CARLETON UNIVERSITY
1038 1399 01 12

ORGANIZED LABOUR AND THE LAURIER ADMINISTRATION :
The fortunes of a pressure group

William David Atkinson

A thesis submitted to the Department of History in conformity with the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts

Carleton University

1957 c1.1, 1958

Contents

I Introduction 1

II The Alien Labour Act and the Undefended Border . 7

III The Implications of British and Continental European Immigration 49

IV Oriental Immigration 89

V Wages and Hours 127

VI The Senate 153

VII Conclusion 165

Introduction

It was a rather weak,certainly not a robust, labour movement which confronted the freshly-elected Laurier administration in 1896. The eleven-year-old Trades and Labour Congress [1] had weathered the now lifting depression badly; in the previous year, attendance at the Congress had dropped to a new and disheartening low point.[2]

It was a hale and wholesome movement which in 1911 saw the next change of government. The very prosperity which had enhanced the reputation of the Liberal party had also nursed and nourished the movement from a "...disheartened band... into a great fighting unit, fully alive to its rights and liberties."[3] In truth, these years constitute an era of growth and a period of consolidation.

To acquire the joys of health and vitality was one thing; to attain unity, another. Ramsay Macdonald expressed astonishment, in 1906, when he observed that organized labour in the North American Dominion was so

hopelessly sectionalized.[4] Indeed, the labour men soon found their movement was not only carved into geographic blocs, but also disunited in opinion. Seldom could the leaders, and more especially the rank and file, come to agreement upon problems such as the following : what political direction to take; how far they wanted immigration restricted; what to think about international trade unionism; and whether to press for a high or a low tariff. Labour in this period may well be described as a movement in search of its own soul.

If oneness was a fundamental goal of organized labour during these years, the movement was singularly fortunate in securing leaders who were equal parts of energy and foresight. There was, for instance, Ralph Smith. A miner, and a man of obvious popularity, Smith had migrated from Newcastle-on-Tyne to Nanaimo, British Columbia in 1892. As President of the Trades and Labour Congress between 1898 and 1901, Smith dedicated himself to the cause of unity within the Canadian labour ranks. Then, too, there was Dan O'Donoghue. The accredited 'Father' of the movement, he played an energetic, sometimes a central role during the earlier years of Laurier's rule.

O'Donoghue was a kind of informal labour adviser to the Prime Minister for several years after 1896. And in 1900, he became Fair Wages Officer with the new Department of Labour. Again, Alphonse Verville, a French Canadian of crisp, laconic bearing, was elected President of the Congress between 1904 and 1909. Alphonse Verville worked hard to further the aims of organized labour. And to some degree, his election symbolizes ethnic integration within the movement.

By far the strongest pressure imposed upon the Laurier Ministry was generated by the Trades and Labour Congress, which, in 1904, found itself solvent enough to support a full-time Parliamentary Solicitor. Two other large labour organizations, the Canadian Federation of Labour (or 'National')[5] which splintered from the Congress in 1902, and the Provincial Workmen's Association of Nova Scotia, exerted no impressive influence upon the Administration. Indeed, at first sight, the support-- or apparent lack of it-- given by these two associations to the Congress, is reminiscent of Bliss Carman's verse :

"Hem lay 'round and Haw looked on
While God did all the work."[6]

This judgement is, of course, not fair. The Provincial

Workmen's Association obtained most of its legislation not from Ottawa, but from Halifax; and was astonishingly successful in impelling the Nova Scotia legislature to obey its wishes. As the Association's Secretary noted in 1898, every piece of legislationasked for in the past nineteen years had been granted.[7]

It appears too, that the Canadian Federation of Labour by itself determined few Dominion government labour policies. To begin with, it was weak. It had made a determined, but singularly unspectacular beginning in 1902; and so modest was the success of this organization that by 1905, the Trades and Labour Congress gleefully hoped that "...the next year will witness the disappearance of this body altogether."[8] Moreover, many of the Federation's demands evinced a peculiarly parochial quality. It appears that a new dry-dock at Quebec City, or a higher tariff on boots and shoes could often allay the asperities of this society's leaders.[9]

The fortunes of organized labour during the administration of Sir Wilfrid are as interesting as they are enlightening. In the following chapters, some of the movement's hopes, triumphs, and frustrations will be investigated.

References to Introduction

1. The labour men preferred to count the assembly at Toronto in December, 1883, as the first meeting of the Trades and Labour Congress. The second convention, they reckoned, was in September of 1886. From that time, meetings were annual.

2. Only thirty-nine delegates, representing twenty-seven organizations, took part in 1895. There were fluctuations, but in September, 1912, 252 delegates gathered. See R.H.Coats, "The Labour movement in Canada," Canada and its Provinces, IX, (Toronto,1914), 301.

3. Proceedings of the 25th Annual Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1909, 9.

4. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, VI, (Toronto, 1906), 304.

5. At first, this offshoot chose to call itself the National Trades and Labour Congress. In 1908, the name was changed to Canadian Federation of Labour. For the sake of clarity, the latter name will be employed throughout this thesis.

6. This is from a poem entitled 'Hem and Haw'.

7. Pro. of 14th Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1898, 10.

8. Pro. of 21st Ann, Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1905, 10.

9. See Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, VI, (Toronto,1906), 299, 300.

The Alien Labour Act and the Undefended Border

"Working people in this country are but little concerned in mere theories or with barren academic discussion upon the law." John G. O'Donoghue, 1902.

If the question of immigration was one of the Canadian government's main interests in the fifteen years between 1896 and 1911, it was also the greatest single concern of organized labour during the period. The Canadian worker saw new people arriving from every direction except the north: an army of British and Continental Europeans was moving across the Atlantic; from the opposite direction came Asians; and a multitude of Americans crossed over from the Republic.

The story of American immigration is, from the workingman's standpoint, primarily the tale of a statute, the Alien Labour Act; for this piece of legislation constituted the only fence between the Canadian worker and the expansive, unquiet labour market of the United States. If there were inadequacies in this act, it is evident that there would be volcanic consequences. Let us, therefore, give some attention to this problem.

I

In May of 1897, M. K. Cowan, a Liberal member for South Essex, introduced into Parliament what was to one of the most curious pieces of legislation of the Laurier period, the Alien Labour Act. Before the Bill had been introduced, the Government had been allowed little rest; they were to have none after it was passed. Both labour and capital disliked this new legislation. Many newspapers took the view that it was a 'relic of barbarism'; and Laurier himself did not favour it.[1]

What, then, was the nature of this measure? Why was it introduced? How did it affect the workingman; and to what extent was it re-shaped by the labour movement?

In 1885, one year before the Trades and Labour Congress was organized on a permanent basis, Labour in the United States found itself influential enough to impel the Cleveland administration to enact a Contract Labour Law. Universal in application, this law was intended to prevent the less scrupulous employer from deliberately undermining the standard-of-living of his men by importing labour which had previously contracted for smaller wages in a foreign country. From the standpoint of affording a degree of protection to the American workingman, the Contract Labour Law with its various amendments was a sensible, and on the whole serviceable, measure.

When the legislation was being drafted, it was apparent to the Washington administration that the northern frontier, too, must be guarded to prevent contract labour from slipping in by "the back door".[2] As a consequence, the Canadian government was asked to enact similar legislation. Ottawa declined, however, fearing that the Mother Country would be offended.

Like their American brothers, the Canadian workingmen had been condemning imported contract labour for some time; but unlike the Americans, they were not in a strong position in the 1880's. In 1890, though, the four-year-old Trades and Labour Congress was able to persuade George L. Taylor, a Conservative representative for the border constituency of Leeds, to introduce into Parliament a Bill which was almost identical with the American Contract Labour Act. But after a second reading, Taylor withdrew his measure at the request of his leader. The Bill was re-introduced in the following year, but again it was held in abeyance; this time, Sir John Thompson moved a six months' hoist. For seven years, Taylor's contract labour Bill was regularly submitted for Parliament's consideration, but each time, it failed to reach a division.[3] In 1895, the Trades and Labour Congress was joined in its assault by the Provincial Workmen's Association. But through the greater part of the 'nineties, organized

labour in Canada had little to be jubilant about; efforts to obtain a contract labour law, like many other attempts to win labour legislation, went unrewarded.

A new government in 1896 brought a fresh approach to the whole problem of contract labour. In July of 1896, Laurier became First Minister; by August of 1897, the Canadian workingman had been given an Alien Labour Act. Why should the Government be disposed to act os precipitately?

The answer is partly to be found in the state of public opinion at the time. A new wave of anti-American sentiment had begun to grip the country in 1895; in December of that year, many Canadians were angered by President Cleveland's 'twenty-inch-gun note'to the United Kingdom. And the Presidential election of November, 1896 made it manifest that Washington was going to be strongly protectionist during the next four years.

Bad feelings were further aggravated by the American Contract Labour Law.[4] Almost from the very day it was passed, this statute began to antagonize the Canadian labourer and therefore the Canadian government. During the period of economic stagnancy in the 'eighties and early 'nineties, Canadian workers had been emigrating in rather disquieting numbers to the United States. The American Officers charged with the enforcement of the Contract Labour Law-- especially at Detroit and Buffalo-- began to take the fullest advantage of the powers conferred upon them to debar many Canadians from entering the country.

Thus the bitter, vindictive spirit which had been prevalent throughout Canada, and particularly at border regions, became exaggerated. One Member of Parliament reported to Laurier that during the spring of 1897, the tariff and the Contract Labour Law were the issues most frequently upon the tongue of the general public.[5] There was a widespread impression that an Alien Labour Act which would operate against the United States would tend to appease popular opinion. "No one not living on the frontier can form any idea of the strength of feeling in favour of such a measure," a Brockville business man wrote to Laurier, "and while the feeling finds its strongest advocates in the labouring classes, it is not by any means confined to them alone."

While in Opposition, Laurier himself had vainly advocated an alien contract labour law which would operate against the United States. "There can be no necessity, in my opinion, that this matter should be adjourned for another day," he had urged in 1890, "for surely there can be no two opinions on the question.... I believe that by simply remonstrating against this abuse to the United States Government, we would have our remedy."[7]

It is indicative of Laurier's early attitude to organized labour that he did not consult the leaders of the Trades and Labour Congress-- the only national labour body

in existence-- before he enacted this piece of legislation. It is only fair to say, however, that some labour groups did have a limited influence in placing this measure upon the statute books. Various local unions, such as those which had waited upon M. K. Cowan, the author of the Bill, had for some time been urging retaliation. Moreover, the Grand Trunk Railway was at the time being brusquely rejuvenated, and there was considerable consternation in labour circles when the new Vice-president and General Manager, Charles M. Hays, began releasing many personnel. Rightly or wrongly, it was believed that the railroad was about to be 'Americanized' to the detriment of Canadian workers. Almost as soon as he had taken office, Laurier was beleaguered by a deputation of engineers.[8] The Prime Minister promised this group that if the United States government could not be persuaded to exempt Canada from the effect of their Law, then a similar measure would become law in the Dominion. In February, 1897, the Canadian government-- unofficially through John Charlton-- negotiated with Washington, but to no avail.

In retrospect, however, it is clear that the Alien Labour Act, one of the most important Labour measures of the period, was less the Canadian government's expression of friendship toward the Canadian workman, than an exposition of resentment toward the American government.[9]

The most embarrassing feature of a retaliatory law is that although the aggrieved and the affronted are momentarily appeased, very few others positively favour it. This, at least, was what happened in the present instance. The Alien Labour Act was never cordially received by the responsible leaders of organized labour, notably the officers of the Trades and Labour Congress, and the Toronto and Hamilton Trades and Labour Councils. It was, of course, a beginning. But never much impressed by the anti-American excitement, these men refused to consider the Act retributive justice. The American Federation of Labour chief, Samuel Gompers, appears to have held an unflinching grip upon his Canadian brothers. Gompers, theoretically an internationally-minded man, proved a very decided American nationalist when it appeared that contract labour could be imported from the north. Yet Gompers, persuasive and forceful, was able to convince his Canadian colleagues that a nationalist position in regard to imported labour was justified; that a country would derive unequivocal benefits from a contract labour law. "The organized workingmen of Canada," stated a Hamilton official, "do not object to a fair and reasonable enforcement of the United States'Alien Contract Labour Law; they consider it proper legislation, and only regret that the Dominion government has

failed so signally to recognize the fact and has neglected its opportunities to extend the benefit of a bill drawn on the same lines to the wage-earners on this side of the line."[10] These views became more distinct as time passed and it became apparent that the Act was no boon to the Canadian labourer. As George W. Dower, Secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress told Sir Wilfrid in September 1898, "What is wanted by the working men of Canada is a 'Contract Labour Law' applicable to every country in the world."[11] In the eyes of the labour men the Act was a protective measure. Consequently they demanded protection from it. Very little was given.

To begin with, few indeed were the members of Parliament who approved of the Alien Labour Act; many worked against it, subtly or otherwise. "The measure has had to contend from the first with the opposition, either open or partly concealed, of every member of the Government and of the majority of its supporters in the House of Commons," lamented the Secretary of the Hamilton Trades and Labour Council, Henry Obermeyer.[12] The legislation soon became distasteful to Sir Wilfrid. "I do not like the Alien Labour Law," he later declared. "I am not in sympathy with it, but so long as our neighbours maintain it, I do not see how we

can help not following even that bad example."[13] And by sponsoring the legislation, he invited the disfavour of Canadian employers, upon whose freedom the Act impinged. Periodically, therefore, Sir Wilfrid would receive an anxious letter from an incredulous employer who 'hadn't known' of the existence of the statute.[14] But the prospect of mollifying an irate employer was nothing compared with the bogey of placating the American government. And on more than one occasion, in various quarters in the United States, the enforcement of the Canadian Alien Labour Act was interpreted as the commencement of a chilly new foreign policy.[15] It was indeed paradoxical that the more conscientious the Canadian government was about having the law of the land enforced, the greater grew the danger of provoking recriminations from the Republic. This meant a half-heartedness in the application of the law, and a disposition to let the pressure of events determine policy.

To enforce the law, a series of Agents was stationed at various points along the Canada-United States border. These men had no power to debar offenders. They were vigilantes. It was their duty to inform the Minister of Justice if the law was broken. He would (if pressed) attend to the complaint. It must have been hard for these Agents to perform their work with

alacrity; they received no remuneration! "As Parliament did not make any provision for enforcing the Act," it was lamely explained to them, "you will have to perform these duties without salary."[16] Small wonder, then, that the Hamilton Labour men complained to Sir Wilfrid that "the officials have to be prodded continually even to make a show of doing something."[17]

In the main, complaints came not from border points such as Niagara Falls, Ontario, or Emerson, Manitoba, but from industrial centres. Through the winter of 1897 and the following spring, the Trades and Labour Councils of such cities as Toronto, Hamilton, Victoria, and Montreal, pressed Sir Wilfrid to appoint Agents. But the Government would not. In May of 1898, however, the Toronto Trades and Labour Council experienced a singular stroke of good fortune when a Conservative member of Parliament, E. F. Clarke, championed their cause and apparently embarrassed the Government into appointing an Alien Labour Officer for his home city. The officer named was W. B. McMurrich, former Mayor. McMurrich, however, was only slightly <u>en rapport</u> with the aims of organized labour, and to the annoyance of the Toronto workers, he celebrated his appointment, not by attending to the exigencies of the Toronto labour scene, but by leaving the city on a pleasure trip.

Other cities were even less fortunate. In spite of a threat of a Hamilton worker that "the omission of the appointment would cost the Liberal party more than 300 votes in this one constituency," and even though the Hamilton Trades and Labour Council offered to provide their own Agent at no expense to the Government, Sir Wilfrid remained obdurate.[18]

These, then, were some of the shortcomings of the Alien Labour Act which coloured the views of the Trades and Labour Congress by 1898. As it made plain, the act was "... entirely unsatisfactory to the working people of this country, in operation, in its machinery, and unsought for by this Congress."[19]

II

Sir Wilfrid sought a way out of his difficulties. The Anglo-American Commission was to meet in the fall of 1898. What could be a more effective medicament for an

unwell international situation than a truce in antagonistic labour legislation? Perhaps, if the Americans would agree, the problem of the Alien Labour Act could be settled by the Commission "once and for all".[20] Thus Sir Wilfrid negotiated "a private understanding at Washington that pending the negotiations of the Commission, the Alien Labour Law on both sides of the line would not be enforced."[21] And so to the more familiar problems on the Commission's agenda such as the reciprocity question, the recurrent fisheries controversy, and the Alaska boundary dispute, was added a new issue--the Alien Labour Act.

The Joint Commission which convened at Quebec City late in August, 1898, met in a frank and friendly spirit. Outside of the council chamber, however, the mood was just as frank, but noticeably less cordial. No sooner did the conference begin, than a portion of the Canadian press opened fire upon the American authorities because they had not perceptibly relinquished the enforcement of their Act. In truth, it was not possible for them to do so; for, as the American Immigration Office later told Sir Wilfrid, "The Law is mandatory; no one, not President McKinley himself, could stay its operation without the consent of Congress."[22] Did Sir Wilfrid

not understand this? Or, as he later explained to a Labour spokesman in Parliament, did he honestly believe that the Americans would apply their law "with leniency"?[23] The result was the same. Washington was accused of breaking faith, and Sir Wilfrid was condemned for his weak-kneed attitude.

The favourite target of labour and the press was the American Officer at Buffalo, one DeBarry, who imprudently exercised his duties with a "rudeness and coarseness of manner and language".[24] Moreover, DeBarry's eagerness to enforce the law afforded an unpleasant contrast to the attitude of the Canadian authorities, particularly when Italians were imported under contract from Buffalo by the Grand Trunk Railway, in what seemed a cavalier disregard for the Canadian Alien Labour Law. This "one-sided discrimination" was acrimoniously condemned by the Trades and Labour Congress.[25]

The Canadian public sided with labour in this matter, but not always from the motives of labour. Lord Atholstan's Montreal Star voiced an opinion which was widespread:

> "The primary object of the law was to create a defensive measure against an unfriendly American law. To place such an act on the statute book and then confess that we are afraid to enforce it,

> while the United States government continues to enforce a similar law against Canadians, even in one place, is to confess an inferiority which must tend to our prejudice in international negotiations. That both countries should abstain from actions calculated to irritate each other while negotiations are going on is in accordance with common sense, but there is no reason why the Washington of the North should approach the Washington of the South on all fours, and with its nose in the dust. It is all very well to be friendly, but there is no reason why we should crawl."[26]

The views of the Laurier Cabinet were a strange admixture. Sir William Mulock, the Postmaster-General, appears to have been more alive to the dangers of an unfriendly labour movement than Sir Wilfrid. "Pending negotiations, it may be all right to suspend action on our part," Sir William warned his leader, "but I think there should be mutuality, and I write now in the hope that you may be able to arrange with the United States authorities to suspend all action on their Alien Labour Act, and that an announcement to this effect may be made to appear in the press from Washington.... It will not do to be indifferent to the feelings of the labour men."[27]

Sir William's concern was further manifested when in mid-November a number of journals, including the Ottawa

Citizen, published a resolution of the Montreal Railway Brotherhoods. It urged that "if the bill is not made effective in the interests of the masses instead of the classes, then the workingmen should support that party at the next general election that will do so."[28] Mulock was frankly worried. He realized that the resolution was extreme; so extreme that "one can easily see the trail of Tory behind it."[29] Nevertheless, he thought it would "catch many a workingman". He wrote to Sir Wilfrid:-

> "I attach much importance to this matter, and if you concur, kindly try to counteract the impression made by this resolution. We will be before the country in no time, and at present we have six bye-elections on, and if they go badly for us and we lose prestige by them, it will hurt us for the next general election."[30]

Sir Wilfrid was less concerned with these forebodings; his feelings were mostly those of annoyance. On one occasion, while being queried in Parliament, he even lost his characteristic aplomb. Sir Charles Tupper, the crafty leader of the Opposition, was quick to make capital of this lapse. "I see no cause for heat; I see no cause for the violent temper which the First Minister exhibited,"[31] chided Tupper puckishly. "I am afraid there is something outside which we have not seen which ruffled the temper of my Right Honourable friend." Could it be that Tupper suspected some-

thing which Laurier knew for certain; that daily it was becoming more apparent that the Anglo-American Commission could find no solution for the Alien Labour problem? The Act with its manifold imperfections would once more have to be set in motion.

III

Would the Laurier government again bring the Alien Labour Act into force in a manner which was obviously unsatisfactory to the Canadian labour movement? As it turned out, the answer to this question was supplied, not by events in the central provinces, but by agitation in the newly-opened and rapidly-developing mining areas in the interior of British Columbia.

On November 3, 1899, eight months after the adjournment of the Anglo-American Commission, Sir Wilfrid received an ominous telegram from the Kootenay district. It was from the Secretary of the Sandon Miners' Union, and read:

> "One thousand Canadian miners of the Slocan, with their wives and families, are being driven out of Canada by the importation of foreign labour from the United States."[32]

This was clearly an overstatement,[33] yet the message embodied a certain urgency which the Government dared not ignore. The mine owners were also having their troubles in British Columbia. As one of the province's largest capital investors wrote to the Ottawa government, "I fear that things are not any better here, from what I learn from the various camps: the Government are backing them up and the strikers are becoming daily more aggressive."[34]

The difficulties in British Columbia had begun in June. On the first of that month, the Legislative Assembly, responsive to the requests of the workingman, had passed an Eight-Hour Law. The mine owners, in reply to this latest challenge to their security, had combined into a protective organization, the 'Silver-Lead Mine Owners Association'. One of the methods which this Association employed to defend its component members was to draw American labourers into British Columbia, for a fluid labour market would lessen the danger of strikes. Whether the mine owners were right in doing this is an open question. But were they within the law?

This was another question, and one for which the labour organizations demanded an answer.

The Government was first apprised of the gravity of the situation in October. When matters further deteriorated in November, Sir Wilfrid made a not-uncharacteristic move; he appointed a Commissioner to investigate. But the arrival upon the scene of R. C. Clute, a Toronto barrister, did not stop the importations which "continued beneath the very eyes of the Commissioner".[35] Clute tried to be impartial; but his tightly legalistic interpretation of the Alien Labour Act rendered it almost a dead letter.

Clute found three loopholes in the Act. First, employers-- unlike United States employers-- could not be prevented from advertising abroad. This permitted mine managers, by advertising in American journals, to carry on an immigration programme which Clifford Sifton would have envied. Secondly, as long as the contracts between labourer and employer were made in Canadian territory, the law was not broken. Third, Commissioner Clute ruled that virtually any number of non-Americans citizens could enter Canada, contract or no contract. Thus employers could import ad libitum the Hungarians, Russians, Swedes or Finns of the Middle West. The

prospect of having Canada filled with "non-English-speaking foreigners" caused squeamish consternation among the British Columbia miners.[36] One officer of the Trades and Labour Congress feared that "... hundreds, in fact, thousands will be driven from their homes and country because there is an unlimited supply of foreigners in the Middle Western and North Western States."[37]

The mine managers, emboldened by this propitious turn of events, began to inaugurate a vigorous immigration policy. The months of January and February in 1900 were marked by the arrival of groups of labourers from the United States.[38] Most of these men were bound for mines around Sandon in the Slocan district, or for Rossland to the south. Their coming naturally had a great impact upon the miners of the Kootenay District, who, at the time, numbered only three thousand.[39]

During these months, Sir Wilfrid was censured by a score of unions, petitioned by a dozen Members of Parliament, and even supplied with proof that the influx was of dubious legality, by the Western Federation of Miners. Mass public meetings were called in Sandon to express indignation. In the view of the British Columbia labour elements, who were

not yet fully conscious of the Government's latest refinement of the Alien Labour Act, the Silver-Lead Mine Owners Association were able to break the law of the land with impunity. Thus the aggrieved unions in British Columbia, and such labour spokesmen as James Wilks, gave expression to a thought the Government had been entertaining for some time: the Alien Labour Act must be amended.

But amended in what way? The British Columbia miners' unions provided the answer to this question. They suggested that it be altered in a manner which would put an end to the maddening period of time between the registration of a complaint, and the resulting action (if any) taken by the Department of Justice. It should be revised in order to allow any labourer to set the law in motion merely by bringing his complaint to the local judge or magistrate. From his study of the British Columbia's difficulties, R. C. Clute came to the same conclusion. "Until those who are interested in enforcing the Act feel that they are at liberty themselves to do so, it will be unsatisfactory," he wrote in his Memorandum.[40]

The prospect of placing the Alien Labour Act within tempting reach of every disgruntled labourer in the country

was not comforting to the employer class. A Woodstock furniture maker warned Sir Wilfrid that to implement any amendment to the Act would not be a "wise move".[41] The Vice-President of the Centre Star Mining Company presented Laurier with a novel interpretation of what injury the amendment might occasion.

> "The (Sandon) Miners' Union voted down the strike for this year last Monday by a very narrow majority. The chief reason for it was that the Alien Labour Law was not yet in condition to suit them. The British Columbia unions, if they can get the Labour Law in shape to exclude labour from the south, feel satisfied that they need not fear labour from the east, two or three thousand miles away, and that they will be in a position to control the development of British Columbia and put their price upon their labour."[42]

In spite of representations such as these, however, Sir Wilfrid felt called upon to do something. At the time, he was not at all displeased with the fairness and discretion which the labour men had shown in invoking the Act. In Parliament on April 2, 1901, he was moved to pay tribute to the labour societies:

> "I will say that it is very much to the credit of the labour organizations-- and I am proud to say, at this moment, that when drafting the bill , we drafted it after a conference with the labour organizations-- that ever since the Act

> has been in force since 1897, the labour organizations have been very moderate in their demands, and have never tried to abuse the powers of the Law, but have tried simply to have the Law faithfully carried out."[43]

On the basis of the suggestions, and of Commissioner Roger C. Clute's report, therefore, Sir Wilfrid authorized an amendment to the Act. And this time, in contrast to his action in 1897, Laurier made certain that "the Bill would be acceptable to the labour organizations of the land."[44]

The Amendment to the Alien Labour Act, as finally drafted, did more than to make the law easy for the labourer to set in motion. It also forbade the importation of the United States' great 'foreign' population, and "at the suggestion of the labour organizations who have strongly pressed for its adoption," the amendment included a clause to prevent Canadian employers from adverising for help in American newpapers.[45] The new measure met with the approval of the labour world; the greatest criticism that the Labour representatives in Parliament could make was to say that it did not go far enough.[46] So it was passed in April of 1901.

IV

Then the labour societies made two shocking discoveries. The first was made soon after the passage of the amendment; on August 3, eight hundred Canadian Pacific Railway employees came out on strike.[47] To take their places, the management, it was believed, had imported Americans. But the aggrieved workers found, as innumerable others were to find, that the law was too costly to implement. Most labour organizations at the time were notoriously poor; and if there was anything a union needed more than a swift law, it was an inexpensive law. But in asking for the Amendment, had the labour men forgotten that it might be expensive to invoke? It appears so; for during the last ten years of the Laurier period, surprisingly few of the alleged violations of the Act were tried in court.

The second revelation was the nature of the Laurier administration's attitude to the revised legislation, and was gradually discerned after various Labour groups had made long and fruitless efforts to secure Government assistance. Ottawa

now refused to interfere when it was reported that the Law was broken. "No one thought, nor was it ever suggested," remarked the solicitor for the Trades and Labour Congress, J. G. O'Donoghue, "that the purpose of this amendment was to restrict the powers of the Government...."[48] But Laurier was no doubt quite happy to be able to make such a tactical withdrawal. The argument which he repeated tirelessly to complaining labour unions in the following years was a variation of this one:-

> "Permit me to remind you that the Alien Labour Act was amended last session at the request of the Labour associations. By the Act of 1897, it was provided that the enforcement of the Law should be in the hands of the Government. This disposition was found fault with, and it was advocated by several persons who pretend to be the champions of the Labour societies, that this Law, like all other laws, should be left to be enforced by the interested parties. The Government yielded to these representations, and the Act was amended accordingly at the last session."[49]

V

Disturbed, but not undaunted, labour, led by Ralph

Smith, introduced an amendment to the amendment in the following year. Smith hoped to transfer the power to investigate and punish violators of the Act from the Department of Justice to the Department of Labour (which was more susceptible to Labour pressure). But the Bill did not get past second reading. That the Government was determined to remain aloof from the whole question was reported by Smith himself; and he was frequently privy to Sir Wilfrid's views. "I frankly admit that it is a very difficult matter to get the Government to agree with our views on this question," Smith told his brethren of the Trades and Labour Congress, "as I do not believe they have any sympathy with the object of this Act."[50]

VI

In 1904, the Government, which for three years had been disdainfully cautious about assisting in the expulsion from Canada of American contract labour, sallied forth on

behalf of the workingman. This remarkable manoevre was one of the unforseen outgrowths of what J. W. Dafoe calls the "huge, ill-thought-out transcontinental enterprise"-- the Government's own ambitious railroad programme.[51]

Early in 1903, Grand Trunk Pacific surveys had begun and because of sunny times, labour was relatively scarce. To obtain a supply of workers, therefore, Charles M. Hays, the Second Vice-President and General Manager of the parent road, the Grand Trunk Railway, somewhat carelessly drew from across the border. This was done unobtrusively; and if the Government were aware of the influx, it was too anxious to have the line built to complain. Except for the occasional rumour and periodic query in Parliament, Hays' importation remained undiscovered for over a year.

Then,in February 1904, George L. Griffith, an engineer in the employ of the Grand Trunk Pacific, was dismissed. This was unfortunate, for although Griffith may have been an unsuitable worker, he was the Western Secretary of the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering, and therefore in a position to stir up trouble. Other implacable railwaymen who had been either released or denied employment by the Grand Trunk Pacific came to Griffith's aid. Throughout

the spring of 1904, these men conducted a noisy campaign against the Grand Trunk Pacific. The nest of Americans within the railroad was revealed to the public.

As might be expected, this disclosure excited the disapprobation of the Labour men. Earlier, in the fall of 1903, the Government had been beleaguered by a double-barrelled labour movement; not only the Trades and Labour Congress, but its estranged child the Canadian Federation of Labour demanded that changes be made to the existing inept Alien Labour legislation. But on that occasion, Sir William Mulock told the delegates that extreme amendments would be unwelcome, and that "better wages and more comforts", not artificial barriers, were to his mind the goals toward which the workingman should strive.[52]

The Grand Trunk Pacific revelations in the spring of 1904 confirmed the worst suspicions of the labour world. Protests came from both the labour movement and the Dominion Institute of Amalgamated Engineering. In Parliament, Edward F. Clarke again did service to the workingmen by persistent inquiry. And so aroused were the labourers in Montreal that in a bye-election early in 1904, a candidate was elected largely because he pledged that he would try to rebuild the Alien Labour Act.[53]

How did the Laurier administration react to this pressure? The Government was suspect; the railroad programme was an enterprise in which public money was heavily invested. If the Alien Labour Act were to have any value, except perhaps as a vague piece of anti-American propaganda, it was up to the Government to take remedial action. Laurier, who from the start had viewed Hays with suspicious tolerance, was not unwilling to do this.[54] Hays, Sir Wilfrid believed, was determined to have the surveying parties composed of American engineers. The public must be impressed at the outset that the Grand Trunk Pacific would be "a thoroughly Canadian railway".[55] "The pressure is very strong," Sir Wilfrid told Sir Thomas Shaughnessy in May, "and whilst I have no inclination to give way to the extent of the pretensions pressed upon us, I must say that I feel willing to do something in that direction."[56]

But it was Laurier's Minister of Labour who was to give impetus and direction to the action which ensued. Sir William Mulock did not like Charles M. Hays. A somewhat militant humanitarian, Mulock could not look benignly upon a man who had inaugurated his connection with the Grand Trunk Railway by discharging many old and faithful employees "upon the streets to starve".[57] "There is the widest difference

in the world," Mulock confided to his leader, "between the attitude of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway toward their respective employees. The former treat their men as human beings with rights; the latter treat them as serfs."[58] In Mulock's view, Charles M. Hays, the Second Vice-President and General Manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, was a "heartless," "cruel," and "tyrannical" man.[59]

As a result of the Grand Trunk disclosures, therefore, the intransigence which Sir William Mulock had shown toward the workman's delegations in the previous fall dissipated with a wondrous celerity. As he observed in April, 1904, "The question will not, I think, admit of delay or temporizing policy. There is a feeling amongst Canadian workmen that Mr. Hays and Mr. McGuigan, being Americans themselves, favour their own people to the prejudice of Canadians. This may or may not be a well-founded suspicion. Nevertheless it exists, and the fact that Messrs. Hays and McGuigan are Americans, in the judgment of the workmen, lends colour to the suspicion."[60]

With key Cabinet Ministers in this frame of mind, it was apparent that decisive action would be forthcoming. The Laurier government took the two most positive steps that had been taken since the Act was passed in 1897; a Commission

was appointed to investigate the charges against the Grand Trunk Railway; and a new Alien Labour Bill, the 'Mulock Bill', was introduced into Parliament, in order to prevent a recurrence of this embarrassment, and to tighten up the machinery of the Alien Labour Act. "Both sides," a disgusted official of Dominion Steamship Lines told Laurier, "are pandering altogether too much to the labour vote, and the outlook for all interests is far from satisfactory."[61]

The Royal Commission was conducted by Judge Winchester, who was soon known in Labour circles as a "most capable investigator".[62] As far as Commissioner Winchester was concerned, "... Canadian engineers are not inferior to American engineers, but having better knowledge of the country are better qualified."[63] A veritable purge resulted. Winchester found that about one Grand Trunk Pacific employee out of every twenty-five was an imported American. These people were sent scurrying for the border in order to avoid the humiliation of arrest and deportation. This was the first of several railroad 'housecleanings' administered by the Canadian government.

Hays was furious. If he had known, he told Sir Wilfrid, that the importation of a few American employees

on "the great work we have undertaken was going to be construed as unlawful and result in annoyance and obstruction of the kind we have experienced, we should certainly have given up all attempt to push the project."[64]

As Winchester's investigations uncovered more and more Americans in the Grand Trunk Pacific service, Hays sent repeated dispatches and threats to Sir Wilfrid. But even if he were disturbed by these inauspicious rumblings, the Prime Minister was adamant; the Alien Labour Act must be enforced.

The other action which the Government took was to introduce some new Alien Labour legislation. To this end, Mulock had prepared a Bill which provided that if a railroad were aided by public money, it must hire Canadians or bonafide immigrants where possible.[65] This measure would be a bold stride toward giving the Canadian worker an alien contract labour law.

When the intent of the Government became widely known, however, pressure began to increase from another direction. Industrialists feared-- as unions hoped-- that the Bill was the narrow end of more stringent legislation. Thus "the Minister of Labour's latest attack upon the honesty of the employer of labour" was viciously opposed.[66]

The Montreal Gazette, the organ of St. James Street, saw the Mulock Bill as a scandalous gift to the Labour men:

> "In Canada, we have one Phillips Thompson, the Toronto correspondent of the Labour Gazette, bewailing monthly in the columns of that fake publication the disturbing influence on the labour market caused by these people. At Ottawa, we have had Sir William Mulock standing on his tiptoes in his anxiety to grandmother the desires of the union element. The result is this combination of idiocy and mischievousness, the Alien Labour Bill."[67]

The Bill-- as was so often the case when the workingman was to benefit-- was introduced at the close of the session. The debating in Parliament was both vociferous and bitter.[68] The imminence of the measure excited the manufacturing elements. On the eve of the Bill's passage, protests poured onto Sir Wilfrid's desk: Hays protested, the influential Canadian Manufacturers Association protested, industrialists-- especially those who employed quantities of skilled labour-- protested. The pressure became unbearable. Sir Wilfrid conversed with Mulock.[69] Could the Bill be postponed until another time? Mulock was reluctant, for the Government had pledged itself to pass the Bill that session. To break a

promise would be to disappoint friends amongst the workingmen. Yet Sir William knew, and Sir Wilfrid knew, that other labour legislation had been given the hoist in other years. Mulock had a more cogent reason for wanting this measure on the statute books immediately. The Grand Trunk Pacific, even if it did not begin actual construction work in 1904, would be carrying on "preliminary work". "I would therefore regard an abandonment of the Bill as most serious," he thought, "furnishing a powerful weapon against the government, and likely to have very disastrous political consequences."[70]

VII

The Mulock Bill passed from the House to the Senate. But opposition began to mount. Symbolically enough, debating was choked off; and minutes later His Excellency arrived "amid the booming of cannon" to prorogue Parliament.

The Bill was not reintroduced into Parliament in the following year. Justice Anglin proved to be the Government's deus ex machina. In the summer of 1905, while the

Trades and Labour Congress was pressing the Laurier government to introduce again the amendment, Anglin declared that, under the Act, the Minister of Justice had no power to deport. Although the Judical Committee of the Privy Council reversed this decision at the end of the year, the Government remained neurotically[71] inert throughout the rest of the Laurier era; and it was generally conceded by the Trades and Labour Congress in subsequent years that the Alien Labour Law was "practically a dead letter".[72] The problem of the importation of American labour under contract was, to a large extent, superseded by another urgent problem, immigration from across the Atlantic Ocean.

VIII

"It was inevitable that this should occur and will recur indefinitely," said Roger C. Clute as he watched the British Columbia mine owners import American labourers.[73] Clute's words would almost seem to epitomize the Laurier

government's attitude toward the whole question. Sir Wilfrid appears to have believed that a statute could never be a wall high enough to prevent American workers from spilling over into the Canadian market; that Canada was no more capable of defence against an invasion of American labourers than was, say, Poland, against military attack. But this does not alter the nature of the legislation. The Alien Labour Law was a bad law-- bad because it did considerable damage to the Government; and because it afforded scant protection to the Canadian worker.

From the moment that the various Trades and Labour Councils began demanding Alien Labour officers, the existence of the Act was disadvantageous to the Liberal party. On numerous occasions-- for example, when the Anglo-American Commission was in session, or when "carloads"[74] of foreigners were being imported into British Columbia-- the Government was cursed for its inaction. In addition, the workers were exasperated by the seeming tergiversation of the Laurier administration; when the contentious statute was enacted in 1897, the Government had seen fit to deport; in 1901, it gave up these powers; three years later, the Government reverted to its original policy without any change in the Act; and during the last six years of office, the Ministry again assumed

its "do-nothing" stand. "If that is policy at all," remarked J. G. O'Donoghue in 1909, neatly summing up the feelings of the Labour leaders, "it is a policy of shilly-shallying, not creditable to a Government that has placed on the statute books a notable record of laws making for the betterment of the wage earners of this country."[75]

And the Alien Labour Law gave but little protection. Sir Wilfrid himself claimed that the value of the Act lay in the fact that it had compelled the Americans to be more lenient in enforcing their law at Detroit and Buffalo.[76] Is not this in itself a tacit admission that the Act was more a threat than a reality?

The Government, Sir William Mulock told a Trades and Labour Congress deputation, did not conceal the fact that it was letting itself be guided by popular sentiment on the Alien Labour question.[77] Between 1896 and 1911, there were two occasions when the public gave unequivocal support to the workingman: at the beginning of the Laurier regime, and again in 1904. In the earlier instance, a blind anti-American agitation prompted the Government to act; and the result was a questionable piece of labour legislation. In contrast, it was the Labour leaders who were able to stir and govern the public in 1904; and as a consequence, these men almost succeeded in winning a serviceable statute.

References Chapter I

1. See, for example, the Toronto News , June 29, 1904; or the Montreal Star, August 4, 1904.

2. "Memo for Sir Wilfrid Laurier,"(from the Buffalo immigration authorities, Laurier Papers, June 16, 1899.

3. "...for seven straight years he swallowed his principles and dropped the Bill without forcing it to a division, "said his Parliamentary antagonist, M. K. Cowan. See Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1904, V , 8568 (August 5, 1904)

4. For numerous instances of anti-American sentiment, see "Memo for Sir Wilfrid Laurier,"(from the Buffalo immigration autorities, Laurier Papers, June 16, 1899.

5. See Laurier Papers, Cowan to Laurier, March 2, 1897.

6. Ibid, Mackenzie to Laurier, May 29, 1897.

7. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1890, I, 1231 (February 27, 1890).

8. See Laurier Papers, Mackenzie to Laurier, May 28, 1897.

9. Referring to the American Contract Labour Law several years later, Sir Wilfrid commented, "For years we were slapped in the face with it, and we merely turned the other cheek. The time came, however, when this Christian charity would have been suicidal, and we had to apply the same law

which was applied against us." Laurier Papers, Laurier to Hays, June 18, 1904.

10. Laurier Papers, Obermeyer to Laurier, June 11, 1898.

11. Ibid, Dower to Laurier, September 26, 1898.

12. Ibid, Obermeyer to Laurier, June 11, 1898.

13. Laurier Papers, Laurier to Hays, August 6, 1904.

14. For example, Ibid, McMurtry to Laurier, August 25, 1898.

15. See, for instance, the St. Paul Dispatch, June 13, 1904.

16. Instructions to (Alien Labour) Agents, Laurier Papers, September 26, 1898.

17. Ibid, Obermeyer to Laurier, July 11, 1898.

18. Ibid, Ballantine to Laurier, July 9, 1898.

19. Proceedings of the 14th. Annual Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1898, p. 29.

20. Ibid, Laurier to Cockshutt, May 29, 1899.

21. Ibid, Laurier to Cockshutt, May 29, 1899.

22. "Memo for Sir Wilfrid Laurier," (from the Buffalo immigration authorities), Laurier Papers, June 16, 1899.

23. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1899, II, 3964 (May 31, 1899).

24. Laurier Papers, Cockshutt to Laurier, May 23, 1899.

25. Pro. of 15th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1899, P.7.

26. Montreal Star, September 10, 1898.

27. Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, November 19, 1898.

28. Ottawa Citizen, November 14, 1898.

29. Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, November 19, 1898.

30. Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, November 19, 1898.

31. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1899, II, 3964, (May 31, 1899).

32. Laurier Papers, Hughler to Laurier, November 3, 1899.

33. It is likely that there were 500 unemployed, and less than half of these were British Subjects. See the Victoria Colonist, December 15, 1899.

34. Laurier Papers, Robertson to Laurier, January 26, 1900.

35. Ibid, Bremner to Laurier, March 9, 1900.

36. Ibid, Parr to Laurier, March 21, 1900.

37. Ibid, Wilks to Laurier, February 27, 1900.

38. According to James Wilks, 28 men came on January 14; 23 on January 28; 25 on February 18; 6 on February 24; 28 on February 26. See Laurier Papers, Wilks to Laurier, March 7, 1900.

39. "Public opinion will soon cry out against the importation ...," James Wilks told the Prime Minister. See Laurier Papers, Wilks to Laurier, March 7, 1900.

40. "Memo by R. C. Clute," Laurier Papers, March 8, 1901.

41. Ibid, Anderson to Laurier, March 18, 1901.

42. Ibid, Blackstock to Laurier, April 11, 1901.

43. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1901, I, 2474 (April 2, 1901).

44. Ibid, 2474.

45. Ibid, 2474.

46. Ibid. 2706. Ralph Smith, President of the Trades and

Labour Congress, and A.W. Puttee, both approved of the Bill as far as it went.

47. The Labour Gazette, I, 71 (September 1900 to June 1901), 71.

48. Pro. of 18th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1902, 26.

49. Laurier Papers, Laurier to Kennedy, November 5, 1901. Among those strongly advocating change were: F. D. Monk, T.S. Sproule, W.F. MacLean, and George A. Clare.

50. Pro. of 18th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1902, 15.

51. J. W. Dafoe, Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics, (Toronto, 1922), 131.

52. Pro. of 19th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1903, 11.

53. This was Honoré Gervais (Montreal St. Jacques). See Laurier Papers, Gervais to Laurier, May 26, 1904.

54. See Laurier Papers, Laurier to Hays, May 24, 1904.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid, Laurier to Shaughnessy, May 26, 1904.

57. Ibid, Mulock to Laurier, September 14, 1905.

58. Ibid, Mulock to Laurier, September 14, 1905.

59. Ibid.

60. Ibid, Mulock to Laurier, April 11, 1904.

61. Ibid, Torrance to Laurier, August 3, 1904.

62. Ibid, Kennedy to Laurier, June 8, 1905.

63. Ibid, Mulock to Laurier, March 20, 1905.

64. Ibid, Hays to Laurier, June 27, 1904.

65. Other features of the Bill were: first, provision against false representations to secure immigrants; and secondly, a general claim excluding undesirable incomers.

66. Montreal Gazette, August 4, 1904.

67. Montreal Gazette, August 4, 1904.

68. G. L. Taylor shouted at Mulock that he would suggest the title of the Bill be "An Act to mutilate the Alien Labour Act." See Debates of the House of Commons, 1904, IV, 8651 (August 5, 1904).

69. Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, (No date:-about August 5), 1904.

70. Ibid, Mulock to Laurier, (no date:- about August 5),1904.

71. If there is any question about the cause of the neurosis, see p.15.

72. Pro. of 22nd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, 45.

73. Laurier Papers, Clute to Laurier, February 1, 1900.

74. Laurier Papers, Wilks to Laurier, March 7, 1900.

75. Pro. of 25th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1909, 53.

76. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1904, IV, 8594 (August 5, 1904).

77. Pro. of 19th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1903, 11.

The Implications of British and Continental European Immigration

"It surely is better that our population should be small and the people happy, prosperous, and contented that it should be large, discontented, poverty-stricken, workless and suffering. But the great anxiety of Governments-- Dominion and Provincial-- seems to be to get immigrants, to dump them in Canada, and then to desert them in the insane pursuit of more immigrants."

Executive Officers, Trades and Labour Congress, 1908.

The year 1903 saw immigration to Canada reach an exciting new level. In that year, the supply of British newcomers doubled, while the total number of arrivals from Europe was strikingly higher than in previous years.[1] A period of dynamic prosperity had come at last.

Generally speaking, however, the labour movement watched the invasion with less enthusiasm; and, in truth, took a curiously schizophrenic view of the increased numbers. Workers in secure positions or in strong unions could afford

to view the second great wave of immigration as a contribution to national progress; and adherents of the Liberal party such as Ralph Smith could say, "I agree entirely with progressive immigration policy of this government, and I believe that the great prosperity of the country at the present time is due to that progressive policy."[2] In the main, however, the native worker suffered from a feeling of nervous perturbation; these foreigners not only endangered his standard of comfort, but placed his very job in jeopardy. Even worse, a fluid labour market meant that the workingman's only real weapon, the strike, could no longer be held as an effective threat to an employer's bumptiousness. Perhaps the basic feeling entertained by the working class in Canada is succinctly expressed at the Victoria convention of the Trades and Labour Congress in 1906: "There is no hurry . . . ," the Executive Committee warned. "The fewer our people and the greater our wealth, the more ideal will be the existing conditions."[3]

Was the workingman justified in embracing such extravagant views as these? Possibly not, but statistics relating to the flow of immigration offer us an eloquent reminder that the Canadian worker was not altogether to be blamed for his anxiety. To Canada, a country of five and a third millions

in 1900 (and therefore with a working force considerably smaller) came more than a million people from overseas during the next decade.[4] In spite of the rural background of most of the Continental European arrivals, only one-quarter of them announced their intention of entering agricultural work in Canada.[5] The prairies were a discouraging distance from the ports of entry, while Eastern cities were close at hand, offering wages which must have been quite enticing to the unsophisticated peasant. To the grief of the native toiler, over one-half of the Europeans gave general labuur as their intended occupation; they took such jobs as stevedores, construction workers and factory hands.

Few of the British immigrants were farmers, but many were seasoned craftsmen, for the industry of Great Britain was no longer growing. Jostled by expanding rivals such as Germany and the United States, the United Kingdom offered fewer opportunities for ambitious artisans. England was fast becoming a sort of greenhouse for skilled labour.

Uneasy about the immigration, the labour movement favoured placing restraints upon-- if not totally reorganizing-- the Canadian government's ambitious project. Thus it is illuminating to observe the diverse ways in which the labour leaders attempted to press Laurier and his colleagues to adopt their views, for above all, the demands of labour

had to be acceptable to Canadians at large; a display of stark self-interest would be more likely to repel than attract any degree of popular support. In attacking Government policy, therefore, organized labour assailed a dozen or so features of the immigration which were either repugnant to the public, or were conspicuously unjust to the Canadian worker.

What phases of the Laurier government's immigration programme did the Labour groups impugn? And did the Government give any consideration to these demands? Let us now give our attention to these significant problems of a not unimportant phase of labour history.

I

Perhaps now forgotten, but at the time urgent, was the problem of deceptive advertising which became acute with the tidal wave of immigration in 1903. Let us here examine the nature of the problem and then investigate the events which occasioned change.

As the trans-Atlantic migration increased, the number of abuses connected with this human traffic became more and more frequent. One of the most dubious practices of those in a position to benefit from the influx-- for example, steamship companies and immigration agencies-- was to exaggerate the propitious state of affairs in the Dominion. Even the Canadian government was not free from participating in a mild form of this deceit, as an editorial taken from the Aberdeen Gazette of December 21, 1907 points out.

> "It is quite apparent that the exodus to Canada has been completely overdone. The rush has arisen to a great extent from the fact that unscrupulous agents have all along held up the rosy side of the picture for the inspection of prospective emigrants. The Canadian Government, however, are not by any means guiltless of employing methods of a similar nature. Some time ago, they issued circulars to various municipalities in the Dominion, soliciting photographs of golden harvest fields and orchards laden with an abundance of fruit; 'but' concluded the circular, 'we don't want snow scenes'. No, of course not. Such scenes might suggest to the canny Scot that the necessity for warm clothing and good fires might run away with his earnings. As a matter of fact, coal is about 45s. per ton in Winnipeg at present."[6]

But the behaviour of the Canadian government was angelic in comparison with the conduct of a number of tiny

profit-seeking agencies which had sprung up, it seems, almost overnight. These bureaus more often than not portrayed Canada as a kind of labourers' Eldorado. Thus the Dominion soon became a mantrap baited with hyperbolized attractions and delusive idealizations.

It would be an understatement to say that the Canadian labour societies were aggravated by these agencies packing the labour market with disappointed immigrants. But false advertising had even more serious ramifications for the Canadian worker: who was to stop irresponsible agents (in collusion with Canadian manufacturers) from sending men to the scene of an industrial dispute, there to serve as strike-breakers? Alphonse Verville, President of the Trades and Labour Congress, explained labour's position on this question to Parliament in May of 1906.

> "I do not contest the right of anyone, when there is labour trouble, to get men to take the positions of the strikers; but on the other hand, I do not believe that anyone has the right to go on the other side of the line or to the old country and publish misleading advertisements, and by false representations induce men to sell out everything and come out to this country .... Ask the workingman of Montreal, Kingston, Toronto, Hamilton, St. Thomas and Windsor, and you will find out that any number of men have been brought to these places only when there were labour troubles to be dealt with."[7]

In attempting to counteract misrepresentations in British journals, the Canadian labour organizations were themselves charged with distorting the truth. Senator McMullen, a man with little patience with an impertinent young labour movement, drew the attention of his fellow-Senators to labour's own misleading propaganda:

> "I was amazed on Monday last to read in the Globe, a copy of a circular that has been issued by labour organizations of this country for circulation throughout Great Britain, telling men that there is no room in Canada for skilled labour--that the price of everything had gone up to such an extent that this was not a country for skilled labour-- that there was no room here, and the workmen here were living from hand to mouth."[8]

The labour leaders became decidedly attentive to the problem of misrepresentation in 1903. At that time, there was a strong impression that a London agency, the Canadian Labour Bureau, had been sending unwitting strike-breakers to relieve the inconvenience caused by two industrial disputes, one at the mines in Fernie, British Columbia, the other at the Canada Foundry Company in Toronto. In the following year, two more cases of misrepresentation were unearthed; these were more flagrant than the previous ones, and in the end, brought the Government to the aid of the Canadian workingman.

The first of these affairs centred about a man named Grahame Hunter, president of a small but lively emigration agency, the Associated British-Canadian Society of Glasgow. During 1903 and 1904 Hunter frankly advertised himself as a 'strike smasher'. He received some orders for workers from Canadian manufacturers; and when needy industrialists could not be found, he sent out labourers in excess of the demands. Disappointed immigrants and Canadian labour unions made deadly certain that the Government had a detailed knowledge of the shabby practices of Hunter's agency.

While the Hunter matter was being investigated, a second instance of delusive advertising was disclosed. This had an infinitely more damaging effect upon the Canadian labour market and, illustrating the portentous possibilities of unrestrained advertising, it goaded the Government into action.

For a number of years Italian labourers had been streaming into Canada, especially to the port of Monteal, with the object of obtaining construction work. In 1903, the C. P. R. alone employed over 3,000 of these navvies.[9] The flow was not spontaneous, but was encouraged primarily by certain Italian agencies in Montreal who, with the financial assistance of railroad and steamship companies-- notably

the Canadian Pacific Railway-- were utilizing "almost inconceivable devices" to bring Italians to Canada.[10] The most vigorous of these agencies was directed by one Antonio Cordasco.

Cordasco proclaimed himself 'King of the Italian Workers'. He could, he declared, give ten-thousand men immediate employment with the Canadian Pacific Railway; and he offered attractive wages. His medium of advertisement was a journal, Le Corriere del Canada. This he sent in large quantities to Italy, there to be circulated in districts in which emigrants were likely to be recruited. Largely owing to the zeal of Cordasco, a plethora of his countrymen arrived in Canada in early 1904; the first five months of that year saw between 6,000 and 8,000 hopeful Italians disembark at Montreal.[11]

The effect of this sudden influx on the condition of the labour market was immediate. Wages for unskilled workers fell; local labour groups were up in arms; Montreal became temporarily an employer's paradise. James B. Mack, Vice-President of the Trades and Labour Congress and one of the founders of the Montreal Trades and Labour Council, described the critical conditions thus:-

> "I am labour editor of the 'Star'. In going about, I am looking for information, and I met large numbers in our streets, parks, crowds everywhere near the Windsor Station, of men out of employment .... Italians came to the 'Star' in large numbers; they were anxious to get statements in the paper. They said they had been brought here by speculators, men who wanted to get from one to ten dollars for securing employment. They stated that they had been grossly deceived, and they made statements to us."[12]

Matters grew worse when the unemployed had to be supported by public charity. The Mayor of Montreal was obliged to communicate with the Dominion government to see if some aid could not be obtained. The aggrieved workmen themselves solicited the assistance of the Department of Labour. Sir William Mulock dispatched his Deputy to Montreal to investigate. "I am of the opinion," reported W. L. M. King, "that the fraudulent practices of these agencies, injurious alike to unsuspecting immigrants who become the victims, and the Canadian public, and the industrial classes in particular, who are also made to suffer, make it eminently desirable, in the public interest, that a thorough enquiry should be made by means of a Royal Commission, and that steps should be taken, by legislation if need be, to effectively put a stop... /to/ all similar agencies or organizations wherever situated in any part of the Dominion."[13]

Mackenzie King's advice gave shape to the ensuing Government action. The powers of Judge Winchester, at that time conducting a Royal Commission investigating the nationality of Grand Trunk employees, were extended to enable him to study the Montreal crisis. His findings corroborated the preliminary report of the Deputy Minister of Labour. Judge Winchester's recommendations were subsequently incorporated into the ill-fated 'Mulock Bill' which failed to receive third reading in the Senate in August, 1904. A separate Bill covering the same ground was introduced in July of the following year, and 'An Act Respecting False Representations to Induce or Deter Immigration' received the assent of Parliament.

Taken in retrospect, the full scope of this legislation may be easy for us to see; but it was not at all apparent to those involved. As a matter of fact, the Act could not possibly curb the practice of fraudulent advertising. This fact was brought out by labour disturbances late in 1905.

One-third of a century had passed since the Toronto printers had spearheaded the nine-hour movement in Canada,

only to be checked by a wile of George Brown, Now, late in 1905, the printers once more struck for the shorter (eight-hour) day. This time, Winnipeg was chosen as the Canadian centre in which the campaign was conducted. Once again the printers met with legal frustrations; and once again the Government came to the rescue.

The difficulties began when the local Master Printers financially backed by the United Typothetae of America, tried to break the strike. They dispatched an agent, Charles Brunning, to Great Britain with liberal funds with which to hire and transport printers to Winnipeg. Brunning conducted a thorough advertising campaign in leading British newspapers,[14] but he committed a sin of omission. When asked if there was any labour trouble, Brunning said that owing to the dynamic growth of the West and the incredible increase in the number of newspapers, many printers were required. Thus the hopeful printers arrived only to find strike conditions.[15]

Angry, these men petitioned the Home Government; and the Colonial Office requested the Canadian government to investigate. The "very efficient Deputy of Labour", as Ralph Smith called him, was again ordered to investigate.[16] Viewing the situation somewhat ethically, Mackenzie King observed that "a strike presents a situation serious enough of itself without that situation being aggravated through any concealment

of facts or false representations which may draw innocent third parties into the conflict, subjecting them to the opprobrium which is undeserved, and arousing feelings of antagonism to fellow workmen in other parts of the Empire where there should be only the most cordial relationships."[17] The Canadian Act was designed to meet just this kind of situation. But it did not. Once Brunning saw that his artifice had been discovered, he fled back to the British Isles, safely out of the reach of the Canadian authorities.

On March 26 and again on April 6, Alphonse Verville the earnest President of the Trades and Labour Congress, drew the Government's attention to the Winnipeg débâcle, and inquired what action the Government intended to take. The Honourable Allen Bristol Aylesworth, holding briefly the Labour portfolio,[18] replied that Mackenzie King's findings had been sent to the Colonial Office; and that the Imperial Government had been requested "to consider the advisability of enacting legislation to prevent false representations being made in the United Kingdom."[19]

But the labour organizations were still unsatisfied. As Ralph Smith declared in Parliament on May 9, "occurrences which have arisen this year... have demonstrated that unless

the purpose of Parliament in passing this (1905) Act is to be defeated, some further action is necessary...."[20] Smith hoped that not only the Government, but the entire Parliament, would petition the Imperial Parliament to enact a measure similar to the Canadian Act. His wish was granted.

But many of the Canadian Labour leaders felt that even this would not be good enough. P. M. Draper, Secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress, explained the anxiety of his organization to the Minister of Labour. It was possible, Draper felt, that in the multiplicity of affairs claiming the attention of the Imperial Parliament, a request by the Canadian authorities might become submerged in the waters of Lethe. He posed the suggestion that "someone should be sent to England to press upon the authorities the urgency of the request that had been made, so that immediate action might be taken. If this can be done," Draper continued, "no one is better fitted for the task than your Deputy Minister, Mr. W. L. Mackenzie King, C.M.G., who has an intimate knowledge of the whole case, and whose investigations into the case of the Winnipeg printers, apart from anything else, gave him an opportunity of learning at first hand the nature of the schemes used to dupe immigrants."[21]

"I think your suggestion a good one...," the Labour Minister replied several days later.[22] So the Deputy Minister was sent to England. "Mr. King was eminently successful in his endeavour...," the Trades and Labour Congress Executive was able to report to the 1907 convention held at Winnipeg.[23]

The arresting feature of the whole problem of misrepresentation is the supercharged willingness of the Government to carry out the demands of the labour organizations. Why should Ottawa act with such haste (relatively speaking) in these matters? Was it because the Government entertained a magnanimous desire to see that the Canadian worker was not treated unfairly? Or did the Laurier administration fear that if the matter were delayed, inharmonious relations with the Mother Country might result? These were no doubt contributory reasons for the prompt action taken by the Labour Department. There was, however, a stronger motive. It is clear that the Government was guided above all by the "silent witnesses of the struggle", the public, who were,in this matter, plainly on the side of Labour.[24]

II

Acting as his own Minister of the Interior immediately after Sifton's resignation, Sir Wilfrid Laurier made the following statement to Parliament on March 9, 1905. "The Department does not take any steps to promote the immigration of mechanics, etc. Its efforts are confined to those intending to engage in agriculture. All immigration agents are instructed along these lines...."[25] In essence, this was the Laurier administration's attitude to the canvassing of immigrants. But on occasion, an errant official would overstep the limits prescribed by the Department. When this happened, as it did during Laurier's third term of office, the vigilant labour men constrained the Government to tighten up its immigration machinery.

When rejuvenating the Immigration Branch of the Interior Department, Clifford Sifton decided to place an Emigration Commissioner in London. A formidable task awaited the occupant of this office: he was to rebuild the effete

overseas immigration branch of the lately-deceased Conservative government; and he was to promote and direct a mass migration to a land about which Europeans knew little, and most of it wrong.

The man Sifton chose to fill this pivotal position was W. T. R. Preston, known to his friends as a Liberal party stalwart, to others as a party hack. Preston's views on immigration were, if anything, an exaggeration of Sifton's own 'broadminded' views; he showed an alarming eagerness to fill the country with people, whether acceptable to the Canadian workingman or not. Preston did not, however, possess his master's willingness to conceal his convictions. During his nine-year tenure of the Commissioner's post, he was frequently a source of embarrassment to his Liberal friends.

For example, Preston could not bear to see adverse reports about opportunities for employment in his native land. As a consequence, from time to time, corrective letters would appear in leading British journals signed by the Canadian Commissioner of Emigration. Illustrative of these was a statement in the London Daily News on May 9, 1903. This denied that the Canadian labour market was congested; the Dominion had room for 5,000 farmers and 10,000 mechanics, Preston told Londoners.[26] Such super-optimistic reports invariably reached the keen ears of the labour societies in Canada.

They, in turn, were not shy about expressing their displeasure.

In the fall of 1903, for instance, it was widely rumoured that W. T. R. Preston had induced miners to sail for British Columbia, there to serve as strike-breakers. "Was this action authorized by your Government?" the Congress leaders demanded. "If not, we ask for Preston's immediate recall."[27] By untempered action such as this, Preston gradually earned the lynx-eyed scrutiny of the labour unions. And from this time on, he was often accused of dishonesty; with some justification as it turned out.

In Parliament, spokesmen were at this time complaining that a man called Louis Leopold had set up an immigration office in the same building as Preston.[28] It was charged that in order to create the impression that his office was a branch of the Canadian government, Leopold, "alias Lazarus",[29] had craftily named his agency The Canadian Labour Bureau (replete with a Canadian coat-of-arms over the door). Leopold made a business of sending to Canada both skilled and general labour, the very kind of immigrant toward which the labour organizations continually pressed the Government to adopt a policy of <u>laisser faire</u>. The Canadian labour men contended that Preston was involved in this traffic. They

charged that the Canadian Emigration Commissioner in London was acting neither honestly nor in accordance with Government policy.

From time to time, therefore, ministers at Ottawa would receive complaints and resolutions demanding Preston's removal. The Laurier government professed concern, and on occasion voiced its desire to oust the Leopold agency from its present location. But Sifton averred that his London Commissioner was free from knavish practices, and invited information which could prove otherwise. "The instructions which I have given have been most explicit," said Sifton, "and there can be no possible excuse for any officer of the Department, either directly or indirectly, in any shape, form or manner, being connected with, or encouraging, the traffic these people [Leopold et al.] are carrying on."[30]

The Toronto District Labour Council, an organization which had figured prominently in the struggle, took pains to find evidence that the Canadian Emigration Commissioner in London was in league with Leopold. The Council demanded a Government inquiry. Laurier obliged. In the investigation which followed, it was shown conclusively -- largely through the efforts of Alfred Jury, an emigration officer

in Liverpool-- that Preston was not only in collusion with Leopold, but that he had engineered the whole ill-starred scheme.[31] The modus operandi of these men was as the Labour leaders had suspected. "There was posters all over different parts of London as advertisements for men wanted in Canada," one disillusioned artisan told the Toronto labour men:

> "So I went to the immigration offices, so they told me they could not guarantee work for machinists, but there was a man upstairs that would do so. That was Leopold. I seen him personally. I asked him how was work for machinists, he said very good indeed and would advise every workingman to go there that wanted to get on."[32]

In spite of these disclosures, however, Preston was not immediately recalled, for the issue became a part of a broader party struggle over immigration policy. But the labour organizations stayed discreetly out of this altercation; and to secure Preston's removal let loose upon the Ottawa government one of the greatest fusillades of protests of the entire Laurier period. Virtually every body affiliated with the Trades and Labour Congress passed resolutions demanding Preston's dismissal.[33] These were supplemented by condemnations in the Labour press, and by an appeal from the President of the Canadian Federation of Labour. In the end, this torrent of indignation proved effective. With

Sifton gone from the Labour Department, Preston had few supporters. He was 'orphaned'.

There was some uneasiness amongst the Trades and Labour Congress leaders that "Labour's old-time friend", Alfred Jury, the Government official who had helped to disclose the Preston-Leopold alliance, would lose his job for his trouble.[34] "His dismissal or removal will be regarded by organized labour as an indication that your Government was not anxious to disturb Mr. Preston in the work he was carrying on through Leopold," Verville admonished Sir Wilfrid.[35] Soon Preston was transferred to a post in the Department of Trade and Commerce in the Orient. Jury, however, remained at his post in Liverpool.

III

Labour opposed the Government's offer of financial assistance to encourage immigration. "I do not blame the government for having granted bonuses at the outset," Alphonse

Verville stated in Parliament, "as it may have been necessary at the time the law came into force, to induce immigrants of the farming class to go to the Northwest.... It would seem /however/ that the time has arrived when the flow of population to Canada is so numerous and Canada is so well-known that bonuses are no longer necessary."[36] Indeed, labour had a strong argument; the Government was protecting its manufacturers from world competition; but the workingmen were unprotected. This was not all. With their taxes they were paying to bring cheap foreign labour to compete against themselves.

Organized labour, that is, the Trades and Labour Congress and its offshoot, the Canadian Federation of Labour, had little objection to subsidizing the fares of bonafide farm immigrants.[37] But when immigration took on frightening proportions in 1906, even this view was abandoned. The Trades and Labour Congress, for example, attacked the entire system in that year. In convention at Victoria, it was resolved "that this influx should be the spontaneous movement of the immigrants themselves, and in this regard we declare against any system of assisted immigration, or the granting of bonuses for that purpose."[38] But despite the strength of the

pressure from the labour societies, and the soundness of their arguments, the Government would not drastically alter its course. On only two occasions were the labour organizations able to impel the Government to make discernible modifications in the bonusing system.

During Sifton's tenure, the Government, in order to encourage settlers to the West, had been quite liberal in subsidizing the transportation of any type of settler, including mechanics, provided that they would promise to engage in agricultural pursuits on their arrival in this country. This practice invited deceit; there was nothing to prevent a foreign labourer from punctiliously vowing that he would work on a farm in order to obtain a bonus, and then changing his mind once he was here. To meet the demands of organized labour, steps were taken to correct this abuse in 1906. As the Honourable Frank Oliver told Ralph Smith, the payment of bonuses was, on April 1, restricted to persons who had been for at least a year previous to emigrating, either domestic servants, or "farmers, farm labourers, gardeners, stablemen, carters, railway section men, navvies, or miners, who had signified their intention of following farming in Canada." The Trades and Labour Congress leaders agreed that "This is a notable restriction in the payment of bonuses."[39]

Two years later, labour was again able to persuade the Government to pare down the handouts to immigrants. For some time, the ingress of railroad labour had been a thorny question in Canada, especially since Americans had been discovered on the Grand Trunk Pacific surveys, and Italians had swamped the Montreal labour market in 1904. So apprehensive were the labour elements that when in December, 1906, Lord Grey imprudently ventured the opinion that cheap foreign labour should be admitted in abundance to aid in railroad construction, he was given a peppery rebuke by the Toronto District Labour Council.[40]

The Government was willing to give a bonus to the railroad labourer provided that he promised to enter into farm work in Canada; but as with mechanics, there was little to deter him from returning to his trade on arrival in this country. Alphonse Verville dwelt on this subject in a speech to Parliament on April 14, 1908. "Would it not be better," he asked somewhat rhetorically, "to have our railway contractors put to some little disadvantage and expense in which this work lasts for but seven and a half months per year, rather than have the army of labour suffer during the winter?"[41] Verville's suggestion was not lost on the Laurier government; for in the spring of the following year, the practice of offering bonuses to navvies was discontinued.

IV

Only once during the Laurier era did it appear that the Government would have to curb its aggressive immigration programme; events and agitation in the year 1907 made an abrupt change of policy seem imminent.

1907 was in Castell Hopkins' phrase "a banner year in Canadian immigration".[42] In the autumn, however, there occurred a sudden financial depression. Throughout the winter, in the larger North American centres, the unemployed grimly tramped the streets in search of jobs. Bad times were considerably worsened when various British immigration societies--[43] deaf to the cries emanating from Canada-- went about their business with more zeal than ever. As W. R. Trotter phrased it, "To speak of thousands of unemployed, of distress, destitution, beggary and want, of crowded soup kitchens, and other intolerable features which were being created in Canada--- these things did not disturb their equinamity or deter their indefatigable secretaries."[44]

This threat to prosperity confirmed all of the labour

societies' fears about the Government's 'full throttle' immigration policy. "Your Executive Council realize that the strong position taken by organized labour on this important question in the past has been entirely vindicated by the events of 1907 and 1908...," the annual convention of the Trades and Labour Congress was told.[45] At the same gathering, Vice-President James Simpson evoked loud cheers from his compeers by stating that the unchecked immigration programme of the Liberal government was the cause of the adversity.[46]

In a precarious position, the Ottawa government could not but note the dangerously mounting total of unemployed. The Administration did not however (as the labour organizations had hoped) stop stoking the immigration machinery with financial fuel. Instead, they had another plan. By an Order-in-Council on January 8, 1908, every adult newcomer who had neither relation or friend in Canada was compelled, in order to enter the Dominion, to have on his person $50.00.[47] And two months later the Government introduced a new system of medical inspection for immigrants.[48]

Unemployment had impelled change. Canada, at least temporarily, was no longer a land which welcomed Europe's

destitute and suffering; the Government had been obliged to show an illiberal spirit toward those people whose interest in Canada had been so assiduously cultivated. But only momentarily!

V

The year 1910 saw the genesis of an Imperialist idea. This was a scheme, propounded by a British Member of Parliament, Sir Clement Kinloch-Cooke of the Central Immigration Board in London, to extend the British labour exchange system to cover the whole Empire.

But the Canadian workingman viewed the whole plan through hard, realistic eyes; and at the Fort William convention of the Trades and Labour Congress in 1910, the Executive Council questioned both the value of such an exchange, and the motives of its proponents:

> "The establishment of 'Imperial' labour exchanges at the present time would simply, we believe, enable those disposed to do so, to dump batches of

> workmen in localities affected by industrial disputes, with the result of unsettling local labour markets, and causing intense dissatisfaction in the community affected. We further believe that the idea of the so-called 'Imperial' Labour Exchange supporter is not so much to satisfy the needs of a particular industry as it is to get rid of an undoubted surplus in Great Britain without regard to the local requirements in Canada."[49]

Discovering that the 'imperial labour exchange' was to be a subject on the agenda of the Imperial Conference of 1911, the Secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress, in April of that year, wrote a strong letter to W. L. M. King, the Minister of Labour, in which the workingman's viewpoint was plainly set out. King relayed these wishes to Sir Wilfrid, before the Prime Minister sailed for England. The scheme for an 'imperial labour exchange' met the opposition of the workingman, Laurier's minister informed him and "... would lead inevitably to much friction between employers and workmen in Canada...."[50]

Presumably Sir Wilfrid knew a good thing when he saw it. With an election before him, he needed the workingman behind him; and here was a transcendent opportunity to gain support from the labour societies while injuring no one (except perhaps the already bruised sensibilities of the 'neo-imperialists'). On June 2, 1911, at the Imperial Conference,

Sir Wilfrid voiced an untempered opposition to the whole plan for an 'imperial labour exchange'.

> "I am sorry to say that we in Canada would not view with favour such a system of exchange as is here suggested in the resolution. The conditions of the labour market are very different in Canada and the Dominions beyond the seas--- at all events, they are very different in Canada. This is a question which chiefly concerns labour, and with us, the labour organizations have not viewed the system at all with any favour. I should say that whilst we have encouraged emigration from Great Britain to Canada, we have really encouraged one kind of immigrant, and that is agricultural immigration for which the market is unlimited."[51]

The Imperial Conference was notable to many because the plan to establish an 'imperial parliamentary federation' "received its quietus".[52] But to the Canadian worker, the Conference was memorable because at that time, the scheme to institute an 'imperial labour exchange' received a crippling blow. "It is to the credit and foresight of the Canadian Premier," observed the Winnipeg Voice of June 30, "that this question was very early relegated to the scrap-heap of the Conference."[53] Is it not paradoxical that one of the most spectacular Labour triumphs in the field of immigration was not a positive, but a negative victory? Could this be a reflection upon the degree of influence that the labour move-

ment was able to exert upon Sir Wilfrid's government?

VI

It is apparent that the Laurier government, and notably the two Ministers of the Interior, Clifford Sifton and Frank Oliver, never gave very warm-hearted support to the requests of the labour societies. Sifton, in particular, evinced a dislike bordering on contempt for these organizations. His actions, and on occasion his words, indicate the he felt the Labour men to be mere Lilliputians hampering the freedom of a long-sighted Gulliver. And on one occasion, when a deputation of workers from Montreal and Toronto asked for an interview to present to the Government the workingman's objections to the Administration's immigration methods, Sifton petulantly told Sir Wilfrid, "I have heard what they have to say some twenty or thirty times, but there is, I presume, no objection to you giving them an appointment if they deserve it, and if you have the time to spare."[54]

The conspicuous disparity between the Government's objects and the workers' demands becomes all the more exaggerated when one realizes that Sifton's intention was never, as he proclaimed, to encourage only "stout, hardy peasants in sheepskin coats".[55] He had much more extravagant aims than this. In the words of one of his colleagues, "His policy was never limited to obtaining agriculturalists for the West, however much there might have been immediate need of these. He had a wider vision. He believed that with a huge general expansion, matters would shape better for the country at large."[56]

Frank Oliver's tenure of the Labour portfolio from April, 1905, to October, 1911, brought but minor changes; at its base, Government policy toward immigration remained the same. And throughout the rest of the Laurier regime, there continued to be a perceptible discrepancy between the aims of united labour and the policy of the Administration. This dissonance is well illustrated in the Government's attitude toward the Salvation Army. By 1907, this organization was able to report that it had already sent 20,000 Britons to the Senior Dominion, and promised to redouble its efforts.[57] Rigid opposition to the Army's activities was provided by such Canadian Labour leaders as Alphonse Verville, James Simpson and

W. R. Trotter. These men believed that the Salvation Army, "the most widely-known combination of emigration touts in the British Isles", was making a business of crowding the country with "hooligans, scamps, loafers and drunkards".[58] More than this, the labour elements were not at all sure that the city dwellers which the Army were sending over would be eager to take up farming upon arriving in Canada.

Knowing these things, however, the Government did not hesitate to give pecuniary help to the Salvation Army. In Oliver's own words, "we contribute to the rental of the Army offices in the Old Country, give advertisments, and make a small grant to aid the Army in its work of distribution in Canada."[59] Here, then, was a too obvious instance of the Interior Department supplying funds to bring to Canada, not people of the agricultural class, which as the Government wearily maintained was the only variety which was financially encouraged, but a species which there was little doubt would remain in the large Canadian centres, there to under-cut the living standard of the native toiler. Labour pressure did not stop the Laurier administration from bonusing the Salvation Army. "The Government," Oliver laconically told Verville, "will maintain its present attitude until a reason for change

is seen."[60]

Because both Ministers of the Interior were inimical to the aims of the labour organizations, can we say that Labour, in attempting to limit immigration, brought about any remarkable results?

The Labour men found that an effective way to win popular support was to attack the features of the immigration which the general public liked the least. Canadians were little disposed to admit the 'Bohunk' or the 'Dago' into any degree of intimacy. The labour organizations therefore were never embarrassed about deprecating the quality, the character, and the 'foreign-ness' of the "riffraff of Europe".[61]

But the Labour men could not bring the public to dislike the immigrant enough to want to keep him out. The majority of Canadians, unlike the native worker, did not have a great deal to do with the inflow; and they were delighted with the prosperity. This appears to be the reason why the workingman was unable to bring about any revolutionary changes in the Government's programme. True, labour found itself able to correct-- at a price-- such stark injustices as deceitful advertising. And it was able to alter several facets of the Government policy-- for example, careless bonusing. But the

labour men were unable to give a turn to the policy itself. Thus in matters of trans-Atlantic immigration, they found themselves in a national minority-- often agreeing with the Nationalistes, farm groups, or the ultra-imperialists.

References Chapter II

1. In 1902, 17, 259 Britons came to Canada, as compared with 41, 792 in 1903; Continental European immigration increased from 20, 161 to 35, 727. See Roland Wilson, "Migration Movements in Canada, " Canadian Historical Review, XIII, (June,1932),164.

2. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1906, 11, 2959 (May 9, 1906).

3. Pro. of 16th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, 11.

4. A.R.M. Lower, Colony to Nation, (Toronto, 1951),405.

5. Lloyd G.Reynolds, The British Immigrant, (Toronto, 1935), 41.

6. Aberdeen Gazette, December 21, 1907. Quoted in Pro. of 18th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1908, 33.

7. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1906, 11, 2961 (May 9, 1906).

8. Quoted in Montreal Star, August 4, 1904.

9. Report of the Royal Commission to enquire into the Immigration of Italian Labourers to Montreal and the Alleged Fraudulent Practices of Employment Agencies, 1904, XI.

10. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1906, 11, 2954 (May 9, 1906).

11. The Labour Gazette, VI, (July 1905 to June 1906), 1347.

12. Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the Immigration of Italian Labourers to Montreal and the Alleged Fraudulent Practices of Employment Agencies, 1904, 136, 7.

13. The Labour Gazette, VI, (July 1905 to June 1906), 1348.

14. He advertised in the London Daily News, the Yorkshire Post, the Manchester Guardian, the Glasgow Herald, the Liverpool Echo, and the Devonshire Western Morning News. See The Labour Gazette, VI, 1122 (July 1905 to June 1906).

15. In the mix-up, the Honourable R.W.Scott, the Secretary of State of Canada, came off rather badly. When the Colonial Secretary asked the Canadian Government if there was a dispute at Winnipeg, Scott informed the Colonial Secretary that Brunning's advertisement was correct; he neglected to say that a strike was called. It was Scott who remarked in the Senate in 1902, "... I am sorry to say that in recent years the tendency has been for unions to go far beyond the rights they are entitled to as free men in a free country. They are becomming agressive." See J. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs (Toronto, 1903), III, 557.

16. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1906, II, 2959 (May 9, 1906).

17. The Labour Gazette, VI, (July 1905 to June 1906), 1130.

18. From November 3, 1905, to June 3, 1906.

19. Pro. of 22nd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, 43.

20. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1906, II, 2958,(May 9, 1906).

21. The Labour Gazette, VII, (July 1906 to June 1907), 1115.

22. Ibid, 1115.

23. Pro. of 23rd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1907, 46.

24. "Their (the employers) efforts were unsuccessful, and the direct result was to win sympathy and encouragement for the men from those who, heretofore, had been silent witnesses of the struggle." See Pro. of 22nd. Ann.Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, 9.

25. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1905, I, 728,(March 9, 1905).

26. Castell Hppkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, III, (Toronto, 1903), 556.

27. Laurier Papers, Draper to Laurier, September 24, 1903.

28. See Laurier Papers, Kennedy to Laurier, June 8, 1905.

29. Pro. of 23rd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1907, 9.

30. Laurier Papers, Verville to Laurier, July 4, 1906. Verville was quoting Sifton.

31. The investigation was conducted before the Committee on Agriculture, and also before the Public Accounts Committee at Ottawa.

32. Statement of Colin A. Grenn. See Laurier Papers, Kennedy to Laurier, June 8, 1905.

33. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs,(Toronto, 1906), VI, 294,295.

34. Pro. of 22nd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, 39.

35. Laurier Papers, Verville to Laurier, July 4, 1906.

36. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1908, IV, 6817,(April 14, 1908).

37. See Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs (Toronto, 1906), VI, 299. See also Pro. of 21st. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1905, 12.

38. Pro. of 22nd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, p. 80.

39. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1906, II, 3406 (May 16, 1906).

40. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, 1906, VI, 294.

41. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1908, III, 6817 (April 14, 1908).

42. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, (Toronto, 1907), VI, 288.

43. Such as British charitable organizations, Boards of Trade, and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association.

44. Pro. of 24th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1908, 39.

45. Ibid, 8.

46. Ibid, 53.

47. On February 15, 1908, this sum was changed to $25.00 and a railroad ticket to the newcomer's destination.

48. The Labour men were strong advocates of such a system. Was this because of humanitarian, or more selfish motives?

49. Pro. of 26th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1910, 14.

50. Ibid, 1911, 16, 17.

51. Ibid, 1911, 17.

52. O.D. Skelton, The Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, (New York, 1922), 342.

53. Quoted in Pro. of 27th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1911, 18.

54. Laurier Papers, O'Donoghue to Laurier, June 29, 1904. Sifton's message was scribbled on this correspondence.

55. John W. Dafoe, Clifford Sifton in relation to His Times, (Toronto, 1931), 321.

56. W. T. R. Preston, My Generation of Politics and Politicians, (Toronto, 1927), 222.

57. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, VIII, (Toronto, 1908), 231.

58. This is Armande Lavergne's phrase, but it well suits the feelings of the labour leaders.

See Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, VIII, 231, (Toronto, 1908),

59. Pro. of 24th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1908, 70.

60. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1909, II, 3705.

61. Pro. of 22nd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1906, 11.

Oriental Immigration

"...their presence in a country is not unattended with disadvantages, foremost among these being the irritation, discontent and resentment they inspire in white labourers." Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, 1885.

For Canada's working class, Oriental immigration, in contrast to British and European immigration, constituted a sharp local pain rather than a national ache. Yet even though the matter did not affect all parts of the Dominion, organized labour found the influx of Asiatic workers, which began in the later nineteenth century, to be one of the most inexorably pressing problems of the period. And efforts by the workingman to debar the Oriental from the country eventually occasioned somewhat theatrical results. Before the Laurier government had left office, Canada was in possession of a high anti-Chinese head-tax; the British Columbia Legislature, deaf to the admonitions of the Federal government,

had flouted Joseph Chamberlain's Imperial policy; and the Ottawa government had (in a rather high-handed manner) negotiated fairly successful agreements with Japan and India to restrict what the Japanese Consul had called an "unwise" immigration.[1]

'But surely,' one may say, 'the workingman did not singlehandedly bring about these things.' No, that is true. Yet he did play a key role; and it is our purpose to see how and to what degree the worker-- through both his labour union and the British Columbia Legislature-- compelled the Dominion government to take action on his behalf.

I

Why did the British Columbia labourer dislike the Asiatic immigrant in the first place? The incomer was disliked principally because he would work for a pittance, thereby driving down wages. Nearly all the Chinese immigrants, for

example, came from the poorer areas of their country; and most were of the coolie class, earning the equivalent of from five to ten cents a day. They were glad to work for even a reduced North American wage which seemed a fortune to them.

Moreover, in Canada the Asians could live in a manner which the white worker could never hope to emulate. "They have no home to build up," remarked the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration of 1902, "they have no children to support, no contributions to churches and schools to make, cost of their clothes, board and lodging is trifling, they live in small shanties and crowd into rooms-- from ten to fifteen to a room. White labour will not hire where the neighbouring places have Chinese or Japs."[2] The Asians, by living frugally, were 'battle trim', as it were.

There was a third reason for the unpopularity of the Oriental workers: they were docile, hence an employer's dream. Complaints of this trait were expressed by organized labour in British Columbia as early as 1885: "their docile servility," noted a Knights of Labour spokesman, "the natural outcome of centuries of grinding poverty and humble submission to a most oppressive system of government, renders them doubly dangerous as willing tools whereby grasping and

tyrannical employers grind down all labour to the lowest living point."[3]

As the population of British Columbia grew, the Asiatic immigration grew with it, and the whole question became ever more explosive: "the Fraser River is crowded with Jap fishermen this summer barring out white fishermen entirely...," wrote Ralph Smith to Sir Wilfrid in 1901;[4] "...over one-half of the labour employed in the salmon canneries is Chinese, "the Royal Commission of 1902 reported.[5]

Viewed from a distance the Orientals might be "objects of good-natured jest," but to the unskilled labourer competing under trying and provocative circumstances, they were objects not of derision but of abomination.[6] Taking its rise from a sheerly economic relationship, there spread amongst the Canadian workers an awesome and almost indescribable prejudice. And by the time Sir Wilfrid took office, hate had evolved into revulsion. "The majority of workingmen will not, if they can avoid it, work with the Chinamen," declared the Chinese Commissioner in 1902.[7]

II

The Chinese were the first to come. Their presence in British Columbia antecedes Confederation itself. Gold strikes on the Fraser River in 1858 brought a rush of miners from California, amongst them Chinese. In the profit-seeking heterogeneous horde, the brown men did not incur any extraordinary degree of enmity. But by 1866, the placer mines were reaching exhaustion, and the Province was cooling off. Anti-Chinese agitation increased.

The question of Oriental labour first came to the attention of Parliament in 1878. In that year, a British Columbia member moved a resolution to debar the Chinese from Canada. The House was shocked. The Honourable Alexander Mackenzie hoped that the gentleman was not serious; the resolution was "altogether unprecedented in its spirit, and at variance with those tolerant laws which afforded employment and asylum to all who came to our country, irrespective of colour, hair or anything else."[8]

In 1881, however, when the Canadian Pacific Railway

construction began in earnest, the Chinese problem became acute, and therefore a subject of recurrent controversy in Parliament. Labour was needed, the cheaper the better. Andrew Onderdonk, the Canadian Pacific Railway contractor on the West Coast, began bringing boatloads of labourers from China; between 1881 and 1884, over fifteen thousand were dumped into British Columbia.[9] In both the Senate and the House of Commons, acrimonious disputes were frequent during these years. Macdonald took the view (frequently put forth by employers) that "...it will be all very well to exclude Chinese labour when we can replace it with white labour, but until that is done, it is better to have Chinese labour than no labour at all."[10] The British Columbia members, however, were not pacified by Macdonald's eloquence. To placate them, Sir John appointed a Royal Commission to study the whole question in 1885, and a year later, after a good deal more agitation, imposed a head-tax of fifty dollars upon each Chinaman entering the country.

The poll-tax was a fairly effective check upon Chinese immigration for about five years. Then employers and steamship companies made a discovery: it was worth their effort to bring Orientals to Canada and lend them funds with which to pay the head-tax; in short order, this sum could be retrieved from the newcomers' earnings. British Columbia

capitalists too freely encourage this kind of immigration, remarked the Secretary of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council in 1891. In that year, Ottawa received over seventy petitions from British Columbia asking the Government to 'do something'.[12] Illustrative of these is a plea to prevent Chinese from working in the coal mines, from 1,421 miners and residents of Nanaimo, Wellington and Comox, on Vancouver Island.[13] A similar petition in the following year bore 2,700 signatures.

In 1891, the British Columbia Legislature urged the Dominion government to increase the poll-tax to at least $200.00. In 1892, the legislature suggested this be raised to $500.00. Demands camparable to these were made in 1895, 1897, 1898, and 1899.[14] But Ottawa consistently refused to capitulate to this pressure on the ground that such action would be inexpedient in view of the possible extension of trade with China.

The Trades and Labour Congress received requests for help in 1890, the year in which the Pacific Province's labour unions became affiliated with the national movement. And to aid their West Coast brothers, the Congress annually demanded that the Government increase the head-tax.

It is not surprising that in June of 1900 Sir Wilfrid introduced into Parliament "An Act Respecting and

Restricting Immigration," which would increase the head-tax; what is more striking is that Laurier was willing and able to delay taking any action for as long as he had. In the election campaign of 1896, Sir Wilfrid promised British Columbia that in regard to Chinese legislation, he would allow himself to be guided by the advice of the West Coast Liberals.[15] Yet in 1897 and 1898, when G. B. Maxwell, M.P., with the support of the British Columbia contingent, had introduced legislation to increase the head-tax, on Chinese, the Government equivocated. The Trades and Labour Congress professed that it was fast losing confidence in the word and promises of Ottawa. Up to a few days before the Session of 1899 ended, the British Columbia Members were assured that attention would be given to their grievance. But to their chagrin, no action was taken, and the opposition was blamed for obstructing the passage of the Bill. Ralph Smith, usually an even-tempered man, was annoyed. "These fine promises," he told the September Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, "instead of being fulfilled, leave us, in my opinion, in a worse condition than before, as their non-fulfillment only gives the hordes of Chinese an incentive to get into the country before a greater possible restriction is placed upon them."[16]

As a consequence of these threats and entreaties from the Dominion Trades and Labour Congress, and from the British Columbia Members of Parliament, labour groups, and the provincial legislature, Laurier, before the election of 1900, afforded a palliative by increasing the per capita tax from $50.00 to $100.00. He did more. He stated that the Government would appoint a Commission to investigate the whole question of the Chinese immigration and its evils.

The Royal Commission which was set up in September of 1900, provided one of the most unanimous judgments since an English-speaking jury had found Louis Riel guilty of treason fifteen years earlier. And no wonder! The Secretary of the Commission was Francis J. Deane. As Editor of the Kamloops Inland Sentinel, he had been, (and was to continue being) a severe critic of Oriental immigration. A Toronto barrister, R. C. Clute, was Chairman. "Clute closely follows the contentions and arguments of organized labour, often expressed during the past twelve or fourteen years," the Secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress had told Sir Wilfrid only a few months earlier.[17] There was little doubt about where the sentiments of the third member of the Commission lay; for Ralph Smith was not only the President of the

Trades and Labour Congress, but was also a Member of Parliament for the mining constituency of Nanaimo. And the remaining member, Daniel J. Munn, sat in Parliament for New Westminster-- right in the heart of the agitation. Smith was replaced in 1901 by Chris Foley, the labour candidate in Yale and Cariboo, a move calculated to appease the anti-Chinese labour organizations in the Kootenay District.[18]

There can be little doubt that in instituting such an anti-Chinese, pro-labour Commission, Sir Wilfrid knew what the tenor of the Report would be, even before the Commission began its hearings; but he must have felt prepared to accept the consequences. Judging from the mood of labour at the time, however, Sir Wilfrid could well afford to be a little more friendly. Moreover, he could now allow himself to treat the Chinese with less cordiality. Since the Boxer troubles had occurred, China was becoming more and more regarded as a prospective foe than a potential ally. (There even seemed a possibility that Canadians might be called upon to aid the Allied Powers in China, as well as England in South Africa.)

Laurier's most formidable task appears to have been to convince Eastern Canada of the necessity for strengthened

anti-Chinese legislation. This was, it seems, the motivating reason for appointing a Commission. Sir Wilfrid felt that many Canadians-- including some with humanitarian views (of whom there were a surprising number far from the scene of the trouble) were not apprised of the situation. He believed he could enact more stringent legislation with less peril to his Government once the Report was disseminated and studied.[19]

The Royal Commission presented its findings to Parliament on February 27, 1902. Referring to the flood of Chinese workers into the British Columbia labour market, the Commissioners concluded:

> "The mere appearance of this class of labour standing as a wedge between the employer and the labourers, is sufficient in itself to arouse the antipathy of the latter.... By the gradual removal of the Chinese-- one of the chief estranging elements-- the industries should not suffer, and a further approach to a better understanding between the employer and the employed will be the result."[20]

A five-hundred-dollar poll-tax was recommended. In due course, Parliament transmuted this suggestion into legislation.

III

In 1896, the outgoing Conservative government had bequeathed to the Liberals the question of Chinese immigration. But a second problem, that of Japanese immigration, was in many ways peculiar to the Laurier era. In 1897, Japanese began to migrate to Canada in numbers; by July of that year, 691 had arrived; over 1,000 entered in the following year; nearly 2,000 came in 1899; and in 1900, nearly 10,000 of these people swarmed into British Columbia.[21]

The prickly disapprobation that the West Coast working class manifested towards the Japanese newcomers soon prompted the British Columbia Legislature to lock horns with the Imperial government. Let us see how this contretemps arose, and whether the aims of the workers were achieved.

To the workingman, there was little difference between Chinese and Japanese labourers (except that the latter were perhaps "keener competitors").[22] By 1900, therefore, the anti-Chinese agitation had become decidedly anti-Oriental. And in both Parliament and the British Columbia Legislature,

efforts were made on labour's behalf to stop this new invasion.

In the House of Commons, for example, W. W. B. McInnes, in March of 1898, moved that since there was little difference between the Japanese and the Chinese labourer, the flow of all immigrants to Canada should be stopped by increasing the head-tax, and extending it to include the Japanese immigrant. But a polite, though peremptory, dispatch from the Japanese Consul warned Sir Wilfrid against supporting any such resolution.[23]

As a consequence of this note, Sir Wilfrid took care to point out the perplexities of a portentous political situation to the next delegation of the Trades and Labour Congress that crossed his threshold. "The Chinese and Japanese," Laurier told the delegates, "could not be treated as on the same level, and the members of the labour organizations should be acquainted with their different conditions."[24] The Chinese were absolutely impervious to progress, he said. Moreover they were filthy, and their quarters pestilential. He was not at all averse to their exclusion. But the Japanese were different. Without violating any state secret, Sir Wilfrid felt himself free to say that the Home Government might feel very strongly on the subject of anti-Japanese legislation. The Chinese Empire might be going to pieces, but Japan, healthy and progressive, was an ally of Her Majesty.

Surely the Trades and Labour Congress Delegates, themselves Canadian citizens and British subjects, could understand that if the Mikado should make representations against a Japanese exclusion bill, there might be unpleasant remonstrances that could not be passed over.

These arguments might have made some impression upon the Labour leaders, but there can be little doubt that the rank and file workers, far away on the West Coast, remained unaware of the subtleties of international politics. And the British Columbia labouring class had found, they thought, an effective tool with which they could at last bring into realization all the restrictive measures they had been advocating so long and fruitlessly.

The British Columbia Legislature was by the end of the century keenly sensitive to the demands of Labour. During the eighteen-seventies, most of the attempts at anti-Chinese legislation had been blocked, for in private life, many members of the Assembly were large employers of labour. But by the end of the decade, the pressure was strong enough to compel Members to adopt an anti-Chinese platform or lose the workingman's vote. Throughout the 'eighties', there existed somewhat of a stalemate. Both capital and labour were

strongly represented in the Legislature. But after, say, 1890, the situation was the reverse of the 'seventies'; even James Dunsmuir, a wealthy mine owner, and a notorious importer of Chinese, was impelled to take an anti-Chinese stand in order to attain the office of Premier.[25]

Many of the West Coast members of the Legislative Assembly represented mining districts, farm areas, or port cities where Asians were landing; consequently they either listened to their constituents, or they would find themselves excluded from the Assembly after the next election. And the Assembly at Victoria contained aggressive labour supporters (of questionable sincerity) such as Robert G. Macpherson, and 'Fighting Joe' Martin of Manitoba Schools fame.[26] Although many of their efforts were to be frustrated by Laurier's administration, the men who sat at Victoria could hardly have been more attentive to the workingman's complaints if they had constituted a labour government.

In this Legislature on March 18, 1897, J. B. Adams arose to propose an Oriental Labour Bill. It was an important bill, for in a period when projects such as roadbuilding, railroad construction, and telegraph and telephone installation were becoming more numerous, this measure would have

prevented Asiatics from finding employment on any of these government-authorized works. "There were a great many people flocking into the Province," argued Adams, "and the passage of the bill would have the effect of giving any available employment to the white man."[27]

Once the Bill had been read, an uneasy Premier announced that it would be "a special bill for a special purpose, and not a party bill in any shape or form."[28] Consequently, party lines were dropped. The measure met little opposition; in fact little discussion took place. "There is a species of demagogism which fears to deal with questions of this nature frankly, lest the opposition of the workingman be aroused," lamented the Editor of the Victoria Colonist.[29] An eye-witness of the proceedings wondered if there was "another legislative body in the world where so radical a law would be allowed to pass with only a desultory discussion."[30]

Almost as an afterthought, a clause was appended to the bill in order that it might apply to the Japanese as well. This was done ostensibly on behalf of the working class, although the workmen apparently did not ask for it. Yet once the bill became controversial, the British Columbia politicians attempted to make the labouringmen believe that this

clause was essential to their welfare.

It was a dangerous move to exclude the Japanese nominatim; and as in the case of the McInnes bill, Adam's measure provoked a sharp protest from the Japanese Consul. "The so-called Oriental Labour Bill," wrote Tatzgoro Nosse to Lord Aberdeen, was one of the "most unjust and unfriendly measures ever taken by any civilized government against a friendly nation of Great Britain and her dependencies."[31] The bill was subsequently reserved by Lieutenant Governor Dewdney.

But the British Columbia Legislature was in no mood to trifle. In the following year a similar measure, the Labour Regulation Act was passed. The intransigence of the West Coast government disturbed the Secretary of State for the Colonies, Joseph Chamberlain; he wrote the following dispatch to Canada's Governor General.

> "...I have to request that you will impress upon your Ministers that restrictive legislation of the type of which the legislation in question appears to be, is extremely repugnant to the sentiments of the people and government of Japan and you should not fail to impress upon them the importance, if there is any real prospect of a large influx of Japanese labourers into Canada, of dealing with it by legislation of the Dominion Parliament on the lines of the accompanying Natal Act [a language test] which is likely to be generally adopted in Australia."[32]

The Assembly of British Columbia would not, however, heed the Scriptural dictum: 'Go unto Joseph, what he sayeth unto you, do.' It refused to amend or rescind the Labour Regulation Act. This placed Sir Wilfrid in an uncomfortable position. He must try and steer between Scylla and Charybdis-- between the barking West Coast Legislature and the impelling force of Joseph Chamberlain. Yet he had no choice. In May, 1899, he wired to Charles A. Semlin, the Premier of British Columbia, "The Federal Government has only four days in which to disallow your acts relating to the Japanese as urged by the Imperial government.... Have you any suggestions to make to this legislation so far as it relates to the Japanese?"

From our viewpoint, the reply was striking for its simplicity; nothing would be done, Semlin cabled back, "in justice to the interests of labour in British Columbia."[33]

The Oriental Labour Bill and the Labour Regulation Act were by no means the only attempts by the British Columbia Legislature to create an 'internal line of defence' with which to drive the Orientals from the Province; but because these measures were the first to meet with the opposition of Chamberlain and Laurier, they provide us with lucid examples of

the disposition not only of the Legislature, but of the Canadian and Imperial governments.

In the years immediately following, a numerous examples of anti-Oriental legislation were either disallowed by Ottawa, or declared ultra vires by the courts; and the Oriental Labour Bill itself was tirelessly re-enacted (in 1900, 1901, 1902, 1903 and 1905), but each time disallowed.[34] Fortunately, however, the menace of the situation was somewhat resolved when, in 1901, the Japanese government voluntarily restricted emigration to Canada.

IV

The years 1904 and 1905 constitute a period of comparative quiescence; both Sir Wilfrid and the working class could devote their attention to other matters-- less frequently does one find the Trades and Labour Congress complaining of Oriental competition. So effective was the head-tax that not one Chinaman entered Canada in the first six months

of 1904; and only eight in the twelve months following. The Japanese immigration, too, had diminished. According to Mackenzie King, fewer than 250 entered Canada each year during the period.[35]

But fewer Orientals meant fewer labourers. This in turn meant higher wages for the unskilled. Between 1904 and 1906, wages offered to Asians often doubled, and in some cases trebled.[36] Mackenzie King described these new conditions in this way:

> "The State, unwittingly, by restricting further competition from without, created a huge monopoly; with organization, without expense, even without agitation, every Chinaman became a unit in a labour group more favoured than the most exclusive and highly-protected trade union."[37]

The demand amongst employers for a greater supply of cheap labour grew steadily through 1904 and 1905. Sir Wilfrid even received a petition from a group of Vancouver citizens, mostly housewives, asking that the head-tax be removed; otherwise it was argued, people would be compelled to give up their homes, and live over restaurants as in San Francisco.[38]

Nonetheless, this growing desire for Orientals boded trouble; and trouble came, 'not in single spies, but in batta-

lions!--from across the Pacific Ocean. Steamship companies and several industrial concerns had begun to look to other Asian lands for relief. India seemed promising, so in 1906, 2,200 of these people were induced to come to British Columbia. The old anti-Chinese and Japanese prejudices were soon transferred to this Indian influx. And the Executive Committee of the Trades and Labour Congress vehemently denounced the Dominion government for permitting this influx. Sir Wilfrid, for his part, censured the West Coast labour organizations for making charges against the Hindus which did not have substantial foundation in fact. This incident passed, however; and when in mid-December, 1906, the Viceroy of India issued a note discouraging the migration of his subjects to Canada, the labour societies interpreted this action as proof that the protestations of labour had not been ignored.

In 1906, a fresh wave of Japanese, mostly unskilled workers, arrived. The Mikado's government was not entirely responsible for this sudden ingress; the greater share of these newcomers had come from the Hawaiian Islands. But they were all Japanese.

Even the Chinese labourer found that owing to the higher wages offered in Canada, it was becoming more profit-

able to borrow $500.00 from a relative or friend within the Dominion; working in this country, he could soon pay off the seemingly prohibitive head-tax.

The new surge of Orientals placed before Sir Wilfrid Laurier an infinitely more complex problem than he had faced in earlier years. India, for instance, was a part of the British Empire; and of what worth was the Empire if it did not promise equality of opportunity in the market, the most abiding and the most fundamental of all the principles of the liberalism of Locke, Bentham and Mill. One can only speculate upon the extent to which this problem played upon the mind of Sir Wilfrid, himself a student of liberalism.

Again, the Japanese question had grown more complex in the intervening years. Not only would a renewed Japanese immigration provoke complex Imperial problems, but it also raised commercial questions. Canadian-Japanese trade had been increasing yearly. So vigorous did this trade become that on January 31, 1906, the Dominion became a conscious party to the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Commerce and Navigation (1894);[39] but the Canadian government did not expect that increased immigration would be a consequence of this agreement. When this occurred a dilemma presented itself.

As Sir Wilfrid pointed out, "it is an old saying that 'we cannot eat our cake and have it', and with regard to Japan, we have to choose between two things: to have commercial intercourse with them, or to shut off all intercourse whatever...."[40]

The Asian immigration grew to distressing proportions in 1907. In that year, ship after ship of Orientals plied its way from Honolulu, Hong Kong, or Tokio to the British Columbia ports; 1,500 Chinese, 2,499 Indians, and over 8,000 Japanese labourers came to Canada.[41] This spectacular influx brought on a recrudescence of agitation which culminated in violence. And the workingmen were pivotal participants in this ferment.

During the early part of 1907, organized labour had been somewhat automatically castigating the Government for permitting the new incursion, but toward the end of July, the mood of the labour men became more militant.[42] Surprise and incredulity was expressed when the 'S.S. Kumeric' brought 1,200 Japanese to the port of Vancouver on July 26. A deputation of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council immediately waited upon Robert G. Macpherson (now representing Vancouver in Parliament). Macpherson, always incredibly eager to be of

service to the workingman, would, he said, at the request of the Council, head a strong and vociferous deputation to Ottawa. In the meantime, protests were sent to Sir Wilfrid, not only by the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council, but by every trade union on Vancouver Island.

In addition, an emergency meeting was held by the West Coast Labour men. To some it looked as if some large railroad were bringing in the Asiatics; others believed it to be another of W. T. R. Preston's schemes. A committee of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council was appointed to consider the possibility of forming a league which might include the general public. Several days later, this committee heartily recommended that an Asiatic Exclusion League be established. The supporters of the new organization packed into Labour Hall on Monday, August 13; they were in an enthusiastic but ugly mood which was aggravated further by the news that the 'S.S. Indiana' had been chartered to make regular trips carrying brown men from the Hawaiian plantations to the Vancouver labour market.[43] Many of those present exhorted R. G. Macpherson to drop political lines and be classed as an agitator. A paper known as Trades Union was commissioned explicitly to awaken the public to the grave state of affairs; and the longest and strongest resolution this far was sent to Sir Wilfrid by John P. McConnell, editor of Saturday Sunset.

From this point it was only a step to the violence which occurred on September 7. The Asiatic Exclusion League planned to stage a colossal anti-Oriental parade in which the city's fifty-eight labour unions (with a membership of nearly 7,000) were to participate.[44] The number of sympathizers which, it was believed, were sufficiently moved to join in, was estimated at 500.

Vancouver was not the starting point of the turbulence. On September 6 in near-by Bellingham local workingmen had endured enough. They raided the mills which were packed with Hindus. They broke into their lodgings, wounding some and driving all from the community. This disturbance no doubt gave impetus to the Vancouver riots which occurred on the following evening.

The trouble in Vancouver brought the whole question of Oriental immigration overnight into national and even international prominence. The Eastern papers were inclined to place a large part of the responsibility for the outbreak upon American agitators who deliberately ignited the flames of violence in order to impress a representative of the Japanese Foreign Office who happened to be visiting Vancouver at the time.[45] After all, was it merely a coincidence that Frank W.

Cotterill, President of the Washington State Federation of Labour, S. E. Fowler, Secretary of the Anti-Japanese and Corean Immigration League, and George P. Lipman, a prominent Seattle labour leader happened to be in Vancouver at the time? Did not these men take turns at haranguing the mob; and were not their colleagues scattered throughout the throng?

Many of the leaders of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council expressed anxiety lest the whole affair be laid at the door of the united labour; but several leaders of the Council and undoubtedly many of the rank and file were candidly jubilant the rioting had occurred. One of the officials of the Victoria Trades and Labour Council gave expression to a widespread feeling thus:

> "We could pass resolutions until the crack of doom and nothing would be done. If at the price of few dollars in plate glass, we can purchase a settlement of this question, then the matter is easily done. You will see that we will get justice now. The Federal government must do something."[46]

Sir Wilfrid held a special meeting of the Cabinet on September 10. Meanwhile, Robert Macpherson had sped eastward. In Montreal on September 10, he was indiscreet enough

to tell an audience that if the Government did not put a stop to the influx, then there would be a Boston Tea Party in British Columbia. One interview with Sir Wilfrid, however, saw him emerge "convinced that a satisfactory solution is at hand."[41]

Lending its support to the British Columbia workers, as it had throughout the whole controversy, the Trades and Labour Congress cabled Sir Wilfrid on September 17. In addition to presenting the First Minister with the usual complaints about the rapidly diminishing opportunities for the working man in the British Columbia lumber, fishing and mining industries, the Congress leaders posited a rather novel thesis which must have struck a tender cord. "The best interests of Canada and the Empire," they asserted, "will be served by respecting the autonomous rights of its component parts; and . . . Canada has already sacrificed much for Imperial interests, as witness the recent generous contribution on Canada's behalf, made by Lord Alverstone in the Alaska boundary award."[48] The solution, the Trades and Labour Congress felt, was a simple one. They asked for an abrogation of the Treaty of 1906 with Japan.

The labour men were not pleased when Sir Wilfrid

firmly refused to indulge in any precipitate action. At the Trades and Labour convention in 1907, delegate R. P. Pettipiece's resolution that Sir Wilfrid's answer be filed "and that we give our answer at the polls on next Election Day" was carried unanimously.[49] The question must remain, did the working man give his reply in the 1908 election? It would seem that he probably did. In the 1904 Federal election, Laurier's party held all seven of British Columbia's seats in the House of Commons. In 1908, however, the Liberals retained but one of these; the Conservatives had captured the other six.[50]

Nevertheless, Sir Wilfrid by temperament and conviction could not agree to any extreme action. Two years later he was to write to a friend in British Columbia, "... I think we were right... especially in the matter of immigration, which we have successfully checked without adopting the extreme measures which were pressed upon us."[51]

Although the Canadian government was not to be pushed into immediate policy changes, the Vancouver riots had made an enduring impact on the minds of Sir Wilfrid and his colleagues. Late in 1907, the Minister of Labour, Rodolphe Lemieux, was dispatched to Tokio. There he concluded

the celebrated 'gentleman's agreement' on December 23. In March of the following year, Lemieux' Deputy Minister, Mackenzie King, journeyed to London with the object of limiting immigration from India. Having accomplished this, King also negotiated a draft agreement with Liang Tun-Yen of the Chinese government.

These arrangements were not completely successful. The Chinese agreement, for example, was never implemented; and more than a thousand Chinese labourers entered Canada each year until the first German war.[52] Moreover, Lemieux' 'gentleman's agreement' was never properly understood by the working masses in this country, and was thus a source of irritation to them.?

Nevertheless, in the final three years of the Laurier regime, the question of Asiatic immigration was relegated to the background. Periodically, of course, agitation would revive when it was rumoured that a distressingly large number of Orientals were arriving-- for example in September, 1909-- and Sir Wilfrid's office would be flooded with telegrams from hyper-vigilant West Coast labour unions. But the Government had acted; and even though the poll-tax was not an effective check, Laurier was able to argue that it was largely owing to the solicitations of the workers that the legislation was on the statute book in the first place.

V

It would not be unfair to conclude that the workingman gave a great deal of impetus and leadership to the anti-Asiatic agitation. And when the fever of the storm had abated, it had left not only such evident results as an agreement with Japan and a head-tax, but a number of intangibles as well, viz., widespread hard feelings, and a government almost as sensitive to the question as the labour societies.

In estimating how great a part the labour movement played in this matter we should not overlook its influence upon that elusive and impressible essence, public opinion. The worker was in a key position, for he was the only person in the community who had much to do with the Asiatics. Here, in other words, was a splendid chance to win the public to his view. Thus in his constant condemnation of the trans-Pacific migration, the worker was carried far beyond legitimate economic grievances. The 'White Canada' cry was relentlessly and somewhat shamelessly propagated by numerous labour

organizations, ranging from the Trades and Labour Congress itself, down to the tiny refractory West Coast unions. Moreover, the labour societies in Canada were never reticent about bringing the unsocial behavior of the Oriental to the attention of the public: he avoided paying taxes; he lived in filthy and overcrowded quarters; he propagated the drug habit, and encouraged prostitution; he had no conception of constitutional government. And had not even the moderate Report of the Chinese Commission of 1885 admitted that these people were "non-assimilable"?

Actively disseminating this kind of propaganda during the period were not only many of the larger British Columbia journals, but diverse West Coast Labour organs such as the Trades Union, Joseph Martin's Vancouver Guardian, John P. McConnell's Saturday Sunset, and R. P. Pettipiece's British Columbia Federationist, the news-sheet of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council. Not untypical of the opinions which were constantly being placed before the general public is the following extract from the Nelson Miner of February 13, 1901:

> "The Chinaman is a curse to this country. That sentence seems to be about the strongest which can be written in denunciation of him, therefore it is repeated. The Government must someday rid the country of that curse. If they do not do it, the people who make and

unmake governments will do it for them. That is all there is about it."[53]

It is impressive to observe the views of the workingmen being gradually spread to the larger community. In 1885, for example, the Royal Commission noted that "in British Columbia, those who are not dependent in one way or another on the support of the labouring classes are, as a rule, unfavourable to anti-Chinese legislation."[54] But by the arrival of a new century, these feelings had spilled over into the community at large. Ralph Smith, fresh from duties as a Royal Commissioner in 1901, expressed amazement that "the testimony of lawyers and of doctors, merchants, divines, judges, in fact of all classes ... showed that they favoured exclusion."[55] Mackenzie King discovered the same phenomenon; reporting to Laurier from Vancouver in November 1907, he remarked: "Nothing has surprised me more than to find in conversations with persons who have every reason to wish for an increase in the available labour supply, a very decided opinion that other than Japanese labourers must be sought."[56]

It would be difficult to conclude this chapter without remarking upon the attitude which the Trades and Labour Congress leaders exhibited toward their West Coast brothers

throughout the controversy. We must award metaphorical laurels to the Eastern labour men; they espoused the cause of national concord amongst the Canadian workingmen, when to many, this must have seemed a futile pursuit. Deputations and representatives of the Congress waiting upon the Dominion government,frequently demanded that some relief be given to the British Columbia worker. Surely the seeds of a sturdy labour movement were being planted in the score of years after the British Columbia unions' affiliation with the Trades and Labour Congress, when this organization made the problems of the West Coast workers its own. This rapidly growing spirit is well-exemplified in David A. Carey's Presidential Address in 1897:

> "The continued support of the labour organizations in the East will be of material aid to them [the British Columbia workers] at this stage. Give it to them with the same generous spirit that prevailed in the past, so that in the near future, when success is theirs, we may share with them in the pleasure and advantage of their efforts."57

This new doctrine of Dominion labour co-operation was visibly manifested in the election of Ralph Smith as Trades and Labour Congress President in the following year.

References Chapter III

1. Victoria Colonist, July 3, 1907.

2. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration (Ottawa, 1902), 185.

3. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration (Ottawa, 1885), 156.

4. Laurier Papers, Smith to Laurier, May 10, 1901.

5. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration, (Ottawa, 1902), 181.

6. A. R. M. Lower , Canada and the Far East - 1940,

7. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration, (Ottawa, 1902), 182.

8. Quoted in the Toronto Globe, January 4, 1879.

9. Charles Woodsworth, Canada and the Orient, (Toronto, 1941), 30.

10, Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1883, I, 326.

11. Pro. of 7th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1891, 11.

12. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1902, III, 1572 (March 21, 1902).

13. Charles Woodsworth, Canada and the Orient, (Toronto, 1941), 40.

14. See F. W. Howay , British Columbia, the Making of a Province, (Toronto, 1928),101.

15. See Pro. of 15th. Ann. Convention of the Trade and Labour Congress, 1899,8.

16. Pro. of 15th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1899, 8.

17. Laurier Papers, Dower to Laurier, June 13, 1901.

18. See Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, December 27, 1900.

19. Contrary to Charles Woodsworth's beliefs, it appears that few in Eastern Canada were excited about the influx until 1907. See Victoria Colonist, August 4, 1907, and Toronto Globe, August 7, 1907.

20. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration (Ottawa, 1902), 276.

21. Charles Woodsworth, Canada and the Orient, (Toronto, 1941), 51.

22. "Confidential Report of Mission to Japan, and on Oriental Immigration," (p.8), Lemieux Papers, January 12, 1908.

23. Sessional Papers of Canada, 1908, no. 746: Correspondence Between Canada and Great Britain on the subject of Japanese immigration. (S.Shimizu to Laurier).

24. Pro. of 15th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1899, 9.

25. One member of the Legislative Assembly put the whole situation in a nutshell when he said, "there was no question upon which so much trimming was done for votes as the Chinese question." See the Victoria Colonist, March 20, 1897.

26. Martin was the author of the Alien Exclusion Bill, which protected British Columbia miners to the extent of depriving foreign (that is, American) miners of their claims, in the Province.

27. Victoria Colonist, March 25, 1897.

28. Victoria Colonist, March 20, 1897.

29. Ibid, March 30, 1897.

30. Ibid, March 26, 1897.

31. Sessional Papers of Canada, 1908, No. 746: Correspondence between Canada and Great Britain on the subject of Japanese Immigration, 47.

32. Ibid, 63.

33. Ibid, 54.

34. G. V. La Forest, Disallowance and Reservation of Provincial Legislation, (Ottawa, 1955), 94-96.

35. Report of the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the Methods by which Oriental Labourers have been induced to come to Canada (Ottawa, 1908), 70.

36. Ibid.

37. Ibid, 71.

38. See Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, VII (Toronto, 1907), 232.

39. The Canadian Government was also urged to take this action by the Home Government.

40.. Laurier Papers, Laurier to Deane, September, 11, 1907.

41. Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the methods by which Oriental Labourers have been induced to come to Canada, (Ottawa, 1908), 70.

42. "Local Labour Men Are Now Aroused," read a prominent column of the Victoria Colonist, July 28, 1907.

43. For an account of the proceedings of this meeting, see the Victoria Daily Times, August 14, 1907.

44. See the Victoria Colonist, August 28, 1907.

45. Aikujire Ishii , the Director of the Commercial Bureau.

46. Victoria Daily Times, September 9, 1907.

47. Victoria Colonist, September 11, 1907. The editor of the Ottawa Journal could not restrain himself from suggesting that Macpherson "went into the sacred presence roaring like a lion, and came out with all his pinfeathers missing!" See Ottawa Journal, September 12, 1907.

48. Laurier Papers, Trades and Labour Congress to Laurier, September 17, 1907.

49. Pro. of 23rd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1907, 79.

50. O. D. Skelton, Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, (New York, 1922), 217, 282.

51. Laurier Papers, Laurier to Deane, June 3, 1909.

52. Charles Woodsworth, Canada and the Orient, (Toronto, 1941), 66.

53. Quoted in Castell Hopkins, the Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, III (Toronto, 1903), 271.

54. Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, (Ottawa, 1885), CXXXIII.

55. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada) , 1902, III, 1572,(March 21, 1902).

56. Laurier Papers, King to Laurier, November 9, 1907.

57. Pro. of 13th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1897, 4.

Wages and Hours

"I say for God's sake, don't make this a political affair."
Alphonse Verville, 1910.

Perhaps the most inhumane of the abuses which commonly take birth in a growing industrial society is the sweating system, whereby a garment manufacturer strives to increase his margin of profit, unmindful of the long hours and low wages for which his underlings are toiling, and oblivious to their "health, comfort, and personal convenience."[1] As it happened, early in the Laurier period the Government was called upon to rectify the malpractice of sweating, and was astonished to discover that it was itself an unconscious accomplice to this evil; contracts which it had been confidently but carelessly farming out to sub-contractors were being fulfilled by the use of sweated labour.

In Britain, public outcry against the sweating system had reached a new peak in the mid-eighties.[2] Because of strong agitation, and owing to shocking disclosures made by

the House of Lords' Sweating Committee, remedial legislation was enacted in 1891.

The excitement in the Old Country seems to have inspired organized labour in Canada to press the Government to adopt a 'fair wage' policy, for as early as 1890, the Trades and Labour Congress was moved to hope that the Government, when awarding contracts, would make certain that the "...successful tenderer shall pay the rate of wages prevailing in such trade or calling in the municipality in which the work is to be performed, or forfeit this contract."[3] Requests such as these, however, received little attention during the early 'nineties.

It was Mackenzie King, fresh from studies in Chicago, who brought the evils of the sweating system to the notice of the Government. In the summer of 1897, King discovered that the workers in the garment trade,working upon the uniforms of letter carriers,were being ill-treated. "On questioning one of the workers as to the remuneration she was receiving for sewing machine and hand work," King wrote some years later,"I found that it came to a very few cents an hour. I shall never forget the feeling of pained surprise and indignation I experienced as I learned of the extent of that woman's toil from early morning to late at night and

figured out the pittance she received."[4]

Mackenzie King brought the unfortunate matter to the attention of the Postmaster-General. Mulock acted swiftly. In all Post Office contracts, he inserted clauses calculated to suppress sweating. These clauses provided that work for sub-contractors must be done in the sub-contractor's own factory; that the factory be open to inspection; and that wages paid "shall be those generally accepted as current in each trade for competent workmen in the district where the work is carried on."[5] Dr. Frederick Borden, following Mulock's example, included anti-sweating clauses in Militia Department contracts. These men earned the thanks of the labour leaders in 1898.[6]

Now that it is becoming fashionable to look bleakly upon Mackenzie King's role in the labour field, it seems rather cheap and mean to depreciate his influence in eradicating the sweating system. Yet Liberal enthusiasts have discerned a casual relationship between King's revelations and the enactment of the anti-sweating (Fair Wages) Resolution in 1900.[7] This is not an accurate observation. To begin with, by the time Mulock proposed his Resolution, three full years had passed since King's discoveries had been made. A more satisfactory explanation of why the Government acted when it acted is provided by E. F. Clarke, M.P.:

> "It is significant, and it is an evidence of the influence which is exercised upon the legislative bodies of the Dominion of Canada today by organized labour, that this resolution of the Honourable Postmaster General should find a place upon the Notice paper on the very day, or on the day after, a deputation, representing the Dominion Trades and Labour Council, had waited upon him. If I am correctly informed, the attention of the government was drawn by that deputation to the necessity of some such legislation as is proposed, or which may be embodied in the resolution."[7]

Labour pressure upon the Laurier government became cumulative. The leaders of the movement beseeched the government to enact 'fair wage legislation' in 1896, and again in 1897. But to no avail! Perhaps the Administration felt it had substantially aided the worker by the introduction of Alien Labour legislation in 1897. The Government was certainly informed about the abuses of subletting contracts. Mackenzie King had submitted an elaborate report upon this subject on January 5, 1898. The conspicuous dearth of labour legislation caught the attention of Sir Charles Tupper during the debates upon the Fair Wages Resolution. He seized the occasion to observe that ". . . it is a little too late for these gentlemen opposite to pose in the light of suddenly waking up, in a deathbed of repentance, to offer a proposition in Parliament which may bring the Labour vote to rally around this

government, which has been the greatest enemy of the working people that has ever ruled in any country."[8]

Tupper's charge was an exaggeration, and quite possibly a desperate bit of strategy conjured by an aging politician; a politician who could sense that his grasp upon the country was failing. But there remains a hard kernel of truth in Sir Charles' accusation; the Government had done unconscionably little to benefit the labour societies during its first four years of office; and an election was approaching. Candour must compel us to observe that the Fair Wages Resolution looks not unlike a succulent piece of election bait. If so, it was not offered a moment too soon. By enacting the resolution, the Laurier government had done something to humour the legislation-hungry labour leaders, and to assuage some of the hard feelings that the rank and file harboured.

Important as this measure was, however, it is hard to believe that it had the thunderous consequences that Mulock's biographer would have us infer from the following paragraph:

> "The adoption of the Fair Wages Resolution brought to a close the debates of the eighth Parliament of Canada. When Parliament reassembled, the general elections had intervened. The Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier had received a renewal of public confidence, and had entered upon

> the second stage of its fifteen consecutive years of Liberal administration."[9]

Mulock's resolution was a curiously spongy measure. In sections of the country or in trades where low wages and long hours were the custom, low wages and long hours remained the custom still. In placing his measure upon the statute books, the Administration was not offering firm and bold leadership in providing the Canadian toiler with what Adam Smith calls "a plentiful subsistence".[10] Yet the resolution was by no means worthless and insignificant, for it provided a good beginning at correcting the worst abuses arising from sweating. And equally important, the Government, as was often pointed out, set a legislative example. Sir William described the possible ramifications of his Resolution in this way:

> "What will be the effect of the example of the Dominion Parliament passing this legislation? I think you will find other legislative bodies in Canada doing likewise. I think we may fairly expect that in due time every legislative body, be it high or low, legislatures of the provinces, of cities, towns, townships, and villages -- you will find them one by one following suit, and ultimately, as the education proceeds in the direction of this resolution, you will find employers of labour as well adopting the principle...."[11]

II

Labour's cry for an eight-hour day is almost as old as the Dominion of Canada itself. In the year 1873, in what would seem a mood of rather unrealistic eagerness, a number of the convening delegates of the new-born Canadian Labour Union proclaimed themselves quite prepared to press for an eight-hour day. But other labour men curbed this idea.[12] It was felt that a general nine-hour day would be a more practicable aim. Fourteen years later, however, the Canadian labour leaders deemed that the passage of time and the changing conditions would permit a new attitude. Feeling puissant, the Trades and Labour Congress placed itself squarely in favour of the shorter day.

'Eight-hour day fever' in the United States reached epidemic proportions in the eighteen-nineties and began to spread. In the following decade, a distinct eight-hour movement took hold of the northern Dominion. During the Laurier period the issue began to invade the political battleground; in 1898 Dan O'Donoghue warned Laurier that the Tories were

threatening to make political capital out of the eight-hour cry;[13] again, in 1899 Ralph Smith told the Trades and Labour Congress that he could detect a growing disposition on the part of Ottawa to listen to the appeals of labour in this matter.[14]

The issue began to constitute a major consideration for the party in power in 1906. On the first day of January the International Typographical Union attempted to establish the eight-hour day throughout the North American Continent. It may be recalled that when the Winnipeg printers struck, the local Typothetae duped British printers into taking their places, and the Laurier government was obliged to take the trouble of straightening the matter out.[15]

Sensing a change of mood at the time, organized labour began to carry their demands for an eight-hour day right into Parliament. During the last seven years of Liberal rule, both the President and the former President of the Trades and Labour Congress, Alphonse Verville and Ralph Smith, proposed measures favouring an eight-hour day.

Ralph Smith introduced, in Parliament, legislation which would benefit the railway telegraphers. These men were at the time working for twelve hours a day, and for 365 days

each year. Smith tried to reduce their working day by four hours. The Employers' Association saw the measure as "nothing but an attempt at a legalized Closed Shop agreement".[16] But the telegraphers were quick to defend Smith's Bill. Railway accidents were often caused by overwork, they contended. "Is this a slave's or a free-man's country that such things are allowed in Canada?"[17] one operator asked Sir Wilfrid. Another promised the Prime Minister that Government adoption of Smith's Bill would "...make your name a household word in thousands of families in this fair land of ours."[18] In 1907 and again in 1908, the Bill was introduced; and each time it precipitated a deluge of pressure letters. It was not passed, though.

Verville's Bill made more progress than Smith's; and the controversy over the measure is uncommonly interesting and enlightening. There were six principal debators. Four of these were consecutive Prime Ministers: Laurier, Borden, Meighen, and King; and two others were sometime Presidents of the Trades and Labour Congress: Verville and Smith. In addition, there were a host of other participants: Thomas Crothers, Rodolphe Lemieux, and Sam Hughes, to name several.

Verville hoped to establish a working day of eight

hours for employees on Government contracts. He introduced his Bill on December 11, 1906, but it received no second reading. Nothing daunted, the Member for Maisonneuve introduced it again in 1908, but "the strong ...succeeded and the weak... suffered," and the measure was stranded on the order paper.[19] On April 27, 1909, he introduced his Bill for a third time. No action was taken upon it. Verville, it seems, was chary about bringing his Bill to a vote. He believed, and with some justification, that he must first disabuse some of the members of misapprehensions which they entertained toward it. The Executive of the Trades and Labour Congress felt as Verville did. "There is much of an educational nature still required to convince the Members and Senators that the workers are earnest in demanding this legislation," declared the Congress officers, "... there are many doubting-Thomases in the House who can only be convinced by persistent demands and protests from their constituencies...."[20]

With a Parliament which was not entirely disposed to favour the idea of an eight-hour day, Verville was pleased that his Bill was even discussed in 1909. Of those debating at this time, Rodolphe Lemieux stands out because he gave classical expression to the Government's unwillingness to act,

and as H. A. Logan points out, Lemieux' arguments were repeatedly used by subsequent administrations.[21] The Government, Lemieux felt, could not constitutionally pass legislation which would apply to individual Government contracts; this would fall within the civil rights sphere. In addition, eight-hour legislation would injure Canada's industries, and the task of building the nation would be seriously checked. "I have not gone very deeply into the subject," Lemieux declared in Parliament, "but I say that in this young country of ours, where all our energies are bent on building up our industries, handicapped as we are by that long winter, it would not be fair to enact shorter hours of labour."[22]

Poor Lemieux! Although he had earlier won the praise of the labour movement, he finished his term of office as an unpopular Minister of Labour. With his arguments, he had won the implacable enmity of the labour people. As J. G. O'Donoghue remarked, "it is all very well to refer to the dignity of labour, but it would be a greater compliment to assume that labour is intelligent enough to see through such arguments as those used by the Honourable Minister of Labour in the discussion on this Bill."[23]

Then why did Lemieux take a stand which he must have known would antagonize the people to whom he was Minister? It

would appear that he was essaying to win the applause of a larger audience. "Public Opinion", he observed, "will always compel the great industries to give shorter hours, such as in the mining industries of British Columbia and Alberta. Public Opinion can always be relied upon to compel the operators to adopt a proper system."[24] But public opinion was apparently not jogging either Rodolphe Lemieux or the Laurier government enough for them to care to sanction or adopt eight-hour legislation.

III

Mackenzie King became Minister of Labour on June 2, 1909. His attitude toward instituting an eight-hour day upon Government contracts, although more ambiguous, was nevertheless decidedly akin to that of his predecessor: shorter hours are primarily a consideration of the provincial legislature; the Government must take no hurried action; the seasonal nature of some jobs makes it desirable that the Government be

cautious about laws involving the principle of an eight-hour day.[25]

So when Verville introduced his measure for the fourth consecutive time, King requested that instead of voting upon it, the question be referred to a Special Committee. Was he trying to shelve the measure? The opposition thought so. They felt that Verville's Bill was being relegated "to that bourne, to that graveyard from which few if any travellers return."[26] And when Mackenzie King, as Chairman of that Committee, called in Professor O. D. Skelton of Queen's University to make a thorough study of the eight-hour question, nothing could convince His Majesty's Opposition that King was squarely and honestly facing the problem, Said Arthur Meighen:

> "The only purpose the Minister of Labour has in view is to avoid the responsibility of saying now what he was compelled to say then, namely: that he was in favour of the principle of eight-hour labour on government works, and so, he wants to shield his responsibility behind the august imprimatur of a Presbyterian professor."[27]

But at the next session-- to the surprise of everyone, including, it seems, the Trades and Labour Congress which was arming for another assault upon Parliament-- the Minister of Labour had 'weather-vaned'; and when Alphonse Verville rose

to introduce his legislation, W. L. M. King proclaimed that, with certain alterations, the Government would support the Bill.[28] This sudden change in the Governmental posture invites the question: to what degree did pressure from the labour movement occasion the change?

At this time, the influence exerted by labour was exceptionally compelling. A great part of Sir Wilfrid's correspondence during the period is composed of petitions and entreaties to enact eight-hour legislation. Sir Wilfrid finally capitulated to these demands; and when supporting the Bill he kept reminding Parliament that "this legislation is tentative as I understand it, It is not, I believe, the result of long settled conviction, but it has been urged upon the government again and again by the workingmen's associations."[29]

Moreover, there is a distinct possibility that the Government felt constrained to adopt at least part of Verville's measure in order to offset the rather inept handling of the Grand Trunk strike in 1910. The full consequences of the "Government's betrayal of the Brotherhoods" were beginning to become quite apparent by the end of October in that year.[30] Thus when Mackenzie King proclaimed on December 15 that, "I am strongly in favour of any movement which will help to bring about an eight-hour day," he was administering an excellent solvent with which to wash away working-class asperities.[31]

Was the Eight-Hour Bill then a simple case of pressure politics? Did the Government entertain no particular friendship toward the working mass? Mackenzie King claimed that he did. Speaking to Parliament in December of 1910, he said:

> "I think men are put here for some purpose other than that of simply spending their lives in toil, that every man should have an opportunity to work but that he should also have an opportunity for a little leisure as well, that he should have an opportunity to spend part of his time with his wife and children... that every man should have an opportunity of developing all the capacities with which he by nature may be endowed."32

Whether or not King was ingenuous in his remarks is disputable. But if he did not catch all of the working class with his rhetoric, he was at the time befriending one of the labour leaders; during 1910, there was a growing intimacy between Mackenzie King and Alphonse Verville, and it seems likely that these two men worked out the Bill together. Arthur Meighen inferred that they did. "It does seem to me strange," quipped Meighen, "that though the amended Bill has a double fatherhood, it should come into the world deformed."33

There is reason to believe that the opposition's taunts and bitter attacks contributed signally to the Laurier Ministry's spectacular reversal of policy. During the 1909-10

session, the Conservative party attacked the Government for its inscrutible reluctance to adopt Verville's Bill. This assault broadened into a fierce condemnation of the inefficiency of the Labour Department. Sam Hughes, for example, took pains to excoriate the "young man who now ornaments the Department of Labour."[34]

But the motives of the Conservative leaders are themselves in doubt. Few of these men indeed appear to have been motivated by a genuine to see the Canadian workingman secure a piece of legislation which would be progressive and practical. Meighen seems to have been more interested in assailing King than in expediting the passage of any eight-hour legislation. Borden's attitude is more difficult to discern. He believed that Canada wanted "a strong virile population, not doomed to work to the last limit of their physical strength;"[35] but he claimed that "labour men and trade unions all over the country"[36] protested against the Government's tampering with Verville's measure. Sir Wilfrid, however had a different opinion of the Conservative party's stand. "My hon. friend (Mr. Meighen) did not dare oppose the Bill, but he was quite willing to place obstacles in its way and prevent it becoming law. That is the attitude taken by the Opposition."[37] The labour organizations themselves were inclined to

be critical of both parties, but especially of the opposition who "...jeered at the honesty of purpose of Mr. Verville."[38]

It is illuminating to watch the evolution of Laurier's own views on the eight-hour question. In 1902 he observed that the eight-hour day was becoming more and more general in private concerns. But while the telegraphers were urging him to support Ralph Smith's Bill in 1907 and 1908, Sir Wilfrid remained silent. His attitude was probably a mixture of extreme caution and mild hostility.[39]

As if to suggest that he was a last minute convert to Verville's views, Laurier remained enigmatically aloof of the debating in 1909 and 1910. Then, at the moment critique, when debating had reached a climax, he threw himself energetically into the affray.

He was deeply impressed by the relentless growth of the labour movement. "The time has passed," he believed, "when the labouring classes were treated as slaves, they are acknowledged now as citizens. By a long series of Acts passed by different parliaments, they have brought themselves to the proud position they occupy at the moment."[40] Having resigned himself to the fact that the labour movement would continue to grow, Laurier's views became views which Adam Smith had never promulgated, nor had Goldwin Smith, who maintained that,

"we must fall back upon natural laws, upon the recognition of the rights of Labour and Capital."[41] In contrast to this, Sir Wilfrid believed that "it is quite convenient, nay, it is legitimate, that legislation should step in to regulate labour."[42]

IV

Alphonse Verville's Bill was killed in the Senate.[43] Few Senators were enthusiastic about the measure; many opposed it. The debating upon the motion for second reading well illustrates the unpropitious reception accorded it. Senator Macdonald was the first to speak. He opposed any such Bill.[44] Senator McMullen spoke next. He believed that the "legislation is contrary to the best interests of the country and will not be tolerated."[45] Sir Mackenzie Bowell followed McMullen and declared himself entirely averse "to the principle embodied in the Bill."[46] The next speaker, Senator Power, contended that it was for the provinces to legislate in this matter.[47] And Senator Beique heartily agreed "with almost every word that has been said...."[48]

A splendidly typical--in fact almost trite--example of the mentality prevalent within the Senate Chamber is revealed in the following speech by Senator Macdonald:

> "I think the title of the Bill should be reversed and that it should read, 'A Bill for the protection of the government and contractors from union labour'. We know now that the workingman is on top. He need not ask more than six hours unless he wishes. Not only that, but he prevents others from working. If he chooses to strike and another man takes his place, he assaults that man, boycotts him, or burns his house down."[49]

V

Now that the passage of time permits us to observe that no eight-hour bill was consecrated into law for two further decades, it does seem rather too bad, from the workers' viewpoint, that Verville's Bill was given its quietus. Arthur Meighen was not sorry. He believed the Bill was of little value, and without principle. He reminded the Administration that, "the Honourable Minister of Labour has been told by the

parties who have urged the Bill that there is nothing left of it except a halting and faltering step in the direction they indicated, and a halting and faltering step is always made by a halting and faltering government.... There is no principle in the Bill whatever."[50] Borden was disposed to agree with his colleague; the measure, he thought, contained "no shred or scintilla of principle whatever". These men were, in fact, pointing out that the Bill would apply inequitably; some, but not all, of the Government employees were to benefit. Sir Wilfrid admitted this; but he believed that Government sanction of the measure would have valuable repercussions throughout the land.

The public was apparently less ready for eight-hour legislation than it had been for the Fair Wages Resolution. "The Country," Mulock had announced, "is interested in every man receiving a fair day's wages for a fair day's work."[51] Mulock was right. His measure was not in the van of public sentiment, as the Toronto Daily Mail and Empire sarcastically observed. "The combined intellect of the Cabinet has been brought to bear upon the subject," noted the editor of this paper, "and Mr. Mulock... has, by a brilliant stroke of genius, ordered that people who make mailbags shall, as in the past, pay the regular wages rate to their workingmen! Thus

has labour been emancipated from the slavery Sir Wilfrid deplores."[52] The Fair Wages Resolution passed easily through a drowsy, half-empty House of Commons.

It was difficult to convince many Canadians of the practicability of instituting the shorter day. There prevailed a widespread opinion that (in Lemieux' words) "shorter hours /mean/ less work; less work, less pay."[53] To counteract these arguments, and win the support of the people at large, the labour men declared that a shorter working day would "...raise the standard of living upon which prosperity depends, it would help the taxpayers by putting the tramp to work..., it would give men a chance to get acquainted with their families, it would promote temperance by removing the desire for stimulants, which comes from long hours of labour, it would make better citizens by giving the citizen more time to understand his duties."[54]

It must have been exhilarating for the labour men to know that, when circulating these views, the climate of public opinion was changing in their favour. And in a sanguine moment, the Trades and Labour Congress Executive Officers recorded that, "it is but a few years since the aims of organized labour in this regard were laughed at by the general public... but public sentiment no longer regards it as the

exception, but rather as the rule."[55] According to Sir William Mulock, however-- and we must admit he was less involved in the struggle than the labour societies-- the labour leaders were overoptimistic. "Public opinion favours nine hours...," he believed.[56] If we accept Sir William's view, Verville's Bill may well have been one of those curious measures driven through the House by labour and political groups but with only a half-hearted public approval. Laurier seems to have sensed this. Noting that the people at large were not substantially in favour of the Bill, he allowed it to be trimmed into a less-offensive shape, saying, "... the Canadian people are not composed only of the working classes; there are other classes, and these other classes object to the Bill."[57]

References Chapter IV

1. The Labour Gazette, I, (September 1900 to June 1901), 11.

2. The demand for "fair wages" had been one of the campaign cries in the British election of 1886.

3. Pro. of 6th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1890, 27.

4. W. L. M. King, Industry and Humanity, (Toronto, 1918), 69.

5. The Labour Gazette, I, (September 1900 to June 1901), 10.

6. Pro. of the 14th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1898, 8.

7. See, for example, The Labour Gazette, L , (September, 1950), 1417.

7(a) Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1900, I, 2490 (March 22, 1900).

8. Ibid, 2508.

9. W. J.Loudon , Sir William Mulock, (Toronto, 1932),124.

10. Adam Smith, Wealth of Nations, I, (London, 1950), 86.

11. W. J. Loudon, Sir William Mulock, 123.

12. H. A. Logan, Trade Unions in Canada, (Toronto, 1948) 45. Fifteen of the delegates favoured pressing for an eight-hour day; seventeen, for the nine-hour working-day.

13. Laurier Papers, O'Donoghue to Laurier, April 22, 1899.

14. Pro. of the 15th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1899, 7.

15. See page 6..

16. Laurier Papers, Employers' Association to Laurier, February 25, 1907.

17. Ibid, Hockin to Laurier, April 19, 1908.

18. Ibid, Muller to Laurier, April 21, 1908.

19. Pro. of 24th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1908, 10.

20. Ibid, 1910, 10.

21. H. A. Logan, Trade Unions in Canada, 498.

22. Debates of the House of Commons, (Canada), 1909, IV, 5943, (May 7, 1909).

23. Pro. of 25th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1909, 55.

24. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1909, IV, 5944, (May 7, 1909).

25. Ibid, 1909-10, I, 1229, 1230, (December 4, 1909).

26. Ibid, 1226.

27. Ibid, 1909-10, II, 2900 (February 2, 1910).

28. Ibid, 1910-11, I, 1413, (December 15, 1910).

29. Ibid, 1532.

30. See H. S. Ferns and Bernard Ostry, The Age of Mackenzie King, (London, 1955), 130.

31. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1910-11, I, 1413, (December 15, 1910).

32. Ibid, 1411.

33. Ibid, 1430.

34. Ibid, 1909-10, II, 2900, (February 2, 1910).

35. Ibid, 1909-10, I, 1262, (December 4, 1909).

36. Ibid, 1910-11, I, 1539, (January 11, 1911).

37. Ibid, 1537.

38. Pro. of 25th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1909, 55.

39. His only illuminating statement upon the subject reads: "Its object is only to apply to Government works, but even this is subject to very careful consideration." Laurier Papers, Laurier to Hagar, March 1, 1909.

40. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1910-11, I, 1532, (January 11, 1911).

41. Pro. of 21st. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1904, 4.

42. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1910-11, I, 1537, (January 11, 1911).

43. It is knowledge such as this, which makes one st lose confidence in Bryce M. Stewart's study. Says Stewart: "The Report of the Select Committee fills a thick blue book but the House took no action on the Bill. See Bryce M. Stewart, Canadian Labour Laws and the Treaty, (New York,

1926), 235.

44. Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1910-11, 417, (January 30, 1911).

45. Ibid, 419.

46. Ibid, 419.

47. Ibid, 421.

48. Ibid, 424.

49. Ibid, 417.

50. Debates of the House of Commons, (Canada), 1910-11, I, 1759, 1760, (January 16, 1911).

51. W. J. Loudon, Sir William Mulock, 122.

52. Toronto Daily Mail and Empire, October 7, 1897.

53. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1909, IV, 5942, (May 7, 1909.

54. Ibid, 5924. These were Alphonse Verville's arguments.

55. Pro. of 21st. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1905, 14.

56. Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, October 15, 1904.

57. Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1910-11, I, 1759, (January 16, 1911).

The Senate

"There is no man in this House or out of it who is opposed to labour unions." Senator W. Gibson, 1903.

If the Canadian Senate had only occasionally or inadvertently antagonized the labour movement, the movement's leaders might have been disposed to forgive the occupants of the Upper House. But the spirit of Louis Napoleon apparently enjoyed a metempsychosis in the Senate Chamber; and repeatedly the venerable Senators showed a thistly antipathy toward the labour leaders and the labour leagues. In 1898 the Senate threw the Union Label Bill-- a bill for the protection of union labels and designs-- into the legislative scrap heap, even though the measure had received the unanimous approval of the Commons. This happened again in the following year. In 1900, urgent legislation specifically exempting labour societies from the Combines Act managed to find its way through the Senate, but was reluctantly passed, and burdened with qualifications.

And let no one suppose that the Senators were content merely to obstruct the passage of labour legislation.

Throughout the Laurier period, organized labour was continually on guard against sudden Senatorial assaults. In 1903, for example, Senator Beique introduced a bill which would have burdened strikers with some of the anti-democratic stringencies of martial law. Moreover, as we shall see, several other measures sponsored by various Senators would have virtually annihilated the movement.

The Upper Chamber, it seems, contained no one who stood to the 'Godless left', and dauntlessly sustained the cause of "the socialist, or his half-brother, the anarchist."[1] There was a phalanx of Senators (for example H. J. Cloran, T. Coffey, and G. McHugh) who could be counted upon to speak on behalf of the labour associations. But these men often constituted a minority. In the main, the Senators were what J. A. Corry has chosen to call "rich men, of powerful business connection". If they were not themselves manufacturers,[2] they were decidedly sympathetic with the views of manufacturers. They believed that the individual worker was a harmless enough soul, and they often cherished a warmly paternal turn of mind toward him; an attitude no doubt reflective of the days when a manufacturer lived at peace with a dozen men whom he employed and called by their Christian names.

But organized labour was something else again. Few Senators possessed, or cared to possess, any understanding of the hyper-thyroidic young movement which time and prosperity, like twin storks, had placed upon the national doorstep. Labour unions, the Senators believed, engendered unrest. And these men loved peace-- a Roman peace if necessary. "I am very glad to see that in Montreal, at the last moment, the military have been called out to preserve peace and order...," one Senator said of a longshoremen's strike in 1903. "I hope every hon. gentleman in this House... is in favour of peace, order and good government."[3]

A strike was abominable. If it did not invite "the use of brickbats, stones, bludgeons, and even firearms," it was an inconvenience; and to men advanced in years, an inconvenience was often seen as a horrendous wrong.[4] Senator McMullen, for example, was annoyed at the consequences of a strike of streetcar conductors in Hamilton. Businessmen were inconvenienced, he grumbled, and "...their families and wives and daughters had to trudge along in the mud in order to get downtown to do business, and all because a strike had taken place."[5] Underlying such recurrent complaints as these, there seemed to exist the assumption that if a strike is called, the

strikers are wrong.

The labour leaders did not bear the Senatorial flagellation with a good-natured grin. Included amongst the aims to which they had dedicated themselves, the most laconic of all was, "Abolition of Dominion Senate".[6]

II

As we may recall, the Kootenay district of British Columbia saw turmoil in the winter of 1899-1900, when the managers of the silver-lead mines enterprisingly commenced to import workers in apparent contempt for the Alien Labour Act. This occurrence was but one symptom of a deeper ill, for British Columbia was fast becoming the battleground of a now hidden, now open, conflict between capital and labour.

There was another explosion in 1902. Coal miners in the Crow's Nest Pass left their jobs; so did the miners of Vancouver Island; the clerks and baggagemen of the United Brotherhood of Railway Employees on the Canadian Pacific Railway struck; stevedores and seamen came out; and even in distant

Australia, an effort was made to tie up Canadian Pacific ships. To many, indluding Ralph Smith, it appeared as if British Columbian society was breaking up, as Marx had predicted, into two great hostile camps.[7]

Watching the West Coast vendetta with an Argus-eyed scrutiny, the Senators saw that a bad situation was aggravated by the presence of American walking bosses, that is to say, labour representatives from the Republic, adept at organizing workers, and skilled in the art of collective bargaining. Western Federation of Miners' organizers had crossed over into British Columbia in 1895. Now, in the winter of 1902-1903, American Labour Union representatives also entered the province. The labour bosses of these two organizations differed widely upon particulars. But they were in obvious agreement not only about the need for aggressive labour organizations, but about the necessity for eliminating private ownership in industry.

Tart and uncompromising, these foreign agitators held little allure for the Senators, themselves tart and uncompromising. Here was a transcendent chance, the Senators felt, to do the country a good turn by outlawing the American troublemakers, and prevent them from filling the heads of Canadian workers with 'ideas'; ideas which stirred up "that

acerbity and bickering and ill-feeling," between an employer and his hirelings.[8]

Senator Lougheed took the initiative. Early in 1903, he brought forth a bill to make it a criminal offence for anyone who was not a British subject to incite workmen to strike. "The Parliament of Canada, some years ago," Lougheed stated in introducing his bill, "passed an Alien Labour Act to prohibit the importation of foreign labour in the Dominion of Canada, and it seems but logical to suppose that this would be carried to its legitimate conclusion."[9] Lougheed drew the instantaneous support of most of his peers, amongst whom was Senator Macdonald, a man who could not restrain himself from interjecting ecstatic utterances whenever a particularly punishing bill was being directed at the labour movement. "It seems a perfect outrage," Macdonald declared, "that a strike can be called in this country from Washington or Chicago or any United States city...."[10]

This is a fair example of the temper of the debating. The Senators exhibited a particularly conspicuous disapproval of "this man Gompers", the arch-organizer of them all. "Imagine," exclaimed one Senator, "such power in the hands of any man, and that he may be allowed to come to Canada, or send his satellites here to destroy our peace and

harmony."[12] In defending international trade-unionism, Senator Coffey asked, "are we going to meet the budding Rockefellers of the great republic with smiles and open arms, and the John Mitchells with the frown and the warrant and the officer of the law?"[13] Another defendant of labour saw Lougheed's measure as an attempt to 'divide and conquer'. "Why not localize your organizations so as to make them insipid, useless, and powerless?" demanded Senator Cloran. "In union there is strength, and I say this Bill is an attack on the brotherhood of man."[14] But arguments like these were soon brushed aside, and Lougheed's Bill passed through the Senate. To the toiler, this was an illuminating demonstration of how astonishingly weak the British tradition could be when the wealthy were alarmed. Fortunately for the Canadian labour movement, the House of Commons did not care to pass Lougheed's Bill. If it had, the movement would have been left, as one Senator pointed out, with "neither a body to be kicked nor a soul to be damned."[15]

III

Later in the Laurier era, the "rabid opponents of international trade unionism"[16] became fewer in number, and by 1907, the Executive of the Trades and Labour Congress was delighted to observe that "...the Senate is gaining in intelligence...."[17] But the anti-labour element became more radical, more vicious, and more adamant. When an unusual influx of American organizers came over in 1907, Senator McMullen embraced the opportunity to introduce a bill, "even more stringent than Lougheed's",[18] to prevent the intervention of international officers in industrial disputes. This measure was, however, "...ignominiously treated to a six months hoist."[19] When, in 1909, McMullen again made "a quiet attempt" to pass a similar bill, it was again "...ignominiously thrown out."[20] In no wise diffident, Senator Belcourt introduced a carelessly drafted but still more drastic measure in the following year. This bill prescribed that unless every member of a trade union was a British subject, the trade union in question would be punishable under the law. If this measure had been transmuted into the law of the land, the life of the twenty-six-

year-old Trades and Labour Congress (and of most of the smaller unions as well) would have been extinguished. The bill was, however, a move of desperation. As the Trades and Labour Congress noticed:

> "We think we may safely say at this stage that the antagonism towards international trade unionism which was formerly manifested by the Senate as a whole, has passed away, and that the few lingering traces of it are now to be found in a few individual Senators who are too old to learn or too prejudiced to change."[21]

IV

Insulated from the effects of what Sir Robert Peel once described as "...that great compound of folly, weakness, prejudice, wrong feeling, right feeling, obstinacy, and newspaper paragraphs, which is called public opinion," the Senators could afford to be more frank; and they did not entertain much love for the labour movement.[22] In the warm closeted atmosphere of the Senate Chamber, ideas could build upon ideas, often with only casual reference to contradictory facts.

Here the awesome power wielded by the voting population could not play upon and mar the inexorable logic of the discussions. "Thank God," vociferated one Honourable Gentleman, "there is one place in the legislature of Canada where men can stand up and do their duty, irrespective of fear or favour, and that is the Senate."[23]

References Chapter V

1. Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1903, I, 679, (July 22, 1903). This was the phrase of Senator T. Coffey.

2. See J. A. Corry, Democratic Government and Politics, (Toronto, 1952), 183.

Amongst the manufacturer-Senators were Sir John Carling and William Gibson.

3. Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1903, 146, (April 29, 1903).

4. Ibid, 1903, 148, (April 30, 1903). This is Senator J. McMullen's phrase.

5. Ibid, 1906-7, 213, (February 7, 1907).

6. This is the eighth plank in the 'Platform of Principles', adopted in 1898.

7. Laurier Papers, Smith to Laurier, April 4, 1903.

8. Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1903, 682, (July 22, 1903). Senator J. A. Longheed's phrase.

9. Ibid, 1903, 143, (April 29, 1903).

10. Ibid, 145.

11. Ibid, 1903, 690, (July 22, 1903).

12. Ibid, 690.

13. Ibid, 1906-7, 218, (February 7, 1907).

14. Ibid, 1903, 692, (July 22, 1903).

15. Ibid, 1903, 679, (July 22, 1903). Senator Coffey's words.

16. Pro. of 23rd. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1907, 45.

17. Ibid, 45.

18. Ibid, 45.

19. Ibid, 45.

20. Pro. of 25th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1909, 58.

21. Pro. of 26th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1910, 10.

22. Quoted by James Bryce, "The Nature of Public Opinion," Public Opinion and Propaganda, (New York, 1954), 7.

23. Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1903, 690, (July 22, 1903). This is Senator W. Gibson's exclamation.

Conclusion

The labour movement's chosen leaders were, in fine, men of transparent honesty and transcendent moderacy, not brash, uncompromising men who would bully their way through the Parliamentary corridors and bumptiously affront Canada's First Citizen with a spate of demands. The captains of labour were clearly decent and reasonable people: they would sometimes cease insisting upon the enactment of legislation if the Government so requested; or they were often prepared to restrict their demands. Here were men who prided themselves upon their fairness until they gradually became exaggerations of themselves.

It appears that they felt a mild but continuous pinch of inferiority. Quite possibly this was a legacy of bygone days. Canada has never been world-famous for her tolerance. It took some years before the shabby newcomer, labour, was admitted-- let alone welcomed-- into the Canadian household. Even the most liberal statesman and the press, as late as 1867, considered trade unions as freakish upstarts, "mere ebullitions of unfounded discontent, whose aims were mischievous.

where not Utopian".[1] The labour movement's first job was to prove its legitimate birth and its honourable intentions. Evidently a mild sense of shame lingered with the movement's leaders. In Laurier's presence, for example, Dan O'Donoghue often exhibited a diffidence which would have done justice to the demeanour of any of the three Oriental kings on the first Christmas morning.

It is surprising to observe that the newer leaders, too, inherited this outlook. For the most part, they displayed a sort of hat-in-hand humbleness in the presence of prominent politicians (a disposition which sometimes dissipated when no one of Cabinet rank was nigh). Illustrative of this is a conversation which occurred during the sittings of the Parliamentary Committee set up in 1910 to study the possibilities of instituting an eight-hour day. W. L. M. King was Chairman. Assisting him was Alphonse Verville. To ascertain a point of fact, King turned to Verville. Said King: "How many Sessions was it, Mr. Verville, that you were president of the Congress?" Verville thought for an instant, then blurted out, "five Sessions, and I am not ashamed of it at all."[2]

The gnawing feeling of inferiority-- and apparently the leaders of organized labour could not rid themselves of

it-- may have been evinced in several ways. It may, for instance, have given rise to the snarling grandiloquence which gave the labour men's speeches so distinctive a ring. Or it may have stimulated efforts at self-aggrandizement by building up a series of alliances which would not only lend strength to the movement, but would have indisputable prestige value as well. The most conspicuous alliance was the Trades and Labour Congress' tenacious affiliation with the American Federation of Labour. In addition, however, the Congress sought to co-operate with non-labour bodies in Canada. In 1901, the September Convention of the Congress unanimously decided to act in concert with the Lord's Day Alliance, perhaps with the idea of gaining the lustre of ultra-respectability. In December, 1908, the first meeting of the Moral and Social Reform Council was held, in Toronto, for the purpose of "...adjusting social and moral conditions."[3] And surrounded by Methodists, Baptists, Anglicans, Presbyterians, and Congregationalists, sat a formidable coterie of labour leaders. In 1910, the Executive Council, evidencing a spirit which was to find more eloquent expression twenty-three years later in the Regina Manifesto, decided that"... the time is at hand when the organized workers in affiliation with this body should co-operate with the farmers of this country for their mutual protection."[4]

It is distinctly possible that a sense of humility filled the labour men with a relentless desire to gain acceptance by Canadians at large. Ralph Smith's election to the Presidency of the Trades and Labour Congress is a case in point. Smith exalted the notion that honesty is the best course;[5] that progress is the law of life;[6] that hard work is the key to success.[7] Smith was convinced that nobody would want to live in a community without churches, and that everyone should, therefore, support the churches.[8] And he felt that although individual Orientals may be all right, as a race, one does not care to mix with them very much.[9] Smith was, in short, a man whose views would be eminently agreeable to, say, the middle class Toronto of that day. And for four years, he was the elected President of the Trades and Labour Congress. Was he the personification of the working class urge for respectability?

II

In those days, party lines ran deep. For example, at meetings of the Toronto Trades and Labour Council, during the period, the Conservatives sat at one side of the table, uneasily scrutinizing the Liberals, who defended the opposite side. (And the Socialists, who made their appearance late in the Laurier regime, entrenched themselves at the table's end, glowering at both factions.)[10]

Yet it is illuminating to observe that so many of the top-ranking labour leaders were active Liberal party adherents. Dan O'Donoghue, the 'Father of the Canadian Labour Movement', was himself "an ardent Liberal-- aye, radical Liberal".[11] John G. O'Donoghue, who in 1904 became the Trades and Labour Congress' first Parliamentary Solicitor, showed the same political leanings as his father. Every Congress President between 1898 and 1909 was decidedly Liberal. So were most of the Vice-Presidents between 1898 and 1911.[12]

Those who were not Liberals at first, showed a peculiar tendency to drift into the Liberal party. The most spectacular examples of this are the two major Congress Presidents

of the period, Smith and Verville. Smith followed the more exaggerated course. When it was decided that he would be a candidate for Parliament, in 1900, surreptitious negotiations commenced between Sir Wilfrid and Smith.[13] Laurier assiduously cultivated Smith's friendship; and Smith, in turn, was not unwilling to become a party member: he cherished a personal admiration for the Prime Minister, and unsuccessfully concealed a hankering to become the first full-time Minister of Labour.

The Smith-Laurier alliance constituted the outstanding attempt of the Liberal government to co-opt the leaders of organized labour. Had this entente been effective, the Trades and Labour Congress would have become a kind of colossal 'company union'. But to control the labour movement by paying court to its leaders, was to seize a glass-snake lizard by the tail. Smith came over. The Congress remained behind.

III

Did no one harbour a liking for the labour movement? It was scorned by Sifton, evaded by Oliver, spurned by Mills and his successor,[14] cursed by Scott, and tolerated or ignored by others. Any of these men possessed enough anti-labour bias to become a distinguished Senator.

Did no one harbour a liking for the labour movement? Laurier exhibited a curious attitude, perhaps reflective of his background.

He was born amid pastoral tranquillity. His father was not a printer or a plumber or a ploughman, but a land surveyor. Sir Wilfrid did not toil his way to manhood with a boisterous, class-conscious proletariat. Instead, he spent his youth in "serene companionship with nature and with books."[15] When he entered law at McGill University, he was also entering man's estate, and it is hard to believe that he knew much about the thoughts and wants of the workingman, let alone the aims of organized labour.

Wilfrid Laurier entered politics in September 1877, just in time to see the demise of the Canadian Labour Union.

Ten years later, when he was elevated to the Liberal party leadership, the current problems he had to face were: depression, a palpable wave of anti-Americanism, and one of the hottest politico-religious controversies the country has known. At this time he can hardly have felt constrained to indulge in a toilsome cogitation over the labour leaders' second attempt to organize a national movement. Bad times in the early 'nineties not only tended to carry the workmen's latest attempt at organization out of the public purview, but appeared to be dispatching it into oblivion. When, therefore, in September, 1896, the representatives of an unwell, emaciated labour movement knocked on the new Prime Minister's office door, Laurier was fifty-four years of age, and he can never have given more than tertiary consideration to labour matters.

Like his conception of the Empire, his attitude to labour was apparently forged in the fire. In 1897, the year he turned dizzily in an imperialist direction, he became something of a labour man as well; and "fresh from his triumphs in the Mother Land,"[16] he told a cheering, ebullient, Toronto crowd that "we must give our attention ...to the welfare of our own people; and if there is a principle that ought to receive Government sanction, and to be applied in this Canada

of ours, it is the principle that Fair Work deserves Fair Wages, and a fair wage for fair work is the birthright of every Canadian (Hear, hear)."[17] A new day was dawning, he declared, and to many, it seemed as though the 'New Canada' doctrine was to be applied to the field of labour legislation, too.

But soon he recoiled. The responsibilities of office quickened a realization of the dangers of pro-labour perorations. The stolid resistance of the industrialists speedily warned him of the perils of granting large concessions to the workers. The endless wants, the insatiable needs, the importunities of the labour societies soon taught him the meaning of pressure group momentum.

An Alien Labour Act of doubtful efficacy, a Union Label Bill repeatedly thrown out by the Senate, a sudden Japanese incursion-- these problems heightened his impatience, and made the labour men sit down and think seriously about organizing a labour party.[18] "Sufficient unto the hour is the evil thereof," old Dan O'Donoghue warned him in 1898.[19] Sir Wilfrid must have heartily, if tacitly, agreed.

When British Columbia was convulsed by strikes in 1902, Canada saw industrial disruption on a scale she had not previously experienced. The social fabric was being torn,

not breadthwise as Laurier had been trained to believe, but lengthwise, as he had never known. He was fed up, and, in a moment of apparent disgust, told Mulock that, "if we must have Labour associations in this country-- and think they are productive of some good, in some respects-- we must endeavour to organize them on national lines."[20] This pedagogic attitude would have got him into a good deal of trouble if he had held it toward the manufacturers, or toward an ethnic group, and not toward the labouring class.[21]

Although we are less privy to Laurier's thoughts in the later years of his administration, his public utterances and his actions make it clear that organized labour remained his enfant terrible. Gradually he developed a policy of opportunistic handouts; a policy which his eager young lieutenant, Mackenzie King, was to bring to perfection before the period concluded.[22]

It is evident that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was splendidly qualified to understand little of the aims and behaviour of the labour unions. A man of moderate disposition, he could not fathom the impetuosity and impatience of men whose next meal often depended upon swift, bold action; and he gained nothing by postponing Preston's transferral, or by refusing to act quickly after the rioting had occurred in Vancouver.

A gentleman, and the soul of courtesy and tact, he soon looked askance at the grubbiness and the frankness of the labour men; and on more than one occasion, he took offence at what Castell Hopkins calls "language".[23] A master of two tongues, and an author of fastidious prose, Sir Wilfrid must have read with amused tolerance the shakily spelt, shakily punctuated communications from men who had little time, opportunity, or inclination to acquaint themselves with more than the rudiments of their own tongue.

It is only by believing that Laurier did not understand labour, that we can account for the fuzzy, vague statements that he made about the movement from time to time. It is only by believing that Laurier did not understand labour that we can explain his dislike for it. He seems to have regarded the new movement as an uncanny, super-organic being. He watched it hungrily eat the legislation he fed it. Incredulously -- almost hypnotically-- he watched it grow.

Did no one harbour a liking for the labour movement? Sir William Mulock did. In him, organized labour had its strongest advocate. Owing to an unusually conventional country upbringing, in the unbelievably idyllic setting of North York and South Simcoe,[24] Mulock came to look upon the workingmen

as personal friends, and as men who must "earn bread for their wives and children."[25] It was not only the workingman he kept under his wing, however, He represented a much greater brotherhood. "Throughout Sir William's long and active career," recorded his biographer, "the lot of the needy and the oppressed has ever been nearest to his heart."[26] It was this element of ingrained humanitarianism which set him apart from his compeers and successors.

But Sir William was also a politician; and ever since he had "dragged the University /of Toronto/ out of the depths of mediaevalism," he had adopted a Rousseau-istic faith in the 'general will'.[27] The following is one of countless examples which reveals the extremes to which he was prepared to go to curry the favour of the People. In April, 1902, he arose in Parliament to propose that railroad employees be deprived of their only effective means of protection, the strike. Why? "There is," he declared, "a third interest to be considered, the public interest, perhaps the greatest of all; and that paramount interest appears to give jurisdiction on this occasion from the House to adopt what is apparently an extreme means...."[28]

It was the turbulent political waters which diluted the humanitarianism of Sir William Mulock, and prevented him

from manifesting the same indomitable spirit which prompted J. S. Woodsworth to snap at a smug Parliamentary antagonist, "no, I am not suffering, and I am glad that there are some of us who are not suffering at present who are prepared to stand up for these people!"[29] Mulock's career must have been a continuous effort to harmonize his humanitarian urge with the will of the public. Two personalities were constantly warring within him. As a kindly Dr. Jekyll, he was troubled by the autocratic machinations of Charles M. Hays. But as Mr. Hyde (the politician, of course) he was not impressed by the possible injustices which the inconsistencies of the Alien Labour Act invited, and he told the labour delegates that the public was not interested and sent them away. Dr. Jekyll was revolted by the thought of girls working intolerably long hours; and he "walked the floor like a caged lion," and finally inserted a 'fair wages' clause in Post Office contracts.[30] Mr. Hyde, on the other hand, was not unwilling to make political capital by putting an end to people working intolerably long hours on public contracts.[31]

H. S. Ferns and Bernard Ostry have portrayed King at this stage as a young bureaucrat, and an 'Expert', "...university trained, and possessed of refinements of knowledge

which Sir William Mulock, his formal superior, could never master."[32] This may be true, but a second look reveals a surprising number of tricks which the young apprentice borrowed from the old master's repertoire.[33] Foremost among these is the belief upon which King came to base his political thinking; it was Mulock, it seems, who taught his Deputy Minister to keep one finger upon the pulse of the mass of 'average' citizens.[34]

In contrast to Mulock, Mackenzie King's thoughts were less complicated by deep-rooted sympathy for his fellow man. For example, industrial accidents in Canada began to occur with a startling frequency in 1905. In that year, a thousand labourers were killed at work, and three thousand more were injured for life.[35] The following year saw the same human waste. This worried Mulock.

Although he was no longer Minister of Labour, he felt impelled to write Laurier. Sir William saw no need for these losses. Many lives could be saved by the judicious use of safety devices. He urged the Government to hold public inquiry into the subject immediately.

But the thought of a thousand workers being killed each year (and three times this number crippled for life) does not appear to have ruffled the equanimity of W. L. M. King.

No action should be taken, he advised Sir Wilfrid, until statistics for "four or five years" had been recorded in the Labour Gazette.[36]

With duller feelings of humanitarianism than Mulock, King could more carefully heed each nuance of the public voice. It is not surprising, therefore, that as Minister of Labour, he exhibited a "... sympathetic interest... in every question dealing with labour."[37] He was freer to obey strong pressures, such as the ones which brought into being the Commission on Technical Education, or which pushed the Eight-Hour Bill through the House.[38]

IV

It is supremely paradoxical that a government which entertained little love for organized labour, was the same government which, in the labour leaders' views, supplied the working mass with "notable record of laws".[39] Credit must be accorded the labour men. To a great extent, they fashioned their own fortunes. They exerted a peremptory pressure directly

on the Laurier Ministry. And they began to develop another technique, too. These years saw the commencement of efforts by organized labour to create and exploit a broad measure of public support for its aims; support which could be mobilized when the legislative situation suggested it. The labour people did not institute a conscious and expensive "educational campaign" such as the Canadian Manufacturers' Association inaugurated in 1902.[39] Their propaganda programme (if 'programme' is not too neat a word) was much more unobtrusive, and apparently lacked central co-ordination.

By virtue of numbers, the labour movement was in a cardinal position to influence public opinion. The movement did not, however, rely upon numbers alone. Working on behalf of the labouring class were leaders of thought (or 'educators') in key positions throughout the land. From the press, pulpit, and to some extent, the schoolroom, these men indulged in vigorous lobbying at the grass roots level.

The labour men found the press a singularly inviting medium through which they could awaken public sentiment. "A newspaper can flout an advertiser," Walter Lippmann once opined, "it can attack a powerful banking or traction interest, but if it alienates the buying public, it loses the one indispensable asset of its existence."[40] During the period, the press was

not at all unwilling to propagate the views of a class of people which constituted such a sizeable portion of its clientele. Senator McMullen did not think there was a newspaper in the land intrepid enough to exercise its "independence". "They are all trying to truckle to the labour classes," he announced morosely, "because they are the most numerous. I presume they expect they will get subscriptions and circulation for their papers."[41]

Organized labour, therefore, had not only a tiny press of its own, but spokesmen in the employ of widely-circulated journals. Most notable was James Simpson, the municipal editor of the Toronto Star through the Laurier era. But there were others. David A. Carey, for instance, wrote for the Evening Telegram, and James Mack was labour editor of the Montreal Star. Selecting facts which would produce the maximum impact, men such as these had a pre-eminent opportunity to present their views in the black-and-white anonymity of the daily press.

Toward the end of the period, labour began to exert a discernible influence in the field of education. For some years, both the Trades and Labour Congress and the Canadian Federation of Labour had been sedulously constraining the

Laurier government to investigate the possibilities of establishing technical schools.[42] In doing so, there can be little doubt that (in the words of a House of Representatives' Select Committee set up to study lobbying techniques) they "recognized the importance of educational institutions as moulders of public opinion...."[43] Acting in an uncustomary alliance with the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the labour people nudged the Government into appointing a Commission on Technical Education in July of 1910; and the Trades and Labour Congress managed to secure a place on the Commission for its former Vice-President, James Simpson (who was contemporaneously Chairman of the Toronto School Board). It is hard to believe that the labour chiefs hoped to prepare Canada's youth for the Revolution. "They do not necessarily pervert this [educational] process," the House of Representatives' Select Committee noted, "but they make every effort to exploit it."[44] This would appear to sum up succinctly the aims of the labour-society officers on this question.

If it had been widely supposed that the labour leaders were indulging in grass-roots lobbying at the ecclesiastical level, in very truth, they would have been condemned as children of darkness. Yet the officers of labour did participate in this practice, apparently without ill effect. A new

phenomenon, Church and Labour Conferences, were held monthly, beginning in 1908. Torontonians crowded Massey Hall or the Assembly Hall of the Labour Temple "to the extremity of its standing and seating capacity," to hear celebrated labour men and clergymen ventilate such pressing subjects as the Sweating System, Racetrack Gambling, the Shorter Workday, and the White Slave Traffic.[45] "We strongly endorse these Church and Labour Conferences," the Trades and Labour Congress proclaimed, "and recommend that their educational value be taken advantage of wherever opportunity affords."[46]

Labour began to meet Government on the public-opinion nexus. It was hardly a rendezvous for an affaire de coeur. But the movement's leaders found that by invading this new precinct, they could gain labour legislation. They were quickly learning, as was Mackenzie King, that "for Public Opinion to be effective, it is necessary that it be made an informed Opinion."[47]

References to Conclusion

1. Quoted in R.D. Coats, "The Labour Movement in Canada," Canada and the Provinces, IX, (Toronto, 1912), 295.

2. See Jourals, House of Commons, 1909-10, Committee Re: Eight-Hour Bill, 223.

3. Pro. of 24th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1908, 9.

4. Pro. of 26th. Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1910, 13.

5. The Labour Gazette, I, 55, (October, 1900).

6. Ibid, 55.

7. Ibid, 56.

8. The Labour Gazette, II, 213, (October, 1901).

9. See Laurier Papers, Smith to Laurier, May 10, 1901.

10. This information was volunteered by Mr. John W. Bruce, July, 1957.

11. Laurier Papers, O'Donoghue to Laurier, May 16, 1898.

12. The conspicuous exception is, of course,socialist James Simpson (1904-1909).

13. See, for example Laurier Papers, Laurier to Smith, December 4, 1900; or Ibid; Smith to Laurier, June 30, 1900.

14. Mills' successor was Charles Fitzpatrick. See Ibid, Smith to Laurier, July 13, 1904.

15. J. S. Willison, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal Party, I, (Toronto, 1903), 28.

16. Toronto Globe, Octbber 7, 1897.

17. Ibid, October 7, 1897.

18. This move was evidently inspired from within the Canadian movement, and less suggested by events abroad than, say, the later effort (in and after 1906).

19. Laurier Papers, O'Donoghue to Laurier, July 19, 1899.

20. Laurier Papers, Laurier to Mulock, February 5, 1902.

21. For example, compare this attitude to the disposition he evinced during the Manitoba Schools Controversy.

22. Said Mackenzie King in 1907:

"Mr. Lemieux's Bill on Strikes and Lockouts, a Committee on 'Co-operation',with the possibility of a measure on the subject being further considered by the House, the inquiry under the Royal Commission into the relations between the Bell Telephone Company and its operatives, and the resolutions which are being debated in reference to Select Committees to inquire into the subject of industrial disputes, etc.,etc., gives the labour problem as much prominence as it is wise to give it at this time."

See Laurier Papers, King to Laurier, February 7, 1907.

23. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, (Toronto, 1907), VII, 287. See, Laurier Papers, Pettipiece to Laurier, September 17,1909.

24. If you do not believe me, See, W. J. Loudon, Sir William Mulock, (Toronto, 1932), 23,24,25.

25. Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, September 14, 1905.

26. W. J. Loudon, Sir William Mulock, 133.

27. Ibid, 65.

28. Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, 1902, 292.

29. Grace Mac Innis, J. S. Woodsworth, (Toronto, 1953), 292.

30. W. L. M. King, Industry and Humanity, 70.

31. See Laurier Papers, Mulock to Laurier, October 15, 1904.

32. H. S. Ferns and Bernard Ostry, The Age of Mackenzie King, 333.

33. For example, can King have borrowed the technique of freezing industrial disputes, or the "pursuance of a safe middle course," from Mulock?

34. "He recognized that in matters of legislation, the part to be played by public opinion was all-important; That public opinion itself was something that very often had to be created; and that to be effective, it had to be an informed opinion." This is not an excerpt from one of the Labour Gazettes, but a quotation from Loudon's biography. See W. J. Loudon, Sir William Mullock, 132.

35. Laurier Papers, King to Laurier, February 7, 1907.

36. Ibid, King to Laurier, February 7, 1907.

37. Pro. of 26th Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1910, 12.

38. And it does not appear as if his liberalism outweighed his thoughts on democracy. See A.R.M. Lower, Colony to Nation, 532.

39. Pro. of 25th Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1909, 53.

40. Walter Lippmann, Public Opinion, (New York, 1945), 324.

41. Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1903, 148, (April 30, 1903),

42. The Canadian Federation of Labour (National Trades and Labour Congress) for example, made a strong demand for technical schools in 1906. See Castell Hopkins, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, VI, 299. The Trades and Labour Congress had been discussing the subject earlier. See, for example, Pro. of 14th Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1898, 8.

43. "House Select Committee on Lobbying Activities," (The Buchanan Committee), Public Opinion and Propaganda, (New York, 1954), 217.

44. Ibid, 218.

45. Pro. of 24th Ann. Convention of the Trades and Labour Congress, 1908, 9.

46. ~~Ibid~~, 10.

47. W.L.M. King, Industry and Humanity, (Toronto, 1918), 314.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE DOMINION OF CANADA

(a) Sessional Papers of the Dominion of Canada.

1902, No. 13: Labour Correspondence

1902, No. 54: "Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese and Japanese Immigration".

(b) Debates of the House of Commons (Canada), 1896-1911

Debates of the Senate (Canada), 1896-1911.

(c) Statutes of Canada, 1896-1911.

(d) Department of Labour.

Labour Gazette, Monthly, September, 1900 to October, 1911, Ottawa: King's Printer.

Labour Gazette: Fiftieth Anniversary Edition, September 1950, Ottawa: King's Printer.

Trade Union Law in Canada, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1935.

(e) Reports of Royal Commissions.

Report of the Royal Commission on Chinese Immigration, Ottawa; Queen's Printer, 1885.

Report of the Royal Commission on the Relations of Labour and Capital in Canada, Ottawa: Queen's Printer, 1889.

Report of the Royal Commission to inquire into the Immigration of Italian Labour to Montreal, and Alleged Fraudulent Practicies of Employment Agencies, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1905.

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into the Methods by which Oriental Labourers have been induced to come to Canada, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1908.

OFFICIAL PUBLICATIONS OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

House Report No. 3138, Union Calendar No. 1085, 81st. Congress, 2nd. Session, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: PRIVATE SOURCES

(a) Laurier Papers, 1896-1911, (Public Archives of Canada). Letters received, and drafts of letters written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. (Laurier's correspondence with Sir William Mulock, Mackenzie King, Ralph Smith, and Daniel O'Donoghue was especially useful)

(b) Lemieux Papers, 1896-1911, (Public Archives of Canada). Letters received, and drafts of letters written by the Honourable Rodolphe Lemieux.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: CONTEMPORARY WORKS

Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, Proceedings of Annual Meetings, 1883, 1886 to 1911.

Provincial Workmen's Association, Minutes of Proceedings of the Grand Council, 1879 to 1911.

Hopkins, Castell, The Canadian Annual Review of Public Affairs, Toronto: Annual Review Press, 1900 to 1911.

Newspapers, 1896-1911

The Victoria Colonist, the Victoria Daily Times, the Winnipeg Free Press, the Toronto Globe, the Toronto News, the Ottawa Citizen, the Ottawa Journal, the Montreal Star, the Montreal Gazette.

BIBLIOGRAPHY: LATER WORKS

Andras, A., Labour Unions in Canada, Ottawa: Woodsworth House Publishers, 1948.

Bryce, James, "The Nature of Public Opinion," Public Opinion and Propaganda, New York: The Dryden Press, 1954.

Bortz, Nelson M., ed., Brief History of the American Labour Movement, Washington: United States Government Printing Office, 1950.

Buck, Tim, Canada, the Communist Viewpoint, Toronto: Eveready Printers Limited, 1948.

Clark, S. D., The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Toronto: The University of Toronto Press,1939. Helpful, and gives us a more complete picture.

_____ "The Canadian Manufacturers' Association", Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, IV (November, 1938), 505-523.

Dafoe, J. W., Clifford Sifton in relation to His Times, Toronto: The Macmillan Company, 1931. Although Dafoe tends, on occasion, to exaggerate Sifton's importance, he gives us a good picture of the obstacles and opposition that Sifton met.

_____ Laurier: A Study in Canadian Politics, Toronto: Thomas Allen Publishers, 1922.

Ferns, H. S., and Ostry, B., The Age of Mackenzie King: the Rise of the Leader, London: William Heinemann Limited, 1955.

Forsey, E. A., " Mr. King and the Government's Labour Policy", The Canadian Forum, XXI (November 1941), pp 231,232.

Gibbon, John Murray, Steel of Empire, New York: The Bobbs-Merrill Company: 1935.

Glazebrook, G.P. de T., Canadian External Relations to 1914, Toronto: Oxford University Press, 1942.

Howay, F. W., British Columbia, the Making of Canada, Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1928.

Innis, Mary Quayle, An Economic History of Canada, Toronto: Ryerson Press, 1948.

King, W. L. M., Industry and Humanity, Toronto: Thomas Allen Publishers, 1918.

Lindblom, Charles E., Unions and Capitalism, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1950.

Lippmann, Walter, Public Opinion, New York: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1945.

Logan, H. A., Trade Unions in Canada, Toronto: Macmillan, 1948. Very helpful. The largest and most complete study in the field of labour history. Occasionally careless.

Loudon, W. J., Sir William Mulock, Toronto: The Macmillan Company of Canada, 1932. Helpful to a certain extent. A trifle eulogistic.

Longheed, W. F., An Enquiry into Labour-Management Relations with Reference to Governmental Position therein, Winnipeg: King's Printer, 1943.

Lower, A.R.M., Canada and the Far East- 1940, New York: Institute of Pacific Relations Office, 1940.

_____ Colony to Nation, Toronto: Longmans, Green, and Company, 1951.

Mackenzie, M.R., ed., Guide to Canadian Ministries since Confederation, Ottawa: Public Archives of Canada, 1957. I found this especially helpful for reference purposes.

MacInnes, Grace, J. S. Woodsworth: A Man to Remember Toronto: Macmillan Company of Canada, 1953.

Mackintosh, Margaret, An Outline of Trade Union History in Great Britain, the United States, and Canada, Ottawa: Department of Labour, 1946.

General history, capably written.

Mackintosh, W. A., The Economic Background of Dominion Provincial Relations, Ottawa: King's Printer, 1939.

McCabe, O.A., and Lester, R.A., Labour and Social Organization, Boston: Little, Brown, and Company, 1938.

McDiarmid, Orville John, Commercial Policy in the Canadian Economy, Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1946.

Ostry, B., see Ferns, H.S.

Perlman, Selig, A. History of Trade Unionism in the United States, New York: Augustus M. Kilbey Inc., 1950.

Clearly written. A 'significant' history.

Porritt, Edward, Sixty Years of Protection in Canada: 1846 to 1912, Winnipeg: The Grain Growers' Guide, 1913.

Preston, W. T. R., My Generation of Politics and Politicians, Toronto:
D. A. Rose Publishing Company, 1927.
Preston has carefully avoided reference to his conflict with the labour men. But, his book gives us a lucid insight into his state of mind.

Reynolds, Lloyd G., The British Immigrant: His Social and Economic Adjustment in Canada, Toronto:
Oxford University Press, 1935.
Very helpful from the standpoint of this thesis, because the British immigration is compared with both European and American immigration.

Skelton, Oscar Douglas, Life and Letters of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, II, New York:
The Century Company, 1922.

Stewart, Bryce, M., Canadian Labour Laws and the Treaty, New York:
Columbia University Press, 1926,
A helpful general study, but, somewhat superficial and inaccurate.

The Trades and Labour Congress: an Historical Review,
Ottawa: The Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, 1956.

Ware, N. J., Logan, H. A., Innis, H. A., Labour in Canadian - American Relations, Toronto: The Ryerson Press, 1937. Wares' "History of Labour extraction", provides us with a good general outline.

Willison, J. S., Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Liberal Party, II, Toronto: George M rang and Company, 1903.

Wilson, Roland, "Migration Movements in Canada, 1867-1925," Canadian Historical Review, XIII (June, 1932), 157-183.

Woodsworth, Charles, Canada and the Orient: a Study in International Relations, Toronto: The MacMillan Company of Canada, 1941. Indispensible in a thesis of this sort.

Young, C.H., Reid, Helen, R. Y., Carrothers, W. A., The Japanese Canadians, Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1938. A study of the social, and to a lesser degree, the economic side of the Japanese immigration.

Ziegler, Olive, Woodsworth: Social Pioneer, Toronto: The Ontario Press, 1934.