THE BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

OCTOBER, 1940

The
BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

Published by the Archives of British Columbia
in co-operation with the
British Columbia Historical Association.

Editorial communications should be addressed to the Editor, Provincial Archives, Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C.

Subscriptions should be sent to the Provincial Archives, Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C. Price, 50c. the copy, or $2 the year. Members of the British Columbia Historical Association in good standing receive the *Quarterly* without further charge.

The
BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORICAL QUARTERLY

"Any country worthy of a future should be interested in its past."

VOL. IV. VICTORIA, B.C., OCTOBER, 1940. No. 4

CONTENTS.

DAVID DOUGLAS IN BRITISH COLUMBIA.[1]

My story comes from an early period of British Columbia history, the period which followed the coastal explorations of Cook and Vancouver and the cross-country expeditions of Alexander Mackenzie and Simon Fraser, and which preceded the gold-rush. It was the rather dull intervening period when fur-traders ruled the country and their forts were the only outposts of civilization. The largest post in the territory now comprising British Columbia was then Fort St. James, far north on Stuart Lake, founded in 1806, the second oldest permanent settlement in this Province.

Let us go back then to the year 1833—four years before the coronation of Queen Victoria. One day in June there arrived at Fort St. James, with the Hudson's Bay Company's annual brigade from the south, a young Scotsman. There was nothing unusual in that, for many of the fur-traders were Scottish. But this Scotsman did not look like a fur-trader. He carried flowers and weeds in his hands and had more in a tin box (vasculum) slung over his shoulder. At his heels trotted a shaggy little Scotch terrier. He had a white man-servant and some Indians to help him with his horses and baggage. He was laden with botanical equipment and with instruments for taking geographical and astronomical observations. Quite clearly he was not a fur-trader.

Instead, he was a nature student and a collector of botanical specimens and birds. That *was* unusual. Fort St. James never before had been visited by a man of science. In fact, this was the first white man of any kind, other than a fur-trader, to visit the posts of the Hudson's Bay Company in the Pacific Northwest.

But before dealing with his journey to Fort St. James, let us sketch briefly his earlier life.

---

(1) General authorities: David Douglas: *Journals*, London, 1914; David Douglas: Journal and letters, in *Companion to Botanical Magazine*, London, II. (1836)—reprinted in *Hawaiian Spectator*, Honolulu, II. (1839), and *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, Portland, V. & VI. (1904–1905); Edward Sabine: *Report on Douglas' Observations*, MS., Royal Society, London.

David Douglas, for that was the visitor's name,[2] was born in 1799, of humble parentage, at Scone, the little village in Perthshire which had been the ancient capital of Scotland. Early in life he became interested in nature study, and preferred rambling, fishing, and bird's-nesting to school-work. The high spiritedness, inquisitiveness, and determination which marked his later life and which led to his tragic death, already were in evidence. He collected all sorts of birds, and sometimes had difficulty in finding food for them. At one time he had some young owls which he fed with mice—when he could catch the mice—but when the mice were too elusive, as frequently happened, he fed his pet owlets with beef liver bought with the daily penny provided him for buying bread for his own lunch.

At the age of ten he was apprenticed in the palace gardens at Scone. His diligence and enthusiasm led to steady advancement. Obtaining a position in the Glasgow Botanic Garden, he became a pupil of Dr. W. J. (later Sir William) Hooker, afterwards famous as Director of Kew Gardens, and was recommended by him to the Royal Horticultural Society of London for a plant-collecting mission to the United States and Upper Canada. This mission was so successful that the Horticultural Society sent him on a similar mission to North-west America, where the Hudson's Bay Company had offered the facilities of its trading-posts and travel routes.

After a voyage of eight and a half months, around Cape Horn, Douglas landed at the mouth of the Columbia River in April, 1825. His botanizing began even before he landed. From the ship he spied three kinds of trees: a hemlock, a balsam fir, and one he could not identify. Little did the enthusiastic young man think, as he studied the forest-covered shore, that the strange tree he saw was to be given his name and become the world's greatest producer of structural timber.

Douglas was enraptured with the country. The scenery he found sublime: the profusion of flowering plants, the natural meadows, the grand forests of giant trees and the snow-capped mountains. As botanist and nature-lover he found it a virgin field, and plunged into his work with desperate zeal. Archibald

(2) David Douglas was no relation to Sir James Douglas, Hudson's Bay Company Chief Factor and first Governor of British Columbia.

Menzies, the surgeon who had accompanied Captain Vancouver, had done some plant collecting, but Douglas was the first to specialize in the botany of the North-west, and systematically comb the territory for specimens. Making his headquarters at Fort Vancouver (now Vancouver, in the State of Washington, opposite Portland), he travelled up and down the Columbia by canoe or on foot, sometimes with an Indian guide, sometimes with the Hudson's Bay Company's men, but often alone with his dog.

The young explorer endured terrible hardships. He had to " live off the country " as he travelled, his food being largely fish, birds, and berries. He became an expert shot and surprised the Indians by his ability to shoot birds on the wing. His journal he wrote by the light of his camp-fire or his " Columbian candle " —a stick containing rosin. Several times his canoe upset, resulting in loss of precious botanical specimens. Frequently he was famished, exhausted, ill; but he persevered.

He laboured at his plant collecting under great difficulties. During the early part of the summer the almost continual rains caused the loss of many of his specimens, for in spite of oilcloths he was unable to keep his plants dry or to preserve a single bird. Before he could lie down to sleep it took an hour to dry his blanket. Sometimes he ran short of food and was so weakened by hunger and fatigue that he could only crawl.

The change from the wet climate of the lower Columbia to the dry climate of the Interior was equally distressing. A walk of 19 miles across a dry, barren plain at 97° in the shade without a drop of water caused much suffering; at night his feet burned like the hot sand, and the upper part of them was in one big blister. Nevertheless, it was here that he discovered the beautiful *Clarkia pulchella* and the gaudy mariposa lily, both of which he introduced into England.

The natives, too, were troublesome. Like children, they were very inquisitive and took up much time with questions and palaver. Their fleas were not only inquisitive, but "pestiferous" and hard to avoid. Often dependent on the Indians for food or canoes or travel directions, he learned the Chinook language. Often they were treacherous, and would steal or murder if they

thought they would not be punished. Douglas had several narrow escapes from bad-tempered or suspicious Indians.

They placed strange interpretations on the white man's inventions. When Douglas made an effervescent drink his canoemen and guides were much surprised to see him drink it "boiling," as they thought. For this, and for lighting his pipe with the sunlight and a magnifying-glass, they classed him with the bad spirits, and called him *olla-piska*, the Chinook words for fire. But beyond all their comprehension was his putting spectacles on his nose, leading them immediately to place their hands tight over their mouths in indication of fear or astonishment. Afterwards, as they came to know him better and understood his earnestness in gathering plants, shrubs, and grasses to send to England, the Indians regarded him as one of King George's chiefs and gave him the title of " The Grass Man."

Nevertheless he continued his work undaunted; he had a robust constitution and a merry heart; fresh difficulties brought forth fresh enthusiasm and determination, and few seemed insurmountable.

Difficult and exhausting as were his journeys, he was happy in the rich harvest of plants which he obtained. His expectations were fully realized. During the six months following his arrival in the country he collected about 500 different specimens (499 to be exact), obtaining as far as possible from twelve to twenty-four samples of each specimen.

All of these he carefully dried in paper brought from England for the purpose, and classified and minutely described in his diary. This work he did at Fort Vancouver during the intervals between his journeys. Some of the plants were of peculiar interest. There was the salal, some berries of which Douglas preserved in spirits for sending to England, but which were stolen at Fort Vancouver " by some evil-disposed person—for the sake of the spirits." There was the camas, an onion-like root baked by the Indians and forming a substantial item of their food. There was the musk-scented monkey flower, which quickly naturalized itself in Great Britain " and so won the hearts of the people that even our grandmothers deemed it old-fashioned,"[3] and which has been of particular interest to botanists because of

(3) F. J. Chittenden, in *Gardener's Chronicle*, London, 88 (1930), p. 457.

its loss of scent.[4] Most important of all was the collection of seeds—over a hundred varieties—which were packed in a chest by themselves. These, soon to bloom in European gardens, included the clarkia, the different species of pentstemons, lupines, œnotheras, ribeses, and a host of other ornamental plants.

Little escaped the keen observation of the young student of natural history. His attention was not confined to vegetation; specimens of birds, insects, and animals were also obtained. The fir which he called *pinus taxifolia,* but which was afterwards named after him, he found nearly everywhere. Its great height proved an obstacle to obtaining cones: his buckshot would not reach them; and the trees were too large to cut down with his hatchet. As to climbing, he had " already learned the propriety of leaving no property at the bottom of a tree." It was some time before he succeeded in getting cones. The gigantic size and compact uniformity of the tree led him to call it " one of the most striking and truly graceful objects in nature." He anticipated its future commercial value, saying:—

" The wood may be found very useful for a variety of domestic purposes; the young, slender ones exceedingly well adapted for making ladders and scaffold poles, not being liable to cast; the larger timber for more important purposes, while at the same time the rosin may be found deserving attention."[5]

After two years' painstaking labour in the Columbia River region, and a very hard journey south towards California to find the sugar-pine he returned to England. He had travelled more than 7,000 miles through what is now Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and British Columbia.

He went home by way of Hudson Bay, making the tedious overland journey with the Hudson's Bay Company's annual express, travelling up the Columbia to the head of the Big Bend and crossing the Rocky Mountains through Athabaska Pass. This introduced him to our British Columbia terrain (April 19 to May 2, 1827). The journey is described in detail in his published journals and need not be dealt with here.

The most noteworthy incident was his climb of one of the Rocky Mountains—the first peak in the Canadian Rockies of

(4) See *Gardener's Chronicle,* London, 45 (1909), p. 267; 75 (1924), p. 79; 88 (1930), pp. 259, 349, 399, 457, 520–1.

(5) David Douglas: *Journals,* 1914, appendix VIII., p. 340.

which there is any recorded climb. He named this peak Mount Brown and another one near-by he named Mount Hooker, in honour of eminent English botanists.[6] His estimates of their altitudes were excessive and led to their being prominently shown on the maps of North America as the most stupendous mountains on the continent. Their true heights were not determined until many years afterwards.

After a two years' sojourn in England, during which he was fêted and lionized for his botanical discoveries, he came back to Western America in 1830. This time he came trained and equipped for doing work quite different from that formerly undertaken.

On his previous expedition Douglas had realized that his limited education prevented him from rendering service to the geographical and physical sciences in keeping with the excellent opportunities afforded by his travels. He regretted particularly his inability to determine geographical positions. The Oregon boundary dispute remained unsettled, and an accurate record of the longitudes, latitudes, and directions of rivers and mountains which might serve as natural boundaries would be valuable from a national standpoint. Accordingly, during his stay in England he underwent a short but arduous course of study in the use of instruments for fixing geographical positions, and the methods of computing the results of observations made with them, together with the essential knowledge of plane and spherical trigonometry and of logarithms. His instructor was Captain (afterwards General Sir Edward) Sabine, Secretary of the Royal Society.

The result was that upon his return to America he added the taking of geographical and astronomical observations to his former pursuits. A year and a half was spent in California, many of whose beautiful flowers he introduced into England. He was back on the Columbia River again in 1832, and wintered there. Then followed the journey into the interior of what is now British Columbia, to which reference has already been made. His plan was to go to Fort St. James, then westward to some

(6) Robert Brown (1773–1858), first keeper of the botanical department of the British Museum; the greatest botanist of his day. William Jackson Hooker (1785–1865), famous teacher and writer on botany; first director of Kew Gardens.

of the Hudson's Bay Company's posts on the sea-coast. He hoped to make his way up the coast to the Russian headquarters in Alaska, at Sitka; then cross the Pacific to Siberia, and proceed overland across Asia and Europe back to England, thus completing a journey round the world. His purpose was to compare the vegetation and the astronomical phenomena of America with those of similar latitudes in Asia. He had conceived this ambitious plan while in England.

"What a glorious prospect," he wrote Hooker, "thus not only the plants, but a series of observations may be produced, the work of the same individual on both Continents, with the same instruments, under similar circumstances and in corresponding latitudes! I hope I do not indulge my hopes too far. . . . People tell me that Siberia is like a rat-trap, which there is no difficulty in entering, but from which it is not so easy to find egress. I mean at least to put this saying to the test. And I hope that those who know me know also that trifles will not stop me."[7]

He submitted the plan to the Russian ambassador in London, who referred it to his government. Four years later, while in California, Douglas received a letter from the Governor of Alaska, extending a warm welcome and offering a passage from Sitka to Siberia on one of the Russian naval vessels.

But while the prospects for the Russian part of the journey were encouraging, those for the journey north and west to the Russian settlements were just as discouraging. New Caledonia, as the territory now comprising the Northern Interior of British Columbia was then called, had a bad reputation among the fur-traders. The climate was (and still is) severe, the temperature sometimes reaching 55° below zero. Food was scarce, the staff of life being salmon, fresh or dried—chiefly the latter—and starvation was not unknown.[8] The trading-posts were isolated and the Indians troublesome. Altogether it was a territory to be avoided. Indeed, the fur-traders had such a dread of being sent there that they looked on it as another Botany Bay.[9]

(7) *Companion to Botanical Magazine*, II. (1836), p. 143 (reprinted in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VI. (1905), p. 223).

(8) *See* A. G. Morice: *History of the Northern Interior of British Columbia*, Toronto, 3rd edition, 1905, pp. 177–8; John McLean: *Notes of twenty-five Years Service in Hudson's Bay Territory*, London, 1849, I., p. 251; W. N. Sage: "Peter Skene Ogden's Notes on Western Caledonia," in *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, I. (1937), p. 52.

(9) John Tod: *New Caledonia*, MS., Bancroft Library, Berkeley, California, p. 52.

Another discouragement was the terrible epidemic of intermittent fever which was raging in the territory along the Columbia. Its ravages amongst the natives were awful. Whole villages were wiped out; the houses being left empty, with famished dogs howling about, while dead bodies lay strewn around in every direction. Whites as well as natives were struck down. Twenty-four of the Hudson's Bay men died; and for a time, the Company's entire business on the Columbia was tied up. Only three whites escaped it altogether, Douglas fortunately being one of that small number.

Greatest discouragement of all was his failing eyesight. Exposure to the glare of the sun on the snow while mountain-climbing, and to sun glare on the burning sands of the Interior and California, had seriously affected the sight of both eyes—that of the right eye being gone almost entirely. Such had been his devotion to science that he had become half blind at the age of 33.

But again his determination brushed aside his discouragements; he decided to make a start and go as far as he could, even though he was forced to return. Leaving Fort Vancouver on the 20th of March, 1833, he travelled with the express as far as Fort Okanagan. From here the journey was over territory new to him. Horses were used to ascend the Okanagan Valley —along the east side of the river, and the west side of the lake.[10] From the head of Okanagan Lake they crossed over to the junction of the Thompson and North Thompson rivers at Fort Kamloops, or Thompson's River Post, as it often was called. Here the horses were changed and the journey continued along the north shore of Kamloops Lake, up the Bonaparte River[11] to Green Lake and Horse Lake, and then northwesterly along the general route of the present Cariboo Road via Lac la Hache and

(10) The name now is spelt *Okanogan* in the United States; *Okanagan* in Canada. It has the distinction of having been spelt in no less than forty-five different ways. *See* L. Norris: "*Some Place Names*," in *Sixth Report*, Okanagan Historical Society, Vancouver, B.C., 1935, pp. 133–6; W. I. Symons: *Report on Upper Columbia River*, Washington, D. C., 1882, p. 130.

(11) Later, the fur brigade route was up Deadman's Creek.

Williams Lake to the Fraser River.[12] The east bank of the Fraser was then followed to Fort Alexandria,[13] where the horses were left. Boats were taken for the remainder of the journey up the Fraser, Nechako, and Stuart rivers to Fort St. James on Stuart Lake, although frequently a portage was used by the fur-traders for the last portion of the journey between Fraser Lake and Stuart Lake.[14]

Although Douglas began the journey with some trepidation he was well provided as to equipment; and in this there was marked difference from his expeditions of earlier years. For food he had rice and biscuit, with tea, coffee, and sugar, and even a gallon of wine. He had a small tent, and his clothing included a straw hat, a pair of deer-skin trousers, and twelve pairs of moccasins, as well as two pairs of shoes. As presents for the Indians he took a supply of Irish roll tobacco, scalping knives, beads, coat buttons, and hair ribbon.[15] Moreover, he went well attended. According to a letter which he wrote to Dr. Hooker, there were

> my faithful servants, several Indians, ten or twelve horses, and my old terrier, a most faithful and now, to judge from his long gray beard, venerable friend, who has guarded me throughout all my journies, and whom, should I live to return, I mean certainly to pension off on four pennyworth of cat's-meat per day.[16]

---

(12) Later, an alternative route went up the North Thompson to Mount Olie, then westerly along the shores of Lac des Roches and Bridge, Sheridan, and Horse Lakes to Lac la Hache, where it joined the old trail.

(13) Fort Alexandria afterwards was moved to the west side of the Fraser. Morice, *op. cit.*, p. 194.

(14) On the route in general *see* F. M. Buckland: "The Hudson's Bay Brigade Trail," in *Sixth Report*, Okanagan Historical Society, Vancouver, B.C., 1935, pp. 13–4; McLean, *op. cit.*, I., p. 307; A. C. Anderson: *History of the Northwest Coast*, MS., Bancroft Library, pp. 4, 42–4; George Barnston: "Abridged Sketch of the life of Mr. David Douglas, Botanist, with a few Details of his travels and discoveries," *Canadian Naturalist and Geologist*, Montreal, V. (1860), pp. 277–8; F. W. Howay: "British Columbia Brigade Trails," in *The Beaver*, Winnipeg, Outfit 269, No. 1 (June, 1938), p. 50.

(15.) Transfer Book B 239 CC2, 1831–5, Hudson's Bay Company's Archives, London, fol. 897–901.

(16) *Companion to Botanical Magazine*, II. (1836), p. 158 (reprinted in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VI. (1905), p. 306).

As his personal servant he had William Johnson, an employee of the Company, who afterwards became the first permanent settler on the site of the City of Portland, Oregon.[17]

After a few days at Fort Okanagan, the horse journey with the New Caledonia brigade was begun. They travelled slowly, and Douglas was able to botanize and take astronomical observations and fix geographical positions along the way. Regularly during the whole of the journey he never allowed twelve hours to pass without taking an observation of the sun or stars. A list of the positions is given at the end of this article, together with the modern positions furnished by Major G. G. Aitken, Chief Geographer for British Columbia, as far as he has been able to identify Douglas's observation points. Major Aitken tells me that,

> speaking generally, the Douglas latitude observations are exceedingly good, considering the instruments and difficulties he had. Naturally, the longitude observations are not so close; although, speaking generally, they are surprisingly near the present-day positions we have.

Douglas also undertook the making of field-sketches along the route and did a continuous series of the country travelled from Fort Okanagan to the Quesnel River, showing the natural configuration, with notes on trees, vegetation, and soil. I succeeded in finding Douglas's note-book containing these sketches in England in 1938, and it has since been deposited in the British Columbia Archives.

Fort Kamloops, established by the Astorians in 1812, was the half-way house of the northward journey, and here the horses were changed for new ones. During the few days' stay, Douglas had a very serious altercation with Chief Trader Samuel Black, who was in charge of the Post. The incident is related by the historian, H. H. Bancroft, in his *History of the North West Coast,*[18] as follows:—

> For one who had received from the Hudson's Bay Company nothing but kindness, David Douglas was somewhat free with his comments. He did not like to see that powerful organization which was so ready at all times to sacrifice human life on the altar of their own avarice, so cold and selfishly indifferent outside of their money-making to anything affecting the weal or

(17) George B. Roberts: *Recollections*, MS., Bancroft Library, p. 11; Henry E. Reed: "William Johnson," *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, Portland, XXXIV. (1933), pp. 314–23.

(18) San Francisco, 1884, II., pp. 510–511.

woe of their fellow-creatures. And the shaggy Scotchman was not afraid to tell them so.

Samuel Black was then in command of Fort Kamloops, and thither David Douglas in his wanderings repaired. While enjoying the lonely hospitality of his brother Scot, and discussing the affairs of the company, Douglas, who was more fiery than politic, exclaimed: "The Hudson's Bay Company is simply a mercenary corporation; there is not an officer in it with a soul above a beaver-skin."

Black was up in arms in a moment. He informed his guest that he was a sneaking reprobate, and challenged him to fight. As it was then dark the duel was postponed until next day. Bright and early in the morning Black tapped at the pierced parchment which served as a window to the guest-chamber, and cried out, "Misther Dooglas! are ye ready?" But the man of flowers declined the winning invitation, and saved his life only to yield it not long after in that luckless wild-cattle pit. Black was formerly of the Northwest Company, and on the coalition was presented a ring on which was engraved: "To the most worthy of the worthy Northwesters."

Though a fur-trader he was not at all indifferent to science, being therein an exception to the fur-worshippers so scourged by Douglas. Black was an educated man of no small attainments, geology and geography being specially interesting to him. At all events he managed to command the respect of his associates, if not by his learning, then by his enormous stature, his powerful swing of limbs, and his slow, sonorous and imposing speech. His death was no less sad than that of David Douglas; indeed, many a brave man went hence from this quarter for whose profitless taking off the angels never gave adequate excuse. Samuel Black was killed by an Indian boy for having charmed away the life of his uncle.

Black was a man of great physical and mental ability—he was a brother of Dr. Black, editor of the London *Morning Chronicle*[19] —and being used to having his own way, even though he had to fight for it, he had a stormy career.[20] The fur-traders were not accustomed to criticisms by visitors (Douglas was the first man other than a fur-trader or an Indian to travel through the country) and it is easy to imagine how his criticisms nettled a man of Black's temperament.

Leaving Fort Kamloops the brigade went on to Fort Alexandria, where the horses were changed for boats. Douglas, however, evidently continued on horseback or afoot to a point a little beyond the Quesnel River, where his field-sketches cease. The strong steady current of the upper Fraser was a severe obstacle to the loaded boats and necessitated the constant use

(19) Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

(20) *See* J. N. Wallace: "The Explorer of Finlay River in 1824," in *Canadian Historical Review*, Toronto, IX. (1928), p. 25.

of the pole and tracking-line.[21] The journey was also up-stream on the Nechako and Stuart rivers. Douglas went up the Nechako to Fort Fraser, on Fraser Lake, and probably went overland from there to Fort St. James, where he arrived about June 6. Here he was the guest of Chief Factor Peter Warren Dease, the Company's superintendent in New Caledonia, and one of the kindest and most considerate of men.[22]

But Fort St. James was a disappointment; not in itself, but in the unfavourable conditions for continuing his journey. He found that a party was preparing to leave on an exploring expedition down Simpson's (now the Skeena) River, and at first was disposed to accompany them. However, as it was doubtful whether and when they would reach the sea or any Company post there, he decided not to go with them. He had come an arduous 1,150 miles from Fort Vancouver on what he hoped was his way home to England. He now found himself in the wilds of New Caledonia, about 500 miles from the nearest Hudson's Bay post on the sea-coast (Fort Simpson, at the mouth of the Nass River), with another 300 miles to the Russian headquarters at Sitka. To reach there meant weeks, if not months, of travel through new country, along little known rivers and waterways and over difficult portages. Moreover, the natives were hostile, especially towards the coast, where they were too plentifully supplied with liquor by American trading vessels.[23]

For once his determined spirit was beaten. Reluctantly he abandoned his plan of travelling home by Siberia, and decided to return to the Columbia. Accordingly, after a very brief stay at Fort St. James, during which he took some observations, he and Johnson embarked in a small birch-bark canoe and descended the Stuart and Nechako rivers. At Fort George they stayed a day or two with George Linton, clerk in charge there, and then began descending the Fraser.

And now disaster was added to disappointment. On June 13, at the " Stony Islands," as he called them, they were wrecked in the rapids; the canoe was smashed to pieces, and they barely

(21) Anderson, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

(22) McLean, *op. cit.*, I., pp. 244, 249.

(23) *See* Frederick Merk: *Fur Trade and Empire; George Simpson's Journal*, 1824–5, Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1931, pp. 301, 309, 311, 314; Bancroft, *op. cit.*, II., pp. 623, 693.

escaped with their lives. Douglas was carried down the rapids and into the whirlpool below, and he was swept about in the turbulent waters for an hour and forty minutes, before being washed on to the rocky shore. He lost everything he had except his instruments, his astronomical journal, notes and charts, and his barometrical observations. Food and blankets—all were lost; also botanical notes, and a collection of about 400 species of plants, 250 of which were mosses, some of them new. What concerned him most was the loss of his diary, which he had been writing daily for Hooker, and which could not be replaced.[24]

Two years ago, after considerable inquiry, I succeeded in finding the exact spot where Douglas was wrecked. His " Stony Islands " are small rocky islets in what now is known as Fort George Canyon, between Quesnel and Prince George.

Fort George Canyon, it may be noted, is a notoriously dangerous place and many persons have lost their lives there. Soon after Douglas's misadventure, Linton himself, with his wife and three children and three other persons, the entire party, were drowned between Fort George and Fort Alexandria—probably at this spot.[25] Before steamboats could pass through it the Canadian Government had to blast out a channel. Even as late as the year 1937, two visitors from California who were descending in a small boat were wrecked there and nearly drowned, losing practically everything—an experience similar to that of Douglas and Johnson more than a hundred years before.

Making their way as best they could back to Fort George, Douglas and Johnson obtained another canoe from Linton[26] and this time descended the Fraser safely to Fort Alexandria, where they obtained horses and proceeded on to Fort Kamloops and Fort Okanagan by the same route as they had come. There is no record of any further quarrel at Kamloops. After his recent hardships, Douglas no doubt appreciated better the rude comforts afforded by the Company's posts, and was not in the mood for criticism; while Black probably was pleased at the turn of

(24) On this disaster *see* the letter, David Douglas to W. E. P. Hartnell, November 11, 1833, in *Madrono* (Journal of California Botanical Society), Berkeley, II. (1933), p. 98.

(25) Archibald McDonald, letter to W. J. Hooker, April 15, 1836, MS., Kew Gardens; Morice, *op. cit.*, p. 193.

(26) *Ibid.*

events or else inclined to pity. Getting two Indian canoes at Okanagan, they descended the Columbia to Fort Walla Walla, where Douglas stayed some days. He again visited the Blue Mountains and botanized more sedulously than ever, to try to make up for his recent heavy losses.

He returned to Fort Vancouver in August, worn out in body and broken in spirit. The hopes for the journey home by Siberia which he had been building up for years had been shattered in the first stage of the journey; and following that came the river disaster. He had suffered severely from hunger and exposure, and had been faced with " indeed, nearly utter starvation."[27]

" I cannot detail to you," he wrote Hooker, " the labour and anxiety this occasioned me, both in body and mind, to say nothing of the hardships and sufferings I endured. Still I reflect, with pleasure, that no lives were sacrificed. - - - This disastrous occurrence has much broken my strength and spirits."[28]

Then, too, besides the loss of his collections, journals, and other belongings, he had lost four months of the best part of the year for travel. Yet despite his cruel experiences he blamed no one.

Such are the not unfrequent disasters attending such undertakings. On the whole I have been fortunate, for considering the nature and extent of the Country I have passed over (now 8 years here) and the circumstances under which I travelled my accidents have been few.[29]

Nor had he any harsh feelings against New Caledonia. Instead, he uttered an encouraging note of prophecy as to its future, saying:—

The interior, north of the Columbia, for the space of nearly 4° of latitude and 7° of Longitude, is a beautiful and varied country; the soil is generally fertile; and even to a much higher Latitude it is well worth looking after.[30]

Another remark:—

The country over which I passed was all mountainous, but most so towards the Western Ocean—still it will, ere long, be inhabited.[31]

---

(27) Douglas to Hartnell, November 11, 1833. *See* note 24, *supra.*

(28) *Companion to Botanical Magazine*, II. (1836), p. 159 (reprinted in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VI. (1905), p. 308).

(29) David Douglas, letter to W. F. Tolmie, September 25, 1833, MS., British Columbia Archives, Victoria.

(30) Sabine, *Report on Douglas' Observations*, p. 12.

(31) *Companion to Botanical Magazine*, II. (1836), p. 159 (reprinted in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VI. (1905), p. 308).

One noteworthy incident of his journey Douglas failed to record—an incident which was an augury of the country's future. It is said that on the shore of Okanagan Lake Douglas found enough gold to make a seal.[32] Just where or when is not stated; but the only occasions on which he visited the lake were on his journey to Fort St. James and back, his route being along the west side. Probably the discovery was made at the mouth of some creek entering the lake.[33] In later years placer-mining has been carried on with more or less success at several places in the region. On Naswhito (Siwash) Creek, operations antedate the settlement of the Okanagan Valley,[34] and it may have been there that Douglas found his gold.[35]

Still another mineral discovery is credited to Douglas: not gold this time, but a great deposit of carbonate of lead, galena, and copper situate on the east shore of Kootenay Lake, in British Columbia, and now known as the Bluebell Mine. The story has been told often, and apparently is taken from a report made in 1887 by G. M. Dawson, Director of the Geological Survey of Canada, which states that the ores "are said to have been discovered by the botanist Douglas in 1825."[36] One writer has amplified the story by adding that Douglas "sent a specimen or

(32) W. C. Grant: "Remarks on Vancouver Island," in *Journal of the Royal Geographic Society*, London, XXXI. (1861), p. 213.

(33) *See* T. A. Rickard: "Indian Participation in the Gold Discoveries," *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, II. (1938), p. 5.

(34) Canada, Geological Survey, *Report*, 1931, p. 73A.

(35) Douglas's name is also linked with the discovery of gold in California; for it seems that one of the tales he told upon his return to the Columbia River was that he had found enough gold about the roots of plants in California to make a watch seal (Roberts, *Recollections*, MS., Bancroft Library, p. 11). He does not seem to have written home about it at the time, probably because he did not deem it of sufficient importance. Furthermore, after news of the great discovery in California in 1848 reached England, some one remembered that the roots of some of the pines sent home from California by Douglas in 1831 were found to have small flakes of gold held together in the clotted earth still attached to them. And there was a tendency to blame the early botanists for being so engrossed with the flora and fauna that "they had not an eye to the main chance and saw no gold." (*Quarterly Review*, London, 87 (1850), p. 416.) But neither did those whose business it was to see it: Fremont, the American explorer, and Dana, the skilled mineralogist and geologist of the Wilkes expedition, who even made a geological report on California. (*Ibid.*, pp. 417–418.)

(36) Canada, Geological Survey, *Report*, 1887, p. 62R.

two of the glittering ore home with his report. In 1831 these and other samples were assayed and their low grade established."[37]

How the story and its amplifications originated is a mystery, for Douglas never was on any part of the shore of Kootenay Lake. His carefully written journal, with its daily entries and a detailed list of his travels during 1825–27, makes no mention of it, and, in fact, leaves no room for it. Nor is it shown on the map of his route in Hooker's *Flora Boreali Americana.* On his return to the Columbia in 1830 he went only as far as Fort Walla Walla and the Blue Mountains; while in 1832–33 his travels were on the lower Columbia, and to Puget Sound, New Caledonia, and again to Walla Walla and the Blue Mountains.

Except for his overland journey to Hudson Bay in 1827, in the course of which he passed the mouth of the Kootenay (or McGillivray's) River,[38] his nearest approach to Kootenay Lake was at Kettle Falls (Fort Colvile). He was there three times in 1826, spending altogether seven weeks, and on one occasion walked 20 miles up the Columbia and back. That was the closest he got to Kootenay Lake.

However, while at Kettle Falls he may well have heard of the great ore deposit. No doubt it was known to the Indians. They afterwards called it Chicamen (metal) Mountain,[39] and ore was used by them and by the Hudson's Bay men for making bullets.[40] Douglas was known to be interested in minerals as well as plants, as he was collecting rocks from various places along the Columbia, and he would almost certainly be told about it. Kittson, his travelling companion, himself had been up the Kootenay River during the previous summer.[41] Possibly he was Douglas's informant.

---

(37) W. A. Baillie-Grohman: *Sport and Life in the Hunting Grounds of Western America,* London, 1900, p. 232. The writer has searched diligently and written many letters of inquiry in an effort to find where Dawson and Baillie-Grohman secured their information, but without success. Possibly there is something hidden away in some old book or scientific journal which search has not yet brought to light.

(38) Douglas, *Journals,* 1914, p. 249.

(39) R. E. Gosnell, in *Vancouver Daily Province,* November 21, 1908.

(40) Canada, Geological Survey, *Summary Report,* 1928, Part A, p. 129A; British Columbia, *Sessional Papers,* Victoria, 1909, p. J 95.

(41) See *Washington Historical Quarterly,* 5 (1914), pp. 177–8; 186–7.

Douglas carried his collection of rocks all the way home to England, and presented them to the Geological Society of London. The collections of this society were transferred to the British Museum (Natural History) in 1911, but Douglas's specimens were not amongst them. No trace of them can be found at either place, although the museum has the list of them written by Douglas. This list does not mention any from Kootenay Lake.

To add the climax to Douglas's troubles, the intermittent fever seized him. However, he fought it off, and " being something of a leech, had an early recovery, and recruited perfectly by following his wonted healthful perambulations."[42]

The season of 1833 was an unhappy and unfortunate one for him: everything seemed to have gone wrong. Nor did Northwest America look promising to him for the immediate future. The fever epidemic continued. Travel northward along the coast was unsafe, not only on that account, but also on account of the hostility of the natives. He therefore gave up entirely his idea of the Alaskan-Siberian journey.

The Sandwich Islands beckoned him—those tropical islands whose enchanting beauty and opportunities for botanical and astronomical observations had drawn him more and more strongly whenever he visited there. Instead of going home by Siberia he decided to go by the Islands; so on October 18, 1833, he left the Columbia, as it turned out, for the last time: " A land where his discoveries had furnished him frequently with the brightest moments of the purest joy, and where also his losses had caused him days of the most poignant sorrow and regret."[43]

While Douglas was away on his New Caledonian journey, two interesting persons arrived at Fort Vancouver from England: Doctors Meredith Gairdner and William Fraser Tolmie, two more of Hooker's students, who, upon his recommendation, had been sent out by the Hudson's Bay Company to help Dr. McLoughlin, the Company's head officer in the Northwest, in combating the fever epidemic. Gairdner brought Douglas a long letter from

(42) Barnston, *op. cit.*, p. 214, from which it appears that the illness was in 1830. However Douglas's letter to Hooker of April 9, 1833, states he has escaped the disease so far.

(43) Barnston, *op. cit.*, p. 329.

Hooker, and upon Douglas's return from the north the two young men spent much time in discussing matters of mutual interest. Tolmie, who was one of Hooker's most zealous botanical students, had brought with him some acacia seeds, which he planted at Fort Vancouver. Some of the trees are still standing. Later, Dr. Tolmie took some of their seeds to Victoria, on Vancouver Island, and from them grew the beautiful trees now at the old Tolmie homestead. Dr. Tolmie had been sent to Fort Nisqually before Douglas returned from New Caledonia, but Douglas wrote him indicating the most favourable fields for botanizing and urging his attention to seaweeds.[44]

Douglas looked on Gairdner and Tolmie as his successors on the Columbia. Writing to Hooker regarding his recent misfortunes, he says:—

It reconciles me somewhat to the loss, to reflect that you now have friends in that country, who will probably make up the deficiency. I have given Dr. Gairdner my notes on some more new species of Pinus. This gentleman and Mr. Tolmie will have a good deal to contend with. Science has few friends among those who visit the coast of North-West America, solely with a view to gain. Still with such a person as Mr. McLoughlin on the Columbia, they may do a great deal of service to Natural History.[45]

Again his prophecy proved true: both men did render a great deal of service to natural history, in spite of their multifarious duties and in spite of the early death of Gairdner, who survived Douglas by only three years.

Gairdner's situation at Fort Vancouver turned out to be quite different from what he had been led to expect. Besides the duties of medical officer, those of Indian trader were allotted to him, so that he had little or no leisure to devote to natural history pursuits. He complained bitterly of the close confinement to the Company's service, saying: "Scientific researches are quite out of the question in their service however liberal they may be in encouraging them in persons unconnected with them." The former part of this remark confirms the sizzling criticism Douglas offered Samuel Black at Kamloops. The latter part shows envy of Douglas's freedom, as also does another remark: "The true method of examining this country is to follow the plan

(44) Letter, Douglas to Tolmie, September 25, 1833, MS., British Columbia Archives, Victoria.

(45) *Companion to Botanical Magazine*, II. (1836), p. 160 (reprinted in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VI. (1905), p. 309).

of Douglas, whether with the view of investigating the geognostic, botanical or zoological riches of the country."

Gairdner brooded over his disappointment so much that it affected his health; he began to have hæmorrhages from the lungs—symptoms of tuberculosis. Temporary benefit was obtained from a visit to the Interior and from bleeding himself by opening veins in his arms, but the disease continued. As a last resort he got leave to visit the Sandwich Islands, hoping their equable climate would arrest the disease. But it was in vain; he died there in 1836.[46]

Tolmie was more fortunate, being sent to outlying posts where he had leisure for botanical and other pursuits. His complaint was of loneliness and monotony of trading-post life in the *pays du sauvage;* but his rugged constitution and philosophical nature enabled him to survive and to attain prominent positions in the Hudson's Bay Company and in Vancouver Island, where he afterwards lived for many years.[47] The late Premier of British Columbia, Dr. Simon Fraser Tolmie, was his son.

The last months of Douglas's life were spent in the Sandwich Islands. He arrived in Honolulu in December, 1833, and spent the next few months in exploring the island of Hawaii. He collected a large number of ferns. The two great volcanic peaks attracted him and he climbed both, being the first white man to do so. As usual, he endured terrible hardships.

In August, 1834, while crossing the island alone with his dog he fell into a pit used for trapping wild cattle, and was gored to death. Some say he was pushed in, and in this way murdered for his money. Whichever it was, it was a horrible death, and an untimely one, for he was only 34 years old.

Douglas was a votary of science. From the long, hard days of his youth as a garden boy, his whole life was devoted to scientific pursuits. Strong, enthusiastic, self-reliant, and resourceful, he faced dangers, overcame difficulties, endured hardships, and

---

(46) *See* A. G. Harvey: "Chief Concomly's Skull," *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, Portland, XL. (1939), pp. 161–7.

(47) Bancroft: *op. cit.*, II. pp. 615–6; Dorothy O. Johansen: "William Fraser Tolmie, "*The Beaver*, Outfit 268, No. 2 (September, 1937), p. 29; William Fraser Tolmie: *Journal*, MS., British Columbia Archives, Victoria —partially published in *Washington Historical Quarterly*, Seattle, I. (1906), pp. 77–81, III. (1912), pp. 229–41, XXIII. (1932), pp. 205–27.

made sacrifices such as have been the experience of few men. Over and over again he had driven his body beyond the safe limit of human endurance. He became racked with rheumatism, his eyesight was seriously impaired, and his mind confused. So he met his end. His work was done. His devotion to science was so great that he prematurely wore himself out in its service.

As the pioneer botanist of North-west America and California, Douglas made their flora known to the world. The number of plants which he introduced to England in the form of root, seed, or cutting is remarkable. Other collectors have contributed more to botanical knowledge or made more extensive collections, but none has contributed more to our stock of beautiful and hardy plants than he. A list of them published by the Royal Horticultural Society shows 254. " There is scarcely a spot deserving the name of a garden, either in Europe or the United States, in which some of the discoveries of Douglas do not form the chief attraction," says an English admirer; " To no single individual is modern horticulture more indebted than to David Douglas."[48] Hardly a garden exists that does not contain the clarkia, mariposa lily, California poppy, or some of the lupines, phlox, pentstemons, mimulus, or others of his beautiful flowers.

Towering over all is the great tree, the Douglas fir, and it is for introducing this that he is chiefly remembered. From 1827 (the year Douglas returned to England from North-west America), when John Lindley, Assistant Secretary of the Horticultural Society, received two planks, each about 20 feet long, to test its durability[49]—one wonders whether Douglas had anything to do with it—it has come to be the world's greatest structural timber. Growing over a great range of territory and thriving under diverse conditions, it is the most important tree in the American lumber trade.

Outstanding also as an ornament, this "King of the Conifers" is a favourite with garden lovers and tree planters. It has been introduced into gardens and estates wherever climatic conditions permit its growth. Nowhere, outside its original habitat, has it grown to greater perfection than in Douglas's native county of

(48) An unnamed writer, quoted by Neville Cooper, in *Gardener's Chronicle*, London, September 25, 1926.

(49) *See* R. C. Mayne: *Four Years in British Columbia and Vancouver Island*, London, 1862, p. 409.

Perthshire, where it is deservedly popular. The Earl of Mansfield, at Scone, his old employer, was one of the earliest planters, and to-day in the palace grounds near Douglas's birthplace may be seen a sturdy Douglas fir raised from the first seeds brought home by him in 1827.

It is also distinguished for the large number of names, scientific and common, by which it is or has been called—more than any other American tree. Oregon pine, red pine, Puget Sound pine, Oregon spruce, red spruce, Douglas spruce, red fir, yellow fir, Oregon fir, spruce fir, are some of the common names. Scientists have fought over the name more than lumbermen or laymen. The name given by Lambert in his great work on pine trees, *The Genus Pinus*, 2nd edition, 1832, *Pinus Douglasii*, came to be *Pseudotsuga Douglasii* (Carriere), and that is the name in general use in Great Britain. However, according to the code of the International Botanical Conference of 1905, and subsequent conferences, the name is *Pseudotsuga taxifolia* (Lambert) Britton; and this is the scientific name officially recognized in Canada and becoming generally adopted in the United States.[50]

So, wherever we go, whether to his Scottish birthplace, or whether to the wilds of Hawaii half-way round the world where he was killed, or whether to some forest, field, or garden somewhere in between, we may find trees and plants that David Douglas made known to the world. By them let him be remembered.

A. G. HARVEY.

VANCOUVER, B.C.

(50) John Davidson: *Conifers of British Columbia*, London, 1927, pp. 39–40; E. H. Finlayson: *Native Trees of Canada* (Forest Service Bulletin 61), Ottawa, 1933, pp. 6, 61; *Journal*, Royal Horticultural Society, London, XIV. (1892), pp. v., 12–3, 245.

APPENDIX A.

COMPARATIVE GEOGRAPHICAL POSITIONS, AS DETERMINED BY DAVID DOUGLAS IN 1833 AND BY MODERN OBSERVATIONS.

Place of Observation.	DAVID DOUGLAS.		MODERN POSITION.		Remarks.
	Latitude.	Longitude.	Latitude.	Longitude.	
Jct.: Columbia and Okanagan Rivers	48–05–10	119–27–25	48–05–45	119–44–40	
E. Bank ¾ mile below 1st tributary to Okanagan	48–21–21	.....	48–20–50	.....	Assumed ¾ mile below Salmon Creek
Okanagan Jct. of trib. on W. bank	49–09–36	.....	49–08–57	.....	Assumed jct. of Reed Cr.
„ Jct.: Beaver River	49–30–45	.....	49–28–52	.....	Jct. of Shingle Creek.
„ Lake Jct. Bear R.	49–55–47	.....	49–55–37	.....	Jct. of Lambly Creek.
„ „ Jct. River La Biche	50–07–32	119–19–30	50–08–05	119–29–36	Assumed jct. of Shorts. Cr.
„ „ at creek at head of Lake	50–20–48	119–09–00	50–21–09	119–19–09	
Jct. Thompson and N. Thompson Rivers	50–41–15	120–11–30	50–40–53	120–20–19	
Thompson River Jct. of Knipe R.	50–49–36	.....	50–49–50	.....	Assumed Knipe R.–Dairy Cr.
Western extremity Johnson's Lake	51–04–09	.....	51–10–18	.....	Identification doubtful.
1 mile W. of W. extremity Horse L.	51–36–08	123–38–48	51–36–10	121–13–02	
E. Bank Fraser R. opp. small rocky island	52–14–57	.....	52–15–03	.....	Approx. at N.W. 4728 Whisky Cr. *See* F.B. 4503/13 P.H. 38. Cariboo.
Fort Alexandria	52–32–45	122–28–52	52–33–37	122–28–50	Situated within Lot 46.
Jct. Fraser River Quesnel R. E. bank	52–58–15	122–31–18	52–58–12	122–29–50	
Hudson's Bay House Fraser Lake	54–03–28	124–39–55	54–05–15	124–36–40	Doubtful as to whether present site identical with Douglas's. Approx. 20 chs. N. of N.W.
Hudson's Bay House Stuart Lake	54–26–46	124–19–52	54–26–34	124–15–20	I.R. No. 1 fixed by S.B.M. control.
Fort George Jct. Nasetley and Fraser River	53–55–02	122–45–00	53–54–46	122–42–50	Assumed jct. Fraser and Nechako, centre of bridge. *See* R.M. 22A.
Fraser R. foot of Rocky Islands	53–40–58	.....	53–40–47	.....	Vicinity Fort George Canyon.

APPENDIX B.

DOUGLAS'S ITINERARY.

1833.	Going.
March 20	Left Fort Vancouver.
April 13–7	Fort Okanagan.
April 25	Head of Okanagan Lake.
Ap. 28–May 1	Fort Kamloops.
May 11–8	Fort Alexandria.
May 20	Quesnel River.
June 2–4	Fort Fraser.
June 7–9	Fort St. James.
	Returning.
June 12	Fort George.
June 23	Fort Alexandria.
July 11	Fort Okanagan.
July 15–25	Fort Walla Walla and Blue Mountains.
August 7	Fort Vancouver.

THE DISCOVERY OF THE FRASER RIVER: THE SECOND PHASE.

At first blush it may appear like threshing the straw to offer anything on the discovery of the Fraser River. Every schoolboy, to use Macaulay's oft-quoted expression, knows that in 1793 Sir Alexander Mackenzie found its headwaters and traced its course as far as Alexandria, and that Simon Fraser in 1808 explored it to the mouth of the North Arm. But the story of the discovery of its main channel—the approach to the mouth of the Fraser River by water—is one not so generally known. It is the purpose of this article to set forth in detail (and, where possible, in the words of the actors) the steps by which that end was accomplished.

From 1792 to 1794 Captain George Vancouver was engaged in the exploration of the mainland coast-line from the Strait of Juan de Fuca northward to ascertain if there existed any navigable channel either to the Atlantic Ocean or reaching far inland. In June, 1792, he passed the mouth of the Fraser River three times: twice in his boats and once in the *Discovery*. It is frequently asserted that he did not see it, and he is sometimes criticized by arm-chair explorers for this alleged failure. It must be remembered, first of all, that in his instructions he was told that his work was to be carried on " without too minute and particular an examination of the detail of the different parts of the coast laid down by it ";[1] and, secondly, that he was to seek arms of the sea leading to the eastward; thirdly let us see what he actually wrote. On June 13, as he, in his boats, approached Point Grey, the position of which he fixed as being seven leagues from Point Roberts, he said:—

The intermediate space is occupied by very low land, apparently a swampy flat, that retires several miles, before the country rises to meet the rugged snowy mountains, which we found still continuing in a direction nearly along the coast. This low flat being very much inundated, and extending behind point Roberts, to join the low land in the bay to the eastward of that point; gives its high land, when seen at a distance, the appearance of an island:

(1) George Vancouver, *A Voyage of Discovery to the North Pacific Ocean*, London, 1801, I., Introduction, p. 65.

this, however, is not the case, notwithstanding there are two openings between this point and point Grey. These can only be navigable for canoes, as the shoal continues along the coast to the distance of seven or eight miles from the shore, on which were lodged, and especially before these openings, logs of wood, and stumps of trees innumerable.[2]

Menzies, the Scottish botanist who was with the expedition but did not accompany the boats, reports that they

met with an extensive shoal laying along shore the outer edge of which they pursued for about 15 miles in a North West direction & found it much indented with small Spits; its greatest extent from the Shore was about 3 leagues & the land behind was low & woody; in two places they saw the appearance of large Rivers or Inlets but could not approach them even in the Boats.[3]

Neither Bell, in *A New Vancouver Journal*,[4] nor Manby, in his manuscript account of Vancouver's voyage, makes any reference to the matter.

At almost the same time the Spanish expedition of the *Sutil* and *Mexicana*, under Galiano and Valdes, was in these waters. These commanders were particularly interested in the discovery of the Fraser River, for in the preceding year a Spanish officer, Eliza, had seen Point Roberts and Point Grey, and regarded them as islands lying in the mouth of Floridablanca (Fraser River). They had searched for the canal or river, whichever it might be, trying to find its mouth by way of Boundary Bay. This effort proving futile, they had rounded Point Roberts, having difficulty with the Sandheads and noticing the discoloured water, as Vancouver had done, and they had sailed across the Strait of Georgia, eventually reaching the vicinity of Nanaimo.

On June 19 they recrossed the Strait of Georgia to examine the mysterious Floridablanca Canal. In the night they collided with a large, drifting tree, brought down by the freshet then running, and early the next morning they reached Point Grey and anchored in 2½ fathoms. The Indians from the village on the south-west side of the point came out to meet them and traded a canoe and some salmon. The current ran, at this time, 4½ miles an hour, and was supposed to be more rapid in the so-called canal, inside the point.

---

(2) *Ibid.*, II., pp. 188–189.

(3) *Menzies' Journal of Vancouver's Voyage*, edited by C. F. Newcombe, Victoria, 1923, p. 60.

(4) In *Washington Historical Quarterly*, V. and VI. (1914–15).

"We were now," say they, "in almost fresh water, and we saw floating thick logs; these indications confirming our idea that the mouth that we called Floridablanca was that of a river of great volume."[5]

The vessels soon shifted their position and finding the depth of water very changeable: 70 fathoms, then 25 fathoms, and finally shallowing to 10 fathoms, they cast anchor near Spanish Bank in English Bay. The Indians tried to induce them to enter the North Arm, promising them refreshments, but for some reason the Spaniards did not comply. That ended the Spanish effort to solve the mystery of Floridablanca. Thus, for the second time the Fraser River "was nigh found but was not, for reasons which are said or sung."

While they lay at anchor, on June 22, Captain George Vancouver, returning in his boats from Jervis Inlet, saw them and came on board. The commanders compared the maps of their discoveries, and, says Vancouver:—

. . . They seemed much surprized that we had not found a river said to exist in the region we had been exploring, and named by one of their officers Rio Blancho, in compliment to the then prime minister of Spain; which river these gentlemen had sought for thus far to no purpose.[6]

Sixteen years later Simon Fraser arrived at Musqueam, near Point Grey, the terminus of his exploration of the river whose mouth had evaded both Vancouver and the Spaniards. He had come from the interior, and had a dream of crossing the Strait of Georgia in the hope of reaching the "sea coast," but the hostility of the Indians prevented him from putting the plan into execution. After Fraser's departure no European was near the mouth of the baffling river until 1824. In that year James McMillan, under instructions from the Hudson's Bay Company, led an expedition from Astoria to the Nicomekl River, ascended that river, crossed overland to the Salmon River, dragging his boats with him, descended the Salmon, and reached the Fraser, which he called the "Coweechin" River, near the present Fort Langley. After two days spent in examining the river with an eye to the location of a trading-post, McMillan and his party, on December 19, 1824, began their return journey. They descended

(5) *Viage hecho por las Goletas Sutil y Mexicana*, Madrid, 1801, p. 65. Quoted from a translation kindly made for me by V. D. Webb, Esq. See also *A Spanish Voyage to the North-West Coast of America*, London, 1930, p. 54.

(6) Vancouver, *Voyage of Discovery*, II., p. 212.

the Fraser, but when they reached the site of New Westminster instead of taking the North Arm, as Fraser had done, they chose the South Arm and passed out of the river by the main channel. John Work, whose journal of the expedition is in the Provincial Archives, says:—

There were two other channels on the south side and a large one supposed to be on the N. side. The channel through which we came was sounded in several places towards its discharge and found to be from 7 to 3½ fathoms about high water.[7]

From the main channel McMillan and his men rowed along the edge of the Sandheads, called by Vancouver "Sturgeon bank," 12 miles to Point Roberts, and we follow no farther the first European that passed out of the Fraser. In his report on the expedition, McMillan calls the river "Frazer's" stating that, though called by the natives "Cowitchens," it was without doubt that explored by Messrs. "Frazer and Stewart," as one of his party who had been with those explorers identified and described several parts of it. McMillan describes it as "a fine large River emptying itself by various channels, but in none of which do I conceive there is a draft of Water for a Vessel exceeding 150 to 200 tons burthen."[8]

As McMillan's expedition was connected with the plan of the Hudson's Bay Company to establish a trading-post on Fraser River that should, if possible, become its headquarters on the coast, so the next visit appears to be linked with the same scheme. In August, 1825, the Company's barque *William & Ann*, Captain Hanwell, was at Point Roberts on a trading voyage, but it would seem with instructions to ascertain whether there was a navigable channel into Fraser River. Dr. John Scouler, the botanist, was on board, and in his journal under date of August 23, as the vessel sailed along the edge of the Sandheads, he wrote:—

The fresh taste of the water, although we were three miles from the shore, seamed [*sic*] to indicate the vicinity of large rivers. As this was the grand object of our enquiries, the long boat was dispatched & on its return in the evening confirmed our suspicions. The river is shut up from the access

(7) "Journal of John Work, November and December, 1824," edited by T. C. Elliott; in *Washington Historical Quarterly*, III. (1912), pp. 198ff, at p. 223.

(8) Frederick Merk, *Fur Trade and Empire*, Cambridge, Mass., 1931, p. 249.

of vessels for a great way by sand banks & has not more than 6 feet water at its mouth.[9]

Though Captain Hanwell had not entered the river he appears to have proclaimed himself as having discovered it, for in Stephen Reynolds's manuscript journal under the date of April 29, 1827, he states:—

Captain Swan of the Hudson's Bay Company's ship *William & Eliza* [*sic*][10] pointed the position of the new river discovered a year or two since by Capt. Hanwell of the brig *William & Eliza* [*sic*] just to the north of Point Roberts in about latitude 49° 07′. Vancouver overlooked it.[11]

So far the story of the approach to the Fraser by water has covered thirty-three years, yet no vessel has entered the river. McMillan's boats had, it is true, passed out in December, 1824, and the long-boat of the *William & Ann* had perfunctorily examined and sounded the supposed channel in August, 1825. Now comes the pioneer vessel, the schooner *Cadboro*. The Hudson's Bay Company had determined to build a trading-post: Fort Langley, on the Fraser River. In pursuance of that purpose, McMillan with a party of twenty-five men left Fort Vancouver on June 27, 1827, and met the schooner *Cadboro* at Whidby Island. They embarked on July 12, and three days later were at the mouth of the river. For nine days the effort to find the channel continued; the schooner was constantly dragging her anchors or going aground on one sand-bar or another. The trials and difficulties of the *Cadboro* in pioneering the route through the Sandheads of the Fraser are set out baldly in the Fort Langley Journal. A copy of its entries follows:—

Sunday 15th July, 1827 . . . . We got under weigh for Fraser's River, but the wind being from the North west, and the tide against us, we made little or no progress, and came to an anchor not far from that of last night.

Monday 16th. Wind still unfavorable—with the morning flood Tide, hove anchor and stood out into the Gulf. At change of tide cast anchor on the edge of Sturgeon Shoal. In the afternoon the same was repeated

(9) "Journal of a Voyage to N.W. America, by John Scouler," in *Oregon Historical Quarterly*, VI. (1905), p. 203.

(10) Reynolds has made a mistake in the name and rig of the vessel. He has written "William & Eliza" for "William & Ann" in both instances. She was a barque. The *William & Ann* was wrecked at the mouth of the Columbia River in February, 1828.

(11) From the manuscript copy of Reynolds's *Journal* in the possession of George Carter, Esq., of Honolulu, Hawaii. Reynolds served for some years as harbour master and pilot of Honolulu Harbour.

but we made little or nothing out of it. Shashia came on board again, and remained all night. Scenawa who has contrived to follow us thus far was also on board but went away in the evening.

Tuesday 17th. Another attempt was made this morning to beat up to the entrance of the Channel into Fraser's River but without proceeding any distance, for the wind fell and about 7 A.M. anchor was again cast on the edge of the south Sturgeon Shoal. Captain Simpson and Mr. Annance were off twice in a Boat during the day to sound for the channel; but returned after 9 at night without having discovered one.

Wednesday 18th. Mr. Sinclair the first Mate was sent off to Sound; and upon his return reported that there was a good channel into the River, and that two Fathoms were the least Soundings he had in the fair way.

Thursday 19th. This morning stood across the mouth of the Channel, and anchored on the edge of the North Shoal. About 11 at night the vessel was discovered to be drifting, her anchor having lost hold of the steep Bank on which it had been cast. The Cable was let loose with the idea that the water was not deep, and that the anchor would still catch. This however did not happen—the cable was dragged out to its full length 80 or 90 Fathoms, and with difficulty checked at the end. All Hands called, Ship's Company, & Canadians, to heave upon the Windlass.

Friday 20th. By two in the morning the Cable was got in, and all sail set to beat up again for the entrance of the Channel. At Break of day we found that we had drifted considerably to the North West. A Fresh Breeze during the day from the South East. In the afternoon the wind shifted to the Southward and we succeeded before night in again anchoring near the Entrance of the Channel.

Saturday 21st. Weighed Anchor early—made across to the Southward till we had on the Bearings for entering the River, and then stood in. At 7 A.M. we got aground upon the Shoal which forms the south side of the Channel—no damage done. Were again afloat at 2 P.M. Half Tide. It now blew a light air from the South East, and we anchored a mile within the river, at 3 O'clock, close to the Black Bluff of Woods on the north side.

Sunday 22nd. Went down at 12 O'clock to the north Point of Entry, which Captain Simpson has named Point Garry, and by a Meridian Observation made the Latitude 49.5.30. This is hardly however to be depended on as the observation was but an indifferent one on account of the shoals that extended themselves to a great distance along the Horizon. Mr. Sinclair was sent up the River in Boat to Sound, and returned in the evening saying that he had found deep water as far as he had gone which was a considerable way up. During his absence, the *Cadboro* was put under weigh, but as it was still uncertain on which side the Channel ran, and the wrong one being unluckily taken, we got into shoal water and were obliged to return to our anchorage to await the arrival of the Sounding Party.

Monday 23rd. All hands employed towing across to the other side. At 3 P.M. a breeze springing up from the South West, Sail was set, and we passed the Cowitchen Villages Saumm Pinellahutz & Quonutziu about 6 O'clock, and anchored about a mile above, 200 Yds. from the north Bank. Scanawa was on board all day but went on shore at night. The Population of the Cowitchen villages may be at a rough guess 1500 Souls.[12]

In conclusion, a few words may be added in regard to the *Cadboro*. This vessel, sometimes called a schooner, at others, a brigantine, was a small craft of about 72 tons burthen, built at Rye, England, in 1824. She was only 56 feet in length; her greatest width was 17 feet; she had two masts, mounted six guns, and carried a crew of thirty-five men. She was, says Bancroft, the pride of the Pacific. She arrived at Fort Vancouver in the spring of 1827. Almost as historic as the pioneer steamship *Beaver*, she was the first vessel to enter Victoria Harbour, Cadboro Bay, and Fraser River. She had a long life; her end came in October, 1862, when, lumber-laden, she was driven ashore near Port Angeles, Washington, and became a total wreck; but she had lived to see the route she had pioneered through the Sandheads of the Fraser become well-marked and, if the expression be allowable, way-worn.

F. W. HOWAY.

NEW WESTMINSTER, B.C.

(12) Quoted from the original journal in the Provincial Archives.

THE PEDIGREE AND PROSPECTS OF LOCAL HISTORY.

The writer of local history is to-day deservedly receiving more and more recognition. Thanks to the part that his more dramatic findings can play in arousing the historical imagination of children at school, and to the attention that is paid to his subject in research-work directed from universities, a growing number of people now take an interest in the background of the communities in which they live. The subject has always a certain romantic colour; it appeals to local patriotism, and it has also, to students of history and sociology, a more serious appeal.

This serious interest in the evolution of community life is essentially modern. The writing of history was for many centuries guided by quite different ideas. One can therefore best appreciate and understand the position and importance of the study of local history by looking backward over the long procession of writers and thinkers who throughout the ages have sought to interpret past experience.

Men's outlook upon history has always been conditioned by the attitudes and interests of their own time; this has been so from the very beginning. When a consciousness of the past first began to dawn within our Western civilization warlike and predatory peoples were playing a dominant rôle. Tales of adventure—recited either in prose, or in verse, which was more easily memorized—were everywhere popular. In the circumstances any one who wished to arouse interest in the past naturally tended to fasten upon the adventures and deeds of great heroes and leaders. Memories of the past were inevitably shaped into stories, and were handed down in the form given them by the more dramatic story-tellers.

When professional story-tellers and poets appeared, another influence was brought to bear upon the shaping of historical traditions. For the audiences best able to reward these men were to be found at the courts of kings and chieftains, and here the subjects most in favour were the valour of the leader and

his nobles and their ancestors. Since in all warlike and aristocratic societies people have held blood and ancestry in more or less superstitious reverence, the minstrel who could spread abroad the fame of a leader's ancestors might very greatly enhance his prestige. Thus early written history inevitably came to focus upon the fortunes of the great, the holders of power.

Historical narrative was not at first clearly distinguished from mere story. It was only very gradually and painfully that the idea of founding history upon what had actually occurred assumed the force of an ideal; and had the relating of history been left entirely to the poets and minstrels of the courts, this ideal might never have arisen at all. But fortunately, early in the development of the great kingdoms and empires of the ancient world, the poetic monopoly was broken by prosaic competitors, for it became the duty of certain officials to compile a record of major public events as they took place, year by year. Such annals made dull reading, but their value grew with their length. They preserved and symbolized, for governments and dynasties, the accumulating dignity of age and lineage; besides, they were of practical use. To be able to refer back to exact records was a convenience, and sooner or later a necessity, in the work of government. Hence a care for truthful records of many kinds arose.

Mythology and religion also exercised an immense influence in moulding the traditions of the historian's craft. Indeed, it was through mythology that the historical imagination was originally stimulated. The idea of supernatural intervention in human affairs was carried over from mythology and remained for many ages the chief means of explaining critical turns in the course of events. Priesthoods in many cults had much the same attitude towards the past as noble families and royal dynasties, feeling that records enhanced their dignity. They made efforts, with varying degrees of success, to develop the science of chronology. Moreover, the priests, unlike the kings, could embrace a vision not only of the past but of the future. The Hebrew and the Christian religions gave to the whole sweep of history one single meaningful pattern. As early Christian writers viewed it, the history of the world was that of a sequence of empires rising and falling in turn; of these the Roman Empire

was to be the last, and in some form it would endure until the world's end, when men would be gathered in for judgment upon the fate of their immortal souls. In this vast prospect all issues but moral issues were dwarfed into insignificance. Such a philosophy of history obviously gave little direct encouragement to concentration upon accuracy of detail for its own sake. Nor did it have any tendency to turn attention to the study of local communities.

In the Greek and Roman worlds a number of intellectual and emotional interests opened on to the past. Among the wealthy nobility, family pride fostered the art of constructing flattering genealogies, that sometimes ran back to divine ancestors. Religious cults kept a medley of myths in circulation. Nevertheless, an educated and sophisticated reading public gradually emerged, among the ruling classes, that was deeply interested in the political history of its own time. Both in Greece and in Rome the art of tracing the fortunes of empire in vivid political narrative was carried to a high point of excellence. History came in fact to be viewed as a way of studying politics. As such its scope was limited by the scope of popular political theory. And since political theory as yet took little account of economic and social problems, there was no need to delve into the details of local history, as is the fashion to-day. The histories of Rome deal less with the city itself than with the successes of its armies and the expansion of its power. The pages of most of the classical historians echo, often monotonously, with the clash of arms and the ringing periods of great political orations.

Like all other intellectual pursuits in Western Europe, the art of writing history sank to a low ebb during the early Middle Ages. With the decline of Roman civilization the sophisticated reading public disappeared. A limited circle of ill-educated readers remained, confined for the most part within the ranks of the clergy and the monks. These kept alive among themselves some knowledge of ancient historical writing and of Church history with its Biblical background. But new historical composition was inevitably conditioned by the tastes of the public at large, consisting now mainly of a boorish military and land-owning aristocracy and an utterly ignorant and superstitious mass of peasants. In such an environment historical traditions

could live and develop only in story and epic form. Ancient times were viewed through the curious perspective of the poetry of Virgil, and memories of more recent times tended to recede into a kaleidoscopic confusion of romantic adventure, abounding in supernatural occurrences and supernatural creatures, both pagan and Christian. A few men of superior intellect—a Gregory of Tours, a Bede—wrote faithful accounts of the careers of kings and bishops, but their work was not nearly so popular as the dramatic short stories, encrusted with legend, that told of the lives of saints, or the long poetic romances about the exploits of Alexander the Great, Charlemagne, King Arthur, and their warriors. On so colourful a stage there was no room for the drab figures of the humble and obscure, with which truthful local history would largely have had to deal.

In time the Church succeeded in gradually raising the level of education among the clergy, and from the tenth century onward, with reviving prosperity and longer periods of peace, more and more members of the richer laity found leisure to read or to listen to reading. Romances, religious treatises, and legends of the saints were still their chief fare, but there was some demand for genuine history. Interest centred naturally in matters which the nobility best understood, and in which they or their ancestors had played a part; that is, in political conflicts and in the fortunes of aggressive leaders. Writers among the clergy supplied what was wanted, producing lively narratives of the Crusades, biographies of kings, and national chronicles.

The chronicles grew out of the files of notes on important events which many monasteries made it their business to keep. It became customary for the abbot to assign a capable monk the task of working the notes into a connected narrative. The monastic writers were often well-read in scriptural and classical history, and well-informed on contemporary politics. In any case their interests tended to stretch far beyond their monastery walls, for the property which monasteries accumulated through the gifts of the pious was often widely scattered. Furthermore, the chances of retaining the whole of the property securely depended upon the state of law and order, and this depended increasingly upon the power of the king, his character, and ability. At the same time there were religious and moral reasons

why churchmen should follow the fortunes of monarchy with eagerness, for it was regarded as an institution divinely sanctioned, and each king at his consecration was sworn to the maintenance of justice. For the one reason or the other most of the monk-historians followed the plan of concentrating upon the development of royal power. Thus they created national history.

Some of the monks who were assigned to historical writing attempted little more than the compilation of a history of their own house. The result was a kind of local history, but a kind that suffered from the defects of a narrow and partisan spirit. The purpose of this type of chronicle was simply to magnify the importance of a monastery and the power of its abbots. The writers took no interest in their neighbours outside the precincts of the cloister, and rarely mentioned them except when they proved to be unsatisfactory or rebellious tenants. In the Peterborough chronicle, for example, one learns of the development of industry in the district only through an account of the abbot's action in seizing the stones of mills that had been set up by tenants in defiance of his monopoly rights as feudal lord. The monk always took the point of view of a lord intent on his feudal rights. In short, he was incapable of viewing local developments objectively.

The cult of local history grew up among the bourgeoisie of the mediæval towns. The people of the mediæval towns, crowding together for security, century after century, behind their encircling walls and moats, generated among themselves an extraordinarily intense spirit of community. It grew and found expression in long and tenacious struggles to win rights of self-government from feudal overlords, in the adoption of laws and customs different from those of the countryside, in the triumphant enforcement of the custom that all residents of the town acquired the status of free men. Pride in local traditions was in the very atmosphere. Every street and market-place, every church tower, had its dramatic associations with the past. For a time these traditions would be handed down orally. But those townsmen who were engaged in trade were obliged for business reasons to learn to read. Hence there was sooner or later—sooner in the South of Europe, later in the North, which was

economically more backward—a bourgeois public eager to read histories in which the bourgeoisie would figure.

The earlier town chronicles can scarcely be regarded as models of good historical writing. They are crude in form and unpolished in style. Their authors, who were usually of the merchant class, the ruling class in the towns, looked down upon the humbler inhabitants. They often concentrated rather narrowly upon the fortunes of the town government, and they were not free from bias in discussing quarrels among the magistrates. Their interest in national development, like that of the monk-historians, was restricted to the surface of political events. Although they were obviously more sceptical of stories of miracles than were the monks, they were not above relating entertaining fables about the founding of their city by the descendants of gods or mythical heroes. Yet, despite all these limitations, the vigorous and neighbourly sense of community which was a part of their character as townsmen enabled them to portray a wider sector of local life than any other historians had yet had the power to describe.

For example, here and there they would fill in a few lines with journalistic jottings of matters of human interest that had evidently been the talk of the town. They note the bolder local crimes, crimes committed by women, sensational damage done by storms in the neighbourhood, the nature of local epidemics, as how one summer many people were ill of a flux that came from eating too much fruit. They introduced anecdotes of eccentric characters, such as the story of a musician in London who superintended his own funeral, coming to the service and making offerings at masses sung for his soul, because, as he said, he could not trust executors to do this for him liberally enough. With all their faults, the town chroniclers had their feet planted squarely on the common earth on which the common people lived.

From another point of view their work became of the highest importance. The interest in town history that had been aroused in Italy by the time of the Renaissance helped to make possible a marked improvement in historical writing. One of the results of the vogue that classical studies enjoyed at that period was a renewed enthusiasm for the writing of history. Scholars were anxious to prove that they could write in as elegant a style, and

with as much political shrewdness, as had historians in ancient Greece and Rome. They chose to write of their own cities, partly because they could often obtain commissions to do so, and could therefore be assured of readers and pecuniary reward, and also because the wars and revolutions in which the Italian cities so constantly indulged made them a fascinating field in which to study political rivalries and factions. The Italian scholars sought, in the spirit of the ancient Greek and Roman historians, to produce books that would be useful to rulers by pointing out mistakes made by their predecessors. As Machiavelli expressed it in his own book on Florence, rulers might be "thus taught wisdom at the cost of others." Whether or not the new histories achieved this end, the emphasis that they laid upon the political development of the Italian city-states had the effect of giving educated people a better historical perspective. The way was opened for scholars to modify the early Christian view of world history, which had been based upon exaggeration of the rôle played by the ancient empires and by the Hebrews, and upon a faulty chronology; and the old pessimistic assumption that all hope of progress on earth had died with the decline of Rome began to yield before a new spirit of optimism. Wherever the culture of the Italian Renaissance radiated, these new views of history spread.

Outside Italy, historians in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries were naturally more preoccupied with the writing of national history. Intelligent kings, realizing that knowledge of and pride in a people's common traditions could be of invaluable help to them in the work of national unification, wisely encouraged the scholars. The cult of local history also received a fresh impetus from the growing sentiment of national patriotism, for it was soon realized that only through the winnowing of local traditions and records could sound and reliable national history be written. John Leland, who was appointed official historiographer by Henry VIII., toiled up and down England amassing notes on local institutions of all kinds—monasteries, churches, families, towns. So ambitious was his programme and so severely did he drive himself that he ruined his health and collapsed into insanity before his researches were nearly completed. But a succession of scholars arose to carry on the labour

of research in the same spirit of excitement, inspired partly by local patriotism, by love for their own city or county, and partly by national feeling. John Stow, who, to quote his own word, "consecrated" forty-five years of his life and much of a modest bourgeois fortune to research, is best known for his *Survey* of Elizabethan London and its monuments, which he felt himself "bound in love" to undertake, but he worked also to popularize the reading of national chronicles. It is evident that history, both local and national alike, was a means of enriching and widening the sense of citizenship.

No one nowadays could sit down and read very far at one time in the books of John Stow and his successors for pleasure. Their works are still indispensable to the specialist, but they were compiled for the most part with complete disregard of literary style or artistic form; they were in essence merely encyclopædias of local antiquities. Modern scholarship, having at its command a much greater volume of sources, can pick out inaccuracies, but the authors were unquestionably guided by scrupulous zeal for accuracy of detail. In setting themselves this ideal, as also in their indifference to artistic canons, the early English antiquaries breathe the Puritanism of their age. The heavy yoke of discipline under which they bent their shoulders, however, was lightened daily by the sheer delight that they experienced in the turning-up of ancient yellowed records and in the exploration of the long-forgotten details of past events. John Stow liked to think of himself as one of the great explorers: "I have attempted the discovery of London, my native soyle and Countrey," he wrote.

In course of time this first enthusiasm waned. It received little encouragement from the universities and less and less, as the years wore on into the eighteenth century, from the reading public. It was not that the reading public of the eighteenth century was uninterested in the trend of history. Gibbon's philosophical and controversial manner of treating the story of the Roman Empire and the Church won him sensational success, and partisan political histories of England found a ready market. The antiquaries were neglected because they lagged behind contemporary thought; they were not discovering or discussing anything that appeared to bear upon vital interests of the day.

They became absorbed in detail for its own sake, never pausing to consider whether one fact was not more significant than another in illustrating the direction of social change. Moreover, they busied themselves chiefly with the Middle Ages, a period which the fashionable wits and intellectuals of the day, following the lead of Voltaire, chose to view as an era of ridiculous and debased superstition, best buried in oblivion. Yet under the banner of the Society of Antiquaries, founded in 1717 with barely two dozen members, a small group of enthusiasts ploughed obstinately on in the observation and study of miscellaneous mediæval antiquities. Monumental county histories, representing monumental labours and of immense value to later historians, continued to appear at intervals until late in the nineteenth century. For a long period, however, there was little progress in the art of writing local history.

The cultivation of local history did not come into its own again until the rapid social and economic changes of the nineteenth century aroused an interest in the social and economic aspects of the past. In many places amateur historians had come to realize the great importance of economic changes in their own localities long before the professional historians had grasped their importance in the national life. Societies, such as the Camden Society and county archæological societies, were formed for the publication of documents and descriptive notes bearing on local questions, and were increasingly active from the third decade of the century. Their work gradually made available a great variety of records that dealt in one way or another with economic life, or with gossipy details of private social life in past generations. Thus when some of the professional historians finally decided to turn aside from political and constitutional history to consider economic matters, they found quantities of raw material conveniently at hand in print, and it was clear that there were masses more in manuscript. It is probable that without the work of pioneer local historians the appearance of any satisfactory interpretations of national economic development would have been very considerably delayed.

It is not merely in connection with specialized economic studies that historians have found it necessary to take account of local changes. The old idea that the political and constitu-

tional history of a nation could be written satisfactorily on the basis of the records of its wars and its laws, its parliaments, revolutions and reforms, died hard, but is now safely in its coffin. New laws are a clue to the wishes of those who framed them, but one cannot necessarily assume that they were enforced. Much of the legislation of mediæval and early modern times fell as far short of its aim as the Eighteenth Amendment to the constitution of the United States. Local opposition decided its fate. Nor, even when enforced, did it necessarily produce the effects that its architects intended. Local conditions again were decisive. Even the significance of important constitutional changes has often been dependent upon the state of repair of the machinery of local government.

Even the more popular type of historical writing, the kind that bases itself on biography, cannot afford to ignore the work of the local historian. The notion that the gist of a nation's story is contained in the life and character of its great statesmen and generals is true only in a superficial way. It is true that the lives of such men as Cromwell, Danton, Robespierre, and all the great colourful leaders of movements, not only changed the course of many other men's lives but also expressed in some degree the spirit of their time, since they would not have become leaders had they not been capable of dramatizing the aspirations and hopes of many of their contemporaries. Yet, since great numbers of their fellows hated, loathed, and despised them, one may still ask why such men were thrown upon the central stage of power. And to answer that question one must turn to the little country towns and villages, to scenes where there were probably no great figures at all, but where the impact of unwise government policies, of official corruption, of sacrifice in war, or of gradually changing conditions—the rise of new occupations, new families and classes, and the decadence of old, were creating social tension and cutting channels for new ideas. Every aspect of general history is inevitably bound up with the slow currents of change at work in the local community.

Most modern corrections of the errors in fact or interpretation that are to be found in the work of the older historians are based upon increased knowledge and understanding of the diversity of local conditions. Scholarly modern accounts of the rise

of the great national states of Western Europe rest upon hundreds of patient investigations into the duties and efficiency of local officials, the organization of local industries, the trade of ports, the fortunes of the peasant under the different agrarian systems of different regions, the spread of education and ideas among different sections of the people. Every type of record that survives from the past is pressed into service—not only the vast files of government and municipal records in public archives, but the intimate letters and diaries of private people; family housekeeping accounts; the business letters and accounts of merchants, bankers, industrialists, and stewards of landed estates; wills, inscriptions on tombs; the inventories of old libraries long scattered; ecclesiastical records; school and hospital records; not to mention early newspapers and handbills and literary material of every kind. It is beyond the powers of a single scholar to master all the materials that are needed to illustrate truthfully the varied aspects of life in any historical period. The writing of history is therefore now essentially a co-operative enterprise. It progresses only by virtue of a working partnership between the general historian and the specialist in local research.

Looking back over the evolution of his craft, the local historian may well feel proud of the long cultural traditions that he inherits and represents. Mediæval townsmen, politicians and patriots of the Renaissance, seventeenth and eighteenth century seekers after truth, and nineteenth century social philosophers, have each in turn practised it with similar and perpetual delight, but guided by ever-widening horizons of thought and aspiration.

On this continent the local historian has had the advantage of enjoying the whole of this heritage with almost none of the trouble that was involved in creating it. He has been spared the heavy labour of research in damaged mediæval records written in bad, semi-legible abbreviated Latin, and has been spared the reproaches of those who have no patience save for modern history. He has been able to avoid the antiquary's temptation to concentrate upon the genealogy of long-dead aristocrats or the architecture of ruined buildings. It has been much easier for him to gain the respectful co-operation of the general historian because the striking diversity of different regions on this conti-

nent has made it essential for the latter to seek the assistance of his special knowledge. Again, economic factors have played so obvious a part in shaping national life that the value of the economic and social data which form so large a proportion of the local historian's stock-in-trade is readily recognized. Although a very great amount of work remains to be done, it should not, in these circumstances, take very much longer to round out the history of national development. But when this task is approximately finished, when all the documents in all the archives have been made to yield up all the economic, political, constitutional or biographical facts that bear upon the national development, when all the important sources now mouldering in the cupboards and basements of lawyers' offices and business firms have been tapped, what will the local historian do? What will become of him? Will he be regarded as a useless relic of the past?

It is sincerely to be hoped that he himself will never take this view, for there will always be vital and absorbing work for local historians. New horizons and new goals will always be appearing. The idea of writing national history will in all probability be succeeded by the idea of writing international history. This will entail far more than the analysis of diplomatic negotiations and the conduct of foreign policies. It will have to include a study of all those movements that transcend national boundaries, not matters of world trade alone, but also cultural changes, currents of opinion, the rise of new attitudes and ideologies, new objects of ambition, changes in the social structure.

Rapid changes of this order in many quarters of the world have been reshaping the lives of our own generation. We live in a day of mass movements, of unprecedented possibilities for good or evil through the mobilization of public opinion. The study of shifting attitudes, opinions, and values is already of far more than abstract academic interest: it is essential for any one who professes to have a realistic approach to the political problems of the day. As time passes it will become more and more necessary for those who are in charge of the planning and administration of government policies to understand the forces that are at work in the formation of public opinion. To whom will they turn for guidance? The journalists, no doubt, will be at hand with advice. We have already floods of journalistic comment on such

questions. But journalistic generalizations about the ideas and interests of the average man in this or that corner of the world are of necessity often based on haphazard guesswork, and often biased by prejudice and the desire to be impressive. What is needed is expert intimate knowledge of local conditions. The sociologists, again, will offer help in the form of detailed surveys of social conditions in typical communities. These are useful and important. Yet what is needed is not only a knowledge of the material conditions under which people live, but a grasp of the varied elements in the traditions of their community which will help to determine their attitude to new ideas and policies. For this reason a full understanding of local conditions can only be gained through an historical approach.

It is not likely, therefore, that the local historian will wish to fold his hands when present tasks are completed. He will find instead more and more occasion to cultivate the skill and insight of the gifted sociologist. It may be that enlightened governments of the future will find work for him. He may become able to develop the art of forecasting, as it were, the social and political weather. In any case, his unique understanding of tradition, of its lasting influence and its ways of change, cannot fail to find useful application.

SYLVIA L. THRUPP.

UNIVERSITY OF BRITISH COLUMBIA,
VANCOUVER, B.C.

THE ANNEXATION PETITION OF 1869.

The emergence of an annexationist movement in British Columbia was not a political phenomenon peculiar to our Province. Movements, very similar in character, existed elsewhere in British North America. In Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, for example, dissatisfaction with the newly-organized Canadian Confederation for a time assumed the form of a distinct agitation for annexation to the United States. Even in the Red River Settlement the same spirit existed among some of the leaders in the insurrection. It was, therefore, only natural—indeed, almost inevitable—that in British Columbia such a sentiment should arise during the crucial years which witnessed the transformation of a federation of eastern British American colonies into a transcontinental dominion.

British Columbia's American heritage dates from the influx of miners drawn from California by the lure of Fraser River gold in 1858. Long after the main body of the rush had withdrawn there still remained a large proportion of Americans in the permanent population of the colonies. This was particularly true of Victoria, the commercial metropolis. Geographical isolation from the mother country, as well as from Canada, successfully hindered the augmentation of the British element in the population by any considerable immigration. In consequence, it was almost inevitable that within the colony there should be evinced a sympathetic response to the increasingly insistent propaganda of the " manifest destiny " school of American expansionists.

Moreover, there was much to dishearten even the most patriotic of the British residents of the colonies. Political discontent and economic depression were widespread. The union of the colonies of Vancouver Island and British Columbia in 1866, designed as an economy measure, had been bought at a high price —the loss of the representative assembly, and of the free port system on Vancouver Island. And, unfortunately, it had failed to act as a panacea for the ills of the country. In addition, the anti-imperialist statements of the " Little Englanders " then current gave rise to the uncomfortable idea that possibly the mother country was not desirous of retaining her colonial possessions.

In direct contrast to this, the United States had given tangible proof of its interest in expansion in the North Pacific by the purchase of Alaska from Russia, in 1867.

Such, then, was the background for the annexationist movement. Its history has often been told,[1] but now for the first time it is possible to analyse more fully its significance. The erroneous rumour of a negotiation pending between Great Britain and the United States, which contemplated the cession of British Columbia, or at least a portion of it, in settlement of the Alabama Claims,[2] followed closely the receipt of the news of the acquisition of Alaska by the United States[3] and brought the latent annexation sentiment to a head. In July, 1867, a petition to the Queen circulated in Victoria, which sought:—

> Either, That Your Majesty's Government may be pleased to relieve us immediately of the expense of our excessive staff of officials, assist the establishment of a British steam-line with Panama, so that immigration from England may reach us, and also assume the debts of the Colony.
>
> Or, That Your Majesty will graciously permit the Colony to become a portion of the United States.[4]

In all probability the petition was never transmitted to the Queen, certainly not through the regular channels. Its existence, however, was not unknown to the Colonial Office, for in a private letter to the Duke of Buckingham, Governor Seymour had written:—

> There is a systematic agitation going on in this town in favor of annexation to the United States. It is believed that money for its maintenance is provided from San Francisco. As yet, however, nothing has reached me officially on the subject, and should any petition on the subject, I will know how to answer it before I transmit the petition to your Grace. On the Mainland the question of annexation is not mooted . . .[5]

---

(1) Sage, W. N., "The Annexationist Movement in British Columbia," *Transactions of the Royal Society of Canada*, 3rd ser., XXI., sec. ii. (1927), pp. 97–110; Sage, W. N., "The Critical Period of British Columbia History, 1866–1871," *Pacific Historical Review*, I. (1932), pp. 424–443; Keenleyside, Hugh L., "British Columbia—Annexation or Confederation," *Canadian Historical Association Report*, 1928, pp. 34–40.

(2) *British Colonist*, April 25, 1867.

(3) *Ibid.*, April 3, 1867.

(4) Annexation Petition, July, 1867, enclosed in Allan Francis to F. H. Seward, July 2, 1867, *Consular Letters from Victoria, Vancouver Island*, Department of State, Archives, Washington, D.C., vol. 1.

(5) Seymour to Buckingham, June 26, 1867, private, *C.O. 60/28.*

The reaction of the Colonial Office to the situation is to be gathered from a *minute* by Frederic Rogers, permanent Under-Secretary of State for the Colonies, dated September 16, 1867.

As to the future it is no doubt true that high taxation, distress and want of assistance from home, will probably cause the American population of these colonies to keep for annexation, a purpose w^h w^d soon become irresistible except at a cost far greater than the worth of the fee simple of the Colony. On the other hand if the Colonists ever find that the annexation threat is satisfactory in extracting money from us, they will plunder us indefinitely by it. . . . I suppose the question to be (in the long run) is B.C. to form part of the U.S. or of Canada; and if we desire to promote the latter alternative what form of expenditure or non-expenditure is likely to facilitate or pave the way for it.[6]

Within the Colonial Office the decision favoured amalgamation of British Columbia with Canada, and from that time every effort was made to facilitate that end.

Annexation sentiment, however, died hard in the colony. The apathy of Governor Seymour to the cause of Confederation did little to destroy it. Moreover economic conditions were still far from satisfactory. Consequently there was an occasional resurgence of the movement; a typical example of which is to be found in a letter to the editor of the *British Columbian*, dated April 20, 1869, and signed " Anglo Saxon."

With a depleted treasury, revenue falling off, and the Colony suffering from a depression beyond all precedent, with no prospect, either present or remote, of immigration, what are we to do? . . . Were the inhabitants of British Columbia a thriving community, the question of annexation would not be popular; for the people are loyal and patriotic. The force of circumstances alone compels them to advocate a change of nationality. . . . I am a loyal Briton, and would prefer living under the institutions of my own country, were it practicable. But I, like the rest of the world of which we are each an atom, would prefer the flag and institutions of the United States with prosperity, to remaining as we are, with no prospect of succeeding as a British colony.[7]

Economic dissatisfaction was the basis of the movement. To many the alternative of confederation with Canada offered little hope of a satisfactory solution of the problems facing the colony. Just as twenty years earlier, in Montreal, discontent, bred of economic and political disillusionment, had resulted in the signing

(6) Minute, signed F. R., September 16, on Seymour to Buckingham, July 15, 1867, *C.O. 60/28*.

(7) *British Columbian*, April 30, 1869.

of the famous *Annexation Manifesto,*[8] so, in British Columbia, similar conditions produced similar results.

In the fall of 1869 there circulated in Victoria another petition, this time to the President of the United States, seeking his assistance in facilitating the annexation of British Columbia. In the issue of November 13, 1869, the *British Colonist* reported that the document had been entrusted to General Ihrie, a passenger on board the U.S.S. *Newbern,* for delivery to President Grant, and asserted that it had "less than forty signatures, principally those of foreigners." In addition it was claimed that the chief agent in circulating the petition was a "*naturalized* foreigner."[9] Actually, however, the petition appears to have been handed to Vincent Collyer, special Indian Commissioner for Alaskan tribes, judging from an item in the San Francisco *Morning Bulletin* of November 17, 1869.

Vincent Collyer, special Indian Commissioner for Alaska tribes, who arrived here from Alaska and British Columbia this morning, carried with him a petition signed by forty prominent business men of Victoria, addressed to President Grant, praying for the annexation of British Columbia to the United States. Another petition of similar import is to be forwarded to the Queen. The petition is very strongly worded, setting forth with much force and cogency of reasoning, the isolated and helpless condition of the colony, and the imperative necessity for forming a political alliance with its powerful and more prosperous neighbour. Mr. Collyer represents the feeling in favor of annexation as having received new impulse from the recent note of Earl Granville, urging the British Columbians to affiliate with the Canadian Dominion. This they regard as little less than insulting, as it would increase their burdens without affording them either political protection or material relief. Mr. Collyer is on his way to Washington and has promised to present the petition in person to the President with a statement of what seems to be the prevailing sentiment of the people.[10]

On December 29, 1869, the petition was formally presented to the President. The press dispatch announcing the event merits reproduction.

Washington, Dec. 30. Vincent Collyer yesterday handed to the President a memorial signed by a number of property holders and businessmen in Victoria to be followed by another which will contain the names of all the British merchants and others at Victoria, Nanaimo and other places, in favor of the transfer of British Columbia to the United States. The Presi-

(8) Allin, C. D., & Jones, G.M., *Annexation, Preferential Trade and Reciprocity,* Toronto [1911], *passim.*

(9) *British Colonist,* November 13, 1869.

(10) San Francisco *Morning Bulletin,* November 17, 1869.

dent to-day returned Collyer a verbal reply that he had received it with great interest and sent it to the Secretary of State. Collyer also showed a memorial to Senator Sumner, Chairman of the Committee of Foreign Relations, who, after reading it, said the movement was important and could have but one termination. Meanwhile the government waits the movement of England, which is fast seeing the uselessness and impracticability of European empire on this hemisphere. Both the President and Sumner desired their replies to be made known to the memorialists.[11]

The petition itself was found in the *Miscellaneous Letters to the Department of State* in the Archives of the Department of State, Washington, D.C.[12] It is herewith printed for the first time, complete with forty-three signatures.

To

His Excellency, the President of the United States of America.

Your Memorialists beg leave most respectfully to represent, that we are residents of the Colony of British Columbia—many of us british subjects and all deeply interested in the welfare and progress of our adopted country.

That those that are british Subjects are penetrated with the most profound feelings of loyalty and devotion to Her Majesty and Her Majesty's Government and that all entertain for Her, feelings of the greatest respect as well as attachment to the country.

That while we thus indulge such feelings, we are constrained by the duty we owe to ourselves and families, in view of the contemplated severance of the political ties which unite this Colony to the "Mother Country", to seek for such political and commercial affinity and connection, as will insure the immediate and continued prosperity and wellbeing of this our adopted home.

That this Colony is now suffering great depression, owing to its isolation, a scarcity of population and other causes too numerous to mention.

That we view with feelings of alarm the avowed intention of Her Majesty's Government to confederate this Colony with the Dominion of Canada, as we believe such a measure can only tend to still further depression and ultimate injury for the following reasons, viz:—

That confederation cannot give us protection against internal enemies or foreign foes, owing to the distance of this Colony from Ottawa.

That it cannot open to us a market for the produce of our lands, our forests, our mines or our waters.

That it cannot bring us population, (our greatest need) as the Dominion itself is suffering from lack of it.

---

(11) *British Colonist*, January 11, 1870.

(12) Now in the National Archives, Washington, D.C. A photostat copy of this petition was presented by the writer to the Archives of British Columbia.

That our connection with the Dominion can satisfy no sentiment of loyalty or devotion.

That her commercial and industrial interests are opposed to ours.

That the tariff of the Dominion will be the ruin of our farmers and the commerce of our chief cities.

That we are instigated by every sentiment of loyalty to Her Majesty, by our attachment to the laws and institutions of Great Britain and our deep interest in the prosperity of our adopted country, to express our opposition to a severance from England and a confederation with Canada. We admit the Dominion may be aggrandized by confederation, but we can see no benefit either present or future, which can accrue to us therefrom.

That we desire a market for our Coal, our lumber and our fish and this the Dominion seeks for the same produce of her own soil, she can take nothing from us and supply us nothing in return.

That confederating this Colony with Canada, may relieve the mother country from the trouble and expense of fostering and protecting this isolated distant Colony, but it cannot free us from our long enduring depression, owing to the lack of population as aforesaid and the continued want of home markets for our produce.

The only remedy for the evils which beset us, we believe to be in a close union with the adjoining States and Territories, we are already bound to them by a unity of object and interest; nearly all our commercial relations are with them; They furnish the Chief Markets we have for the products of our mines, lands and waters; They supply the Colony with most of the necessities of life; They furnish us the *only* means of communication with the outer world; and we are even dependent upon them for the means of learning the events in the mother Country or the Dominion of Canada.

For these reasons we earnestly desire the ACQUISITION of *this Colony* by the *United States*.

It would result at once in opening to us an unrestricted market for our produce, bring an influx of population and with it induce the investment of capital in our Coal and Quartz Mines and in our forests.

It would insure us regular Mails and communication with the adjoining States and Territories and through them with the World at large.

It would lessen the expense of Government, by giving us representative Institutions and immediate control of our domestic concerns, besides giving us protection against foreign enemies. And with all these, we should still be united to a People of our own kindred, religion and tongue and a people who for all time, must intimately affect us in all our relations for weal or woe.

That in view of these facts we respectfully request, that Your Excellency will cause this Memorial to be laid before the Government of the United States, that that in any negociations which may be

pending or *undertaken* between Your Government and that of Her Most Gracious Majesty, for the settlement of territorial and other questions, that you will endeavor to induce Her Majesty to *consent* to the *transfer* of *this Colony* to the *United States*. We believe that Her Majesty earnestly desires the welfare and happiness of all Her People, in view of the circumstances that for years she has consented to the annual exodus of tens of thousands of her subjects to the United States and that she will not let political traditions and sentiments influence her against a Measure, which is so earnestly desired by the People of this poor isolated Colony.

British Columbia
November 1869.

H. F. Heisterman	Thos. Fowlis	H. M. Cohen
Emil Sutro	A. Martin	David Shirpser
Jacob Morris	William H. McNeill	William Wale
L[d] Lowenberg	B. Ronssin [?]	G. R. Fardon
W. H. Oliver	I. Oppenheim (Yale)	John Swanson
Hry. Wolff	Frank Sylvester	Jno. Dickson
Lewis Lewis	Joseph Joseph[s]	Louis Wolff
J. L. Jungermann	G. W. Boardman	J. Kriemler
A. de Neuf	David F. Fee	Thos. Chadwick
Thomas Geiger	M. W. Waitt	R. H. Adams
P. Brady	Samuel Stubbs	C. W. Kammerer
Archd. Turner	Tulino Seitz	W. Farron
John G. Wirth	Anton Vigelius	Henry Rudolph
Louis Vigelius	G. C. Keays	P. Feuchs
		Joseph Loewen

The press dispatch mentioned the probability of further signatures being forwarded. This was actually done, for in Washington, D.C., an additional list of sixty-one names was found. This supplementary list was forwarded to President Grant in a letter from T. G. Phelps, of the Collector's Office, San Francisco, California, dated September 1, 1870, which read, as follows:—

I have the honor to enclose a letter from Mr. Heisterman to W. H. Olliver [*sic*], Esq., a very prominent resident of Victoria, British Columbia, temporarily stopping in this city, relative to the resources of British Columbia, annexation, &c., also some additional names to a copy of the petition presented to you by Vincent Collyer, some time since. I trust Sir, you will not deem me too importunate in this matter. I feel that the advantages which would accrue to us from annexation are very great, and that this is the golden moment for bringing it about. That the great majority of the people are favourable to it, there is no doubt, but the office-holders—those who have a chance to make themselves heard and felt, will, and do oppose it. These men to retain their positions and power, are doing everything they can to

forward confederation with Canada. Should Confederation take place, I greatly fear it will postpone annexation for many years, if it does not defeat it altogether. I am informed that copies of the petition enclosed were sent through British Columbia and very generally signed, but with the exception of the one enclosed, were destroyed by parties in the interest of confederation.[13]

The enclosed letter from Mr. H. F. Heisterman, dated August 17, 1870, at Victoria, was an eloquent attempt to convince the Government of the United States, by detailed references to the agricultural and mineral resources of British Columbia, of the excellent bargain to be had in the acquisition of the colony. It read, in part:—

Understanding that you are likely to have His Excellency President Grant among you some time this month and that you will likely have an opportunity, I herewith hand you a further list of names to the memorial presented in December '69 by Vincent Collyer, Esqr. It would have been sent then, but owing to the hostility shown to it by the Canadian Newspaper here it was not sent. I therefore transmit it to you, to make whatever use of it you see fit in the premises. It is exasperating to me and to many of my fellow citizens, to see a country aggregating 405,000 square miles, of which 11,000 square miles come upon Vancouver Island and 6,000 square miles upon Queen Charlotte Island and the balance of 388,000 square miles upon the mainland of British Columbia, shut out as it were from the prosperity around it. The people of the Colony are too few to make an armed resistance to Confederation which seems from all accounts intended to be forced on us unless some countenance were given to parties who desire annexation to the United States by the Government of President Grant, in a proposal to settle the Alabama Claims by the transfer of this Colony, I don't see how we can move in the matter.[14]

The additional list contained the following signatures:—

Charles Meloy	B. La Bel	W. Hoffman
Edwin T. Percy	Wm. C. Bryant	John Glassy
W. D. Lyts	Henry La Fleur	Andrew Vigelius
P. W. Scully	Thomas Holden	H. Passerard
Wm. Wolff	Wm. Shepherd	J. Valentine
James Burns	Henry Calbraith	Oliver Sweney [?]
Collin Rankin [?]	George Henderson	Eli Harrison
Peter Walsh	Thomas La Vuz	H. Laihauf [?]
Joseph Dwyer	George Wilson	Joseph Lovett

(13) T. G. Phelps to President Grant, September 1, 1870, *Miscellaneous Letters to the Department of State*, Department of State, Archives, Washington, D.C.

(14) H. F. Heisterman to W. H. Oliver, August 17, 1870, enclosed in T. G. Phelps to President Grant, September 1, 1870, *ibid.*

Henry Malery [?]	Andrew Patten	Thomas H. Currie
Peter Ousterhout	L. A. Davis	T. N. Hibben
Emil A. Mihin [?]	Robert Snelling	M. W. Waitt
Alex. Hendry	Henry N. Simpson	B. S. Armstrong
John Stanoviz	Bart. Dooling	J. A. Williams
H. T. Shepherd	George Stelly	D. W. Chauncey
John Montebi	John J. Murphy	John Fenerty
Charles Loring Reed	J. W. Williams	C. B. Sweeney
Wm. Davis	T. J. Burnes	Henry Grunbaum
Edward Holman	J. F. Becker	Edward Grunbaum
John Sinclair	Thos. Golden	David Jenner
Aime Leclair		

The true significance of such a memorial depends upon the status of its signatories. Of the forty-three signatures on the original petition, forty-one have been identified. Wherever possible the attempt has been made to ascertain the nationality of the signatory, his occupation in 1869, and his ultimate relation to the colony. The result of an extensive research reveals the following information.[15]

H. F. Heisterman:

Born July 22, 1832, in Bremen, Germany; removed to England in 1853, where he was naturalized in 1861. He arrived in Victoria in August, 1862, and after an unsuccessful effort at mining in the Stickeen district established a reading-room in Victoria and later a wholesale paint and glass business. In 1864 he established the real-estate business which he conducted until shortly before his death on August 29, 1896. In 1869 he was president of the Germania Sing Verein, and Grand Secretary of the Provincial Grand Lodge of British Columbia, A.F. and A.M.

Emil Sutro:

A German Jew, who arrived in the colony probably late in 1859. He was a partner of G. Sutro & Co., cigar and tobacco dealers and importers. He removed to San Francisco in November, 1875.

Jacob Morris:

Partner of Wolff & Morris, boot and shoe dealers and clothiers, who presumably left the colony about 1871.

---

(15) Biographical information was obtained principally from the following sources: Scholefield, E. O. S., and Howay, F. W., *British Columbia*, Vancouver, 1914, III. and IV.; Kerr, J. B., *Biographical Dictionary of well-known British Columbians*, Vancouver, 1890; Mallandaine, Edw., *First Victoria directory*, 2nd, 3rd, and 4th issues, Victoria, 1868, 1869, 1871, respectively; and Victoria *British Colonist*.

L[eopol]d Lowenberg:

Born in 1818, a native of Potsdam, Prussia. He was involved in an extensive law suit with the Hudson's Bay Company over a land purchase in 1861. He was a real-estate agent and a man of considerable means. He died in Victoria, December 22, 1884, and Sir Matthew B. Begbie acted as one of his pall-bearers.

W. H. Oliver:

Probably arrived in the colony about 1863. He acted as agent of the Victoria Chamber of Commerce in San Francisco to disseminate information regarding the Big Bend gold district in 1866. Of him the *British Colonist*, June 23, 1870, wrote: "Mr. Oliver is one of our oldest and most respected American citizens and has given palpable evidence of the confidence he reposes in the future prospects of our beautiful city by the heavy investments he has made."

H[en]ry Wolff:

Known to be in the colony in July, 1869, when he was arrested on a charge of assault with a deadly weapon.

Lewis Lewis:

Born in 1828 in Poland, removed to England in 1837 and thence to New York in 1845. After residing in Brazil and Peru he reached California in 1849 and came to British Columbia in June, 1858. After visiting Yale, he opened a grocery business in Victoria in 1859, and in 1861 started the clothier's establishment which he operated as late as 1890. He was a Mason and Oddfellow and a member of the Hebrew Society.

J. L. Jungermann:

Born in 1820, a native of Hesse Cassel, Germany. He arrived in Victoria in 1861, and established himself as a watchmaker and jeweller. He died in Victoria, May 28, 1879.

A. de Neuf:

An employee of J. L. Jungermann in 1869, who presumably left the colony in 1871.

Thomas Geiger:

A partner in Geiger & Becker, barber-shop.

P. Brady:

An employee of H. Mansell, bootmaker.

Arch[ibal]d Turner:

Also an employee of H. Mansell, bootmaker.

John G. Wirth:

A trader, resident of Hope, who was in the colony at least as early as 1860, and who, in 1870, was appointed postmaster at Hope.

Louis Vigelius:

A native of Bavaria, Germany, who arrived about 1866, and established the St. Nicholas hair-cutting saloon. In 1886 he became an alderman of the City of Victoria.

Thos. Fowlis:

An employee in the store of Fellows & Roscoe, iron merchants, who presumably left the colony in 1871.

A. [J.] Martin:

A general dealer and mariner. He was included in a list of "many old Victorians on board the *Prince Alfred*" in the *British Colonist*, August 17, 1871.

William H. McNeill:

A retired Chief Factor of the Hudson's Bay Company, born in Boston, Mass., in 1801. He first arrived on the coast in 1816 from China, and returned in 1826 on the brig *Convoy*, a trader for a Boston fur company. In 1832 he returned to the coast in command of the American brig *Llama*, and in April of that year entered the Hudson's Bay Company's service when his vessel was acquired by that company. He remained with the company until 1865 when he retired as a farmer, but evidently returned to command the steamer *Enterprise* for a time, from which position he retired in 1874. He died in Victoria, September 4, 1875.

B. Ronssin:

Signature indecipherable, no such person known.

I. Oppenheim:

A member of the famous firm of Oppenheimer Bros., dry-goods merchants, established at Yale in 1858. Signed his name variously as "Oppenheim" or "Oppenheimer."

Frank Sylvester:

Born in New York in 1835, of Jewish parentage. He came out to California in 1853 and on to British Columbia in the gold-rush of 1858. After several years of mining in the Interior settled in Victoria. In 1869 he was employed by H. M. Cohen, clothier, but he later joined the firm of J. P. Davis & Co., auctioneers. Ultimately he established himself as a private accountant. In 1869 he was secretary of the Board of Delegates, Victoria Fire Department. He died in Victoria, December 25, 1908.

Joseph Josephs:

Born in 1810, a native of Liverpool, England, of Jewish extraction. In 1869 he was messenger, City Council Chambers, and continued as such until his death, September 10, 1872.

G. W. Boardman:

A miner, known to have been in Victoria 1869 to 1871.

David F. Fee:

Born in Mercer County, Pennsylvania. In 1851 he removed to California and came north to Victoria in 1861 on the *Enterprise* and continued on her as engineer at intervals until 1883. He also had charge of the engines of the *Beaver*, *Otter*, *Yosemite*, and *Wilson G. Hunt* at various times.

M. W. Waitt:

In 1869 an employee of T. N. Hibben & Co., booksellers and stationers, and S.G.O., Provincial Grand Lodge of British Columbia, A.F. and A.M.

Samuel Stubbs:

A foreman, employed by H. Mansell, bootmaker.

Tulino Seitz:

Unidentified.

Anton Vigelius:

Born on September 24, 1847, at Kaiserlautern, Bavaria, Germany. He arrived in Victoria, June 15, 1868, and was employed by his brother in the St. Nicholas hair-cutting saloon.

G. C. Keays:

An employee of Fellows, Roscoe & Co., iron merchants, and later mined in Omineca. He was a Past Master of the Vancouver Lodge, No. 421, A.F. and A.M.

H. M. Cohen:

Arrived in the colony about 1862, and operated a clothier's establishment. In 1869 he was Vice-President of the French Benevolent Society and manager of the Jewish Cemetery.

David Shirpser:

Of Jewish extraction, came to the colony as early as 1860. He entered the dry-goods business in Victoria in 1862, and in 1867 opened a store in New Archangel, Alaska. The *British Colonist*, July 13, 1869, records that Major-General Thomas, then inspecting the American military stations on the coast, passed through Victoria *en route* to Sitka, and that "Mr. Shirpser, formerly of this city, is interpreter for Gen. Thomas."

W. Wale:

An employee of G. C. Gerow, wagon and carriage builder.

G. R. Fardon:

A native of Staffordshire, England, born in 1806. He migrated to New York and in 1849 to San Francisco, as a daguerreotypist, and is credited with the introduction of photography to that city. He came to Victoria in 1858 and established himself as a photographic artist and made important investments. He was a half-brother of Mr. A. J. Langley, J.P. He died in Victoria, August 20, 1886.

John Swanson:

A native of Rupert's Land, who joined the Hudson's Bay Company as a lad of 14 and came out to British Columbia about 1843 as an apprentice on the schooner *Cadboro*. He helped clear the site of the old Hudson's Bay Company's fort and stockade in Victoria. He was elected the first member of the Vancouver Island Assembly for Nanaimo in 1859, his constituency having only one qualified elector. He became a Chief Trader of the company in 1860 and commanded

many of their vessels, including the *Labouchere* and *Otter*. He was a member of the B.C. Pilot Board in 1866 and Pilot Commissioner in 1867. In 1866 he assumed command of the *Enterprise*, on which he continued until his death October 21, 1872.

Jno. Dickson:

Born in 1827, a native of Dungannon, County Tyrone, Ireland. He claimed in 1862 that he was an American citizen. He was a stove and hardware dealer in Victoria, and one of the founders of the Fire Department, in which organization at one time or another he held the positions of foreman, treasurer, chief engineer, president, and delegate. In 1869, after two terms as chief engineer, he became head of the Board of Delegates. Later he was purser and part owner of the Stickeen river steamboat *Glenora*. He died at Wrangel, Alaska, June 2, 1875.

Louis Wolff:

A partner in Wolff & Morris, boot and shoe dealers and clothiers, which had a branch store in Barkerville.

J. Kriemler:

A native of Switzerland, who was in the colony as early as 1862. In 1869 he was a partner in Spratt & Kriemler, Albion Iron Works, and also chief engineer of the Victoria Fire Department and Treasurer of the French Benevolent Society. He was naturalized, July 5, 1872, and in 1874 removed to Guatamala, where he established himself in a very lucrative business.

Thos. Chadwick:

A saloon-keeper, formerly proprietor of the *International*. In 1868 he opened *Garrick's Head Saloon*, and in 1871, the *Blue Post*.

R. H. Adams:

A partner of Robert Beaven, general outfitters, who arrived in the colony as early as 1863. In 1869 he was Sub Grand Master, Provincial Grand Lodge of British Columbia, A.F. and A.M. In 1870 he removed to San Francisco, where he entered the hat business.

C. W. Kammerer:

An employee of T. N. Hibben & Co., booksellers and stationers, and later a member of the firm. He took out naturalization papers along with T. N. Hibben, August 4, 1880.

W. Farron:

Born in 1840, a native of County Down, Ireland. He came to British Columbia in 1858 and was one of the holders of rich claims on Hill's Bar, and subsequently went to Williams Creek and owned in the Aurora and other claims. He acquired considerable wealth which he invested in real estate in Victoria. In 1869 he owned the *Yates Street Saloon*. He was also a pioneer of the Omineca and Cassiar mines. He was drowned *en route* to Cassiar aboard the steamer *Grappler*, passing Ten-mile Point, May, 1877.

H. Rudolph:

A native of Germany, and pioneer watchmaker and jeweller in Victoria, where he died, December 20, 1879.

P. Feuchs:

Employed by Wm. Lohse in the *Bank Exchange Saloon.*

Joseph Loewen:

Born in Ediger, Prussia, in June, 1832. He moved to New York in 1850 and to California in 1856 and arrived in British Columbia, July 4, 1858. In 1869 he was a partner with Joseph Lovett in the *Bank Exchange Saloon,* and also librarian of the Germania Sing Verein. In 1871 he became a partner in Erb & Loewen, Victoria Brewery, in which business he continued until his death in 1906.

Of the sixty-one signatures on the supplementary list, it has been possible to identify only forty, but of these it can be said that they are representative of much the same elements of the population of the colony as is indicated by the preceding analysis of the original signatories. A few of the more important are singled out for special note.

George Stelly:

Born in Bettlach, Switzerland, in 1829. He went to New Orleans in 1852 and eventually to California by way of Illinois and Iowa. In May, 1858, he arrived in Victoria, and after mining unsuccessfully at Hill's and Emory's Bars, returned to Victoria and commenced business as a contractor and transfer agent. He was also a pioneer farmer of Saanich district. He died in Victoria, May 28, 1913.

J. W. Williams:

Born in 1830, a native of New York, who came to Victoria in 1859. He possessed considerable property in Victoria and San Francisco, and served four years on the City Council, and represented Victoria City in the local legislature from 1878 to 1882. He was naturalized in November, 1872. He died in San Bernadino, California, January 24, 1887.

T. J. Burnes:

A native of Dublin, Ireland, born about 1832. He came to Victoria in 1858 from San Francisco where he had resided since 1854. For some time he was a member of the Customs House staff of the colony, but later engaged in the hotel business, owning the *American Hotel* in 1869, at which time he was also foreman of the Tiger, No. 2 Company of the Victoria Fire Department. As late as 1907 he re-entered the Customs service.

Thos. Golden:

Proprietor of the *Brown Jug* saloon and Treasurer of the I.O.O.F. Victoria Lodge, No. 1, in 1869. In 1871 he removed to San Francisco.

Eli Harrison:

Born in September, 1822, in Cheshire, England. He went to Macon, Georgia, in 1850, and shortly afterwards removed to San Francisco and to Victoria, June 18, 1858, where he established himself as a house- and sign-painter. From 1878 to 1881 he was Grand Master of the Masonic order in the Province, and served for several years as a Justice of the Peace in Victoria. He died in Victoria in September, 1907.

T. N. Hibben:

A native of Charleston, N.C., born in 1828. He went to California in the gold-rush of 1849 and subsequently established a stationery business in San Francisco which he sold to H. H. Bancroft, the historian, in 1858, on his departure for Victoria, where he established himself as an importing stationer and bookseller. He was naturalized, August 3, 1880. He died in Victoria, January 10, 1890.

D. W. Chauncey:

Born in 1830, in Brooklyn, N.Y. He went to San Francisco in the rush of 1849 and on to British Columbia in 1858. He was a carpenter and joiner by trade and at one time was considered a wealthy man. He was a brother of the Chaunceys who were extensive steamboat operators on the Hudson River. He died at Victoria, May 2, 1887.

Because of the relatively small number of signatures, it could hardly be maintained that the petition was representative of the opinion of the majority of the residents of British Columbia. Certain observations, however, can be made with reasonable accuracy. There can be no doubting the sincerity of the signatories of the petition,[16] nor is it reasonable to levy the charge of disloyalty against the signers of the petition. They were motivated by the conditions in the colony and considered annexation to the United States a preferable solution to the alternative of confederation with Canada. It is to be noted that most of those signing remained in the colony long after Confederation was accomplished, some rising to positions of considerable importance. From the petition it is apparent that the annexation sentiment was confined mainly to Victoria, and even there drew its main support from the non-British element in the population. Indeed, most of those concerned were not even Americans. Germans and Jews provided the main support for the movement and lead one

(16) Some of the leading signatories of the petition were also active in a movement amongst the Masons, the object of which was to secure an independent Grand Lodge for British Columbia. The point is of some interest, and will be dealt with in a subsequent issue of this *Quarterly*.

to suspect that it was a foreign move purely and simply. It did, however, have a broad base, for the signatures are a fairly adequate sampling of the various elements of the population, constituting, as they do, a curious blend of prominent and public-spirited businessmen and inconsequential characters of doubtful reputation. Moreover, the petition is remarkable for the absence of the signatures of certain Victorians who might have been expected to sign, notably Dr. J. S. Helmcken, who gained the reputation of being annexationist in sympathy, though actually there is little to substantiate the accusation, and J. Despard Pemberton, ex-Colonial Surveyor of Vancouver Island, whose three letters on separation from the mother country,[17] appearing in the *British Colonist* on January 26 and 29, and February 1, 1870, provoked such a storm of controversy in the colonial press.

In the colony itself the petition did not arouse a great deal of interest. The Victoria *Evening News* reproduced it in its issue of November 15, 1869, and continued to moot the subject—a policy which contributed greatly to its demise in June, 1870, after a precarious existence of only fourteen months. The *British Colonist*, strong advocate of Confederation, dubbed the movement a "sublime bit of cheek," but none the less recognized the urgency of the local conditions which had given rise to the spirit of annexation.

> We cannot say we are surprised that some colonists should desire annexation to the United States. The loyalty of British subjects in this colony has been submitted to far too severe a test, one under which the loyalty of most persons in the Mother Country would long since have broken down; and all that can be said regarding the present movement is that the fruits of misgovernment and neglect have made their appearance in a less harmful form than open revolt. The feasibility of the movement and the advantages promised by the sought for change are, however, a very different affair.[18]

From an official point of view the cause of annexation was hopeless. Governor Musgrave had been appointed to British Columbia for the specific task of bringing about Confederation. By the publication of Lord Granville's dispatch of August 14, 1869, in the *Government Gazette* on October 30, 1869,[19] he had revealed to the people of British Columbia that the Colonial Office

(17) *British Colonist*, January 26, January 29, February 1, 1870.

(18) *Ibid.*, November 18, 1869.

(19) British Columbia *Government Gazette*, October 30, 1869, reprinted in the *British Colonist*, October 31, 1869.

was irrevocably determined upon seeing Confederation accomplished. Governor Musgrave chose to ignore the whole question of annexation. His only report on the incident occurred in a dispatch to Sir Edward Thornton, British Minister in Washington, who had been shown the petition by the American Secretary of State, Hamilton Fish.[20] Musgrave wrote (it is to be noted none too accurately) :—

I am not aware that any such memorial was ever forwarded. It was known some time ago that a foolish Petition to the President of the United States was said to have been entrusted to Mr. Colyer (*sic*) from about forty foreign residents in Victoria, but the matter was indeed of so little importance that I did not think it necessary even to mention it to the Secretary of State in my despatches. The names you give are known here but they are not those of British subjects or of persons of any standing or influence whatever in the Community. I do not believe that a single British subject signed the Petition. The frequent notice of this matter in the American Papers have been a fruitful source of pleasantry in the Colony.[21]

With the imprimatur of the Colonial Office on Confederation, with Canada anxious to obtain a Pacific outlet, and with the mainland of British Columbia strongly advocating the cause of Confederation, it is not to be wondered that the *British Colonist* should counsel:—

Knowing, as we do, that Annexation is impossible, even if it were desirable, and that Confederation is inevitable, even if it were undesirable, would not all of us be more profitably employed in seeking to secure the best possible terms for this Colony as a province of the Dominion.[22]

---

(20) Thornton to Musgrave, January 12, 1870, enclosed in Musgrave to Granville, March 7, 1870, confidential, *C.O. 60/38*. Thornton reported there were forty-three signatures, but having only seen it for a moment only remembered that the first name was Heisterman and that the names of Wolff and Adams also occurred.

(21) Musgrave to Thornton, February 23, 1870, enclosed in Musgrave to Granville, March 7, 1870, confidential, *C.O. 60/38*. In the covering dispatch Musgrave wrote: "My reply to him contains all that really need be said upon a matter, which I believe to be of no importance." The whole correspondence arose from Granville to Musgrave, February 3, 1870, confidential, *C.O. 398/5* in which were forwarded two letters from the Foreign Office containing Thornton's reports on matters in Washington. Similar information was sent to Canada, *vide*, Granville to Monck, February 5, 1870, confidential, *C.O. 43/156*.

(22) *British Colonist*, November 20, 1869.

The advice thus tendered was evidently taken to heart, judging by the terms of confederation finally agreed upon.[23]

In the United States, however, the petition aroused a more sympathetic response. Numerous press references are made to the movement in all parts of the country,[24] and the petition was frequently printed in full. In Washington Territory considerable interest was evoked.[25] The Olympia *Pacific Tribune* became particularly belligerent over a rumour to the effect that the ruling powers in British Columbia planned to arrest the leaders of the movement, which act, it prophesied, " would fan into flame a fire long smouldering in our midst, and bring upon the people of that country a force of filibusters who, under the pretext of releasing the prisoners, would really seek the overthrow of British Dominion on this coast."[26] The *British Colonist*, moreover, reported that the Legislature of Washington on November 23, 1869, had passed a memorial relative to the annexation of British Columbia.[27]

The receipt of the petition by the President was a signal for the renewal of the legislative schemes for the annexation of at least a portion of British America in settlement of the " Alabama Claims." This fact was made apparent to the Foreign Office by a dispatch from the British Minister in Washington, who, referring directly to the British Columbia annexation petition, wrote:—

This circumstance, the existing disturbance in the Hudson's Bay settlement, and the asserted disaffection in Nova Scotia, are much commented on by

(23) *Vide*, Ireland, W. E., " Helmcken's Diary of the Confederation Negotiation, 1870," *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, IV. (1940), pp. 111–128.

(24) *Cf.*, Detroit *Free Press*, January 2, 1870; St. Paul *Press*, December 23, 1869 (which reprinted the earlier petition to the Queen); New York *Tribune*, January 6, 1870; New York *Times*, December 31, 1869; San Francisco *Alta California*, January 21, 1870. Even the London *Times*, January 1, 1870, carried the news dispatch. The Toronto *Leader*, January 5, 1870, mentioned the petition and returned to deprecate its importance in the issue of January 20, 1870.

(25) Olympia *Transcript*, November 20, 1869; Seattle *Weekly Intelligencer*, November 22, 1869; Olympia *Washington Standard*, February 5, 1870.

(26) Olympia *Pacific Tribune*, November 20, 1869.

(27) *British Colonist*, December 1, 1869. No further reference to this memorial has been found at the time of writing.

the newspapers of this country, and are looked upon as the beginning of a separation of the British Provinces from the mother country, and of their early annexation to the United States. This view of the matter is put in connexion with the settlement of the differences with us arising out of the "Alabama" affair, and Senators are evidently indulging in the [i]llusive hope that England has it in her power, and might not be unwilling to come to an amicable settlement of those differences on the basis of the cession of our territory on this Continent to the United States.[28]

The resolutions introduced to this effect by Senator Corbett, of Oregon, on January 10, 1870, made an extensive quotation from the petition,[29] and the subsequent resolutions of Senator Ramsey, of Minnesota, on February 1, 1870,[30] probably were much encouraged by its publication.

The American Government, however, was more loath to take direct official notice of British Columbia's plea. To be sure, a copy of the petition was forwarded to the American Minister in London, John L. Motley, but the accompanying instructions as to the action he was to take were extremely vague.

I enclose a copy of a paper purporting to be a memorial from Inhabitants of British Columbia urging the transfer of that colony to the United States, which has been presented to the President, and which has already been printed in the public papers of this city and elsewhere through the agency of the parties charged with its presentation.

In an informal conversation with Mr. Thornton, he referred to this petition, and I showed him the original. As Mr. Thornton had very frequently and very openly, not only to me, but in the presence of others, expressed the willingness of the British Government to terminate its political connection with the Provinces on this Continent, whenever it should appear that a separation was desired by its present dependencies, I took occasion to suggest that possibly the desire indicated by these petitioners, taken in connection with the troubles in the Red River or Selkirk Settlement, and the strong opposition to confederation manifested in the Maritime Provinces, might induce his Government to consider whether the time was not near when the future relations of the colonies to Great Britain must be contemplated with reference to these manifestations of restlessness, and to some extent, of dissatisfaction, with their present condition. . . .

It is not impossible that Mr. Thornton may have communicated to Lord Clarendon, the substance of the conversation to which I have referred. Should the subject of the Red River troubles, or of the petition before mentioned be referred to, at any time, by Lord Clarendon, you will express the anxiety of this Government that the Indians remain quiet. . . .

(28) Thornton to Clarendon, January 3, 1870, *F.O. 5/1191.*

(29) *Congressional Globe*, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., part I., pp. 324–325. *Cf.* also, Thornton to Clarendon, January 11, 1870, *F.O. 115/506.*

(30) *Congressional Globe*, 41 Cong., 2 Sess., part I., pp. 931–934.

You will exercise your discretion in reference to this question availing yourself of every opportunity to obtain information as to the real sentiments of the British Government on the question of the separation of the colonies from the Mother Country, and when opportunity offers, indicating the facts which seem to make such separation a necessity.[31]

Such an opportunity did arise on February 19, 1870, at the home of the British Foreign Secretary, Lord Clarendon, on which occasion an interview took place "so informal, intimate and unrestrained" that Motley thought it "improper to record the conversation, even if I could report it accurately, in an official despatch, which might come before the public." Of the substance of the conversation relative to British Columbia he wrote:—

We talked fully of the Red River Insurrection, the annexation petition from British Columbia and the opposition manifested by the Maritime provinces of British America to Confederation.

I did not find his views materially different from those which are set forth in your despatch and from the opinions which I have myself always entertained on these grave subjects. Substantially he said that the British government would never use force to retain them whenever they decided to set up for themselves and assert their independence. He observed that a pro-colonial feeling had of late got up in certain quarters and rather energetically manifested; but I gathered from the tone of his remarks that he had no great sympathy with it; considering it rather a transient than a permanent symptom of the public humor. . . .

On the general subject of independence and annexation I talked very unreservedly; expressing my conviction that the natural course of events within a period that is rapidly diminishing in extent must bring about the independence of all the British Colonies in North America and that furthermore independence would lead naturally to amicable annexation to the Union.

An independent, separate confederacy stretching across the continent and conterminous with our own Republic would have no special reason for existing. So soon as the slight and much-relaxed cord which now bound these colonial possessions to the far distant Crown had been voluntarily severed, they would gravitate to the Union through a community of interests and circumstances.

He expressed no dissent whatever from these views and contemplated such a fortune without regret; observing however that attempts at conquest and

(31) Fish to Motley, January 14, 1870, *Instructions to the United States Minister in London from the Secretary of State*, Department of State, Archives, Washington, D.C., vol. 22.

violent annexation of those territories by the United States were much to be deprecated. . . .[32]

Whatever may have been the personal views of both the British and American statesmen on the question of the future position of the British colonial possessions in North America,[33] there were foreshadowings of an important shift in opinion. No clearer statement of the new attitude is to be found than that offered in the editorial columns of the New York *Times*.

The future political and material destinies of the vast region lying to the north of the United States, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, have long been topics of no ordinary interest to the advanced thinkers of both countries. . . . Sooner or later the whole continent must be brought to the recognition and adoption of one harmonious policy, in which not only the general interest but the allied championship of all by all shall be assured. . . . Such a policy by no means implies absorption into the United States, so far as Canada is concerned. We are believers in " manifest destiny," but our faith does not necessarily carry us to that extent. We are content with the assertion of a purely American civilization, in which the principles upon which our institutions are based shall be established and perpetuated from the Pole to the Isthmus. Outside our own boundaries we should not presume to dictate in the matter of details beyond the point of European interference or aggression. In that respect we stand frankly upon the Monroe doctrine.[34]

The wise policy, thus advocated, was adopted and has become a guiding principle of Canadian-American relations.

The Treaty of Washington of 1871 rang down the curtain on the issue of annexation by removing the many diplomatic problems which had troubled British-American relations since the American Civil War. But of far greater significance than its actual clauses, is the fact that the Treaty of Washington gave the tacit consent of the American Government and people to the right of the British possessions in North America to pursue their own national destiny.

WILLARD E. IRELAND.

PROVINCIAL ARCHIVES,
VICTORIA, B.C.

---

(32) Motley to Fish, February 21, 1870, confidential, *Despatches from the United States Minister in London to the Secretary of State*, Department of State, Archives, Washington, D.C., vol. 102.

(33) For a recent detailed discussion of this question, *vide*, Shippee, L. B., *Canadian-American Relations, 1849–1874*, New Haven, 1939, pp. 180–212, 472–478, in particular.

(34) New York *Times*, April 1, 1870.

NOTES AND COMMENTS.

BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

The annual meeting of the British Columbia Historical Association was held in the Provincial Library, Victoria, on the evening of Friday, October 11, with the President, Dr. T. A. Rickard, in the chair. The report of the Secretary, Mrs. M. R. Cree, showed that the year just closed had been a particularly successful one and that the membership was still increasing. The number of paid-up members was 480, which compared with a total of 462 on the corresponding date in 1939, and 444 in 1938. The Treasurer, Mr. G. H. Harman, was able to report a substantial balance on hand, as his department reflected the increased membership. Dr. W. Kaye Lamb, Editor of the *Quarterly*, stated that the paid circulation of the magazine had risen to the gratifying total of 501, which compared with a total of 485 on the corresponding date in 1939. In view of world conditions, the Association's record is a remarkable one, and the unfaltering support which the membership has accorded the Council and the executives of the various Sections throughout the year has been most encouraging.

The report of the scrutineers showed that the following officers and councillors had been elected for the year 1940–41:—

President	Mr. Kenneth A. Waites, Vancouver.
1st Vice-President	Mr. B. A. McKelvie, Victoria.
2nd Vice-President	Mr. E. M. Cotton, New Westminster.
Honorary Secretary	Miss Helen R. Boutilier, Vancouver.
Honorary Treasurer	Mr. W. E. Ireland, Victoria.
Archivist	Dr. Robie L. Reid, Vancouver.
Members of the Council	Mrs. M. R. Cree, Victoria.
	Mr. J. R. V. Dunlop, Vancouver.
	Rev. J. C. Goodfellow, Princeton.
	Judge F. W. Howay, New Westminster.
	Major H. T. Nation, Victoria.

Dr. Rickard chose as the subject of his presidential address *The Strait of Anian*. The topic was dealt with in a most comprehensive manner, and, in addition to the Strait of Anian proper, Dr. Rickard traced at length the search for a passage from the Atlantic to the Pacific, either by the north or south, and the successive stages by which men gradually became aware of the physical extent of the Americas. The narrative was carried down through the ages to the work of such nineteenth century explorers as Franklin, and the expeditions of Amundsen and others in more recent days. Dr. Rickard's paper will be printed in the near future.

The new President, Mr. Kenneth Waites, and the new Secretary, Miss Helen Boutilier, who were in attendance, and who brought greetings from the Vancouver Section, were introduced at the conclusion of the meeting. A vote of thanks was accorded the retiring executive, and particular men-

tion was made of the work of Mrs. Cree, who had been Secretary of the Association since its reorganization in 1936. Mrs. Cree had been urged to stand once again for re-election, but had declined because she felt that, as the new President was a resident of Vancouver, the work of the association would benefit if its Secretary were also on the Mainland.

The meeting closed with the singing of the National Anthem.

VICTORIA SECTION.

The field day held annually by the Section took the form of a box-picnic, and was held in the Goldstream Canyon, which is some 20 miles from Victoria, on the afternoon of July 20. Between 80 and 90 members attended, and perfect weather added to the success of the gathering. Mr. B. A. McKelvie, President of the Section, addressed those present, and recounted the fascinating story of the gold-rush to the Goldstream district which took place in 1863–64. It all began, Mr. McKelvie explained, on October 19, 1863. The next day the Victoria *Colonist* reported that a hundred men had gone to the new diggings. He recalled that the discovery of the deposits at Goldstream resulted from one of the last official acts of Governor Douglas, who had sent out a party of four prospectors to look for gold and silver in the vicinity of Victoria. Sir James was among the first to go out to the diggings after they were reported. At the height of the excitement about 300 men were at work on the creek. One of the richest claims staked assayed no less than $430 to the ton, and so positive were the good people of Victoria that an extensive and profitable field had been found at their very door, that a crushing and recovery plant to treat Goldstream ore was constructed at the Albion Iron Works. Unfortunately the workings did not prove as remunerative as had been expected, though wages could be made. The majority of the miners in the country at the time were placer-miners, and when the rich gravels of Leech River were discovered in July, 1864, by Dr. Robert Brown's expedition, Goldstream was abandoned, and it has never been worked since. Some twenty-two mines had been worked between the first discovery in the Goldstream area and the discovery of the placer wealth of the Leech River.

The first meeting of the autumn season was held in the Provincial Library on September 23, when the Section was addressed by Mr. George Naden. His subject was *Early Days in the Kootenays*. Mr. Naden, formerly Deputy Minister of Lands, first went to the Kootenays in 1891, and was later Mayor and Member of the Legislature for Greenwood. He played a prominent part in public affairs during the colourful days of early mining activities in the Boundary and Kootenay districts, and told many interesting anecdotes which threw light upon persons and events of the time. Among those mentioned were John Houston, one time Mayor of Nelson and a pioneer journalist of note, whom the speaker characterized as having been "one of the ablest paragraphers that British Columbia ever had"; Fred Hume, who later became Minister of Mines; John Oliver, later Premier of British Columbia; Pat Burns, who became one of the big names in Western Canada as head of the firm of P. Burns & Company, and the famous and beloved "Father Pat," the Anglican clergyman whose service to the Province in early days is commemorated by a monument erected in Rossland.

Miss C. I. Alexander contributed an interesting sketch of the life of her brother, the late J. Stephen Alexander, who served for some years as Government Agent at Fernie, and handed to the Archives, for copying, a number of Mr. Alexander's letters concerning his work from 1885 until the time of his retirement.

Mrs. Michael Jamieson presented to the Archives a miner's pickaxe, which had been found at Goldstream, and which was of special interest to members in view of the fact that the Section's field day had been held at Goldstream only a few weeks previously.

Mrs. Curtis Sampson, Vice-President, presided in the absence of the President, Mr. B. A. McKelvie. Members stood in silent tribute to the memory of the late Charles H. French, former Chief Factor and Fur Trade Commissioner of the Hudson's Bay Company, and a past president of the Association.

The annual meeting of the Section will be held in the Provincial Library on Monday, October 28.

VANCOUVER SECTION.

The Section met in the York Room of the Hotel Georgia on September 18. The President, Mr. J. R. V. Dunlop, presided. The speaker of the evening was Rev. J. H. White, D.D., who had chosen as his subject *Recollections of Pioneer Days in British Columbia, 1859–1871.* Dr. White, a retired minister of the United Church, commenced his first journey to British Columbia from Ontario, where he was born, at the age of four. The date was December 30, 1858. The Methodist Church had decided to send missionaries to the gold mines which were then opening up, and Dr. White's father, the Rev. Edward White, was one of the first party to travel by way of the Isthmus of Panama to Victoria, and thence to Queenborough, as New Westminster was then called, which was reached in April, 1859. Mr. White went to New Westminster a few days before his family, and when they finally joined him there, he recorded in his diary: "What a blessing to be home again"—home at the time being a tent which the Whites shared with another family.

Life was interesting for a small boy who was on the alert for adventure. The little community was surrounded by forests, and a young lieutenant found that the growth was so dense that it took two hours to cover 1½ miles. Dr. White's aunt was the only unmarried young white woman in the entire community, so the family met most of the eligible bachelors of the district. The speaker seems to have enjoyed the contacts, and his stories were many and amusing. The first school for white children in New Westminster was a private venture conducted by Mrs. White's sister.

From 1863 to 1866, Rev. Edward White's duties took him to Nanaimo, where his family became friends of the Dunsmuirs. Almost the entire population of the town was interested in the coal-seams, and the mines were operating on three shifts at the time. The family returned to New Westminster in 1866, and that city formed the centre for Methodist activity extending as far as Chilliwack. From 1864, settlers began coming from Yale, where they had been placer-mining, to the Chilliwack Valley, and the first religious services in the district were held in the homes of Isaac Kipp,

at Chilliwack, and David Miller, at Sumas, in June of 1865. Regular Sunday activities included services at Langley, Maple Ridge, and New Westminster. Life in a pioneer community, where travel was difficult and communication slow, left little time for either clergy or laity to rest.

The annual meeting of the Section will be held on Monday, October 28, when Dr. Robie L. Reid will speak on *The Komagata Maru Case.*

SIMILKAMEEN HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION.

The election of officers for the year 1940–41 was held in July, when the following were elected:—

Honorary President	Mr. Perley Russell.
Honorary Vice-Presidents	Mrs. H. Tweedle.
	Mr. P. Y. Smith.
President	Mr. A. Gould.
Vice-President	Mr. J. D. Saunders.
Secretary-Treasurer	Rev. J. C. Goodfellow.

The annual supper meeting was held in Princeton on the evening of Wednesday, October 2. The gathering was well attended, 126 persons being present for this, the ninth annual banquet of the Association.

At the quarterly meeting held on October 29, reports were received, business transacted, and Rev. J. C. Goodfellow read a paper on *A. C. Anderson and his Explorations in Similkameen.*

NEW PROVINCIAL ARCHIVIST.

Mr. Willard E. Ireland was appointed Provincial Archivist of the Province as from September 1, in succession to Dr. W. Kaye Lamb, who resigned in August to accept the position of Librarian of the University of British Columbia. Mr. Ireland, who is a native son, is admirably qualified for his new position, both by training and experience. He graduated from the University of British Columbia, with first-class honours in history, in 1933, and received his Master of Arts degree from the University of Toronto in 1935. The same year he was awarded the Alexander Mackenzie Research Scholarship in History, which enabled him to pursue his studies in many of the great archives collections. These included the manuscript collection of the Library of Congress and the National Archives of the United States, in Washington, D.C.; the Public Archives of Canada, in Ottawa; and the British Museum and the Public Record Office, in London, England. In addition Mr. Ireland enjoyed for several months the privilege of access to the archives of the Hudson's Bay Company, in London, and his personal acquaintance with and knowledge of the papers relating to British Columbia in all these collections is unique. The Government is to be congratulated upon Mr. Ireland's appointment, and there is every reason to expect that the Archives Department will prosper under his direction.

For the present at least Dr. Lamb will retain the editorship of the *British Columbia Historical Quarterly*, but Mr. Ireland will become Associate Editor and share with him responsibility for the publication of the magazine.

CONTRIBUTORS TO THIS ISSUE.

A. G. Harvey will be remembered as the author of the article entitled *The Mystery of Mount Robson*, which appeared in this *Quarterly* in October, 1937. Readers will find his present paper equally interesting. Mr Harvey has devoted several years of careful search to the task of compiling a definitive biography of David Douglas, and the article here published is based upon two chapters of the longer work, which has now been completed. It is to be hoped that the book will be printed at an early date.

His Honour Judge F. W. Howay, LL.D., F.R.S.C., is the leading authority on the history of British Columbia, and the author of the standard history of the Province.

Sylvia L. Thrupp, Ph.D., is a member of the Department of History of the University of British Columbia. She received her doctor's degree from the University of London, England, and is the author of *A Short History of the Worshipful Company of Bakers* (London, 1933), and other studies and articles.

INDEX.

VICTORIA, B.C.:
Printed by CHARLES F. BANFIELD, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty.
1940.

600-1040-7186

The BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION

Organized October 31st, 1922.

PATRON.

His Honour ERIC W. HAMBER, *Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia.*

OFFICERS, 1940–41.

HON. G. M. WEIR	*Honorary President.*
KENNETH A. WAITES	*President.*
B. A. MCKELVIE	*1st Vice-President.*
E. M. COTTON	*2nd Vice-President.*
WILLARD E. IRELAND	*Honorary Treasurer.*
HELEN R. BOUTILIER	*Honorary Secretary.*
ROBIE L. REID	*Archivist.*

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL.

MRS. M. R. CREE. J. R. V. DUNLOP. F. W. HOWAY.
J. C. GOODFELLOW. H. T. NATION.
MRS. CURTIS SAMPSON (Victoria Section). E. S. ROBINSON (Vancouver Section).
E. M. COTTON (New Westminster and Fraser Valley Section).

OBJECTS.

To encourage historical research and stimulate public interest in history; to promote the preservation and marking of historic sites, buildings, relics, natural features, and other objects and places of historical interest, and to publish historical sketches, studies, and documents.

MEMBERSHIP.

Ordinary members pay a fee of $2 annually in advance. The fiscal year commences on the first day of October. All members in good standing receive the *British Columbia Historical Quarterly* without further charge.

Correspondence and fees may be addressed to the Provincial Archives, Parliament Buildings, Victoria, B.C.