to erect its station at Broadway and Main. Chipman informed London that construction of the Union Station building at Main and Broadway was to commence on June 5, 1908.92

In conclusion, the junction area or the HBC flats was largely excluded from the urbanization process that characterized Winnipeg from 1880 to 1908. The Winnipeg real estate boom of 1881-82 generated some excitement about the area's potential but never really reached the Forks before it expired. Consequently, the site remained largely vacant throughout the rest of the 1880s. Prior to 1888, the Hudson's Bay Company was the only owner of the junction property and the Company's utilization of it was minimal. A relatively small milling operation (in comparison to the Ogilvie and Great Lakes operations in Winnipeg) plus a few scattered warehouses along the Assiniboine comprised the total Hudson's Bay Company operation. The rest of the property remained vacant except for the shanties of a few vagrants.

The development of the N.P. & M. Railway Company terminals on the flats in 1888-89 was the first significant urban development of the site. It too, however, was a relatively small operation consisting merely of a few railway support structures strung out along the west bank of the Red River and then up Water Street. The largest portion of the HBC reserve east of Main Street remained vacant.

The availability of vacant land was so great and the prospect of disposing of it so small, that the Hudson's Bay Company was compelled to accept an offer in 1894 to have eleven and one-half acres of the property developed into a park. An attractive development it may have been, but hardly
an appropriate option for a Company interested in generating maximum return from its real estate holdings.

The underutilization of the Forks during this 20 year period is a direct result of the land policies instituted by the Hudson's Bay Company in the 1870s. Moreover, it reflects the inertia that is created in urban development once certain key decisions and pre-requisites are obtained. This phenomenon is clearly evident in an assessment of C.J. Brydges' career. His grand plans for the development of Winnipeg's south end in 1879 never materialized despite his untiring efforts. The southeast portion of the HBC reserve adjacent to the Forks, in fact, changed little during his ten year administration.

Furthermore, the sale of the property for railway purposes, first to the N.P. & M. Railway, in 1888, and then to the Canadian Northern in 1902, cannot be interpreted as a successful or beneficial transaction for the Hudson's Bay Company. The sale of more than 20 acres for railway facilities immediately adjacent to the centre of an expanding city for $350,000, even at 1902 prices, was not a considerable sum. Moreover, the development of the railway marshalling yards themselves also reflected the continuing under-development of that urban property.
IX Winnipeg's Union Station and East Yards: 1908-1980

The present Canadian National Railways' Union Station and East Yard terminal facilities in Winnipeg are an outgrowth of a shortlived sharing agreement of three railway companies. In order to understand the evolution of these yards it is necessary to outline the history of the three railway companies—the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental; and their successor, the Canadian National Railways.

At the turn of the last century, Canada experienced an unprecedented economic boom, brought about largely by the influx of a large number of immigrants into its western provinces and territories. This boom triggered optimism and investment in almost every aspect of the Canadian economy. Railway investment and expansion, in particular, mushroomed.¹

The Canadian Northern Railway, started by Donald Mann and William Mackenzie in 1896, stretched from Port Arthur to Edmonton by 1905. Both its strengths and weaknesses lay in its predominantly regional makeup. The Canadian Northern established a profitable and complex system of branch lines throughout much of the north central prairies. Unfortunately, the company's heavy west to east traffic was not balanced by a complimenting east to west flow. In order to secure its future security, a strong eastern connection had to be obtained. In the years after 1902, the Canadian Northern acquired a number of small eastern railways and defunct charters in its attempt to strengthen its eastern network.

The same optimistic speculation that spurred the Canadian Northern eastward, provoked western expansionist
plans from the Grand Trunk Railway. The Grand Trunk, one of Canada's oldest railways, served the industrial centres of southern Ontario and Quebec and provided connecting lines with numerous American cities such as Chicago and Minneapolis. Furthermore, it had established eastern seaboard terminals at Portland, Maine. At the same time that the Canadian Northern was considering eastern expansion the Grand Trunk petitioned the Canadian Government for a transcontinental charter. By utilizing the government owned National Transcontinental Railway, the Grand Trunk proposed to establish a transcontinental route from Moncton, New Brunswick to Prince Rupert, British Columbia. The proposal was much too large for the Grand Trunk to handle alone. In need of Federal Government involvement to succeed, the Grand Trunk approached Wilfrid Laurier's Liberal government with a proposal for which they received approval and a Federal Charter in 1903.

The terms of the Grand Trunk Charter called for the project to be divided into two sections. The eastern section of the line from Moncton to Winnipeg was to be built and supervised by the government owned National Transcontinental Railway, under the guidance of the Railway Commissioners for Canada. Upon completion the operating rights would be leased and assigned to the Grand Trunk Pacific. The western section of the project from Winnipeg to the coast was to be built by the Grand Trunk Pacific. Construction began on both sections in 1905.

The most logical solution to the Grand Trunk and Canadian Northern problems of 1902-03 was an amalgamation of the two lines or at least a traffic sharing agreement. While the Grand Trunk was centered in the east and non-existent in western Canada, the reverse was the case for the Canadian Northern. When the two companies petitioned the Federal Government in 1902-03 for charters and financial guarantees, the government attempted to persuade the two concerns to reach
an agreement. Unfortunately, the discussions between the railway companies "degenerated into snarling sessions." With neither party prepared to compromise, the railway companies failed to arrive at an agreement.

Unable and unwilling to reach a compromise, both roads began independent and elaborate construction projects. Financed principally by foreign investment of English origin, and guaranteed by the Federal Government, the railway companies staked their future in the belief that the economic boom of the early 1900s would continue. Apparently the London financial houses shared this optimism, because both the GTP and CN experienced little difficulty in raising the many millions of dollars needed to finance their construction projects. From 1903-12, both railways managed to operate at a profit, and consequently, met their large interest payments.

By late 1912, however, the market for Canadian railway and other Canadian bonds including large municipal issues, became glutted. That same year, a general and widespread spirit of pessimism concerning a possible recession also prevailed. These two factors combined to make the sale of Canadian railroad bonds increasingly difficult. In short, the demand for funds on the London money markets in 1912-13 simply exceeded the supply. Unable to raise the needed money or meet the escalating cost of construction, both the CN and the GTP soon found themselves in difficult positions.

The outbreak of the first World War in August 1914 further influenced the railway companies' financial position. Shortly after the commencement of hostilities, an embargo on foreign investment was levied by the British government. The mounting debt charges and the inability to raise money forced William Mackenzie of the Canadian Northern to seek the assistance of the Canadian government. Robert Borden, the incumbent conservative Prime Minister, was less receptive than his predecessor to the railway's plea for money. He
agreed reluctantly to advance funds, but under stringent conditions.

By early 1916, Borden and his government became increasingly alarmed at the general state of Canadian railways. Both the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific had begun to draw heavily on the financial resources of the Federal Government. In July 1916, a Royal Commission was set up to look into the overall state of the Canadian railway operations. It soon became apparent to the commission that Canada's two newest transcontinental projects were in desperate financial straits. The outstanding liabilities of the Canadian Northern in June 1916, for example was estimated at $427,947,574. The debt load of the GTP was somewhat less, but still reached a prohibitive level of $220,764,600.

With little prospect of increased traffic, there was no hope that either railway company could meet its debt payments. With the Federal Government being the largest creditor of the Canadian Northern, the commission's majority report recommended that the CN property be taken over by the government and run as a crown corporation. After an extensive valuation proceeding designed principally to save the Canadian Northern's banker—the Canadian Bank of Commerce from collapse, the Government of Canada, by an Order In Council dated December 20, 1917, placed all the Government owned railways, including the National Transcontinental, the Intercolonial Railway, the Canadian Northern and a number of smaller lines, under the control of an appointed board of civil servants. This decision was the beginning of the Canadian National Railways.

The demise of the Grand Trunk Pacific followed a similar pattern to that of the Canadian Northern. By late 1912, the escalating construction costs of the western section of the line and the railway's inability to secure funds, persuaded the GTP to renege on its contractual obligations with the Federal Government. The railway wanted to be relieved from
its promise to lease and operate the government built eastern section. Prime Minister Borden was prepared to co-operate but the railway would have to relinquish the entire western section of their line. Although the end of the GTP was imminent by 1914, it did not go into receivership until 1919. On May 21, 1920, the Government of Canada took formal possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific and its parent company the Grand Trunk Railway. In 1923, the Grand Trunk Systems were amalgamated with the other government owned lines in Canada to form the Canadian National Railways.

Prior to their collapse, the Canadian Northern and the Grand Trunk Pacific were forced to reach one sharing agreement. In Winnipeg, the terminal properties acquired by the Canadian Northern in 1901 were supplemented by subsequent purchases in 1903 and 1907. The Canadian Northern, at the time of their major property acquisition from the HBC in 1903, planned to enlarge their terminal facilities in Winnipeg. This plan, in fact, formed one of the conditions of the sale. In their attempt to secure financial backing for this major construction program, the Canadian Northern approached the Manitoba Government. The province agreed to guarantee an issue of terminal construction bonds with the provision that the railway company open the terminals for use by the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental. An agreement between the railways was reached after lengthy negotiations. A joint terminal company resulted with representatives from both railways forming the directorate. The board appointed a terminal manager. Subsequently, the New York architectural firm of Warren and Wetmore was commissioned to prepare plans for a Union Station and supporting joint terminal yards.

The evolution of the East yard terminal facilities is best traced through an examination of the numerous railway plans and photographs of the site (see figures 74-85). The takeover of the assets of the N.P. & M. by the Canadian
Northern Railway in 1901 included the Winnipeg terminal properties of the American based company. The N.P. & M. was merely a branch or feeder line of the N.P.R. Its operations, therefore, were relatively small. An indication of the scope of the N.P. & M. operations is reflected by the total number of its rolling stock. In 1901, when the railway was purchased by the Canadian Northern, its fleet consisted of nine locomotives and 120 box cars. Consequently, its terminal facilities in Winnipeg were small. The evolution of the N.P. & M. yards have already been discussed in this study (see pp. VIII, 10-21).

From the date of the Canadian Northern's purchase of the terminal facilities in 1901, until its signing of the joint terminal agreement with the Grand Trunk Pacific in 1907, there was little alteration to the Winnipeg yards. The most substantial change in the status of the junction property during this period was the sale of some 24 additional acres to the Canadian Northern by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1903 (see pp. VIII, 27-29, and figure 72). The most useful evidence for this period is a plan of the Winnipeg terminals dated 1908 (see figure 74). This plan, when compared to the N.P. & M. plan of 1895 (figure 65) reflects all the alterations commissioned by the Canadian Northern during the period 1901-1907. The more notable alterations to the yards and its building include:

1. A southerly extension to the existing car repair-engine house complex.
2. An addition of 15 stall round house and turntable on lots 191, 192 and 193.
3. The addition of numerous small unidentified one storey frame buildings along the bank of the Red River.
4. A "Gasoline Plant" on the west half of lot 197.
5. A "Store house office" and adjacent "store house" just south of lot 202.
6. An ice house on lot 196.
7. A road Master's office and pay office of the north east intersection of Christie Street and Broadway - lot 149.
8. Live-stock pens on the northeast portion of the yards.
9. A new railway bridge connecting St-Boniface to Winnipeg, just north of the old Broadway Bridge (see figure 79).
10. The removal of the original N.P. & M. water tank, formerly on lot 196.
11. A new water tank on lot 183.

While the above alterations to the yards were significant, the most substantial change took place during the period 1908-1912. After the signing of the joint terminal agreement, the Winnipeg joint terminals board authorized the construction of seven major railway structures. The most important was the "Union Station" at Broadway and Main with its adjoining train shed (see figures 75-76). The passenger station and the general layout of the yards were designed by the noted American architectural firm of Warren and Wetmore, who also designed New York's Grand Central Station. The contract for the construction of the building was let to the Montreal based firm of Peter Lyall and Sons Ltd., at an original price of $886,000. The price escalated in May 1909 to $939,000 when an additional storey was required. The construction of the building, which took more than three years, finally reached completion in August 1911. Centered at Broadway, the station building stretches 350 feet along the east side of Main Street. Winnipeg Union Station is "a fine example of a restrained Beaux-Arts classical style," which portrays an image of strength and stability. The building's exterior is of smooth Manitoba Tyndall stone, supported by a superstructure of skeleton steel.
Symmetrical in design, the station rises 100 feet above street level to a dominant copper-covered dome. Directly beneath the dome is the passenger and ticket lobby, which is flanked to the north by a waiting room and to the south by the baggage facilities. The floors above the main floor provide some 50,000 square feet of office space.

In addition to the station, the joint terminals board commissioned the construction of three freight sheds and two stable buildings. The freight sheds were erected alongside the existing freight shed, at Water Street that had been built for the N.P. & M. in 1888. The two most southerly sheds, now known as sheds #3 and #4, were erected for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway. The Canadian Northern Railway retained the old N.P. & M. shed (now shed #1) and erected another shed just to the south and parallel with it (shed #2). All four of these structures remain in use today by the Canadian National Railway (see figure 82).

Two stable buildings, one apiece for the CN and the GTP, were erected in 1909 and 1910 to house their cartage and express teams (see figures 77 and 78). The first built was for the Canadian Northern during 1909. Like the Union Station, this structure was designed by Warren and Wetmore. The construction contract was let to the Winnipeg firm of G.H. Archibald and Co., at a cost of $60,000. The original specifications of the building reveal that it was a two storey brick structure measuring 100' x 96'. It was designed to accommodate about 120 horses. The building continued in this capacity until 1938, when it was converted into a garage. The second storey after 1938 became the stationary department office. The building still stands and is used by the Canadian National Railways as a garage and training centre for the Canadian National employees.

The Grand Trunk Pacific stable was erected a few feet to the south of the CN stable in 1910. Except for the fact that the GTP stable was 48 feet shorter, and was designed
to accommodate about 100 horses, the buildings specifications are identical with those of the Canadian Northern stable.

The separate stable buildings and to a lesser extent the separate freight sheds are significant. They reflect the unnecessary duplication of services and structures that resulted when the CN and the GTP were not able to reach an accommodation agreement.

The last major railway structure erected in the east yards during the period 1907-1912 was an ice house (see figures 77-79). It was situated immediately northwest of the stables. It still remained in a 1930 aerial photograph of the yards (figure 81) but was demolished sometime prior to 1960 (see figure 84). The actual date of its destruction or demolition is not known. According to the building records index of the Canadian National Railway, the ice house/blacksmith shop was burned in May 1954 but it can be seen in a photograph of the site dated 1955-56 (see figure 82). Of the seven railway structures erected under the authority of the joint terminal board (1907-1912), all remain in service except the ice house.

As the original owners of the junction property, now known as the east yards, the HBC retained possession of a considerable portion as late as 1907. In 1907, the HBC mill and the 3.69 acres that comprised the site were sold to the Canadian Northern for $180,000. Following the sale and the subsequent demolition of the mill, elevator, and adjoining warehouses, the HBC maintained a small presence on the site. Their "track warehouse," (see figure 70) which was erected alongside the Canadian Northern track in 1903 was included in the sale but was allowed to remain standing until it became expendable for the railway company. By the summer of 1911, the approaching completion of the Union terminal facilities necessitated its evacuation and demolition. In May 1911, HBC stores commissioner Herbert Burbridge informed
London that plans were being prepared for a new warehouse to be erected east of the railway stable buildings. The new warehouse was to be a modern three-storey structure measuring 241' x 118'. It was completed in 1912, and is visible in figure 78. This substantial warehouse did not remain in the possession of the HBC. As early as 1918, it was occupied jointly by the Canadian Northern Railway Transfer Company and the McNaughton Fruit Company. The building is visible in the 1930 aerial photograph of the yards (figure 81) and is represented in a Canadian National 1949-50 plan of the East yards. The 1955 Western Canadian Fire Atlas, however, notes that the buildings were demolished, and all that remained was a stone basement covered with a wooden platform. This warehouse, therefore, was demolished sometime between 1950 and 1955.

The largest building in the east yards (next to the station) is the Johnston Terminal Building. This warehouse structure is situated between the old engine house-car repair shop complex, and the stable buildings (see figures 81-83). It was erected for the Canadian National Railways in two stages between 1928 and 1930. Prior to 1921, the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific operated separate cartage and storage businesses in Winnipeg. After the nationalization and amalgamation of the railway companies, duplicated services were either amalgamated or tendered out to contract. The cartage and storage business was one aspect of the business which was let to contract. Percival G. Denison of the National Cartage and Storage Company approached the Winnipeg terminal manager and offered to perform the cartage business for the new government-owned railway. After due negotiation, an agreement was reached. A 21-year lease was signed which conveyed certain buildings including the blacksmith shop, garage and two warehouses (one of which was the old HBC warehouse), to the cartage company. By 1927, the railway found
that it needed some of the building space leased to the carriage company. A new warehouse, therefore, was built in 1928, by the Canadian National Railways and leased to the National Cartage Company at 5\(\frac{1}{2}\) per cent of the total construction cost of $134,700.\(^{27}\) Upon completion in 1928, the four storey building measured 141 feet by 81 feet 5 inches. By 1929, the increased traffic and the added demand on the warehouse induced the railway to increase its capacity. In 1930, an additional 30,000 square feet was added to the southeast portion of the building.\(^{28}\) From its conception in 1928 to its abandonment in 1977, the building served as a warehouse. At present the building is vacant.

The most recent addition to the east yards was the construction of the central heating plant or power house in 1948.\(^{29}\) (see figure 82).

Aside from these major building additions, numerous smaller support structures were erected in the post-1908 period. The following chart should be used in conjunction with figures 83-85.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Building</th>
<th>Construction Year</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yardman's Shelter</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block House - North end of Assiniboine bridge</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switchmen's Locker and Lunch Room</td>
<td>1920</td>
<td>$877.40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additions</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1945</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yardhouse</td>
<td>1904</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuccoed</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge &amp; Building Workshop</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolished</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridge &amp; Building Store</td>
<td>1925</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolished in 1961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sash Building</td>
<td>1914</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolished in 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 gallon Water Tank</td>
<td>1902-1907</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolished in 1957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oil House</td>
<td>1902</td>
<td></td>
<td>Demolished in 1962</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Conclusion

The historical evolution of the Red and Assiniboine rivers followed two distinct chronological phases, with the years 1870-75 representing the transitional period. Before 1875, the aboriginal and fur trade societies who resided at the Red/Assiniboine junction were closely linked and dependent upon the resources of the land and a river oriented transportation system. The junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers represented a big transportation intersection which provided a direct east-west and north-south access route to diverse geographic and vegetation zones.

In the pre-contact period, the junction or "Forks" became a buffer zone or no man's land separating warring Indian tribes. The "Forks" was a much sought after site but no one Indian tribe managed to gain outright possession of the Forks. In the early post-contact period, however, the junction of the Red and Assiniboine assumed a more prominent role. The early French explorers and fur traders also depended, to a large extent, on strategic water transportation centres and meeting places. The French explorer La Vérendrye, for instance, recognized the strategic importance of the Forks when he first passed by in February 1737. In October 1738, at the urging of the Cree and Assiniboine Indians, a small fur trade outpost was erected at the Forks, on the south bank of the Assiniboine. It probably remained active until the mid-1740s.

Although the fur trade continued to expand further westward after 1760, the Forks' significance diminished in the 1765-1790 period. The more intensive competition for furs
during the late 18th century took place in the Saskatchewan country while the Red River, particularly in the vicinity of the Forks, was comparatively quiet. By the 1790s, however, the fur trade's increased dependency on "country provisions" elevated the Forks to a renewed position of prominence.

Alexander Henry's arrival on the Red River in 1800 further enhanced the junction's role in the fur trade. Henry led the move to integrate the North West Company's Red River and Assiniboine operations with the junction becoming a regular and important fur trade brigade rendezvous. In 1810 Henry's successor, John Wills, transferred the North West Company's Red River Department headquarters from Pembina to the Forks. He christened the new establishment, Fort Gibraltar.

From 1810 to 1821, competition for the possession of the Forks reached a new high. A little more than a year after the establishment of Fort Gibraltar, the first contingent of Lord Selkirk's settlers arrived on the Red River. The North West Company interpreted this colonization scheme as a veiled attempt by Selkirk and the Hudson's Bay Company to invade and disrupt the North West Company's operations on the Red River. The resulting hostility and conflict reached a peak in June 1816 when 20 men of the Selkirk Colony were killed at the Battle of Seven Oaks. No fewer than seven separate colonial and fur trade establishments were erected near the Forks from 1810 to 1821.

Following the amalgamation of the Hudson's Bay and North West companies in 1821, the Red River Settlement and the Forks witnessed a period of consolidation. By 1823, the Hudson's Bay Company's first Fort Garry at the Forks housed both the fur trade operations of the united company as well as the colonial administration. As the Hudson's Bay Company was the dominant force in the Red River Settlement, its establishments, particularly Upper Fort Garry after 1835,
became the focal point of the community.

After 1875, major shifts in terms of transportation orientation, urban development and HBC policy significantly reduced the importance of the Forks. After 1875, the history of the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers and its adjacent area is, in fact, a history of a site in decline. From 1875 to the present, the Forks has been on the economic and social fringe of Winnipeg's development.

Archaeological Recovery Potential
The possibility of uncovering physical traces of the historic activities at the Forks is tempered by a number of important considerations. These include:

1. Natural river bank erosion. The erosion of the river banks in the vicinity of the Forks is linked primarily to the great fluctuation of water levels in the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. Recurring spring floods and accompanying ice have done considerable damage to the site. More importantly, the rapid fall of water levels in the summer and fall has caused large segments of the bank to fall into the river.

2. Site disturbance. Early architectural and agricultural pursuits at the junction have undoubtedly disturbed the physical remains at the Forks. Similarly, the extensive preparations of the land prior to the establishment of the railway yards drastically disturbed the site. For example, in 1888-89 some 15,000 cubic yards of earth were graded in the preparation of the relatively small Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway yards. Furthermore, many of the supposed locations of the historic sites coincide with existing company structures, or railway support features.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>$</th>
<th>s</th>
<th>d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fort Douglas 132 Feet in Front by 155 long valued as per Statement</td>
<td>236</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. 1 House per ditto</td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 1 House ditto</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. 1 House ditto</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. 1 House ditto</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. 1 House ditto</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. 1 House ditto</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. 1 ditto ditto</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. 1 Mill ditto</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 1 Barn ditto</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. 1 Stable ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. 1 Ice House ditto</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. 1 Potatoe House ditto</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The 2 Bastion s.</td>
<td>721</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter Tools ditto</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black Smith ditto</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardener Tools ditto</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tin Smith's Tools ditto</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchen Utensils</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembina Buildings s.</td>
<td>381</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saws s. Mr. Perrone</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Playfield Farm ditto</td>
<td>545</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boats s. Rigging s.</td>
<td>866</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: £4620 -- 5
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. House 40 feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Apartments, 30 ft. broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 feet high</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Sack windows</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 - 9 pane ds.</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 doors pannel'd - 5 panes glass</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 doors Pannel'd</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 doors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cabin Locks</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Stock Locks</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pad Lock</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Stair Case</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cupboard with 2 half pannel'd doors &amp; 2 locks</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 tables</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 chairs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 window shutters</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Chimneys</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1090</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>D</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2. House 82½ feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16½ feet broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 feet high</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in 6 apartments</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 windows</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Glass 9 pane window</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Window shutters</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Stock Locks</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cabin Door Lock</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pad Lock Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chest 7 feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 feet broad</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 ½ feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>185</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. House 17 feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 ½ feet broad</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Doors &amp; Porch with</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Window Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cabin Door Lock</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chimney</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. House with 4 Apartments &amp; an Indian Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44 ½ feet long</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 ½ feet broad</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 ½ feet high</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doors with 2 padlocks</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office 2 apartments</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Stove Complete</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Desk &amp; Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Doors, 2 Stools, 1 Cabin lock</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Window Glass</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Windows</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Windows in 2nd Hall</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Hand Mill</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Chimneys</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>109</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>House 31(\frac{1}{2}) feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15(\frac{1}{2}) feet broad</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6(\frac{1}{2}) feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Doors &amp; 2 Pad locks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 Windows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Chimneys</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Table</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>1 Tool House 11(\frac{1}{2}) feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9 feet broad</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6(\frac{1}{2}) feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Window</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Door &amp; Padlock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>8</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>1 Forge 19(\frac{1}{2}) feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16 feet broad</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8(\frac{1}{2}) feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Bench</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 Windows partly Glass</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Door &amp; 1 Padlock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>27</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>1 Mill 30(\frac{1}{2}) feet long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24 feet broad</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10 feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Machinery, stones 1 horse power</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>30 Punches</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Step ladder</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Door and Padlock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3 Windows and 3 Mill Picks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>121</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>£</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. 1 Barn 26 feet long</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 feet broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Screen</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Chest 15½ feet long</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8½ feet broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Doors &amp; 1 Stock Lock</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Stable 10½ feet long</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11½ feet broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6½ feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ice House 16 feet Diameter</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoe House 16 feet long</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 feet broad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 feet high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Oven</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Privy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Ploughs Complete</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dill ds. ds.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Harrows</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Spades</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Shovels</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Groving Picks</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pick</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bill Hook</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 Sickles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wheelbarrows</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bushel Measure</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Large Hatchets</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>h</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Grapes 3 prongs</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Pitch Fork</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Steel Yards</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Long Ladder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Small do.</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Platforms with 1 Gallery</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with padlock &amp; Step Ladder</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Union Flag</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Land Roller &amp; Frame</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Box Cart</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Wood Sledges</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Box do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 prs. Frams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pr. Iron Cound Wheels</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Backyard with 303 Pickets &amp;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Gate with Padlock</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 pr. Copper Scales with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>½ oz. to 4 lbs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Lanterns</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Beam &amp; Boards with</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Bastion 16 feet square</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Story high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Glass Window</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Iron Bars</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Doors &amp; 2 Padlocks</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Platform &amp; 1 Step Ladder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bastion 16 feet square</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Story high</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Door &amp; Padlock</td>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 SpyGlass</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Brass Sieve</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>s</td>
<td>d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Cow &amp; Calf</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Bull</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Horse</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber Oak Logs</td>
<td></td>
<td>459</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sq. ft. 3675 2/6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber 10 feet long</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timber White Wood bound logs</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 3/6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Sheep</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Ram lamb</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 lbs. Merino Wool</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dogs.</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>721</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SPECIFICATION

Of various Works to be done and Materials (except otherwise mentioned), to be furnished in and for the Erection and Completion of an Immigrant Shed, Cook Houses and Closets, to be built at Fort Garry, Manitoba.

Excavations. — Necessary holes to be dug for all pickets or posts, also for cess-pools of W.C.; and, when fixed in place, ground to be well and hard rammed to sides of or around the same, till top is reached.

The ground to be levelled so that water will flow or fall from the building in every direction. If any hollows occur, they will have to be filled up to the level shewn, with good hard, and dry stuff.

No earth to be placed under main cills of building closer than six inches; but to be fixed against plinth.

There being no floor boards to the sheds, &c., the ground, if soft, will have to be rolled over to make it firm.

Carpenter and Joiner's Work. — The scantling timbers for framed work, also boards for sheeting sides of buildings and roofing boards, will be supplied to the contractor on the sport or site of buildings; but in case timbers have to be cut up, then contractor to state in his tender a price per thousand feet B.M. for sawing same out of logs or squared
timber, to suit scantlings required; also a price for haulage per 1,000 feet B.M. per mile of haulage. As the work has been arranged so that each part is a duplicate of the other (i.e., each particular kind), great facility in erection is given.

The whole work to be well framed and put together in the best manner; and to sizes marked; sill plates to be in long lengths, and where butting against each other, then to be halved, say 1'0" long, over a picket, and pinned with 2" hard-wood pin.

Pickets to be fixed at, say average distance centres, of six feet, thick end down, well squared off at top, and levelled throughout.

Posts to be two sticks or pieces of 5" x $\frac{1}{2}$ or 5" x 2" each, separated by thickness of divisional boards, and well pinned together with 1\$\frac{1}{2}" thin hard wood pins. Boards of divisions to be laid on edge or flat, and ends to be slipped between posts thus. Where longitudinal and transverse divisions meet, the posts to be grooved out on one side 1 inch deep by the thickness of board; externally the sheeting to be up and down, well and strongly nailed to plates, firts, and sill plate; the water table or plinth to be, say one inch thicker than boards, be splayed or chamfered on top, and boards to fit on same correctly. Fillets 2\$\frac{1}{2}$ x $\frac{1}{4}$ inch, to be nailed over joints of boards; nails driven into one board only.

Roof to be put together, as shewn; timbers to be half dove-tailed to each other, checked half inch and pinned, as strength, and not appearance, is required; the struts will go on reverse sides of each of these principals; these to be fixed, say 4'0" average centres, but made so to suit length of boards, without extra waste; at bottom to be firmly spiked on to plate. First piece to be half checked and $\frac{1}{2}$ shouldered. Portions of roof over dwellings No. 7, 9, 23, 24, to be bridged
from plate to ridge, X on plan, with 5" x 2" stuff, nailed or spiked at either side of principals, being butted against but not checked into them; horizontal braces, say 10 feet long, of 5" x 2", to be fixed on to, and between plates, and strutting braces on vertical parts (as usually and generally done), at angles of buildings and extra ditto in two places on the length, each side.

The whole of the roofs to be shingled with best split shingles, not less than 14 inches in length, to shew not more than 4 inches to the weather, and be well nailed down with shingle nails, of the proper and requisite length. Provide and fix on ridges and hips proper and good cappings.

Roof boarding under, to be laid in bays, or made to break joint, say every 3 feet in length of spar, so that ends will not all occur on same principal; to be well nailed down with 3" cut nails, not less than 7 nails to each board.

Provide and fix in each compartment, raised platforms, as shewn; bevelled on top, and enclosed down to floor; boards to be grooved and tongued, nailed on to runners or beams; small ditto fixed on to division to carry ends; fix on these of inch stuff, a box with loose top, to serve as such, or for a bolster.

WINDOWS.— To be inch grooved and tongued boards, with ditto cross-bars behind, made to slide sideways on a rib of wood grooved out, with similar ditto at top; these ribs to be hard wood. Water table to be 2" laid on bevel; linings external, to be inch -- all made so, that rain water will not work its way in. Note. Windows in gables, with lattice blinds, fixed dead.
DOORS—. To be 1½ inch grooved and tongued stuff, with No. 3 rails behind, screwed to boards, hung upon one pair strong "T" hinges, well screwed with long screws, and fastened with each, one strong hand made thumb latch; 1 square hand made bolt; and one good strong iron rimmed lock; casing to be 2 inch thick, with stop planted on, and hard wood sill weathered, projecting well over the line of front and throated.

Internal doors to be similar to above except thumb latch and and hard wood sill, so far as its projection is concerned.

At all angles of buildings and around doors and windows, provide and fix facings, say 5 wide and one inch thick.

In each cook house build upon 4" x 4" or similar stuff, a small flue 12" x 12" inside, 8" brick all round, set in good mortar, with two rows of brick at bottom, laid upon 2 inch stuff, which will connect uprights together; in each flue insert No. 3 pipe rings with tin stoppers fixed at different levels, one of which to serve as a sweep door, at top to be arranged as shewn; to be plastered inside with mortar mixed with cow dung; between uprights fix, say 5 shelves of inch stuff and case two sides. No timber of framing to go nearer flue than 4 inches, and boards inch.

Doors to be the same height as lining shewn, to be hung each upon one pair strong "T" hinges and fastened with good strong hand made thumb latch; (style of work equal to outer doors specified) with hard wood capping on top.

CLOSETS OR PRIVIES—. Box under seats to be out of 2 or 3 inch stuff, well in length. Where it projects as at ends, then to have covers of similar stuff, made to take off-and-on, this cover to be fixed 1"0' below the level of ground;
seats and risers to be of hardwood, pierced with holes as shewn, riser not to go as low as floor. Divisions to be as shewn, going as high as plate of roof, to have good bevelled and grooved capping, latter for boards to slip into Doors to be fixed to each division, to come within 18 inches off the floor, be hinged on strong T hinges, and have good slide bolts of hard-wood, fixed inside; doors to be as front doors of building but 1 inch thick. Lucarnes, as shewn in roof, to have fixed laths. Provide and fix 2 ventilators as shewn of inch stuff, made very tight and close, with a division in the centre (dividing box into 2 parts) grooved into the sides, one half to go well into the box at one end, and the other to finish under the seat; at top to have inch cover falling four ways.

PAINTER &C., WORK.--Doors and Windows both sides, together with their frames or linings to be painted 3 coats good oil paint, tops and sides of Platforms to be also painted.

The whole of the external and internal wood work of all the buildings seen, to be whitewashed or colored, 2 coats good work; for outside work, salt and umber to be mixed in.

NOTE---Shingled Roofs to be included.

The whole of the works required, to be done and executed to the satisfaction and approval of the Honorable the Minister of Public Works or of any person that he may appoint, and will have to be finished complete and ready and fit for occupation on or before the day of one thousand eight hundred and seventy-two.

A bulk sum to be named for the completion of the works.
Prices for sawing and haulage extra, as before mentioned.

Department of Public Works
Ottawa, 22nd March, 1872.

Thos. S. Scott
Chief Architect
Appendix C. "Fort Garry in 1871" from J.A. Griffin, From Toronto to Fort Garry, Hamilton, 1873, pp. 53-54.

FORT GARRY

On the northern bank of the Assiniboine River, and about five hundred yards from its junction with the Red River, stands the much talked of and much written of Fort Garry. The fort itself is a rectangular structure, 90 yards in width by 180 in length, having circular bastions built of limestone at the south-east and south-west corners, and one in the centre of each of the two side walls; these bastions, which at one time formed the four corners of the fort—it having been originally a square—are pierced with port-holes for artillery and loop-holes for small arms, and are connected by a stone wall twelve feet high and between two and three feet in thickness, while the east and west sides have been extended to double their original length, the additional piece of wall having been built of squared oak timber, as was also the new northern wall. Over the north gate is a square tower, also pierced for both guns and small arms, and over it waves the flag of the British Empire. Entering the fort by the southern gate, we find directly in front of us the building occupied as officers' quarters; immediately to our left and against the south wall are the guardhouse, orderly room, and sergeant's mess, and down the western side are four long two-storey buildings, built for store-houses, two of which are now used as barracks; between these and the wall are several smaller buildings, used for cook house, bake house, etc. On the east side are several more storehouses, a retail store, and
the residences of the Governor of the fort and other Hudson's Bay Company officials; in the centre are the offices of the Hudson's Bay Company and the engine-house; near the northern end, and facing the north gate, is the residence of the Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of Manitoba. In the barrack square, in front of the officers' quarters, are a number of field guns of different calibre, and several garrison guns and mortars, which, with the piles of shot and shell lying about, and the sentries pacing their beats in different directions, give the place and scene a truly military appearance, which is still further enhanced at times by the mounting of guards or the drilling of the various squads or companies of soldiers.
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Figure 4.

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Map Collection

RESTRICTIONS Credit P.A.C.

CAPTION See map

REMARKS This is the map that La Vérendrye took with him to Québec in 1737. If Lake Winnipeg (Ounipigon) and Lake Manitoba (Lac des Prairies) are rotated in a clockwise direction the map then becomes reasonably accurate. The notation "Fort abandonné" at the mouth of the Red River refers to the site of Fort Maurepas in 1737, and its intended move. The notation "Fort Maurepas" at the junction of the Red River (Rivièrè Rouge) and the Assiniboine (Rivièrè des Assiniboiles) refers to the proposed new site of the fort.
Figure 5

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Map Collection

RESTRICTIONS Credit P.A.C.

REMARKS In this 1740 map Lake Winnipeg's situation in relation to the Winnipeg River, Lake of the Woods System, has been corrected. Hudson Bay and Lake Manitoba are still incorrectly depicted. The Assiniboine River is also shown incorrectly. It should run in a more westerly direction. Of more importance to this study note the location of Fort Rouge on the south bank of the Assiniboine at the "Forks." Note also Fort Maurepas' new site at the mouth of the Winnipeg River and Fort la Reine's position on the Assiniboine River south of Lake Manitoba.
This map is attributed to La Jemeraye and was supposedly drawn in 1733. More likely it was drafted after 1740 as the detail concerning the sites of the forts and the situations of the various water bodies could not possibly be known in 1733. The La Vérendrye expedition did not reach the area west of the "Forks" until late 1738.

Note again in this map the site of the Fort Rouge on the south side of the Assiniboine.
SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
National Map Collection

RESTRICTIONS
Credit P.A.C.

REMARKS
Again note the site of the abandoned Fort Rouge (Ancien Fort) on the south side of the Assiniboine.
river junction 1738-1810
Figure 9

SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE

RESTRICTIONS
Credit P.A.C.

CAPTION
Plan of the Settlement on Red River, June 1816, by Peter Fidler.

REMARKS
According to this plan the distance between F. Douglas and the site of the North West Company's Fort Gibraltar is 3,630 feet.
PLAN
of the SETTLEMENT on
RED RIVER,
as it was in June 1816.

SCALE

1. The place where Governor Sample and his party were massacred
   on the 27th June 1816.
2. Fort Oblation, established in 1815, held over by the North West
   Company in 1816, and again in 1817, and finally captured in 1817.
3. Site of the present town, established by the Hudson's Bay
   Company in 1817.
4. Site of the Church & School of the Resident of Montreal
   and the Missionary of the Société des Missions.
5. Site of the French Settlement.
7. Site of the Union Settlement.
8. Site of the North West Company's Post.
9. Site of the North West Company's Post.

Plains, Prairies or Grassy Plains
extending 20 or 30 miles northward and westward,
without any interruption of extensive Woods or Swamp,
but occasionally varied by small Lakes, Hills, and
trails of Wood.

This work was created in 1816 and is in the public domain.
Figure 10

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine


RESTRICTIONS Credit P.A.C.

CAPTION "William Sax's Map of Red River

REMARKS Calculated distance from F. Gibraltar to Fort Douglas in 3,750 feet.

Date 1818.
Remarks from depositions in behalf of the Half breeds.

A. Site of Fort Gibraltar, destroyed part of the North West Company.

B. Spot where the Affray of 19th June 1816 took place; on Lots No. 8 and 9 a little to the N.W. of the Road from Fort Douglas to Frog Plain.

C. Road by which the Half Breeds returned towards Fort Douglas, previous to the Affray above mentioned.

Scale 100 Yards to an Inch.

True Copy. W. Sej. D.P. Surveyor April 1818
SUBJECT  Junction of Red and Assiniboine - ARC

SOURCE  Peter Rindisbacher

RESTRICTIONS  Credit Glenbow-Alberta Foundation
Note: $5 charge for publication.

CAPTION  Incorrectly titled "First Fort Garry."
It should be "Fort Gibraltar II."

REMARKS  This is the only known depiction of the
North West Company's rebuilt Fort Gibraltar
(1817-1821) at the forks of the Red and
Assiniboine. In the autumn of 1821 it was
renamed by the Hudson's Bay Company as
Fort Garry. It served the Hudson's Bay
Company as the headquarters of its Red
River district until 1830, when it was
largely abandoned in favour of Lower Fort
Garry.

Date 1820.
HUDSONS BAY CO. POST
MAY 1813 - MAY 1814

HUDSONS BAY CO. POST
MAY 1814 - JUNE 1815

FIRST FORT DOUGLAS
MAY 1813 - JUNE 1815
SECOND FORT DOUGLAS
AUGUST 1815 - 1850 ca.
PROPERTY SOLD TO
ROBERT LOGAN 1825

SOURCE: GEORGE BRYCE,
"THE FIVE FORTS OF WINNIPEG"
TRANSACTIONS OF THE ROYAL
SOCIETY OF CANADA (1885)

river junction 1810-1821
SUBJECT     Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE      Hudson's Bay Company Archives

RESTRICTIONS Credit HBCA

CAPTION     Lithograph of "Fort Garry" by Henry J. Warre.

REMARKS     Upper Fort Garry looking from the south. Erected by the Hudson's Bay Company 1835-37. Date 1845-46.
SUBJECT    Red-Assiniboine Junction


REMARKS
The rough sketch is of particular interest as it reflects the relative locations of the first Fort Garry and Upper Fort Garry. Warre calculated the distance between the forts as 350 yards.

Date June 7-16, 1845.
Figure 15

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE George Finlay Collection, Glenbow-Alberta Foundation.

RESTRICTIONS Credit Glenbow-Alberta Foundation

CAPTION "Upper Fort Garry from the mouth of the Assiniboine."

REMARKS Note the relationship between Upper Fort Garry and the remains of Fort Gibraltar—Fort Garry I. The main dwelling house in the Old Fort appears to be the same as that depicted by Rindisbacher in 1820. (see figure 11). The two blockhouses, as well as the diagonals of the fort appear in both depictions.

Date June 1847.
Figure 16

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE George Finlay Collection.
Glenbow-Alberta Foundation

RESTRICTIONS Credit Glenbow-Alberta Foundation

CAPTION "Upper Fort Garry - N. America"

REMARKS A view of Fort Garry from the north,
This is the only known depiction of the
fort's north face prior to its enlargement in 1850.

Date October 1846.
Figure 17

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE George Finlay Collection
Glenbow-Alberta Foundation

RESTRICTIONS Credit Glenbow-Alberta Foundation
$5 charge for each publication

CAPTION View from inside Fort Garry, looking north.

REMARKS Date n.d., probably 1846-1848.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUBJECT</strong></th>
<th>Red-Assiniboine Junction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>George Finlay Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Glenbow-Alberta Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REstrictions</strong></td>
<td>Credit Glenbow-Alberta Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5 publication charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPTION</strong></td>
<td>&quot;5 soldiers in winter dress.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS</strong></td>
<td>A view of some of the soldiers of the Sixth Regiment of Foot at Fort Garry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date - 1846-1848.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS
Credit P.A.M.

CAPTION
General Survey of Upper Fort Garry and vicinity by Captain Humpden Moody, Royal Engineers.

REMARKS
An excellent plan of the Forks. Of particular interest, note the assemblage of structures adjacent to the junction. These are the remains of the first Fort Garry and the Hudson's Bay Company's Experimental Farm. North along the Red River and near the right edge of Fort Douglas. As for Upper Fort Garry itself, note the layout of the buildings within the walls, and the several buildings outside them including the Garrison Hospital - jail complex and the stable.
An enlargement of a portion of figure 19. The group of buildings represented here are the remains of the Fort Gibraltar II - Fort Garry I complex erected in 1817 and abandoned in 1830. Some of these buildings served as the headquarters of Captain Cary's Experimental Farm from 1836-41. At the time of the plan's formation, these buildings probably housed the gardening operations of Upper Fort Garry and perhaps a few soldiers of the Sixth Regiment of Foot stayed there. Immediately to the north of the old fort are the "Stables, etc." which again were remnants of Captain Cary's Experimental Farm project.
Figure 21

**SUBJECT**  Red-Assiniboine junction

**SOURCE**  Provincial Archives of Manitoba

**RESTRICTIONS**  Credit P.A.M.

**REMARKS**  Another enlargement of Figure 19 this time centering on Upper Fort Garry. This plan shows the building layout of the fort prior to its enlargement.

Date 1848.
Figure 22

**SUBJECT**    Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**     Provincial Archives of Manitoba

**RESTRICTIONS** Credit P.A.M.

**CAPTION**    Enlargement of the northern portion of figure 19.

**REMARKS**    Note the depiction of the Logan property and the adjacent "site of an old Fort" which is undoubtedly the remains of Fort Douglas.

Date 1848.
Figure 23

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Hudson's Bay Company Archives G.1/320.

RESTRICTIONS Credit HBCA

CAPTION "Rough chart of Red River Settlement showing the unoccupied land in the vicinity of Fort Garry" by Edward M. Hopkins.

REMARKS Of particular interest is the small cluster of buildings to the north east of Fort Garry labelled H.B. Co. Farm.

Date: March 1848.
Rough Chart of
Red River Settlement

Showing the unoccupied
land in the vicinity
of Fort Sarry

March 1828
**SUBJECT**  
Fort Garry. Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**  
National Photograph Collection, C18695

**RESTRICTIONS**  
Credit P.A.C.

**PHOTOGRAPHER**  
H.L. Hime

**CAPTION**  
(Assiniboine and Saskatchewan Exploring Expedition - 1858). Fort Garry at Confluence of Red and Assiniboine.

**REMARKS**  
The earliest known photographer of Upper Fort Garry.  
Note the enclosure on the east and south sides of the fort.  
Also note the byre or stable to the south west.
Figure 26

SUBJECT  Red-Assiniboine Junction
          Fort Garry

SOURCE   PAC National Photograph Collection

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAC

CAPTION  Fort Garry Man. [1858]

REMARKS  

Figure 27

SUBJECT  Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE  Notman Photographic Archives, McCord Museum, McGill University, Montreal.

RESTRICTIONS  All Rights Reserved by McGill University
*Clear publication rights.

CAPTION  Steamer International at Fort Garry.

REMARKS  An identical engraving taken from this photograph is available in the Canadian Illustrated News, December 1869.

Also see Alexander Begg's Red River Journal and other Documents, in Chaplain Society, Vol. XXXIV, p. 382.

Date: 1869.
river junction 1851-1870
Figure 29

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Map Collection

RESTRICTIONS Credit P.A.C.

CAPTION Plan of Hudson's Bay Company's Reserve in Winnipeg.
Figure 30

SUBJECT Fort Garry.
       Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry 29.

REMARKS Note the incompleted Liquor Store
         adjacent to the south east bastion.

         See also the large two storey structure,
         immediately to the west of the river
         gate. This is the only photograph of
         the fort which depicts this building.

         Date 1872.
Figure 31

SUBJECT     Fort Garry
            Red-Assiniboine Journal

SOURCE     Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION     Fort Garry 36

REMARKS     A view of the fort from the south west, looking north east.
            Date 1872
Fort Sarry at Winnipeg in 1872.
Figure 32

SUBJECT
Fort Garry
View from South Bank of Assiniboine
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
National Photograph Collection, C16834

RESTRICTIONS
Credit PAC

CAPTION

REMARKS
Date ca. 1872
SUBJECT      Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE      Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS      Credit PAM

CAPTION

REMARKS      Photograph of an oil painting by W.F. Lynn.

Note the warehouse buildings along the north bank of the Assiniboine.

Date ca. 1872.
The Sisters  The Ferry  The Forks  Fort Garry  Site of Fort Gibraltar
Pontoon Bridge  French Half-breeds with Ox-carts

RED AND ASSINIBOINE RIVERS

FORT GARRY

(From Oil painting of Mr. W. Frank Lynn made in 1872, now in possession of the Author.)
Figure 34

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Glenbow-Alberta Foundation

RESTRICTIONS Credit Glenbow-Alberta Foundation
*publication charge.

CAPTION Arrival of First Mennonites at Winnipeg.

REMARKS A touched up photograph and somewhat distorted. The elongated structure at the right edge of the photo may be the immigrant shed.
Date ca. 1873.
Figure 35

SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
Photograph of a painting by W.F. Lynn.
Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS
Credit PAM

DATE

REMINDERS
Date: ca. 1873
SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Hudson's Bay Company Library, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg.

RESTRICTIONS Credit HBC Library

CAPTION The "International" docked at Fort Garry.

REMARKS An excellent depiction of the period when the forks was the major "port" and receiving centre for Manitoba.

Date c. 1873
SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
National Photograph Collection
PA-11337

RESTRICTIONS
Credit P.A.C.

REMARKS
A view of Fort Garry from the southeast. The large frame building in the foreground is the H.B.C.'s "No. 4 Warehouse." Note also the temporary bridge across the Assiniboine and the large quantity of lumber lying on the river bank. The Fort Garry stable facilities are visible immediately southwest of the Fort.

Date ca. 1873.
Figure 38

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry '48'

REMARKS A view of the south east corner of Fort Garry. Immediately to the left or west of the bastion is the liquor store. The Company's retail store is situated to the right of the bastion or little to the north-west. Note the partial dismantlement of the fort's stone walls. The bastion near the centre of the photograph was the fort's south-east corner. It corresponds approximately with the present intersection of Main Street and Assiniboine Avenue.

Date c. 1873-74
Figure 39

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Photograph Collection, PA9834

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAC

CAPTION 'Fort Garry Manitoba'

REMARKS A view of Fort Garry south east corner, looking southwest. The southeast bastion is situated at the left edge of the photograph and the HBC's Retail Store faces the camera.

Date 1873-74
Figure 40

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Winnipeg views 85.

REMARKS An excellent view of the "Forks." The detail of the actual river banks is especially interesting.

The dwelling house west of Fort Garry along the north bank of the Assiniboine are probably the 'cottages' erected by the HBC in 1872.

Date ca. 1874-75.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUBJECT</strong></th>
<th>Red-Assiniboine Junction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **SOURCE**   | Hudson's Bay Company Library,  
Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg |
| **RESTRICTIONS** | Credit HBC Library |
| **CAPTION**  | Main Street looking south |
| **REMARKS**  | Note Fort Garry at the south end of Main Street. Also note, the vacant appearance of the HBC reserve east of Fort Garry.  
Date: 1876 |
This house was the residence of Governors of Assiniboia A.G. Dallas (1862-64) and William Mactavish (1864-70), and Manitoba's first official Government House 1870-83. The building faced to the north and was situated just inside the north gate of Fort Garry.

Date: 1876
Figure 43

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Map Collection
V1/540 Winnipeg

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAC

CAPTION A Map Showing the City of Winnipeg
by G. McPhillips Jr. (A portion thereof),

REMARKS Note the respective locations of:
1) Upper Fort Garry,
2) The HBC No. 4 Warehouse,
3) The McLane, later HBC grist mill,
4) Emigrant shed.

Date: May 29, 1877.
Figure 44.

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Public Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry Gates

REMARKS A view of Government House, Fort Garry, showing its relation to the north or Stone Gate of Fort Garry. This gate is all that remains of the fort. Note the construction of the wooden wall adjoining the Stone Gate. It was erected around the northern extension of the enlarged fort in 1853.

Date 1878
SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry 45/6

REMARKS Another view of Fort Garry's south east corner; looking north west. The Company's liquor store, and retail store are clearly visible at the left portion of the photo.

Note the removal of the south east bastion and the fort's stone walls.

Date: 1878-1880.
Figure 46

**SUBJECT**
Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**
Provincial Archives of Manitoba

**RESTRICTIONS**
Credit PAM

**CAPTION**
Fort Garry 46

**REMARKS**
Fort Garry from the northeast. The bastion near the centre of the photograph marks the northern extremity of the fort prior to 1853. The wooden wall or fence north of the bastion was completed in 1853.

The retail store is clearly visible at the southern edge of the photo. The brick building at the northern edge of the photograph outside the fort's walls is the HBC's Land Office erected in 1874.

Note also the large vacant appearance of the property east of the fort, which characterized the HBC reserve in the 1870s and 1880s.
**Figure 47.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUBJECT</strong></th>
<th>Red-Assiniboine Junction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>Provincial Archives of Manitoba</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REstrictions</strong></td>
<td>Credit PAM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Caption</strong></td>
<td>Fort Garry</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Remarks** | Another view of Fort Garry's interior.  
Date: ca. 1878.  
See Appendix C. |
Figure 48.

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Photograph Collection
Public Archives of Canada, PA-28579

RESTRICTIONS Credit P.A.C.

CAPTION Mild Elk Spirit leaning on cannon

REMARKS An interior view of the Fort looking north from just inside the river gate. The building at the centre is the "mess building" which Louis Riel occupied from November 1870 to August 1871. The buildings running along the east and west sides are the Company's store houses and warehouses. They also served as barracks for the troops in 1846-48, 1857-61, and 1871-74.
A view of the interior of Fort Garry looking north. Along the right or east side of the photo beginning at the south are: 1) Clerk's house, 2) Men's House (later J.H. McTavish's house), and 3) the unpainted Flour House. John H. McTavish's residence is visible directly at the end of the boardwalk. The rear of the Lt. Governor's residence is evident to the northwest of McTavish's house. The mess building is situated at the left or western extremity of the photo.
Figure 50

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry

REMARKS The Mess building.
Date: 1878.
Subject: Red-Assiniboine Junction

Source: Provincial Archives of Manitoba

Restrictions: Credit PAM

Caption: HBC offices Main Street and Broadway

Remarks: These two brick buildings were erected by the Hudson's Bay Company in 1874. They were authorized by Donald A. Smith, due to a lack of accommodation within the fort.

Date: 1878
Figure 52

SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
National Photograph Collection
Public Archives of Canada, PA9906

RESTRICTIONS
Credit PAC

CAPTION
Fort Garry, Manitoba

REMARKS
The large 3½ storey frame building on the right of the photograph is the HBC mill. The other frame buildings along the Assiniboine are the HBC warehouses. The three storey building behind and slightly to the right of the mill is the Pacific Hotel erected in 1873. It was situated at the North West corner of Main Street and Broadway.
Figure 53

 SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

 SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

 RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

 CAPTION Fort Garry 45/4

 REMARKS A view of Chief Factor J.H. McTavish's garden.
 Date: ca. 1878
SUBJECT          Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE           Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS     Credit PAM

CAPTION          Fort Garry 45/1

REMARKS          An interior view of Fort Garry, looking north from a spot just south east of the mess building. The rectangular iron structure in the background is the first Main Street bridge across the Assiniboine. Note also, the good example of half-timber or "colombage" construction in the warehouse building at the right edge of the photograph.

Date: ca. 1880-81.
The east of the old fort showing train at bridge 
To the old Davis house at north end of bridge
**Figure 55**

**SUBJECT**  
Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**  
Hudson's Bay Company Library, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg

**RESTRICTIONS**  
Credit HBC Library

**CAPTION**  
Main Street bridge looking toward Fort Garry.

**REMARKS**  
Note the total absence of either bastions or stone walls. Also note the emergence of the town of Winnipeg north and east of the fort.

Date: 1880-81
Figure 56

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry 45/8

REMARKS Note the approach to the Main Street Bridge in the foreground.

Date: ca. 1880
SUBJECT  Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE  William Notman Photograph, Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS  Credit PAM

CAPTION  Winnipeg Bridge - Main Street

REMARKS  Note the almost complete dismantlement of Fort Garry, save the mess building, Government House and one warehouse.  
          Date: 1883-1885.
Figure 58

SUBJECT       Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE        Hudson's Bay Company Library, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg

RESTRICTIONS  Credit HBC Library

REMARKS       A view of the steamer Cheyenne docked on the Assiniboine River. Note the Main Street Bridge in the background.

               Date: ca. 1880.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>SUBJECT</strong></th>
<th>Red-Assiniboine Junction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SOURCE</strong></td>
<td>Hudson's Bay Company Library, Hudson's Bay House, Winnipeg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RESTRICTIONS</strong></td>
<td>Credit HBC Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CAPTION</strong></td>
<td>HBC Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>REMARKS</strong></td>
<td>The HBC mill near the junction of the Red and Assiniboine. Built 1874, Demolished 1907. n.d.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 61

SUBJECT  Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE  Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS  Credit PAM

CAPTION

REMARKS  A view of Winnipeg from St-Boniface. The southern or eastern edge of the photograph coincides approximately with the present line of Broadway. Note, the shanties and shacks that existed on the HBC flats in the early 1880s.

Date: 1880-81.
SUBJECT

Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE

HBC Archives, A.73/2, fo. 89.

RESTRICTIONS

Credit HBCA

CAPTION

Portion of Plan of Hudson's Bay Company's Reserve at Winnipeg. Showing proposed route of Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railway.

REMARKS

Note the location of HBC mill operating and warehouse.

Date: plan drawn 1887
alterations 1888
Figure 63

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE F.J. Haynes Foundation Collection
Montana Historical Society, Helena Montana

RESTRICTIONS One time reproduction only.

CAPTION Manitoba Hotel, Winnipeg.

REMARKS A rear view of the Northern Pacific and Manitoba Railways, Manitoba Hotel at the intersection of Main Street and Water St.
Adjoining the rear of the hotel is the railway's train shed and office building.
Date: ca. 1895
Figure 64

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Manitoba Hotel

REMARKS Frontal view of Manitoba Hotel at Main St. and Water St. Note the Hudson's Bay Company's mill and elevator complex on the banks of the Assiniboine, at the right edge of the photo.

The Manitoba Hotel burned in 1899.

Date: c. 1896
SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
Hudson's Bay Company Archives, A.73/2, fo. 90.

RESTRICTIONS
Credit HBCA

CAPTION
Portion of Plan N.P. & M.R. yards in Winnipeg.

REMARKS
Of particular importance is the relationship between the railway structures and the lot numbers.

Date: 1895.
N. P. & M. R'y
Yard and Station Grounds
WINNIPEG
SCALE: 80 FEET TO 1 INCH
Figure 66

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

REMARKS A view of the old HBC reserve east of Main Street.
   - Note the last remnant of Fort Garry North Gate.
   - Furthermore, the relationship between the old Fort and the Streets of Winnipeg is apparent here. The intersection in the centre of the picture is Broadway and Fort St.
   - The early beginnings of the junction site as a Railway terminus is visible in the background.

Date: ca. 1900
Figure 67

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Fort Garry Gate

REMARKS A view of the old north gate of Fort Garry, looking east. The small N.P. & M. railway yards are visible in the background.

Date: c. 1890.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECT</th>
<th>Red-Assiniboine Junction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SOURCE</td>
<td>National Map Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTRICTIONS</td>
<td>Credit PAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REMARKS</td>
<td>Portion of &quot;McPhillips Map of Winnipeg.&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date: 1895.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SUBJECT: Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE: HBCA G.7/3, fo. 43.

RESTRICTIONS: Credit HBCA

CAPTION: Insurance plan, 1906

REMARKS: Fort Garry Park Grandstand and HBC dwelling house near Assiniboine Ave. and Main Street.

Date: 1906.
SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Hudson's Bay Company Archives E.48/5, fo. 28.

RESTRICTIONS Credit HBCA

CAPTION A plan of Hudson's Bay Company's mill and warehouse facilities in relation to the Canadian Northern Railway track and Assiniboine Bridge.

Date: 1903
Figure 71

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Hudson's Bay Company Archives
G.7/3, fo. 45.

RESTRICTIONS Credit HBCA

CAPTION

REMARKS An insurance plan of the HBCA mill and warehouse complex at Winnipeg, 1906.
Figure 72

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba
Railway Commissions Collection, RG13, A.1

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

REMARKS The shaded area in the plan are the lands that were conveyed to the Canadian Northern, 1907.
NOTE: SHADED AREA INDICATES A RACETRACK IN EXISTENCE (1894-1906)
Figure 74

SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
National Map Collection

RESTRICTIONS
Credit PAC

REMARKS
This is a plan of the yards as they existed prior to its development by the joint terminals.
SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Photograph Collection, PA1222478

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAC

CAPTION Construction of Union Station, Winnipeg.

REMARKS A view of Winnipeg's Union Station under construction from the rear of the building looking north-west.

Date: Autumn 1908.
Figure 76

**SUBJECT**  Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**  Provincial Archives of Manitoba

**RESTRICITONS**  Credit PAM

**CAPTION**  "Union Station Winnipeg, Canada"

**REMARKS**  Union Station Winnipeg
  Date:  1920-22
Figure 77

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Winnipeg Railway Yards CNR 5.

REMARKS A view of the Winnipeg joint terminal yards looking east to St-Boniface ca. 1914, apparently from the top of the Hotel Fort Garry. The Hudson's Bay Company Warehouse building, now Hudson's Bay House, is visible in the foreground. Behind it is the Canadian Northern Railway stable building, and at the right edge of the photo is a portion of the Grand Trunk Pacific stable. Near the bank of the Red River is the Engine House, car repair shop facility erected by the N.P. & M. Ry. Co. in 1889.

Note the turntable is still intact. Also visible to the north of the N.P. & M. shops is the turntable facility erected by the Canadian Northern Railway in ca. 1903.
Figure 78

SUBJECT		Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE		Public Archives of Canada

RESTRICTIONS	Credit National Photography Collection
PA 49808

CAPTION	'St. Boniface from Roof of Fort Garry Hotel'

REMARKS	A similar photograph to the preceding one.

Note the substantial alteration to the N.P. & M. Engine house facility -- the turntable has been removed. Also note the disappearance of the Canadian Northern turntable.
Figure 79

**SUBJECT**  
Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**  
National Photograph Collection PA 30177

**RESTRICTIONS**  
Credit PAC

**REMARKS**  
A view of Winnipeg looking west from St-Boniface. The bridge in the foreground is the old Broadway Bridge which linked Broadway with Provencher Ave. It was erected in 1881-82, and dismantled in c. 1920. Union station and the Hotel Fort Garry are visible to the west of the bridge. To the south of the bridge a somewhat obstructed view of the joint terminal yards is visible.

Date: 1913.
Figure 80

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE National Photograph Collection PA 30178

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAC

CAPTION

REMARKS A view of Winnipeg from St-Boniface looking north west. The bridge at the south or left of the photograph is the Broadway Bridge. The Canadian Northern Railway Bridge is visible at the north edge of the photo. Of particular interest in this photograph and the preceeding one is the extensive use made of the West bank of the Red River for docking and wharfing facilities.
SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
Public Archives of Canada

RESTRICTIONS
Credit PAC PA 47914

CAPTION
Winnipeg Man. Looking North

REMARKS
An aerial view of the Canadian National Railway yards, at the junction of the Red and Assiniboine Rivers. The large structure situated between the two stable buildings and the engine house, complex, is the National Cartage Warehouse, erected in 1928.

Date: 1930
Figure 82

SUBJECT Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS Credit PAM

CAPTION Winnipeg - Rwy yards CNR 1

REMARKS A view of the east yards looking south east from the corner of Main and Water Streets. Freight shed No. 1 originally erected in 1888 by the N.P. & M. Ry. Co. is visible at the North edge of the photo. The adjacent sheds, numbers 2, 3, and 4 were constructed in 1910-1912.

Date 1956.
Figure 83

**SUBJECT**  Red-Assiniboine Junction

**SOURCE**  Provincial Archives of Manitoba

**RESTRICTIONS**  Credit PAM

**CAPTION**

**REMARKS**  A view of the forks looking northwest from St-Boniface.

Note the location of the railway support structure along the river bank.

Date: 1960
Figure 84

SUBJECT
Red-Assiniboine Junction

SOURCE
Provincial Archives of Manitoba

RESTRICTIONS
Credit PAM

CAPTION

REMARKS
An aerial view of the junction of the Riel and Assiniboine Rivers. A good overall view of the east yards in relation to the city of Winnipeg is evident here.

Date: 1962.
river junction 1913-1966