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"DAUGHTERS OF BRITISH BLOOD"
OR "HORDES OF MEN OF ALIEN RACE"
THE HOMESTEADS-FOR-WOMEN CAMPAIGN
IN WESTERN CANADA

SARAH CARTER

In May 1910 Mildred Williams, a young teacher in Saskatoon, Saskatchewan, made headlines across Western Canada for her pluck and stamina as she waited for twelve days and nights on a chair on the stairs outside the door of the land office in Saskatoon to claim a homestead (see Fig. 1).¹ She was determined to file on a half-section (320 acres) of valuable land near Kindersley. Williams put up with a great deal of inconvenience during her days and nights on the stairs. On the second day she was challenged by a man who wanted the same property and who tried to push her off her chair, but her numerous supporters rushed to her assistance and "came near throwing him down the stairs."² Her vigil was worth the wait: she successfully filed on land that she estimated would be worth ten thousand dollars in three years.

On May 16 she emerged from the land office to hearty applause from her friends, and later that day took an auto drive about the city and was congratulated on all sides. Williams successfully "proved up" on the land, earning her patent, or outright ownership, in 1914.³ What was most remarkable about her achievement was that Williams was a single woman, and single women were not permitted to homestead under Canada's Dominion Lands Act.

Mildred Williams was a celebrity not only among her Saskatoon friends but to a growing contingent of supporters of "homesteads for women" in Western Canada. A homestead system patterned to a great extent on the 1862 U.S. Homestead Act permitted all males (except members of First Nations tribes) over the age of twenty-one (later eighteen) to enter
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on a homestead for a ten-dollar fee. Fulfillment of residence and cultivation duties on the homestead during a three-year “proving up” period earned the entrant the title or patent to the land. In both nations married women were prohibited from homesteading, but the Canadian land laws departed from the U.S. model in one important respect: single women were not eligible to homestead. Under the U.S. Homestead Act of 1862, anyone (except enrolled Native Americans) who was the head of a family or over the age of twenty-one could homestead, regardless of gender. In Western Canada, women were eligible only if they qualified as a “sole” head of household with a dependent child or children. Williams was one of a small number of single women who homesteaded in Canada’s prairie provinces. She acquired her homestead land through purchasing South African scrip, a method available to anyone who had the funds, regardless of gender or marital status. South African scrip sold for eight hundred dollars in May 1910, entitling the owner to file on 320 acres of homestead land, after which they had to fulfill all the regular homestead duties. The scrip was originally granted to volunteers who had served in the South African war, and if they declined the offer to homestead they sold their scrip, generally through land agents.

Voices protesting the gendered injustices of Canada’s Dominion Lands Act began to coalesce and gather momentum by 1908. Susan Jackel’s excellent introduction to a 1979 reprint of Saskatchewan farmer Georgina Binnie-Clark’s book Wheat and Woman (1914) remains the only study of the homesteads-for-women campaign. Many dimensions remain unexplored, particularly how key supporters manipulated and reinforced ideas about racial and ethnic “others” to gain support for the cause. Studies of female imperialists of the British empire, and histories that rethink campaigns for women’s suffrage in North America and the British empire, provide a crucial and broader context for understanding the campaign, which was in part inspired by promoters of opportunities for women farmers in the
colonies of the British empire. The prospects for and accomplishments of women agriculturalists were advertised in the Imperial Colonist, the “official organ of the British Women’s Emigration Association and the South African Colonization Society.” The injustices of the homestead laws in Western Canada were also heightened by the dramatically different situation in the U.S. West, where single women were permitted to homestead, and thousands took advantage of the opportunity, including many women from Canada. A substantial and growing number of studies on women homesteaders of the U.S. West also help provide context for understanding the Western Canadian campaign.

While supporters of homesteads for women devised many arguments for the entitlement of (some) women, they increasingly stressed the logic of the rights of British and Canadian-born women, in contrast to the dubious claims of “foreigners,” both male and female. They called for justice and equality, but only for a privileged few. A petition submitted to the Canadian House of Commons in 1913 asked that the privilege of homesteading be granted to “all women of British birth who have resided in Canada for six months.” Faced with a climate inhospitable to the idea of women farmers, landowners, and voters, and ultimately with a completely intransigent federal government, supporters articulated an imperialist vision to gain acceptance, to show that they could provide a solution to the problem of the “foreign element,” and to demonstrate their fitness for the privileges of citizenship that were denied to them yet available to “foreign” men. Disparaging the suitability of settlers of “foreign” origin justified their own claims for inclusion. Promoters of homesteads for women manipulated ideas about racial and ethnic “others” in an effort to win elite support, while at the same time appealing to an egalitarian code of fundamental justice. As Pamela Scully has observed about the rhetoric of race in the women’s suffrage movement in South Africa, “liberal campaigns for civic rights and equality can in fact depend upon invocations of its supposed antimonies—prejudice and exclusion.”

Similarly, in the U.S. West, racist and nativist rationales surfaced in the rhetoric of some Anglo-American suffrage activists who were hostile toward the “foreign,” men “from the slums of the Old World [who] walk out of the steerage of the ships to become enfranchised citizens and ultimately to vote against giving the suffrage to American-born women.” This elite strategy failed however, in the case of homesteads for women. The federal government remained intransigent as long as they were in control of crown or public lands (to 1930), when there was little homestead land left. The imperial logic and elite strategy alienated key constituencies, such as settlers from the United States, who were accustomed to single women having homestead rights and who expected the same privilege in Canada. The singular and new contribution that this article makes is the argument that the manipulation of fears of racial and ethnic “others” was at the heart of “homesteads for women,” that this strategy must be understood within a larger British imperial context, and that this narrow and elitist approach did not assist but rather hindered the initiative. No matter what the strategy, however, there was little hope for success in confronting deeply embedded views of women as unsuitable and incapable farmers and landowners.

SHAPING “MANLY SPACE”: CANADA’S HOMESTEAD LEGISLATION

In Canada single women were deliberately excluded from homestead rights in 1876. The initial 1871 legislation had permitted “[a]ny person who is the head of a family, or has attained the age of twenty-one years, who is a subject of Her Majesty by birth or naturalization” to enter on a quarter section. This wording was interpreted to include single women, and from 1872 to 1876 there were approximately 150 women, some single, others widows, who filed on homesteads. But in 1876 the legislation was changed to “[a]ny person, male or female, who is the sole head of a family, or
any male who has attained the age of eighteen years.”15 There were three significant changes to the earlier wording. The first was that the eligible male category was lowered from age twenty-one to eighteen, greatly expanding the number of potential male homesteaders. A second change was that a female was eligible only if she was a head of a family, which was interpreted to mean that she had to have a minor child or children dependent upon her. A third important change was the addition of the modifier “sole,” which was used to exclude women whose husbands might be alive, although invalided or otherwise incapacitated, or a woman who had adopted or otherwise was responsible for a child or children whose parent(s) were still alive.

Why was the 1876 change made to deliberately exclude single women? Unfortunately there is no record of why this decision was made. Following a visit to Manitoba and the North-West Territories, Surveyor General J. S. Dennis made the recommendation in October 1875 to “render females, not being heads of families, ineligible to enter for homesteads.”16 In 1875 plans for a prosperous agricultural West were in disarray because of an economic depression and grasshopper invasion that had destroyed the crops for the previous two years. There were a high number of cancellations and abandonments. Perhaps Dennis believed women were not bona fide homesteaders, and that they were contributing to the economic depression. He likely shared with other architects of the Canadian West the idea, retained and promoted over subsequent decades, that women did not have the physical strength and capacity to farm, and that good land was wasted on them. Canadian federal officials consistently insisted that the goal of the homestead system was to make the land productive, and women were not seen as capable of making the land productive, despite all the work they did on the homesteads. Officials stressed that the goal of the homestead system was to settle families or potential heads of families (understood to be male) on the land. Women, preferably British and British Canadian women, were needed in the West for their labor and to reproduce the population, but in Canada the preferred method of attracting women was through domestic servant immigration programs and not through any windows of opportunity for single women to obtain land.

Western Canada was deliberately shaped as “manly space,” where the building block and organizing principle was the authority of the white, property-holding male head of household.17 Control of land and therefore wealth was not to be shared, nor were there to be any hindrances for landowners who wanted to sell or buy. This shaping of “manly space” is illustrated in the homestead laws as well as in the abolition of women’s dower rights in 1885 in Manitoba and 1886 in the Northwest Territories, which meant that a husband could sell the family home without his wife’s consent, or entirely cut her out of his will.18 Shaping “manly space” also involved a concerted campaign to impose the monogamous model of marriage on the diverse inhabitants.19 A national identity would be forged that was distinct from the old First Nations and mixed ancestry people and was distinct from the United States. It would be based on the “traditional” gender order of the obedient, submissive wife and the provider, head-of-family husband. All this was fueled by an image of the United States as a place of disrupted and dangerous alternatives to the “natural” gender order and by a determination that pristine and pure Canada would be kept free of the immoral and corrupting influences from the south.20 This was most clearly seen in condemnations of the loose and lax divorce laws, but another indicator of a society that had run amuck was permitting women alternatives to marriage such as acquiring homestead land for farming.

The only women who qualified for homestead land in Western Canada were those regarded as heads of families—mainly widows with minor children dependent upon them, and in rare cases divorced or separated women, but they too had to have a minor child or children. A complicated welter of Department of Interior and Department of Justice “rulings"
and "opinions" governed which women could homestead. Individual cases were carefully scrutinized by officials in Ottawa with the overall goal of severely restricting the numbers of eligible women, making homesteading nearly impossible for women. Compared to the situation in the United States, much more paperwork and legal proof of divorce, separation, legal adoption, or legal guardianship had to be provided for permission to be obtained. The files of the interior and justice departments contain tortuous correspondence and memorandums on issues such as how to define the term "the sole head of a family."21 "Sole" was not used in the U.S. statutes. A separated woman with a minor child or children could "sometimes" be the sole head of a family if the husband was presumed dead, or "where by a binding agreement or by the Courts she has been given custody or control of the children."22

By contrast, many thousands of solo women claimed and proved up on homesteads in the U.S. West. There were decades of discussion and debate in Congress about the proper place of female landowners in the West, and single women were very deliberately included in the 1862 homestead legislation, just as they were deliberately excluded in Canada in 1876. As Tonia M. Compton has shown, this measure did not spring from confidence in the ability of women to farm; rather, white women were seen as key to the "civilization" and future population of the U.S. West, just as domestic servants from the British Isles were seen as key to the future of the "race" in Western Canada.23 U.S. senator William Dawson from Georgia for example argued that the homestead grant could serve as a sort of dowry for single women, "inducing some to unite with her."24 The argument was also made that if a woman "is unfettered by the marriage ties she has the same natural right to be provided a home from the public domain that the unmarried man of the same age has." Katherine Benton-Cohen has recently argued that in the early twentieth century, the promotion of homesteading for both single women and men was a means of advancing a "cultural agenda of racial improvement [and] national reinvigoration," addressing a perceived need for "desirable white settlers."25

The U.S. legislation permitted a much wider diversity of women to acquire homestead land, and overall there was a greater flexibility in the interpretations of the regulations by officials of land offices and more acceptance of and assistance to women stigmatized in Canada such as unwed mothers and divorced women. Widows applying for homesteads did not need to have minor children dependent on them for support as in Canada. Single, unwed mothers were permitted to make entry, even if they were not yet twenty-one years of age.26 Mormon women who were plural wives were permitted to enter for homesteads because their marriages were not recognized as legal.27 Deserted and divorced women could homestead, and they did not have to have minor children dependent on them. In the United States an abandoned wife, or "one whose husband is a confirmed drunkard," was considered the head of a family.28 A married woman could make homestead entry if she had been "actually deserted" by her husband, of if her husband was in the penitentiary or "incapacitated by disease or otherwise from earning a support for his family and the wife is really the head and main support of the family."29 Most of this was clearly itemized in the legislation, and available in the published guides to prospective homesteaders.

GALVANIZING THE CAMPAIGN AND A FIRST PETITION

In Canada, women who wanted to homestead or farm had several options. One option was to go the United States, and many did.30 Another option was to purchase South African scrip, as in the case of Mildred Williams. Approximately 510 women (single, married, widowed, separated, etc.) homesteaded land in Saskatchewan through purchasing South African scrip.31 Prime agricultural land could be purchased from the Canadian Pacific Railway, and there were women who took advantage of this opportunity.32 They could also purchase "improved" farms from vacating homesteaders,
as was the case with English writer Georgina Binnie-Clark, who bought a farm in 1905 near Fort Qu'Appelle, Saskatchewan, and wrote the book *Wheat and Woman* (1914) about her first years of farming.

Another option was to organize, lobby, and petition for a change to Canada's federal homestead laws. A homesteads-for-women campaign intersected and combined with the campaigns for the reinstatement of dower in the prairie provinces and for women's suffrage. Of these campaigns, homesteads for women was the greatest flop. Legislators never wavered on the issue—women never received the right to homestead in Western Canada, with the exception of Alberta after 1930. When the prairie provinces assumed control of public lands from the federal government in 1930, the right to homestead was abrogated entirely in Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and in Alberta, where there was a little homestead land left, the provincial government drew up regulations that permitted every "person" to apply who was over seventeen, had resided in the province for three years, and was either a British subject or had declared the intention to become one.

In April 1910, just a few weeks before Mildred Williams's twelve-day vigil, editor of the *Edmonton Bulletin*, member of Parliament for Alberta, and minister of the interior (1905-11) Frank Oliver articulated in the House of Commons why he did not support homesteads for women. He was asked by W. J. Roche, member of Parliament for Manitoba (later also to be minister of the interior), if his attention had ever been called to the idea of allowing women to homestead, and the letter of a reverend gentleman in Saskatchewan, published in a Winnipeg newspaper, was read into the record. Reverend W. W. Beveridge recommended allowing women over the age of eighteen to homestead as a means of addressing "a great dearth of marriageable ladies" in the province. He claimed to know of parents of daughters who refused to move west and asked "why that man had not just as much right to homestead and get a quarter section for each of those girls as the man who happened to have four grown-up boys?" Beveridge also knew of men with large families of strong healthy girls in the Dakotas and Minnesota who would come to Canada if their girls could homestead, but because they could not, were moving to Montana instead.

Oliver replied that the matter had been brought to his attention frequently, and his answer was that women homesteaders were "not in the interest of the settlement of our country." He was aware of the different land law in the United States but was "not aware that it is an advantageous law." Oliver explained that the purpose of giving free land to homesteaders was to make the land productive, and that "in order that a homestead may be made fully productive, there should be not a single woman upon it, nor even a single man, but there should be both the man and woman in order that the homestead may be fully advantageous to the country. The idea of giving homesteads to single women would tend directly against that idea." He said that it was the job of the single man "to get the woman, and for the woman who wants to settle on land in the Northwest to get the man, rather than that she shall have land of her own. . . . Our experience is entirely against the idea of women homesteading."

Oliver's response in the House of Commons helped galvanize the homesteads-for-women campaign, which was also assisted by the promoters of agriculture/horticulture as a vocation for British women in the British empire, an initiative that was centered in the journal *The Imperial Colonist*. Binnie-Clark, who split her time between her Cheyne Walk flat in London and her farm at Fort Qu'Appelle, was the critical link between the Edwardian women imperialists in the "mother country" and the Canadian scene. In 1910 Binnie-Clark published a series of articles in *The Imperial Colonist* entitled "Are Educated Women Wanted in Canada?" The journal was mainly devoted to the recruitment of women as domestic servants to the colonies; its thinly disguised subtext was that they would soon be married and helping to augment the population of the empire. As the October 1911 editorial proclaimed,
The Empire's call to the women of our race is clear, urgent and inspiring: never before so insistent as it is today. Our young men want mates of their blood in the great sunny uplands of the Empire. . . . The Dominions need wives, sisters, mothers, teachers, nurses, domestic helpers and home makers.36

But increasing attention was paid to the opportunities for single women with a little capital to invest in the establishment of poultry, dairy, or fruit farms throughout the empire, including Canada. Negative coverage was given to the situation for single women in the United States, and readers were advised that U.S. “alien laws” were rigidly enforced, that there were no chaperones to meet women immigrants as in Canada and other colonies, and that there was danger of being lured away to lives of “white slavery” and Mormon polygamy. Readers were advised that “anyone wishing to go to America [should] choose Canada under our own flag.”37

By 1910 articles in the Imperial Colonist regularly noted opportunities for women agriculturalists in Western Canada. In May 1910, for example, it was reported that a colony of women poultry farmers was the latest scheme of the Canadian Pacific Railway.38 The proposal was to divide land at Strathmore, Alberta, into small farms for the women, who would have a ready-made market supplying eggs and poultry to the railway’s hotels and dining cars. There were advertisements for “colonial training” and for horticultural colleges in England that provided women and girls from across the empire with practical instruction in gardening, dairying, and poultry. By 1910 Georgina Binnie-Clark was training young women from England on her Fort Qu’Appelle farm, advertising in the Times of London for recruits, and taking in students from the prestigious Roedean School near Brighton.39

In November 1908 Binnie-Clark wrote to the Department of the Interior, asking that consideration be given to the idea of “Free Homesteads for Women.”40 She argued that there was no insurmountable obstacle to a woman working a farm, as “if they do not get through as much work as a man in a day, they will get through considerably more in a season.” Women would not “roam around during the off-season” but would devote themselves to their farms and to building their communities. Binnie-Clark recommended that the government offer a limited number of homesteads to English women as an experiment, and she had in mind women of education who possessed some capital and who had training from an agricultural college or on a dairy farm. The answer she received from the superintendent of immigration was brief and to the point.41 Her arguments in favor of giving homesteads to unmarried women were noted, “but unfortunately the law does not allow this and the Department does not make a law and has no power to alter it in this particular.” This answer made it clear that supporters of homesteads for women had to lobby to have the federal legislation changed.

A few weeks after Mildred Williams’s successful vigil in late May 1910, a petition to minister of the interior Frank Oliver, originating from Edmonton, was published in the Edmonton Bulletin, Oliver’s own newspaper, under the headline “Spinsters Want Homesteads.”42 It asked that homestead lands be available to any unmarried woman in Canada over the age of thirty. The central argument advanced in the petition was that unmarried women were as deserving and as desirable settlers as widows. The petition declared it an injustice to favor widows only, as they often had an inheritance, while a “noble class of women” were just as deserving. These were women who found themselves “at middle age thrown out upon their own resources, the majority of them having had to sacrifice opportunities of marriage and competence for the sake of remaining at home with one or more aged parents to provide and care for them in their old age.” The minor children of the widows permitted to homestead would become a financial asset to the mother, whereas those women who cared for parents had no one to provide for them. Signatures were to be collected from “the undersigned, unmarried women of Canada.”
The context for the petition was explained in a letter to the *Manitoba Free Press*, where the petition was also published in mid-June 1910. "M.S.T." wrote that a number of women in the Edmonton district had asked her to organize a petition. She was from the United States and had moved to Alberta because of the advertisements she had read about "free land." When she applied for a homestead, however, she was told she was ineligible. "Well, I was surprised, just having refused to join another single woman, who with her father was filing on 160 acres of choice land in Arkansas." She argued that unmarried women who had cared for aged parents "should be rewarded, not looked down upon and called 'old maids' on the bargain counter." She understood that because of the "scarcity of white women ... good decent men are degenerating and marrying squaws" and further argued that women were far more capable of homesteading than the many "foreigners who come to this country, men who have never pursued agriculture in their home country and know practically nothing about it." It was later reported in the *Free Press* that the author of this first petition had returned to the United States.

**MARSHALLING THE ARGUMENTS FOR WOMEN HOMESTEADERS**

It is unknown how many signatures this petition received, or whether it was ever submitted to Parliament. There were fundamental flaws, however, to the strategy embedded in the petition. It was organized by an American woman, and the petitioners were unmarried women, and of course, nonvoters, and thus Canadian legislators could easily dismiss it. Women reformers were divided about the value of petitions, but most agreed that "petitions signed by women are usually treated as a joke by the electors," as prominent activist Nellie McClung told a suffrage rally in 1912. Although the petition was to become the main tactic of the homesteads-for-women campaign, strategies changed considerably from the first, Edmonton-based petition that stressed that single women should have the same rights as widows. The *Grain Growers' Guide* became the focus for the campaign, and women's page editor Isabelle Beaton Graham ("Isobel" in her column "Around the Fireside") was the main voice of the campaign. The *Guide* had a cooperative reform agenda, and it supported women's suffrage from its first issue in 1908. Readers of the *Guide* were asked to organize, agitate, and educate on the issues of homesteads for women and dower rights. Also supporting homesteads for women were the women's page editors of the *Nor'West Farmer*, Mary S. Mantle or Margaret Freeston, and of the *Manitoba Free Press*, Lillian Laurie or Lillian Beynon Thomas.

Many arguments were advanced in favor of homesteads for women. Supporters pointed to the successes of Binnie-Clark and the South African scrip women homesteaders, but a much richer vein of evidence was found in the women homesteaders of the U.S. West. A related argument was that Canada was losing girls and women to the homesteading opportunities south of the border. Influenced by the literature celebrating the triumphs, pluck, and independence of women homesteaders, supporters made no mention of any difficulties, challenges, and disappointments that confronted U.S. women homesteaders. Samples of the work of literary homesteader accounts were republished in the *Guide*, such as "Woman on Forty Acres," by a woman farmer in Montana who grew wheat, oats, and sugar beets, raised poultry, and had a comfortable home of six rooms. As a reader wrote to the *Nor'West Farmer*, "if American girls can do this, are we Canadian girls so far behind our American cousins that we can't?" Editor Margaret Freeston replied that she knew two girls who went to the Dakotas because they could not secure homesteads in Canada and were "now the proud possessors of deeds to the land. What a pity that 'good stuff' like these girls were made of should be lost to us!" A. H. Cunningham, from Ravine Bank, Saskatchewan, wrote to the *Guide* that

I have often thought it a shame that in the United States women could take land and
here in Canada where there is so much more land they are not allowed the privilege. I have seen women in the States that did their duties far better than the average bachelor. 59

"Canada has never shown any kindness to her women that I ever could see," wrote a woman from Claresholm, Alberta, to the Guide in 1912.50 "Her girls are just as bright and intelligent as those in the United States. The latter were allowed to homestead while Canadian girls were pushed behind the door." She knew of women who had homesteaded in the States, sold out and bought land in Canada, and she also knew Canadian women going to Montana to homestead and asked, "Why could they not stay at home, as our land is just as good if not better?"

Supporters of homesteads for women argued that women had the physical strength and capability to homestead, and that women were proving this throughout the West by performing homestead duties on the farms of spouses, brothers, or fathers. As "X.Y.Z." wrote to the Guide in 1913, "A wife who can rise at four and five o'clock in the morning and wait on a lot of hired men, with the husband in bed, is quite capable of homesteading."51 Homesteading would keep women on the land and away from the evils of the city, offering them a healthy and invigorating environment. Graham argued that it was unfortunate that a daughter raised on a farm had to turn to teaching, dressmaking, or stenography when she had all the necessary skills, and

all her soul [would] call aloud for the prairie, for the grating of the plow, for the swish of the binder, and the hum of the threshing machine, never to mention old Brindle or Bess, or the little colt she had raised by hand. . . . [I]n the name of common sense and common humanity give them a chance to farm and live the life they love and are suited for. 52

Another widely shared rationale was that homesteads for women would provide a source of wives for bachelors of the West. The result would be "contented, prosperous homes, instead of a region of vacant farms, with only the ruins of bachelors' shacks (monuments to a short-sighted policy), to break the monotony of the view."53

A central argument advanced by many supporters was that it was an injustice to award free land to families of boys, while those who had girls were penalized. A family with four boys could have five homesteads altogether, while a family with all girls could only have one; the family of boys became wealthy while the family of girls became poorer, as pointed out in an editorial in the Guide, which concluded, "Until the government of our land is entrusted with the power of ordaining the sex of children it does not seem fair that such discrimination should be made as is done in the case of our homestead laws."54 The issue was interwoven with the dower campaign and protests over inheritance patterns that favored sons who were understood to have earned the land, while no value was attached to the work of daughters.

A fundamental criticism of the homestead legislation was that women were just as deserving of the grant of land. The land grant was cast as a birthright, or inheritance or reward, that was owed to women as well as men. As one supporter of the campaign wrote in the Guide: "God put both Adam and Eve into the Garden of Eden. Evidently Eve had as much right there and on the land as her husband."55 Women had also earned this birthright, as they were directly responsible for increased land values, and this included married or deserted women. Mrs. J. R. Long took this position in her letter to the Nor'West Farmer on May 5, 1910:

There are millions of acres of land lying here waiting to be taken up—any male subject over eighteen years can come and have a half section for the asking and the small entry fee, but a woman who is forced into the world to earn a living for herself and little family cannot have an acre unless her husband is deceased. Is a deserted wife with a
family dependent upon her not more worthy of a homestead than perhaps her unworthy husband who may be in some other part of the country experiencing no difficulty in securing a homestead? And is a widow who either has no family or a family all married not worthy of some consideration?

Although this argument was muted, supporters of homesteads for women linked homestead and property rights to suffrage, arguing that with homestead rights, women would be landowners and would therefore have to become voters. In a letter to the Free Press on June 2, 1910, “Business Woman” wrote,

Why the Dominion government does not grant a homestead to each and all of our Canadian women who want one bad enough to do all the homestead duties the same as a man, instead of importing foreigners from all over Europe . . . I cannot see, unless they are afraid that with women landowners we would the sooner get the vote.

HOMESTEADS FOR SOME WOMEN AND NOT OTHERS

The rationale for homesteads for women that increasingly held center stage was that land grants should be available to “daughters of British blood,” rather than to “hordes of men of alien race.” Similar arguments were being made at this time by some supporters of women’s suffrage. E. A. Partridge, founder of the Guide and supporter of women’s suffrage, argued in a 1909 editorial that it was an “outrage to deny to the highest minded, most cultured native-born lady what is cheerfully granted to the low brawed, most imbruted foreign hobo that chooses to visit our shores.”56 In the Guide Graham increasingly emphasized this argument for (some) women’s homestead rights. In her 1909 column that helped launch the campaign, under the subheading “Consider the Douks,” she protested the gift of homestead land to the Doukhobors (settlers from Russia) who “so scandalize civilization.”57 She wrote,

It is painful to realize that our own Canadian men—our fathers and our brothers—deliberately set us aside as undeserving of a share in our country . . . to bring in ignorant, uncouth, lawless foreigners to occupy lands that we desire, that we have labored for yet cannot have.

In her next most sustained column on the issue, “Unearned Increments and Woman’s Dower,” Graham wrote that the federal government preferred to dower the “unspeakable foreigner” while denying to women the proceeds of their own toil.58 Other readers elaborated on this argument. “Mother Scot” from Alberta complained that they were surrounded by a “colony of aliens whose habits and ways of looking at things make them hopeless as neighbors,” and

I often think how unfair it is to give these outlanders the privilege of homestead and deny that privilege to their own race and blood, when it happens to be of the other sex. Is not the mother—actual or prospective—of sons and daughters of British blood at least as worthy of a share of God’s free gift as the hordes of men of alien race who are given free homesteads without a condition.59

Graham and other supporters of homesteads for women manipulated fears of the “foreign” or “alien” element that prevailed among the British Ontarian settlers. Intolerant attitudes toward immigrants seen as undesirable, including Mormons, Ukrainians, Jews, Doukhobors, and Asians, were stridently and widely broadcast in the late nineteenth and early twentieth century in Western Canada.60 Prominent newspapermen in the West such as Frank Oliver and P. G. Laurie (of the Saskatchewan Herald in Battleford) took the lead in propagating these views.61 A 1906 editorial in the Indian Head Vidette was typical, asking how Canada was to fashion an “intelligent, high-minded” body of citizens out of this “heterogeneous conglomeration” and “maintain in this new land, which we proudly call ‘the Greater Britain Beyond the
Seas,' those principles and usages and ideals that have made Great Britain so strong and prosperous and influential? A further "outrage" was that these "aliens" could vote, "men who have just emerged from serfdom . . . who are ignorant of the very alphabet of the public life of Canada."

Proponents of homesteads for women capitalized on fears of the "foreigner" to connect themselves to issues of national and imperial importance to which they could offer solutions. They were asking for equal treatment, but only for those British and Canadian-born women who were qualified for inclusion. Like suffragists in the U.S. West and in other colonial settings, they "manipulated ideas about racial and ethnic 'Others,' usually reinforcing contemporary racialist and racist attitudes, particularly those linking race, sex and 'civilization.'" In Western Canada however, supporters of homesteads for women could not claim superiority by virtue of their "whiteness," as the "foreign" women they wanted to exclude from the privilege of homesteading were phenotypically similar. It was not particularly clear just who was "white" in Western Canada. As Catherine Hall has observed, the question was seldom straightforward in the colonies of the British empire. Instead of whiteness, Britishness became the marker of privilege in Western Canada, and a British Canadian elite dominated business, politics, law, and education. Leaders of the homesteads-for-women campaign decided to align themselves and identify with this elite, arguing that they would help maintain the hegemony of the group.

The manipulation of fears of racial and ethnic "others" among some supporters of homesteads for women reached a new level in 1911 when the likelihood loomed of a sizeable migration of African Americans from Oklahoma to Alberta and Saskatchewan. They had begun to appear in small numbers in 1905, increasing after 1907 when Oklahoma became a state and the first state legislature passed "Jim Crow" legislation, and again in 1910 when Oklahoma Democrats moved to disenfranchise African Americans. There was a strong reaction against this migration in Western Canada. Graham's columns in the Guide were among the most racist, strident, and alarmist, containing utterly fabricated allegations. Her column "The Negro," of May 3, 1911, began,

Fireside would like well to know what the people, especially the country women of the west think about the negro invasion that is now pouring into the Canadian west and receiving free land grants from the Dominion government, and farming large settlements contiguous to and among the whites. There can scarcely be anyone who is not aware of the atrocities committed by members of these terrible communities, the only corresponding punishment for which is the lawless lynching, and even burning at the stake. Already it is reported that three white women in the Edmonton and Peace River districts have been victims of these outrages accomplished in peculiarly fiendish abandon. Where will the end be? . . . How many of these industrious, courageous, unprotected, country women must be sacrificed to the horrors of negro attack before the slow and rusty machinery that drives the engine of state can be induced to erect a barricade against so dreadful an evil?

Although it seems like an odd leap to make after pointing out the vulnerability of women alone on homesteads, the main point of Graham's column on "The Negro" was that (some) women should be given the right to homestead. She concluded, "It should be possible for Canadian women to secure from the government of their fathers, husbands, brothers and sons at least an equal share with the foreign negro, in the rich heritage of the Dominion's homestead lands." This was Graham's first column to clearly articulate that homesteaders should not be "foreign" women who did not know the "rigors of the country, and who are bound to fail through the discouragements of unexpected hardships. In their interest it is wise to hinder them at the start until fully assured that they understand the undertaking."
THE SECOND PETITION: HOMESTEADS FOR "ALL WOMEN OF BRITISH BIRTH"

A second homesteads-for-women petition, prepared by Graham, was announced in the May 24, 1911, issue of the *Guide* (see Fig. 2). The arguments set forth in the petition were that widows had made successful and desirable settlers; that many others, including unmarried women and widows without young children, desired to homestead; that these women would foster education and health and encourage a “better class of male settlers”; that the homestead laws discriminated against families with daughters; that women contributed their share to the growth and prosperity of the nation and had helped to make Dominion lands valuable; and that the privilege of homesteading would afford women a healthy and economic method of securing an independent livelihood and would ease congestion in towns and cities by drawing the population back to the land. It then asked that the Parliament of Canada to grant the privilege of homesteading to "all women of British birth who have resided in Canada for six months, and if residing with their father or mother or a near relative, are of the age of eighteen years, or if otherwise, are of the age of twenty-one years."

The wording of the petition was deliberately vague on the issue of the marital status of the would-be woman homesteader. It could be understood to include both single and married women. In answer to a reader who wrote that she would support the petition if it meant married women as well as single, Graham wrote, "It is certainly intended that any woman, married or single, of British birth shall be eligible to homestead," but that it was "not thought advisable to flaunt the married woman's claim before 'the powers that be.'" She explained that married women were not specifically mentioned in the petition in the hope that thereby she might pass in unobserved, as it were, but she is certainly there, and who has a better right? It is the married woman, NOT the single man, who has made the Western homestead taste as a sweet morsel in the mouth of the Easterner, and who most merits a homestead.

There was some debate and uncertainty about whose signatures should be obtained for the petition. Initially Graham thought there should be separate petitions, one for men and one for women, "so that it could easily be ascertained which are the voters and how many, and which are the non-voters." Only women over the age of twenty-one were to sign. But this strategy was shelved when it was later decided that only the signatures of voters (men) should be obtained. Graham explained that "it will be taken for granted that all women desire the homestead privilege for their sisters even though they do not intend to take advantage of it themselves."

Many letters requesting petitions soon appeared in the *Guide*. Supporters sought signatures at summer agricultural fairs and events such as Dominion Day and Orangemen's picnics. Other tactics included postcards and letters sent directly to officials in Ottawa (see Fig. 3). In 1913 J. H. Perra of Winnipeg wrote to the minister of the interior,

On the strength of the success that the women of the States have made in homesteading and that which the Canadian women are making on scrip which they have bought, can you not see your way to introduce a bill to give the women of Canada the right to homestead. We women of the west feel that our rightful inheritance is wrested away from us and given to strangers and all because we have committed the sin of belonging to the 'female species.'

But before long fissures appeared that weakened and undermined the campaign. Readers repeatedly asked Graham why American women were excluded under the wording of the petition. As E. L. Stow, born in the United States but resident in Saskatchewan, wrote, "I do not see why I have not as much right to homestead as a woman of British birth. I am
To His Excellency, The Governor General of Canada, In Council:

HUMBLY THE undersigned residents of the Dominion of Canada, HUMBLY SHEWETH that:

1. Whereas The Dominion Lands Act provides that any person who is the head of a family, or a male who is over the age of eighteen years, may homestead a quarter section of available Dominion lands;

2. And Whereas only women who are widows and who have infant children living may secure homesteads;

3. And Whereas experience has shown that widows have made successful and desirable settlers;

4. And Whereas many women, including widows without infant children and unmarried women, both Canadian born and British, possessing means, are most desirous of, and would take advantage of the right to homestead;

5. And Whereas the country would be greatly benefited thereby through the fostering of education through the ordinary graces of living; and the greater encouragement of a better class of male settlers;

6. And Whereas the Homestead Law discriminates against the man having daughters, providing a birthright dower only for the homesteader whose children are sons, and none for the homesteader whose children are daughters, and the accident of sex thereby enriches one family and impoverishes the other;

7. And Whereas many of the women of Canada, although unable to homestead have entered callings where they do secure their own livelihood, and have thereby contributed their share to the growth and prosperity of the country, it is reasonable to assume that, given the homestead privilege, their consequent action will justify this expansion of favors;

8. And Whereas such women have to bear their share of the cost of government, and have largely helped to make Dominion lands valuable, but are nevertheless denied any heritage in them;

9. And Whereas the privilege of homesteading would afford them an easy, healthful and economic method of securing an independent livelihood;

10. And Whereas the trend of population is flowing injuriously to Canada, toward congestion in towns and cities; and all over North America the great cry is, “Get back to the land”;

Now, Therefore, Your Petitioners Humbly Pray:

That as soon as possible a Bill may be introduced by your Government and enacted by the Parliament of Canada, providing that all women of British birth who have resided in Canada for one year and if residing with their father or mother or a near relative and are of the age of eighteen years, or if otherwise, are of the age of twenty-one years, shall be granted the privilege of homesteading.

And your petitioners as in duty bound will ever pray.

Dated this 27th day of June, A.D., 1911.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George Kim</td>
<td>Manjeg</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. The second (1911) petition, submitted to the Canadian Parliament in 1913. File 2876596, pt. 2, vol. 1105, Record Group 15, Records of the Department of the Interior, Library and Archives Canada.
sure I know more about the work of a farm than a Britisher just out a year could do at first." She had “run the binder, stooked, cut, raked, and stacked hay; plowed, disked and harrowed; in fact I think I have done everything necessary on a farm.”74 “Ex-American” wrote, “When I read your petition in Fireside all my fondest hopes were crushed for the petition reads that women of British and Canadian birth be allowed the privilege of homesteading and I first beheld the light of day under the Stars and Stripes.”75 Graham was obliged to try to explain on many occasions in the pages of the Guide. She wrote on August 16, 1911, that she was not opposed to the American woman as a homesteader. She is akin to us in every attribute . . . with the exception of fealty to the British flag. But if we admit any nationality other than British, where shall we, or where can we, draw the line? Instantly the question will be raised, “Is it in the interest of Canada to admit a heterogeneous mass of foreign femininity to the homestead privilege in Canada? Can we absorb them as fast as they will come?” Even as it is the foreign men are a menace and hindrance.76

Graham feared the petition would be unsuccessful if they asked for homestead rights for “women who have no culture whatever, no education, and women who are unlikely to be anything but a drawback to the progress of Canadian institutions for years to come.”77 No one could object, however, to “an influx of law-abiding, industrious, refined and patriotic gentlewomen with some means into the bleak and bare stretches of the West.”78 Graham also insisted that “the American woman has least to complain of inasmuch as she has had the homestead privilege for years and years in her own country.”79

Soon there were many letters objecting to the words “of British birth” in the petition. H.G. Ahern, from Claresholm, Alberta, asked,

Is a woman of British birth any more entitled to homestead privileges than one of any other birth who comes here to live, and by so doing, helps build up the country, by helping her husband and neighbors transform a barren prairie to a garden spot of grain? The women of British birth should not be so selfish and shortsighted as to try to put through a law of this kind . . . for if they succeed it will be a blot on the degree of their intelligence, and a factor of their lack of Christianity as practiced by them, which our historians will be sorry to relate.80

M. E. Graham, who acquired signatures at the Kitscoty Dominion Day celebration, reported that a great number of potential supporters of both sexes were not in favor of the clause “of British birth.” and she personally saw it as a mistake, as there were so many excellent women from the States, and she saw no reason why the homestead law for women should differ from that for men.81 In a letter sent directly to Ottawa, V. C. Bedier wrote from Chauvin, Alberta, to say that the measures Graham was trying to introduce through the petition ought to fail, “because of it being so narrow let it be for all women. . . . It certainly would be hard to find women less suitable to help build a country than some of these very ones she so very narrowly tried to favour.”82

By early 1912 Graham was replaced as women’s page editor of the Guide, apparently in order to pursue the campaign full time, but
it may also have been that her views were too controversial and extreme. She was replaced first, and briefly, by Mary Ford, and then by Francis Marion Beynon, who played a critical role in the suffrage campaign in Manitoba along with her sister, Lillian Beynon Thomas, and Nellie McClung. Francis Marion Beynon had been a consistent defender of the rights of the “foreigner,” believing that all ethnic groups deserved equal treatment. She once commented in response to a slur against African American people: “Because we of the Anglo-Saxon race have been able to bully less militant and aggressive peoples into handing over their territory to us is a poor basis for the assumption that we as a race are the anointed of God and the one and only righteous and virtuous people.”

Nellie McClung also endorsed ethnic diversity and promoted a vision of Canada as a place where “every race, color or creed will be given exactly the same chance.” In 1915 McClung spoke “passionately in defence of the foreign women” on the question of suffrage. At the same time, her writing and speeches expressed deep pride and admiration in the British empire, and in 1917 she briefly seemed to contradict her defense of the rights of “foreign” women when she called for voting rights for Canadian and British-born women only as a war measure. McClung withdrew her support from this, however, and acknowledged her error when Beynon criticized her in the Guide. There were, however, other suffragists who used the same arguments advanced by Graham, asking how they could be disenfranchised when “untutored” “foreigners” could vote and determine their laws and future. They argued that the female franchise could offset the votes of illiterate immigrants, and that “Canadian women had the well-being of the country more at heart than the average foreign immigrant.”

The elite strategy of Graham and other proponents of homesteads for women, which excluded rights for “foreign” women, weakened rather than consolidated their base of support. Key potential constituencies were alienated, including settlers from the United States. But even without these fissures, it seems unlikely that the campaign would have succeeded. The reasons against granting homestead rights to women in Western Canada were clearly articulated in an editorial in the Nor’West Farmer of September 5, 1912. The editors of that journal explained why they could not support the cause, and their reasons had nothing to do with the issue of which women should be granted homestead rights. Homesteads for women were opposed “on the simple ground that women are not naturally fitted to become independent, permanent, capable agriculturalists.” To bestow 160 acres on every woman who should apply for it was “an unwarranted dissipation of our public domain and a menace to our agriculture.” There were enough “agricultural scalawags” as it was, breaking the spirit of the homestead contract by making the smallest possible amount of improvements. Capable, lifelong farmers were wanted. Some women might be capable of managing farms of their own but “the average woman is lacking in the physical strength and natural independence and resource so necessary in a homesteading undertaking.”

Bearing over eleven thousand signatures, and supported by organizations such as the Winnipeg Board of Trade, the three provincial Grain Growers’ associations, the National Council of Women, and Women’s Press Clubs across Canada, the petition was submitted to Parliament in February 1913. There was no debate on or interest in the issue. The minister of the interior W. J. Roche simply said, “This matter is under consideration” when asked if the petition had been received and what action the government proposed to take. The petition received nothing more than a polite written response from Roche to Isabelle Graham, who was informed that “any matter pertaining to the welfare of the Canadian people will always receive my close and favorable consideration.”

Last Gasps of the Campaign: The “Natural” Gender Order Preserved

That was not the end of interest in homesteads for women, but the campaign lost steam.
Disappointed in this as well as the dower campaign, organized women focused attention on the vote as a means of achieving their goals. The turning point came in 1913, when the votes for women cause became a live issue. The petition remained the main strategy, and the one presented to the premier of Manitoba in 1915 had 39,584 signatures (indicating how comparatively few supporters there were for homesteads for British women).90 World War I also diverted attention away from issues such as homesteads for women. Binnie-Clark's 1914 book *Wheat and Woman*, in which she stressed the obstacles faced by the woman farmer in Western Canada, and the injustices of the land laws that permitted all her male neighbors to receive their farms virtually for free, could not have been published at a more inopportune time. Even Binnie-Clark herself deserted the cause, returned to England for many years, and turned her attention to other, war-related issues.

There was a mild revival of interest after the war. At the 1919 convention of the United Farmers of Alberta and United Farm Women of Alberta a resolution was passed asking that homesteading privileges be extended to women on an equal footing with men, stating that “we feel that any natural resources that the Government has to put at the disposal of its citizens should be free to all, irrespective of gender.”91 The reply from the Department of the Interior was that there was no reason why the policy should be changed, that homestead land was getting scarce, and that remaining homestead land was reserved for soldier settlers. Homesteading was also thought not to be in the interests of women, as it would mean isolation from markets and medical attention.92

Still, the homesteads-for-women campaign did not disappear entirely. Throughout the 1920s the Department of the Interior continued to receive many letters of inquiry from individuals and organizations. The replies were similar, that the free homestead policy was designed to attract settlers who intended to farm, and it had never been the policy to grant homesteads to other than heads or potential heads of families. In a 1928 Department of the Interior memorandum other reasons were elaborated, including that

a single woman is unfitted for a great many reasons for the lonely and isolated life led by the majority of homesteaders on prairie farms. Even if this concession were granted I think that very few women would be willing to face the loneliness and hard work entailed by taking up a free homestead. There is also the financial end of the matter, which I think would prove a considerable handicap, as unlike men they would be unable to go out and work in the bush during the winter, or in lumber mills, or work out during threshing season, in order to earn additional money to develop their homesteads.93

It was further noted that despite the “tremendous change in the 'sphere of women' I do not believe that the Department would be warranted in changing its present policy.” They were free to purchase land that was near to markets and churches, and “the capital required for homesteading is not very much less than what would buy a farm.” Binnie-Clark, who purchased her farm, would have disagreed, but she had long since turned to other causes.

In 1929 resolutions were passed at the United Farmers of Alberta convention and by the Canadian Council of Agriculture at Winnipeg, asking that homesteads be granted to women on the same terms as men.94 These were the last gasps of the homesteads-for-women campaign. M. L. Burbank of Carman, Manitoba, wrote to the *Western Producer* in February 1929 that she held out little hope for the resolution, as she had recently written to the Department of the Interior and had received the standard reply that departure from the present practice was not deemed advisable.95 She wrote,

As I see it, this reply simply means that, in the opinion of the government, land is much too valuable to be giving it away to women, and that securing homesteads for
women in Canada looks rather hopeless as long as there are any homesteads worth having. . . . It is truly amazing that any one can claim that women are not quite as valuable 'heads of families' as men are, or that a new country does not need women quite as much as it does men.

Burbank pointed out the fallacy in the argument that few women would be interested. If that were correct, she wrote, then little homestead land would be "wasted," and that, on the other hand, if "free homesteads attracted any considerable number of women surely the country would not suffer from settlers of this type. In any event it would not seem that the privilege of homesteading, with its hard work and deprivations, is an unreasonable 'favor' to ask."

That women did not have homestead rights in Western Canada until 1930 when there was almost no homestead land left reflects the goals of the architects of the Canadian West who imagined and fashioned the region as an extension of the British empire, distinct from their neighbors to the south. In Canada the "traditional" and "natural" gender order was to be preserved. White women, preferably of British ancestry, were viewed as the key to order and civilization, and to the agrarian ideal, but only if they were firmly tied to the home and domestic sphere. Importing young women as domestic servants rather than holding out the hope of landownership and possible independence from marriage best served these goals.

Promoters of agriculture as a suitable occupation for women in the pages of the Imperial Colonist made little impact, nor did the example of the women homesteaders of the U.S. West. Ownership of land (although not work on the land of their spouses, fathers, or brothers) disrupted cherished ideals of British femininity. As Kate Hunter has written about Australia, "[T]o accept the possibility of women involved in cultivation would have meant a subversion of heterosexuality, particularly when the women involved were single and childless. This would constitute a most inappropriate possession of land." Women could be permitted to do the work, but not to own the land. Nellie McClung wrote in 1916,

"Women are doing homestead duties wherever homestead duties are being done. . . . No person objects to the homesteader's wife having to get out wood, or break up scrub land, or drive oxen, so long as she is not doing these things for herself and has no legal claim on the result of her labour. Working for someone else is very sweet and womanly, and most commendable. What a neat blending there is of kindness and cruelty in the complacent utterances of the armchair philosophers who tell us that women have not the physical strength to do the hard tasks of life."

These views of the "armchair philosophers" were so deeply embedded that even the tactic of allying with the cause of bolstering the British fabric of the West did not advance homesteads for women. But there was more involved than a challenge to the cherished ideals of femininity. Architects of the West knew that women were capable of the hard work and deprivation required of homesteaders, but it was useful to insist that they were not, just as the skills of Aboriginal farmers were deprecated. It would mean having to share legal claims to the most valuable resource of the West: land. Improvement of the land and profits from the land were to remain a white male preserve.

Acknowledgments

The author thanks the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada and the Killam Trust for the Killam Research Fellowship that supported this research. Thanks to researchers Gretchen Albers, Corinne George, Leslie Hall, Pernille Jakobson, Michel Hogue, Amy McKinney, and Catherine Ulmer; to the organizers of the "Homesteading Revisited" conference at the Center for Great Plains Studies of the University of Nebraska–Lincoln in 2007, where an earlier version of
this paper was presented; and to the Western History Reading Group of the University of Alberta for thoughtful and helpful comments.

NOTES

1. Manitoba Free Press, May 17, 1910, 1; Saskatoon Daily Phoenix, May 16, 1910, 1; Regina Morning Leader, May 17, 1910, 1.


3. N. O. Coté to Mildred Catherine Williams, February 3, 1914, homestead file 1915194, Saskatchewan Archives Board.


13. “Memorandum on the Subject of the Public Lands of Manitoba” (approved by the governor general in council on April 15, 1871), Records of the Department of the Interior, RG 15, D-II-1, vol. 228, file 798 (1872), LAC.

14. Homestead Land Registers from 1872 (reel T-2), RG 15, LAC. Thanks to Leslie Hall for her research on and analysis of the homestead land registers.


20. Ibid., 56-57.

21. Memorandum, November 8, 1894, in the file “Circumstances under which married woman or widow may obtain a homestead entry,” Department of Justice, Record Group 13 (RG 13), vol. 2247, file Int 25, 74/1896, LAC.

22. Ruling no. 167, p. 53, Rulings of the Department of Justice, RG 15, vol. 2108, LAC.

23. Tonia M. Compton, “‘They Have as Much Right There as Bachelors’: Provisions for Female Landowners in Nineteenth-Century Homestead Legislation” (paper presented to the Western History Association, Oklahoma City, November 2007).

24. Quoted in Ibid., 7.


27. Muhn, in “Women and the Homestead Act,” 290-91, indicates that Mormon women involved in plural marriages were able to file on homesteads until 1878, when the General Land Office ruled that they would no longer be permitted to do so; Benton-Cohen, in “Common Purposes, Worlds Apart,” however, found that Mormon women “finessed homesteading law to accommodate plural marriage or to help children born in Mormon colonies in Mexico to obtain land in the United States” (431).

28. Memorandum, November 8, 1894, Department of Justice, RG 13, vol. 2247, file Int 25, 74/1896, LAC.


31. Thanks to researcher Catherine Ulmer for this tally, working with the homestead files and Saskatchewan Homestead Index of the Saskatchewan Archives Board available at http://www.saskhomesteads.com.


34. See Sarah Carter, introduction to Wheat and Woman, by Georgina Binnie-Clark (1914; reprint, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2007), i-lxvi.


36. Editorial, Imperial Colonist 9, no. 118 (October 1911): 377.

37. Imperial Colonist 2, no. 5 (June 1903): 70.


40. Letter, G. Binnie-Clark to Department of the Interior, November 17, 1908, RG 15, D-II-1, vol. 1039, file 1713679, LAC.

41. Letter, W. D. Scott to G. Binnie-Clark, November 12, 1908. (It is not clear why the letter in reply to Binnie-Clark is dated earlier.)


44. Ibid., June 18, 1910.


46. Grain Growers’ Guide, October 25, 1911, 244.

47. Nor’West Farmer, February 21, 1910, 230.

48. Ibid.


50. Ibid., March 27, 1912, 24.

51. Ibid., August 27, 1913, 9.

52. Ibid., December 13, 1911, 10.

53. Ibid., 9.

54. Ibid., June 8, 1910, 24.
55. Ibid., December 13, 1911, 9.
59. Ibid., May 15, 1912, 13, fol. 4, no. 42.
60. Howard Palmer, Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1982).
62. Indian Head Vidette, February 14, 1906.
63. Mead, How the Vote Was Won, 7.
68. Ibid., May 24, 1911, 25.
69. Ibid., June 14, 1911, 21.
70. Ibid.
71. Ibid., May 24, 1911, 25.
72. Ibid., August 16, 1911, 20.
75. Ibid., June 21, 1911, 21.
76. Ibid., August 16, 1911, 20.
77. Ibid., July 19, 1911, 18.
78. Ibid., August 16, 1911, 20.
79. Ibid.
80. Ibid., July 26, 1911, 17.
81. Ibid., July 6, 1911.
82. Letter, V. C. Bedier to the Department of the Interior, March 25, 1913, RG 15, D-II-I, vol. 1105, file 2876596, LAC.
85. Ibid.
87. Nor’West Farmer, September 5, 1912, 1142.
88. Jackel, introduction to Wheat and Woman, xxviii.
89. Ibid.
92. Memorandum, C. Harris to Mr. Hume, March 26, 1919; Ibid.
94. Memorandum to Mr. Perrin, April 17, 1929, RG 15, Dominion Lands Rulings, 7201–7400, vol. 1987, 7261, LAC.
95. Western Producer, February 14, 1929, 10.