

CANADIAN LABOUR AND THE EMPIRE

LENNOX MILLS

This article was begun in 1920 at the suggestion of Professor H. E. Egerton, and was intended to form a chapter of a thesis for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at Oxford. Circumstances compelled the abandonment of the plan, but on the writer's return to Canada in the autumn of 1924 the subject was resumed, additional investigations being made to bring it up to date. The paper embodies the result of some five months of personal research, during which the writer interviewed or corresponded with about eighty Labour leaders, members of parliament, economists, journalists, business men and university professors in every part of Canada. All the Labour reports and journals available were also studied. To reduce the dangers of a biased account, information was secured not only from Labour leaders of every shade of opinion, but also from men who—while unconnected with Labour—were yet well acquainted with it. Much of the information was obtained in reply to questionnaires in which, amongst other queries, it was asked what Labour's attitude was towards Great Britain and the United States, a Canadian army and navy, an Imperial parliament, Imperial preference, reciprocity, immigration from Great Britain and the Orient, etc. On the whole, the replies were frank and valuable, and every statement made in the article is based upon a careful study of the opinions of men whose points of view differed widely. Amongst those from whom information was obtained were the late President Gompers of the American Federation of Labour, President Moore of the Canadian Trades and Labour Congress, Sir George Foster, Sir John Willison, Mr. Mackenzie King, ex-Premier Bowser of British Columbia, Mr. Johnston (President of the International Association of Machinists), Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, M. P., Mr. A. S. Wells, Mr. A. E. Ivens and other leaders of the One Big Union strike, Mr. J. H. McVety (formerly President of the Trades and Labour Council of Vancouver), Mr. W. R. Trotter (Labour's leading authority on matters of immigration) Mr. Casey of Prince Rupert, the leaders of the Oriental colonies in British Columbia, Professor McIver of Toronto, Professor Clark of Queen's University, Mr. Sutcliffe of Simmons College, Boston, the late Dr. S. D. Scott—a journalist with forty years' experience in every part of Canada—and Mr. R. B. Russell, the Dominion President of the Great War Veterans' Association.

“CANADIAN Labour is disgustingly patriotic”. Thus a Bolshevik agitator in San Francisco, after five months of perfervid but futile propaganda in the Dominion. Probably most Canadians would not endorse his verdict, for there is widespread misunderstanding as to the attitude of Canadian Labour towards the Empire. A like misapprehension exists with reference to Labour's economic policy. The average workman has a passion for indulging in the shibboleths of Socialism: he revels in describing himself as an “exploited wage-slave”, decries patriotism, and consigns all capitalists and governments to perdition. In actual fact, however, the overwhelming majority of the working class is very little affected by the Socialist doctrines which it professes, and is far more moderate in its views than is generally believed. To understand the situation it is necessary to have a clear conception of the two conflicting elements in Labour, the Radicals and the Moderates.

The Radicals.

The Radicals are only about fifteen per cent. of organized Labour, and are to be found principally in British Columbia and the three prairie provinces, although there are a few in Toronto and Montreal. The majority are in Vancouver, Calgary, Winnipeg, and the mining towns and lumber camps of the West. A very large number of the leaders are immigrants from Great Britain. Writing in 1920, Sir John Willison gave it as his opinion that "Canadian trade unions derive much of their Radicalism from British unionists, and a great deal of labour unrest in the Dominion is directly incited by British Socialists." Radicals are divided into several groups with widely divergent beliefs, such as the Industrial Unionists, the Anarchists, and the parties who profess different forms of Communism. The Industrial Workers of the World, the American Syndicalists, have strong influence amongst the British Columbia loggers; but the majority of the Radicals, like the Communists of Great Britain, derive their inspiration from Moscow. The most important section is the Workers' Party of Canada. Our existing structure of society, economic and political, is to be overthrown—peaceably, if no resistance is offered—and we are to have instead the Soviet form of government. The American Federation of Labour is opposed as a reactionary body, which attempts to come to terms with Capital instead of trying to overthrow it. For example, the abortive "One Big Union" strike of 1919 was, from one point of view, an attempt to destroy its power in the West. The Radicals are convinced adherents of the doctrines of the class-struggle and the dictatorship of the proletariat, but also favour political action. Western Labour, especially on the Pacific coast, is one of the most Radical groups on the North American continent.

The influence of the Radicals is fluctuating, and on the whole not very great. Only a small fraction of Canadian Labour, perhaps one-fourth or one-fifth, is organized, and the greater part is not as yet very class-conscious. The agricultural labourers on the prairies, for example, are almost totally unorganized, while even in the cities many workmen do not belong to unions. A large number of workmen become members of their unions for protection only, and are not much affected by Socialist or Bolshevik doctrines. Many of the delegates to the Calgary Convention of 1919, which adopted the proposal for the One Big Union, complained that as a rule not more than 30% or 40% of the members of their unions attended the meetings, and that while "it is the easiest thing on the top of the earth, and everybody knows it, if it is a proposition without

them to shove it forward and get it through", the difficulty was to obtain the energetic co-operation of the majority afterwards. The attempts to apply this Bolshevik and Syndicalist doctrine of the active minority have not as a rule been very successful, but occasionally they secure temporarily at least the support of a large number of Moderates, as in the case of the One Big Union strike. There is an increasingly strong undercurrent of bitterness and discontent amongst the working class at their present economic condition, and at the conservative policy of the American Federation of Labour; and this on occasion is successfully exploited. Since the collapse of the One Big Union the Radicals have not had much influence over the great majority of workmen.

Another factor which minimises the influence of the Radicals is that Canada is still mainly agricultural. Farmers are proverbially conservative; and while they have sometimes, as in Ontario, formed a political alliance with Moderate Labour, Communism is the last policy to appeal to them. This was one of the principal reasons for the failure of the One Big Union strike of 1919; the small groups of Radicals, widely separated and surrounded by a hostile farming population, could not hope for more than temporary success.

The Moderates.

While the majority of the western workmen falls within this category, the strength of the Moderates lies in the eastern part of Canada. Nine-tenths of the Canadian unions are affiliated with the International unions which have their head-quarters in the United States, the most important exception being the Catholic unions of Quebec. The Roman Catholic Church has strenuously opposed the formation of unions in Quebec, with the result that the International unions there are weak and poorly organized. Within the last ten years, however, the Church has formed Catholic unions under its own control, after the fashion of the Catholic unions in Germany. The International unions are united in the American Federation of Labour, which exercises a general control over the Canadian unions, but allows them a large measure of autonomy in local affairs. In order that their interests might not suffer from being controlled by a body whose headquarters are in Washington, the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada was constituted to direct the policy of the unions in all matters distinctively Canadian. It is subordinate to the American Federation of Labour in matters of trade jurisdiction, and the relations of the two are somewhat loose and indefinite.

The policy of the Moderate differs widely from that of the

Radical wing of Labour. While the Radicals so far as possible apply their doctrines in practice, the Moderates are not greatly affected by their Socialistic beliefs, but are almost altogether engrossed in obtaining better wages and working conditions. One reason for this is that trades unionism as a class weapon has appeared in Canada within the past forty years. Besides, the standard of living is higher, and the ease with which free land, free mining privileges, etc., can be obtained provides the workman with an alternative mode of securing a livelihood. Furthermore, many workmen hope eventually themselves to become employers. For all these reasons Labour in Canada is much less class-conscious than in Great Britain and many parts of Europe, does not regard itself as a class apart to nearly the same extent, and does not feel anything like the same bitterness towards other sections of the nation.

A very striking instance of this is shown by the fact that although perhaps only a few workmen are actually members of any political organization, as a class they tend to support Conservative or Liberal rather than Labour candidates for parliament. They are not greatly influenced by the tenets of Socialism, but cast their votes for much the same reasons as other citizens. While it is impossible to obtain definite statistics, this is the view of the Premier, of Sir George Foster, of Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, of Mr. Ivens (of Winnipeg), Mr. Moore, (the President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada) and many members of parliament, labour leaders and journalists. Their opinion is fairly stated in the following extract from a letter from Sir George Foster:—"Up to the present time it has been the almost invariable rule that the great mass of Labour people belong to either one or other of the great parties, and do not group themselves under distinct Labour labels." During the last four or five years, however, Labour has taken more interest in politics than formerly, and has shown an increased tendency to vote distinctively as Labour.

The Radicals and the Empire.

The attitude of the Radicals towards the British Empire may be defined as one of indifference tempered by hostility. They regarded the late war purely as a struggle between two rival factions of capitalists, and considered that Germany was more guilty than the Allies solely because she anticipated them in declaring war, and committed some atrocities. The percentage of recruits which they contributed was much lower than that of other sections of Labour, and they opposed conscription far more bitterly than the

Moderates. It was typical of their attitude that when Goodwin, a Radical and a draft-evader, was killed while resisting arrest, they proclaimed a twenty-four hours' strike in Vancouver as a sign of mourning. Should the Empire become involved in another struggle comparable with the last, they would adopt the same attitude. Even in a war of defence against an enemy invading Canada, the co-operation of the majority would be very doubtful. They would strongly oppose any attempt to raise an army in Canada, even of a few thousand men, lest it should be used against them in the event of a strike. They also fear that it might come under the control of Imperial officers, whom they regard as "brutal aristocrats".

As regards their attitude towards Great Britain, they consider that Parliament is the tool of the capitalists and aristocrats, who are preferable to those of the United States only in that they are less brutal in their methods of keeping Labour in slavery. They hold the strange idea that English statesmen lie awake o' nights devising means to bring back the Dominions to "Downing Street rule" in order to exploit their resources. While, like most Canadians, they have hitherto paid very little attention to the proposals which have been from time to time advanced for an Imperial parliament, so far as they have considered it they condemn it unreservedly for this reason. The only section of Labour in Great Britain of which they approve is the Extreme Left, with which they have a bond of union in their common admiration of Moscow. The influence of the British extremists is inspirational; while it would be difficult to point to any single action which was copied from them, the Canadian Radicals study their methods and adapt these to local conditions. The Shop Stewards' Movement and the policy of Direct Action, for example, have had influence in Canada. Similarly, the Radical wing of Australian Labour has had an influence here.

The attitude towards India, Egypt and the Crown Colonies is one of gross ignorance and indifference combined with hostility. On the rare occasions, for instance, when their newspapers print any information about these places, it is to give a highly coloured and flagrantly false account of British atrocity. That they may indirectly be of value to the working man as a source of raw materials and a market, has never occurred to them any more than it has to the Moderates.

The Radicals' point of view towards the people of the United States is friendly, but at the same time there is no desire for annexation. Although opposed to the monarchy, they regard the United

States as the principal stronghold of Capitalism, and consider that the treatment of Labour there is even more unjust and ruthless than in Canada. In short, they would rather remain in the frying-pan than jump into a particularly unpleasant looking fire. The Radicals, then, so far from being a bulwark of Empire, might rather be described as a disintegrating force. Their influence however is almost negligible.

The Moderates and the Empire.

From the point of view of their attitude towards the Empire, the Moderates fall into two groups, Labour within and without Quebec. The two principal forces which determine the attitude of the manual workers in Quebec towards the Empire are French-Canadian Nationalism and the Roman Catholic Church. Probably all the French unions, both Catholic and International, are more or less impregnated with Nationalism, although the movement seems to be stronger among the peasantry than in the working classes of the cities. The Roman Catholic Church controls the Catholic and has a good deal of influence in the International unions. Divested of the extravagances in which M. Bourassa and other leaders indulge, the Nationalist creed appears to be that the French-Canadians shall enjoy in every part of Canada, and not merely in Quebec, all the rights which have been guaranteed them, such as bi-lingual, Roman Catholic schools. They conceive of their rights in a rather extravagant fashion, but only a few extremists desire independence of Great Britain. The attitude of the Catholic priesthood, so far as one can ascertain, seems to be that while like Canadians in general they do not fully realize how the Imperial connection involves responsibilities as well as privileges, they have no desire for severance from an Empire from which they have received such generosity and justice. The Church does not want annexation to France, which it considers atheistic and anti-clerical, and it would most certainly oppose annexation to the United States. It knows that annexation would result in the descent upon Quebec of a horde of enterprising Yankees who would develop its resources and try to modernize the *habitants*, and it fears that its own influence might be weakened. It is significant that the French-Canadian workmen who have returned after some years in the United States are much more anti-clerical in their views than those who have remained at home. If annexation to the United States should ever become a living issue in Canada, amongst the foremost champions of the British connection would be the province of Quebec.

The attitude of Moderate Labour outside Quebec is much

more difficult to ascertain. Like Canadians in general, working men know little about the Empire save in the rare cases where it is forced upon their attention. Since the war, Canadians have been so absorbed in their private concerns that such Imperial problems as the duty of Canada to take its part in the defence of the Empire have excited very little interest among the people in general.

That war has demonstrated beyond question the patriotism of the great majority of the working class. Despite their professions of Internationalism they have a strong, if latent, love for Canada, and amongst the sixty per cent of British descent there is toward Great Britain a love which shows itself in crises. Labour's record of voluntary enlistment from 1914 to 1918 proves the truth of this contention. To quote Sir George Foster:—"In the late war, Labour in Middle and Eastern Canada assumed its full obligations and carried its share of the burden of the real sacrifices and losses of the war". Should a similar emergency arise in the future, "the bulk of Canadian Labour presented with a clear-cut patriotic issue would respond, if not with noisy enthusiasm, at least with a strong sense of duty". President Moore and other Labour leaders are of the same opinion.

The war has undoubtedly strengthened the deep feeling of affection for Great Britain, and much of the prejudice formerly felt against Englishmen in many parts of Canada has disappeared. Contact with the Imperial troops in France, and the warm welcome which Canadian soldiers received in England have led to a better understanding and removed many prejudices. Writing in 1920 Mr. R. B. Maxwell, the Dominion President of the Great War Veterans' Association, gave it as his opinion that "the effect of the war upon the average Canadian soldier's attitude to Great Britain has resulted in a complete reversal of some of his previous opinions. He now has a greater respect and faith in Great Britain as a result of his close contact with her soldiers and her people. The British Commonwealth of Free Nations is, to him, an actual fact." The majority of the Canadian troops prior to enlistment belonged to the working class, whether they were members of unions or not, and since 1918 large numbers have joined the unions. While it is impossible to gauge their influence in giving their fellows a more correct view of Great Britain, there is no doubt that this will be very important.

Despite the increased attachment to Great Britain, in the event of another war it would be more difficult to arouse the patriotism of Labour than it was in 1914. This feeling is not confined to the working class, but is shared by the nation as a whole, and is

due to the war-weariness which is so manifest in other parts of the world. The present generation have no illusions left as to the nature of modern war; and they would require to be thoroughly convinced that it was just and unavoidable before they would take part in it. Labour in particular would look suspiciously for the cloven hoof of the capitalist. To quote Dr. Clark of Queen's University: "if it should break out in the near future, it would be very difficult to arouse Canadian Labour in favour of any war in which the cause was not spectacularly just and idealistic." Had war with Turkey broken out in the autumn of 1922, for example, it would have been exceedingly difficult to secure its co-operation. At the same time, it is impossible to calculate the result of skilful propaganda on the part of the government. In a war of defence against an enemy invading Canada, Labour would resist to the last.

The question of Canada's contributing her fair share towards the defence of the Empire is not as yet a matter of practical politics, and it is difficult to predict what Labour's attitude would be. It seems evident, however, that it would strongly oppose the creation of a Canadian army, partly on the ground that—to quote President Moore—"the necessary forces could be easily and quickly raised and efficiently trained in case of actual crisis", and in part because it fears that such a force might be used to coerce it in case of strikes. Another element which would strongly influence it is the revulsion against war and all its manifestations which is felt very widely in Canada. Prior to 1914 there was a wide-spread feeling in Canada which tended to regard war as no longer necessary or possible, as a relic of barbarism, and preparation to meet it as militarism, Jingoism, and opposed to religion and national morality. This sentiment, while in no sense universal, has increased in strength since 1918. Amongst the returned soldiers and the men who have come of age since the war there is also a strong dislike of the discipline and restraint of army life. This is reflected in the languishing condition of the militia, which is only about half its nominal strength.

As to a Canadian navy, Labour has hardly considered the matter; but so far it fails to see any necessity for this, considering as it does that national security is to be sought through a policy of mutual disarmament rather than through preparedness. At the same time, Labour probably would not oppose a navy nearly so strongly as an army. It might perhaps be hostile on the ground that this was an unnecessary expense, but criticism on that score is much more likely to come from the commercial and professional classes. The average workman pays few direct taxes, and would not have the same personal interest in naval appropriations which other parts of the nation would feel.

No account of Canadian Labour would be complete which did not deal with the influence of the United States. It is almost impossible to overestimate the importance of this. Labour feels no dislike towards the American people, but at the same time has no desire for annexation to the United States. This is due in part to that illogical feeling of patriotism in the working class, and partly to the belief that the American government is more corrupt and capitalist-ridden than the Canadian, and that Labour is more free and more justly treated here. While individual workmen who have gone to the United States have been Americanized, there are many who have remained there twenty or thirty years without changing their nationality. Mr. Gompers, the late President of the American Federation of Labour, writing in 1920, described the relation between Canadian and American Labour as follows:—"Their economic interests are so closely allied that the fact that they live under separate governments does not affect those relations. . . . The relations are most friendly. This has been the fact for many years. Politically the organized Labour movement of Canada is as independent of the United States as the United States is independent of Canada. The autonomy of the workers and of the citizenship of Canada is just as safe from our hands as ours is from theirs". Mr. Johnston, the President of the International Association of Machinists, wrote:—"I do not believe the question of annexation has ever been given any serious consideration by the Canadian trades unions. . . . I am confident that at the present time there is a strong feeling against annexation. I fully concur in what President Gompers said." President Moore expressed himself to the same effect, as did Sir John Willison and Mr. Mackenzie King.

The Canadian Labour movement, like so many other phases of Canadian life, is a compromise between British and American influences. Mr. Coats, the Dominion Statistician, summarized the situation when he wrote that "the history of organized labour and its claims in Canada is in the main the history of an outpost of the larger movements of the United States and Great Britain. Its legislative ideals have taken their inspiration from the mother country, and . . . its working mechanism has been derived from that of the North American continent". That the Canadian should become affiliated with the American unions was inevitable; economic conditions and the problems of the working class are the same in both countries, while they differ widely from those of Great Britain. The organization and methods of the English and Scottish unions have been elaborated to deal with economic conditions which are comparatively static, and are not adapted to a country

where they are still rather in a state of fluctuation. Moreover, by joining the American unions, the Canadian workmen secured the aid of powerful and established organizations with large strike funds, cheap insurance, an international travelling card which admits a Canadian workman in an American city to membership of the local union, and many other benefits. All the trades unions of Great Britain, with the exception of the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters, have now withdrawn from Canada, and arrangements have been made whereby their members on emigrating here are admitted to the corresponding Canadian union with all the privileges in the way of annuities, etc., which they would have enjoyed had they remained at home.

The influence of the trades unions in the United Kingdom, while very important, is hard to describe. It may best be characterized as inspirational. Labour legislation in Canada is largely modelled upon that of Great Britain, yet at the same time it would be very difficult to find any single enactment which is the same as its prototype. The ideas embodied in it are adapted to Canadian conditions. Similarly, Moderate Labour in Canada has borrowed many suggestions from the policy and actions of the Moderates in Great Britain, but has altered them to fit local needs. The presence of many former members of British unions in Canadian organizations has indirectly had an important effect. Until recently the International unions, under the influence of the late President Gompers, have rather discouraged political action. The Canadian unions have been much more active in this respect, and in the opinion of Mr. J. S. Woodsworth and other Labour leaders this is due to the large numbers of British immigrants who had been accustomed to political action at home.

On the question of Imperial Preference the opinion of Labour would probably be divided. Theoretically it is in favour of free trade, and this would still be its attitude in the parts of the country, more especially the West, where imported English goods would not compete with local manufactures. In the manufacturing centres of the East, like Toronto, the workmen would probably support their employers in opposition to a preferential tariff which might endanger their control of the home market. This policy would be dictated, not from any hostility to Great Britain, but purely from the economic motive that if Canadian factories suffered from the competition they might find themselves out of work.

If a Reciprocity Treaty with the United States should again become a political issue as in 1911, the attitude of Labour would probably be the same. American manufacturers control a far

larger share of the Canadian market than do those of Great Britain, partly because the expense of transportation is much less, and in part because they have taken far more pains to study local conditions and adapt their goods to the requirements of the Canadian consumer. Perhaps there might therefore be a certain preference for American manufactures on the ground that they are better suited to the tastes of the people, although there is a wide-spread feeling in Canada that English-made goods are of higher quality and more durable. On the other hand, with lower tariffs the competition of American manufacturers would be much more serious to Canadian factories, so that one might expect Canadian Labour to oppose a Reciprocity Treaty more determinedly than Imperial Preference. In the opinion of Mr. J. H. McVety, formerly President of the Trades and Labour Council of Vancouver, the workman despite his undoubted patriotism would judge the question purely in terms of his own economic interests, and no consideration of strengthening the ties uniting Canada and Great Britain would outweigh these.

Turning to the thorny problem of the share of the Dominions in the control of British foreign policy, one finds the opinion of the working class as inchoate and hard to determine as that of Canadians in general. While there is a feeling that Canada should have a voice in determining foreign policy, the various discussions at Ottawa have aroused but little interest in the country at large. Labour would most probably oppose any proposal for an Imperial parliament which had effective powers, including that of taxation, and was not a mere debating society whose decisions had to be ratified by the Dominion parliaments. It is difficult, however, to speak with certainty, since the question has never become a matter of practical politics. The increasing strength of Canadian national feeling, especially since the war, would at the present time at least be sufficient to defeat such a proposal. It would be feared that the Dominion might compromise its independence by entering a body in which the majority of the members would represent Great Britain. The outlook of Labour would probably be much the same as that of other classes of the population.

As regards Oriental immigration, the working class is uncompromisingly opposed to the entrance of Chinese, Japanese and Indians, and nothing would induce it to alter its attitude. Labour in British Columbia feels much more strongly than in other parts of Canada on this question, since the majority of the Orientals have settled there; but the whole of the working class would support their comrades on the Pacific coast. While, as a rule, class solidari-

ty in Canada is conspicuous by its absence, any proposal to facilitate the entrance of Orientals would be met by a determined and united opposition. No arguments as to the effect which this position has in India would have any influence. It is to the attitude of Labour, more than to any other cause, that the Canadian government's policy of strictly limiting Oriental immigration is due. Many large employers would like to import coolies for work in the mines, constructing railways, etc., but so far no politician has been found who dared to risk his political future by advocating it. Another factor making for the government's attitude is that the population of British Columbia is at one with Labour on this point. About 1919, when thousands of Chinese coolies from France were being repatriated by way of Vancouver, the Chinese consul there tried to persuade local business men to engage 10,000 or 20,000 as contract labourers to build roads, railways, etc., and in general open up the interior to settlement, afterwards returning to China. They were very favourable to the proposal, and quite agreed with him that by this means the development of the province would be advanced by many years; but the suggestion came to nothing, since the government was afraid to pass the necessary legislation.

The Canadian Trades and Labour Congress has abandoned its demand for the total exclusion of Asiatics, and has instead adopted the proposals of Mr. W. R. Trotter of the Typographical Union in Vancouver, whom it regards as its foremost authority on immigration. Mr. Trotter's proposals are that the government should abrogate the existing agreement with Japan, and should abolish the head tax on Chinese and the direct passage subterfuge by which Indians are debarred from Canada. Instead it should admit from each Oriental country one native yearly for every 1,000 inhabitants of Canada; but where a nation already exceeds the prescribed ratio, no more should be admitted until the correct balance is restored. Since British Columbia has more than its due share of Orientals, no more should be allowed to settle there until each of the other provinces had received its fair quota in proportion to its population.

The position of Canadian Labour with regard to immigrants from Great Britain has perhaps been somewhat misunderstood. To those who genuinely intend to go on the land *and remain there* there has never been any opposition; but in the past many who entered the country as farmers have abandoned their holdings and gone to the cities. It cannot be denied that Labour is somewhat hostile to the entrance of manual workers at present, unless they have an assured position, or have sufficient money to maintain

themselves for a time. Otherwise they are compelled to take the first post available, even at an insufficient wage, and thus tend to lower the standard of living. There is far more resistance to immigration from Southern and Central Europe than to that from Great Britain, since the Italian or Russian, for example, is content to work for a wage which the Englishman will reject on the first favourable opportunity. Since Canada is still largely agricultural, the number of men who can be absorbed by its industries is limited, and there is widespread unemployment. The entrance of artisans and other town labourers results merely in keener competition for the insufficient number of posts vacant.

Such attitude of Canadian Labour towards the Empire, unless its patriotism is aroused, is one of indifference and self-absorption rather than hostility, and so far there is no evidence to show that it is learning to take a broader view of Imperial problems. The degree of influence which it can exert upon the government is therefore of interest. Directly this is not very important, although perhaps it has grown somewhat during the past four or five years, owing to the increased efforts which have been made to form a Labour party. However, the two members at Ottawa can hardly have a very decisive effect. In some of the provinces, as for example Ontario, such influence is much greater. The indirect influence of Labour is more important, though as Mr. Mackenzie King, ex-Premier Bowser of British Columbia, Senator Crowe, Mr. J. S. Woodsworth, President Moore and many other members of parliament and Labour leaders have pointed out, it is less powerful than the agricultural, manufacturing or railway interests. This is very largely the result of its lack of class-solidarity. Whether this attitude of Labour will continue, it is difficult to say; but with the rapid growth of the trades unions, one would expect it gradually to diminish.