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COMPETITION FOR SETTLERS
THE CANADIAN VIEWPOINT

JAMES M. RICHTIK

Many aspects of Canada's relationship with the United States were summed up by Canada's Prime Minister Pierre Elliot Trudeau when he told an American audience in Washington, D.C., "Living next to you is in some ways like sleeping with an elephant. No matter how friendly and even tempered is the beast... one is affected by every twitch and grunt."\(^1\) Canada has always lived next to this generally friendly elephant and Canadian policy makers have never been able to shake off the need to consider what has happened or may happen south of the border. Although the context was different in the nineteenth century, the need to take the United States into account was equally important, particularly in policies relating to the settlement of the Canadian West, where for many years there was direct competition for settlers.

Settlers coming to the North American continent tended to look at North America as a unit, but in many ways there was always a recognition of the importance of the political border. In the early nineteenth century the British North American colonies could count on attachment to the British Crown to bring in significant numbers of settlers from Britain at a time when huge quantities of land were still available in the United States. In addition, at one stage southern Ontario received large numbers of American settlers who seem to have treated Ontario as merely part of the American frontier. However, by the middle part of the nineteenth century the frontier had passed west of Ontario and the movement of settlers was from Ontario into the American Midwest. Ontario continued to attract settlers from Britain, but their numbers were not great and most British overseas migrants went to the United States. As long as the Canadian West was viewed as too isolated for settlement, British North America had no significant amount of available good agricultural land and had little incentive to try to attract agricultural immigrants. Ontario, or Canada West, as it was called before 1867, looked to western British North America as a potential destination for...
Canadian migrants, but until 1870 the literature was mostly concerned with establishing a Canadian presence to prevent the area from becoming part of the United States and to provide a possible destination for those wishing to remain loyal to the Crown.2

During this period of Canadian inactivity, the American government gradually became more active in attracting agricultural immigrants to the United States. In 1854 Congressman Benjamin Wade of Ohio supported a free homestead bill as a way to attract poor Europeans to take advantage of America's regenerative powers. Nine years later, after free homesteads had been established, President Lincoln recommended additional encouragement of immigration. The next year the Republicans began overseas advertising, followed shortly by use of ambassadors as immigration agents. These efforts were supplemented by the agents of states and territories and of railway and land companies wishing to provide settlers for the land and traffic for the railways. The "western fever" that periodically swept large areas of the settled frontier led the agents of states and land companies to concentrate on American targets, but similar agents on steamboats and railways did not discriminate against foreigners, so that, once in the United States and on their way to the frontier, all immigrants ran the gauntlet of hucksters and promoters for numerous different settlements. By 1870 the Americans were already well experienced in promoting their frontier and attracting immigrants—activities that were intensified after 1870 as more states and land companies became involved.3

CANADIAN AND AMERICAN WEST COMPARED

In 1870, Rupert's Land, including virtually all of present-day Canada west of Ontario, was transferred to Canada, providing a Canadian alternative to the American West. This Canadian West was in many ways comparable to its American counterpart of the period, but as early as 1857, Captain John Palliser, sent out by the British Colonial Office, had warned that the only thing keeping settlers from going to the United States was the "security of property" and "good laws, as compared to the insecurity on the American side."4

Because the Canadian West is a northward extension of the American West, the two are virtually identical near the border and not greatly different for some distance. Only in those states more than one hundred miles south are the winters significantly shorter and less cold. Nonetheless, nineteenth-century inhabitants of the entire American West, including North Dakota, viewed western Canada as a land of extremely long, cold winters. Western Canadians pointed out, largely in vain, that blizzards were in fact more frequent and severe farther south because of the larger quantities of snow there, but fear of the cold Canadian winters and short summers that barely allowed time for wheat to ripen were factors that worked against Canadian settlement throughout the nineteenth century.

Canadian soils in the areas open to settlement at any one time were generally as good as those in areas available for homesteading in the United States at the same time, but comparisons of soil quality were based more on rhetoric than on fact. Even today it is almost impossible to compare the land that was available because the individual settler usually had an enormous range of land to choose from. Some settlers in the Canadian West in the 1870s still preferred forest soils, but most western settlers preferred the deep black prairie soils that seemed to them to be capable of producing wheat forever. The westward migration of the frontier led settlers to the thinner brown soils of the short-grass prairies.

Perhaps more important as a physical factor was the presence or absence of trees. By the 1870s the American frontier was pushing through wooded margins of the prairies and onto the treeless grasslands. Canadian settlers, on the other hand, could choose between prairie lands nearer the American border and the wooded lands extending in an arc from near Winnipeg to Edmonton along the north edge of the prairies. The presence of some trees was
considered an advantage in both countries, but most settlers wanted only a small acreage of trees and a preponderance of easily broken prairie. The presence of wooded areas in the Canadian West did little to attract settlers.

The most important advantage of the American West was its transportation system. The American railroads were always ahead of their Canadian counterparts, offering incoming settlers easier access, more dependable and cheaper supplies, and a market for their produce. The first Canadian railway was completed to Winnipeg via the United States in late 1878. Over the next few years branch lines were built in settled areas and in 1885 the Canadian transcontinental was completed, but available land near the new railway suffered from drought during the mid-1880s and the partly wooded lands to the north lacked rail access. This factor, more than any other, served to make the American West more desirable.

OPENING THE CANADIAN WEST

The transfer of Rupert's Land to Canada in 1870 gave the Canadian government the potential for control of agricultural settlement that the American government had enjoyed for almost a century. The Canadian government undertook to settle the West rapidly and systematically, partly to forestall American policies of manifest destiny for the area and partly because of new-found beliefs that the area would help make Canada a world power like the United States. The government seems to have been of one mind with William J. Patterson, who suggested Canada should imitate "in its details, as far as may be possible, the policy of the United States." The policies promulgated in the first few years were not all aimed directly at potential settlers, but included a system of survey, the extinction of Indian rights, and provision for improved access by an all-Canadian route.

The survey system adopted in 1871 was essentially identical to the American township and range system. The minister of public works, William McDougall, suggested in 1869 that "the American system of survey is that which appears best suited to the country except as to the area of the sections." Colonel J. S. Dennis, the surveyor delegated to select a survey system, attempted to choose one "under which the country would be rapidly and accurately divided into farm holdings" for "the future welfare of the country." His original plan was to use 800-acre sections so each settler would receive the standard Ontario farm of 200 acres, but two years later this was changed to the American standard of 640-acre sections and farms of 160 acres. The change was brought in because "half a continent" had already been laid out that way and the system was "known all over the world to the emigrant classes"; because it might also prove more effective in attracting American immigrants; and because it would provide 25 percent more farms with the same amount of land. Because Col. Dennis found it was "generally conceded the American system is faulty in making no appropriation for public roads," an allowance was added around each section for public roads. The ease of survey was to allow the surveyors to subdivide land before it was needed and to avoid some of the excesses of the American preemption system.

Treaties were signed with the Indians starting in 1871. According to James Wright, these treaties were designed to clear potential agricultural land of roving Indian bands so that Canada could compete with western states for settlers. The Canadian government rejected the American frontiersman's maxim that "the only good Indian is a dead Indian" and worked to establish good relations between the races. In spite of the miserly reserves allocated to the most Indian bands and their steady loss of traditional hunting and gathering privileges, the relationships between Indians and whites were peaceful, if not always cordial. Canadians could claim this was the result of fair treatment and of the establishment of the North West Mounted Police to prevent the exploitation of Indians by settlers that had occurred in the United States. As a symbol of authority and fair play on the part of the Canadian government,
the force did help provide a peaceful frontier for agricultural settlement.

Even before the first Indian treaties were signed, the Canadian government had established the right of free homesteads. It seems to have been taken for granted that Canada would follow the precedent set in the provinces and in the United States and offer free quarter-section homesteads. When the legislation reached Parliament, it passed without opposition and almost without debate. "To offset the attractions of the United States," the Canadian homestead act allowed patent to be attained after only three years of residence and land cultivation. For the same reasons consideration was given to making the entry fee only five dollars, but this was changed to ten dollars in the actual legislation. Originally, homesteaders had to be twenty-one years of age, but in 1874 the limit was lowered to eighteen to attract young adults and farmers with older sons who might otherwise see more advantages in the United States. Similarly, in 1874 homesteaders were allowed a second entry if the first entry was given up. Thus a homesteader who made a poor first choice would not be forced either to stay on the poor land or to go to the United States. 8

An 1875 adjustment of regulations for the grasshopper infestation illustrates that Canada was sometimes overcompetitive. According to Mary Wilma Hargreaves, the American government allowed homesteaders to leave their claims during the infestation but extended the time limits for getting patent. The Canadian government, however, had a different version:

The Minister states that he has learned that the United States Government has found it necessary, for the same reasons, to allow settlers in the neighbouring territory of Dakota, to absent themselves from their homesteads until next year, such period to be counted as part of the term of residence required by law to ensure free title to the land.

Canadian settlers were given the same privilege the cabinet believed the Americans enjoyed. 9

A Canadian innovation was a special version of the preemption. The American version, also called squatters' rights, had existed under the Hudson's Bay Company and was continued by order-in-council in 1871, but the 1874 land act permitted a homesteader to reserve a quarter section next to his homestead to be paid for after the homestead had been patented. 10 The only comparable American provision was that passed in the 1850s—contrary to federal legislation—by the Kansas and Nebraska territorial legislatures, giving squatters preemption rights to 320 acres and thereby improving the success of later settlers in homesteading one quarter section and paying for a second as a preemption at the same time. 11 What the Americans permitted for the earliest frontiersmen, the Canadian government made available for all.

**COMPETITION FOR FOREIGN SETTLERS**

Although no Canadian legislation was passed offering reserves for foreign settlers, many such reserves were created. An order-in-council of 18 September 1872 authorizing such a reserve for Swiss settlers explained that the Swiss government was prepared to allow those wishing to emigrate to do so "upon sufficient assurance that its subjects would be properly cared for in the countries in which they settled" and added that "Dr. W. Foos, a member of the National Council ... visited the United States with the object of ascertaining if he could obtain suitable tracts of land free for Swiss settlement." Although only Canada offered such a reserve, the Swiss nonetheless went to the United States. Similarly, reserves were created for Swedish, Scottish, English, Welsh, and German settlers with no more success. 12

More important to western Canada were the Russian Mennonites. In 1871 they had begun investigating Canada and the United States as possible fields of emigration. The prospect of fifty thousand farmers settling in western Canada led the Canadian authorities to agree "to grant them all their demands—exemption from military service, free land—160 acres to each head of a family, reserved in large compact areas in Manitoba, freedom of religion, their
own German language, control of their own schools—practically all the privileges which had been granted them by [Czarina] Catherine in 1787.” The American government, despite pressure from western states, was not prepared to grant them military exemption or to reserve blocks of land for them. However, individual states did offer exemptions from militia duty and railway companies sent immigration agents to Russia. Subsequently, a delegation of twelve Mennonites were sent to look at Manitoba, North Dakota, Minnesota, Nebraska, and Kansas. One of them claimed, “to most of us Manitoba country was not to our liking”; nonetheless the most conservative group chose Canada because the reserved blocks of land and other guarantees seemed less of a threat to their religious way of life. Approximately eighteen thousand Mennonites left for North America, most of them before 1878. Of the total, eight thousand settled in Manitoba, five thousand in Kansas, and the rest in Minnesota, the Dakotas, Nebraska, and Iowa.13 In a head-to-head competition for settlers in which the American government refused to offer any special inducements, Canada still attracted less than half of the group.

In the competition for Icelandic settlers, Canada was initially much more successful. Abysmal climatic and economic conditions in Iceland had prompted the Icelanders to look for possible new colonization sites before 1870, and as many came to Ontario as went to the United States. In 1875 Canada offered both groups a reserve on the west shore of Lake Winnipeg exclusively for Icelanders, but those in Ontario were in such dire financial straits that they asked the Canadian government to finance the move. Originally the government refused on the grounds that it did not assist moves within Canada, but soon five thousand dollars in aid was provided to establish a successful colony that would “attract as settlers to Canada a considerable portion of the inhabitants of Iceland . . . and also probably attract the Icelanders now in the United States.” That decision plus others supplying more aid had the salutary effect of attracting some of the Icelanders from the United States and most of the newcomers from Iceland for the next two or three years. Canada’s “New Iceland” reached a population of 1,029 by 1879 before economic problems and agitation by a minister from Minnesota caused a majority to move to North Dakota in the next two years.14 Thus temporary success against American competition did not guarantee long-term success.

In addition, Canada made strenuous efforts to increase the current of immigration from other countries, but “in the face of the competition of . . . the United States” it was necessary to spend money. In 1873 special agents were established in most areas of Britain, in many European countries, and in the United States, and subsidized fares and other forms of aid were offered to prospective immigrants. Millions of pamphlets were distributed. However, except for the Mennonites and Icelanders, few immigrants went directly to western Canada in the 1870s. James Biggar, an English farmer, explained in 1879 that “so many people have been deceived . . . by overdrawn and highly colored pictures of Western States, published by land companies, railway companies, speculators, and others, that . . . suspicion and distrust of emigration agents generally has arisen.” To overcome this, “the Canadian Government therefore decided on asking the farmers of this country to send delegates from amongst themselves whose report would be received at home with more confidence.”15 The result was a marked increase in the number of British settlers thereafter.

COMPETITION FOR MIGRANTS EN ROUTE

There was also a continued competition with the United States for settlers already in North America. Until 1882 virtually all settlers for western Canada had to come via the United States. On the way, many were tempted by the promises of railways, land companies, states, and territories. Others, traveling west with trainloads of settlers going to American
destinations, reconsidered en route and chose an American destination instead.

The first Canadian response was to establish the all-Canadian Dawson route to Manitoba. It led from Lake Superior to Winnipeg via a rough trail that connected several waterways on which steamerboats provided transport. The Minister of Public Works claimed that "the opening of the Canadian line has had the effect of causing the rates on foreign [American] routes to be greatly reduced" and that it "provided good arrangements for immigrants." Winnipeg papers recommended greater use of the route to reduce the loss of settlers to American agents on alternate routes. However, one of the few settlers who ever used the Dawson route described it as "the worst piece of business I ever saw or heard of anywhere," and by 1876 it was abandoned.16

The second response was to build an all-Canadian transcontinental railway. The 1872 charter reserved land for the Canada Pacific Railway Company to sell in order to pay for the railway, but Canadian capitalists claimed the company "intended to cooperate with parties in the United States interested in the Northern Pacific Railway" who would want "to get control of the Canadian lands, and to retard settlement until their own are disposed of."17 The issue helped bring down the government and delayed railway construction for years.

Ontario was the main source of settlers for western Canada almost to the end of the century, and it was this migration stream that the American agents attempted to divert. J. E. Têtu, the immigration agent at Emerson, reported that "this diversion of our immigrants to Manitoba into the United States is due . . . to the inducements offered by great land owners through their numerous and active agents." Charles Lalime, another agent, accused "high civil and religious authorities" and "several western railway companies holding lands along their lines" of using "every possible means . . . to create an immigration movement towards Kansas, Arkansas and Minnesota," including appointing Canadians as their agents. He found the "unhappy and shameful efforts" of such Canadians hard to counteract: "These people, for the sake of a small commission from certain railway companies in the south-west, sought to establish a current of emigration to Kansas. They retailed most stupid, unfavourable assertions, and in some cases I had to devote several days to the counteracting of the effects of their false diatribes." Têtu also found that "certain parties, who pretend to perform the duties of [Canadian] agents, being stationed at Moorhead, Duluth and Fisher's Landing, succeeded, by false representations, in keeping back a good number of our immigrants." The extent of American agents' propagandizing is hard to assess. Contemporary Winnipeg newspapers and available settlers' journals and diaries make only occasional references to the agents. Furthermore, W. C. Grahame, special agent for Canada, claimed that American agents diverted only 5 percent of those intending to go to Canada in 1878.18

Because the American agents were most successful wherever immigrants spent time in transit in the United States, it was expected that completion of an all-Canadian railway would ensure less loss to the United States. Even the completion of direct railway connections through the United States to Winnipeg was expected to "check these so much per head agents in their work, as it will give them but short time to confer with the immigrants on the road," because the newcomers would not have "to wait hours and sometimes days for the Red River Transportation Company's boats at Fisher's Landing or Grand Forks, where the mischief was generally done." The connection was made late in 1878, but the Canadian agent complained about continued loss, particularly of English capitalists when settlers were forced to wait for a change of trains in St. Paul. A Mr. Drake, land commissioner of the St. Paul and Sioux City Railroad, attracted their attention in St. Paul with "a very large British flag stretched across the street from his office" and then subtly lured them out to look at the company's land.

In 1879 efforts were renewed to build an
all-Canadian railway, and half the remaining public land on the prairies was reserved to pay for it. The next year, to speed construction, the government transferred control of the railway to a private corporation, adding a very generous version of the land grant and cash subsidy that had been used and abandoned by the Americans. As had been the case in the United States, the railway became another purveyor of propaganda for its hinterland, but settlers had no choice but to travel via the United States until late 1882, when the Canadian Railway was finished to Port Arthur, a point served by steamers on the Great Lakes.

**REMOVAL OF CONCESSIONS TO SETTLERS**

The decision to rush railway construction was expected to make concessions to settlers unnecessary. R. W. Prittie and Archibald Young of Toronto, with government encouragement, brought more than seven thousand settlers from Ontario to Manitoba, helping them through the intricacies of customs landing and changes of railways, but the government refused to reward these services, claiming that Prittie and Young did not get the required agreements from their settlers. John A. Macdonald argued that there were enough coming that they “should be left to work [their] own way without any stimulus whatever from the Federal Government.” No further reserves were made for migrants within Canada until December 1881, and even then all the promoters got was the right to buy alternate sections.

Another evidence of this confidence was the 1879 elimination of refunds to immigrants from the western states for part of their fare. Grahame claimed that “the refund was a set-off to the offers of American railway companies, and its stoppage has placed us at a disadvantage. . . . These companies are enabled to give, and they do give, heavy discounts . . . and thus secure, through the bait of cheap travel, a great many whom we now lose because of the high rates from any of the Western States to Manitoba.” He added that most of the immigrants he had talked to who refused to come to Manitoba cited the higher fares and that “to re-establish the fares . . . would give [our] agents an equal advantage with the agents of other corporations.” In spite of his claim that this was the chief cause of reduced immigration from the United States, the Canadian government was not prepared to back down.

During 1879 Macdonald reported he had even considered “a policy of altogether excluding free-grants” along the railway, as had been done in 1874. Instead he decided to do what the Americans were doing—to allow only eighty-acre homesteads and preemptions within the belt where the railway received alternate sections and to charge more for land near the railways. Because the government had reserved alternate sections within 110 miles of the railway for sale to pay for government construction of the railway, this meant that all homesteads in western Canada would be eighty acres. This reduction was occurring at the same time that the Americans were in the process of doing away with the eighty-acre homestead. Even before publication of the new regulations, the Deputy Minister, J. S. Dennis, alerted Macdonald to what the Americans were doing and warned:

> It is evidently desirable to effect a corresponding alteration in the area of Dominion Lands proposed to be homesteaded within the zone embracing Canadian Pacific Railway Lands, otherwise the manifestly superior advantages of the United States over the Canadian policy would result in securing to the Western and North-Western States and Territories of the American Union all European and other immigration for years to come.

Dennis’s fears were proven well founded when homestead entries almost ceased as soon as the new regulations came into effect. Large numbers of immigrants stopped in Dakota to get larger homesteads, while some made it to Manitoba before deciding the 80-acre homesteads were inadequate. American agents took advantage of the discrepancy in homestead sizes and “depreciated without scruple the advantages
which the Canadian North West presented for emigration.” Two and a half months after the new regulations were introduced, Canada not only returned to the 160-acre homestead and the 160-acre preemption but also lowered the price of most railway lands. 22 Canada could not offer less than the Americans.

The 1879 regulations had classified all odd-numbered sections as railway lands closed to homesteading but had allowed squatters in advance of survey to homestead such lands. In early 1880 there were so many squatters south of the railway line that the government posted notices that appeared to end squatters’ rights. So great were the protests and the movement of settlers to Dakota as a result that the government first pointed out it was intended only that those on odd-numbered sections would not be protected and finally informally reinstated squatters’ rights almost completely. However, from mid-1882 to the end of 1883, all lands south of the transcontinental railway were withdrawn from homestead entry, with even more disastrous results. 23

YEARS OF LOW IMMIGRATION TO CANADA

The boom in Canadian prairie settlement that began in 1879 peaked in 1882 and collapsed the following year. By October of 1883, settlements near the American border reported, “Every day settlers can be seen going south to Dakota.” 24 For the next three years, emigration from the Canadian prairies almost equaled immigration, and even until 1890 the Canadian West did not attract many settlers.

The causes were mostly the frequent failure of wheat crops in Canada and the low prices obtaining for wheat, but there were other factors. The initial out-migration was mostly related to the failure to protect squatters’ rights and the “vacillating and unjust laws relating to the lands and settlers thereon” that drove settlers “off to Dakota in droves.” This was not overcome until the new regulations of 1884, reflecting the government’s desire for “settlement at any price,” gave homesteaders the option of living near their homestead while improving it or of holding it for two years without even being anywhere near it and then fulfilling residence requirements. Thereafter, Canadians could claim “that the land laws of the Dominion are in every respect more liberal than those of the United States.” Lack of branch line railways, higher implement prices due to high import duties, and wheat prices that were often lower than in the United States also worked against Canada, even though Canadians could sanctimoniously point to American problems of unfair grain grading, drought, elevator monopolies, excessive freight rates, and mortgages getting first claim on money brought in for wheat sales. There was recognition that prospective settlers from eastern Canada who had returned home discouraged warned others, “Oh, don’t go to Manitoba; the bottom has dropped out of things there.” Doug Owram argues that, in fact, most westerners blamed eastern Canada, but the Nor West Farmer claimed that “our jealous American cousins” were distributing “the most barefaced and insinuating pamphlets” in England and Ontario. There were also complaints that Americans could offer cheaper fares, that they paid their agents better, and that they had a better system of advertising. Most of all, there was also a constant recognition that until the late 1880s the western states continued to attract large numbers of settlers, while western Canada attracted few. 25

In 1882, to help stop the flow to the United States, successful homesteaders who had already received patent were being allowed a second entry. The rationale was that “the applicants are usually those who by fitness and inclination make the best pioneers” and that the regulation would prevent the movement of such valuable pioneers to the United States. No doubt there was considerable popular pressure for such a regulation; during early 1882 there were several references in Winnipeg newspapers to settlers going to Dakota because they could not get second homesteads. 26 In 1889 the privilege was rescinded, a tribute to its failure to achieve its objective.
By about 1890 the movement onto free land in the United States had slowed considerably. There was still free land, but drought conditions forced even the promoters to recognize that until climate improved the American Great Plains had been occupied almost to their agricultural limits. At last western Canada had no competition. Although Canada opened more immigration offices in the United States and railway propaganda was increased, Americans resisted for reasons of nationalism and continued fear of cold Canadian weather. Although Norwegians, Icelanders, and other Europeans were less hesitant, Canada still attracted few settlers during the early 1890s.27

RENEWED SETTLEMENT IN CANADA

When settlement did pick up after 1896, the largest group of immigrants to western Canada were Ukrainians direct from Europe. A Mr. Missler, who had organized a colony in Georgia, gave Ukrainians “an awful description of Canada” and warned them not to come, but failed to dissuade them. In fact, Canada was having success attracting Ukrainians who had spent time working in Pennsylvania and could speak English. The Canadian government sponsored and subsidized the settlers, but American land agents in Canada were still trying to sell them land, apparently with some success. A “North Dakota emigration agent” persuaded a number of Ukrainians to settle near Dickinson, North Dakota. To prevent such interference, security was tightened at the immigration hall, and William Macreary, the Winnipeg immigration agent, is reported to have locked one carload of Ukrainians in their boxcars until they were west of Winnipeg and beyond the reach of agitators and American agents.28 Even when the Americans could offer free land only on the drought-prone areas, Canada still had to compete for settlers.

Throughout the first two or three decades of settlement in western Canada, policy makers in Canada were constantly concerned with the lure of the American West. As one member of Parliament put it, “If we wish to turn aside this tide of immigration and compete advantageously with our neighbours, if we wish to have some immigrants to go to our vast prairies, we must, and no one can deny it, offer conditions at least equal to those offered by the United States.”29 His statement was made in 1881, but could have been made at any time between 1870 and 1890. The American image makers ensured that whatever advantages the American West possessed would be known to potential migrants throughout Europe and North America. The image was polished to an ever-brighter sheen at the same time that the reality of the quality of available land was becoming more marginal. Although Canada mounted an image-making campaign of its own, it was done with the recognition that Canada would have to offer more than the Americans did or do without settlers until there was no more free land in the United States.
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