

## **“Exporting Outcast London” : Assisted Emigration to Canada, 1886-1914\***

by Desmond GLYNN\*\*

*Social imperialism was a doctrine which viewed the Empire as a vehicle for solving pressing social problems in Great Britain. Beginning in the 1880s a number of British philanthropic societies launched schemes of assisted imperial emigration as a means of relieving mass unemployment at home while strengthening the colonies abroad. Some of these agencies enjoyed considerable success and even obtained the patronage and support of the Canadian government; but most failed to establish an official framework through which they could carry out their work. Instead, they found their work proscribed by Canadian authorities because it offended Canadian public opinion. Their lack of success illustrates the institutional and cultural barriers to effective imperial integration.*

*S'inspirant des impérialistes qui voyaient dans le recours à l'Empire la solution aux graves problèmes sociaux que connaissait la Grande-Bretagne, bien des associations philanthropiques élaborèrent, à compter des années 1880, des formules d'aide à l'émigration dans le cadre impérial, pour atténuer le chômage dans la mère-patrie et renforcer le potentiel des colonies. Certaines de ces agences obtinrent un succès considérable et jouèrent même de l'appui des dirigeants canadiens; la plupart cependant n'arrivèrent pas à mettre en place l'appareil institutionnel dont elles auraient eu besoin et se heurtèrent plutôt aux réticences des autorités canadiennes, qui étaient conscientes des susceptibilités de l'opinion en matière d'immigration. Ainsi apparaissent les obstacles, culturels et institutionnels, à la réalisation de l'intégration impériale.*

Studies of British imperialism in the later nineteenth century and the early twentieth have concentrated on the various attempts to create a functionally integrated Empire. These studies have made it clear that imperialists throughout the Empire believed that a high degree of co-operation and interdependence was both desirable and possible. Generally, though, concrete results were hard to come by, as frequently national interests conflicted sharply with imperial goals. The controversy over sending Canadian troops to South Africa, or the acrimonious debate surrounding the contribution of dreadnoughts to the Royal Navy are familiar enough examples. Less familiar, but illustrative of the ways in which national and imperial goals could clash, was the tension generated in Anglo-Canadian relations over Japanese immigration into British Columbia. Repeatedly, the legislature of that province passed laws restricting

\* I would like to thank Profs G. R. Cook and A. V. Tucker of York University, for giving the article a critical reading.

\*\* Open College, Toronto.

the entry of Japanese workers and proscribing their employment in various occupations. Just as frequently official Japanese protests to the imperial government brought successful pressure to bear on the Laurier administration to disallow the offensive legislation. Good relations between the Empire and Japan were fostered, but it was the Liberal Party who paid the political price in British Columbia.<sup>1</sup>

It is a good question whether during these years efforts to achieve imperial co-operation in the area of social policy had any more success. Certainly there was a widespread feeling that the Empire provided a useful mechanism for dealing with pressing social ailments, especially unemployment. By absorbing the "surplus population" the colonies, it was argued, would relieve the dangerous stresses associated with mass unemployment. This was an old idea dating back to the post-Napoleonic era and the schemes of Robert Wilmot Horton, Undersecretary of State for the Colonies. The idea, however, acquired a social imperialist twist in the latter nineteenth century when widespread unemployment in Great Britain again seriously threatened social order. Intra-Empire migration was not viewed as a means of dealing only with unemployment. Many in Great Britain saw it as a way of dealing with a host of social ills, from urban slums to class war. Recently Joy Parr has completed a study on the activities of various British child-saving organizations which used intra-Empire migration as a means of handling the problem of deserted, orphaned children. Between 1869 and 1924, nearly 80,000 such

<sup>1</sup> C. C. BERGER, *Imperial Relations in the Age of Laurier*, Canadian Historical Readings, no. 6 (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1969); S. BUCKLEY, "Attempts at Imperial Economic Co-operation: 1912-1918: Sir Robert Borden's Role", *Canadian Historical Review*, LV (September 1974): 292-306; I. DRUMMOND, *Imperial Economic Policy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1974); N. PENLINGTON, *Canada and Imperialism, 1896-1899* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1965); R. A. PRESTON, *Canada and Imperial Defence Organization, 1867-1919* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967).

For documents relating to Japanese immigration, see CANADA, PARLIAMENT, *Sessional Papers* (Commons) (hereafter CANADA, *Sess. Papers*) 1907-8 (746) XLII, Correspondence between the Government of Canada and Imperial Authorities, and correspondence between the Government of Canada and persons, and all reports in respect to Anglo-Japanese Convention regarding Canada, especially T. Nosse, Consul for Canada, to Hon. Edgar Dewdney, Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia, 19 May 1897; S. Shimizu to Wilfrid Laurier, 14 March 1898; S. Shimizu to Lord Aberdeen, 10 May 1898; J. Chamberlain to Lord Aberdeen, 11 August 1898; and J. Chamberlain to Lord Minto, 23 March 1899. On 29 April 1899 Chamberlain had the following to say to Lord Minto on the subject of anti-Japanese legislation passed by the B.C. Legislature:

Her Majesty's Government earnestly trust that on consideration the British Columbia Government will at once procure ... substitution of legislation on the lines indicated above.

If this is impossible, Her Majesty's Government will feel compelled, however reluctant they may be to cause inconvenience to the provinces, to press upon your ministers the importance in the general interests of the Empire of using the powers vested in them by the British North America Act for cancelling these measures to which Her Majesty's Government object on the grounds of both principle and policy.

On the political impact of federal disallowance see M. ORMSBY, *British Columbia. A History* (Toronto: Macmillan, 1971), p. 352.

children were brought to Canada as apprentices and placed in rural Canadian homes (mostly in Ontario and Quebec) to work as servants.<sup>2</sup> A handful of British philanthropic societies tried to institutionalize imperial immigration specifically to deal with the unemployment question. A few of these organizations have received attention in recent studies of social policy in the late Victorian era, but no systematic research has been done to determine whether these societies had much success promoting the idea of assisted imperial immigration.<sup>3</sup> The experiences of these organizations are worth recounting because they illustrate in yet another way the limitations surrounding that elusive dream of imperial integration.

What were these organizations<sup>4</sup> and why did they make their appearance when they did? Their roots can be traced to the unemployment crisis of the 1880s which exploded in the riots at Trafalgar Square in 1886. Based in London, they were closely linked to the reform movement of that era. The East End Emigration Fund, founded in 1882 by prebendary John Fenwick Kitto, shared an emigration sub-committee with the renowned Charity Organization Society. Adhering to the new liberal outlook that the

<sup>2</sup> J. PARR, *Labouring Children. British Immigrant Apprentices to Canada, 1869-1924* (London: Croom Helm, and Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1980); B. SEMMEL, *Imperialism and Social Reform* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1960), chaps 3 and 6; G. STEDMAN-JONES, *Outcast London* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1971), chap. 18; H. J. M. JOHNSON, *British Emigration Policy 1815-1830, or "Shovelling-Out Paupers"* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972); H. I. COWAN, *British Emigration to North America* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1961); W. A. CARROTHERS, *Emigration from the British Isles* (London: D. S. King and Son, 1929); Arthur HAWKES, *Special Report on Immigration from the United Kingdom to Canada* (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1912).

<sup>3</sup> J. HARRIS, *Unemployment and Politics* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), chaps 3 and 4; B. GILBERT, *The Evolution of National Health Insurance in Great Britain* (London: Michael Joseph, 1966), chap. 5. For earlier references to some of these organizations see CARROTHERS, *Emigration from the British Isles*, chap. 13. The assistance provided by these societies consisted of selling steamship tickets (on commission) and providing emigrants with work. Monetary assistance was restricted to a loan of sufficient funds to purchase passage fare.

<sup>4</sup> The source materials on these organizations are to be found in a number of archives. The Immigration Branch files of the Department of the Interior in the Public Archives of Canada (hereafter PAC), RG 76 are undoubtedly the most valuable source of information. They contain detailed correspondence with nearly all of the British agencies, and various annual reports of these agencies which cannot be found elsewhere. The files of the Immigration Branch's imperial opposite — the Emigrants Information Office — apparently do not exist. A thorough search at the Public Record Office failed to find them. The Greater London Record Office has the minute books of the Central (Unemployed) Body's Emigration Committee as well as the Central Body's annual reports; its files and voluminous case records were not kept. The Local Government Board exercised a paternal supervision of the work of the Central Body by requiring periodic reports, which unfortunately were destroyed — as were many of the Local Government Board papers for the years 1900-14 — by "enemy bombing" during World War II. The British Library has most of the periodical literature published by the private societies as well as many of their annual reports, but most of the societies did not leave their private papers in repositories. Quality Court in Chancery Lane, London has no record of the East End Emigration Fund (renamed the British Dominions Emigration Society in 1912), the Self-Help Emigration Society, the Church Emigration Society or the Central Emigration Board. The Salvation Army papers for this period were lost in a fire. The Church Army papers are not open to inspection.

deserving unemployed were entitled to social assistance free of the poor law stigma, the Fund was acutely aware of the demoralizing effects of prolonged unemployment and sensitive to the social delinquency which accompanied it.<sup>5</sup> The Church Emigration Society did not like to view itself as a reclamation agency, but periodically it co-operated with the Charity Organization Society and eventually came to the conclusion that assisted emigration was a singularly potent means of dealing with the explosive employment question.<sup>6</sup> The Self-Help Emigration Society grew out of the settlement work of the London Congregational Union. Wilson Gates, the London Congregational Union's superintendent of philanthropy organized the Society in response to the publication of Andrew Mearn's *The Bitter Cry of Outcast London* (1883). The Society was an advocate of state-subsidized colonization and sought to combine this with assisted emigration as a means of arresting the degeneracy associated with urban unemployment.<sup>7</sup> The Central Emigration Society and the National Association for Promoting State Colonization did not assist emigrants financially; instead they saw their role as publicists.<sup>8</sup> Two additional organizations require introduction: the Salvation Army and the Church Army. Although these organizations were not created to act as agencies for social reform or to serve as vehicles of assisted emigration,<sup>9</sup> they became closely involved with both. Demonstrations of the unemployed, such as the one which had led to the riots at Trafalgar Square, worried prebendary Wilson Carlisle, the founder of the Church Army. They were, he averred, "a prostitution of manhood" as well as a threat to the social fabric.<sup>10</sup> Trafalgar convinced General William Booth, the founder of the Salvation Army, that his organization would have to

<sup>5</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1884-85, 1894, 1903*. This society saw a direct connection between "enforced idleness" and potential threats to property; its telegraphic code was "Crimeless London". For some details of its connections with the Charity Organization Society, see Greater London Record Office (hereafter GLRO), Charity Organization Society Emigration Sub-Committee Minutes, 25 February 1898. For an account of the Trafalgar Square disturbances see GILBERT, *Evolution of National Health Insurance*, chap. 3.

<sup>6</sup> This society was founded in 1886. See *Annual Report of the Church Emigration Society, 1907*; also "The Advance of Canada", *Quarterly Notes*, no. 6 (April 1903); and "The Emigration of Pauper Children", *Quarterly Notes*, no. 14 (April 1905).

<sup>7</sup> This organization was founded in 1884. See *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report for the Year 1893, 1895, 1896 and 1907*; Rev. Robert MACKAY, *New Homes in Canada* (London: Self-Help Emigration Society, 1889).

<sup>8</sup> *Emigrants Information Office Handbook No. 12* (April 1890), pp. 39-43. This handbook contains a useful directory of the various private and public agencies engaged in emigration work in Great Britain.

<sup>9</sup> P. SANDALL, *The History of the Salvation Army* (London: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1955); A. E. REFFOLD, *Wilson Carlisle and the Church Army* (London: The Church Army Bookroom, 1926).

<sup>10</sup> Wilson CARLISLE, "London's Unemployed", *Church Army Quarterly Paper* (Spring 1903). In the same issue, see J. WILCOCKSON, "The Unemployed and the Unemployable". See also "The Unemployed and the New Act", *Church Army Quarterly Paper* (Autumn 1905).

become involved with the social question if it were to have any contemporary relevance.<sup>11</sup>

Specifically, these organizations belonged to the social imperialist wing of the British reform movement. The Self-Help Emigration Society prided itself on the interrelated functions performed by imperial immigration: "it benefitted those who were assisted; it saved the ratepayer from an additional roll of paupers and bestowed a great boon on the Colonies by providing them with workers of the stamp needed." Indeed, for some of the social activists working for the Society, assisted emigration was a necessary precondition for success at home: "The greatest reforms will not be possible in our own country", said Rev. F. W. Newland of Canning Town, "until the pressure of existence is partially removed and the submerged section of our population no longer clogs the wheels of progress."<sup>12</sup> The East End Emigration Fund took a similar imperialist approach:

Judiciously assisted emigration has no superior as an agency for thorough relief of distress, while at the same time it helps retain within the British Empire a hardworking desirable class of loyal citizens, families who will not forget their country or their Sovereign ... By this means we may still further strengthen ... that pride of race, that unity of sentiment and purpose, and that feeling of common loyalty and obligation which knit together and can alone maintain the integrity of our Empire.<sup>13</sup>

To the East End Emigration Fund all other remedies for dealing with unemployment were transitory and unworkable; emigration would always remain "the one practical solution of our national difficulty of dealing with surplus labour".

In emigration matters the Church Army was disposed to "think imperially" and it thought of the colonies as being "every bit as much a part of the Empire as Yorkshire or Kent". Like the East End Emigration Fund and the Self-Help Emigration Society the Church Army saw intra-Empire migration as the only long-term solution to unemployment: "Surely this transferment [*sic*] of the surplus population whither it is needed is the real solution to the problem. For entire success it only requires to be carried out on a grand scale." With a flair for encapsulation, its *Quarterly Paper* put the matter this way: "Emigration is the

<sup>11</sup> For an incisive contemporary analysis of Booth's ideas and the genesis of the social gospel outlook of the Salvation Army see W. T. STEAD, "The Salvation Army and its Social Scheme", *Review of Reviews* (November 1890). For some samples on the Army's outlook on the employment question see "The Unemployable and Wont-Work", *The Salvation Army Year Book for 1906*; "The Gospel of Work at the Hadleigh", *All the World — A monthly record of the operations of the Salvation Army*, XXIII (December 1902); "The Salvation Army's Colonies", *All the World*, XXVI (August 1905); "The Government and Emigration", *The Emigration Gazette — the Official Organ of the Salvation Army's Emigration Department*, no. 2 (November 1906).

<sup>12</sup> *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report for the Year 1893, and 1901*. For the Church Emigration Society, see "Parochial Imperialism", *Quarterly Notes*, no. 14 (April 1905).

<sup>13</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1903*, p. 3.

imperial solution to the national problem of the unemployed".<sup>14</sup> The social imperialist theme was an integral motif of the reform thought of all these organizations. Of course, it was frequently highlighted as a means of soliciting public support: the East End Emigration Fund, for example, always emphasized the fact that only people who intended migrating within the Empire received assistance. There is no reason to doubt, however, that these organizations saw the Empire as an indispensable mechanism for alleviating pressing domestic social problems.

Although the disturbances at Trafalgar Square made the idea of assisted emigration appear attractive it was not successfully utilized in the following years despite the initial victory of pressuring the Colonial Office to create the Emigrants Information Office in 1886. James Rankin, MP, Chairman of the Central Emigration Society, and Walter Hazell, MP, Treasurer of the Self-Help Emigration Society, were appointed to the Managing Committee of the Emigrants Information Office; but the Colonial Office resisted every attempt to make the Emigrants Information Office into anything more than a trustworthy information bureau. In 1896 Rankin submitted a report calling for a more streamlined administration of the Office; a modernization of its methods of collecting and disseminating data about the international labour market; the active participation of colonial representatives; and finally placing the Office in charge of any emigration initiated by the county councils or the imperial government. The report was largely ignored; Joseph Chamberlain refused to permit the Colonial Office to pay for as much as the additional rent that colonial representation on the Office would entail.<sup>15</sup>

Also disappointing were the attempts to link land colonization with assisted emigration. Labour-intensive agriculture, these societies belatedly discovered, was no longer financially self-supporting; inevitably land colonization was a failure.<sup>16</sup> H. W. L. Lawson, a Colonial Office representative on the Managing Committee of the Emigrants Information

<sup>14</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1894*; "Tightest England and a Way Out", *Church Army Quarterly Paper* (Spring 1905); "Children, Money and Empire", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 12 (Summer 1912); "Empire Calvinism", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 16 (March 1914); F. A. MCKENZIE, *Waste Humanity* (London, 1908), chap. 4; "The Army as Empire Builder", *Reports on the Social Work of the Salvation Army 1908-1909; Charity Organization Society Emigration Sub-Committee Report, 1893*.

<sup>15</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 2723, Report of the Committee of Inquiry into the Working of the Emigrants Information Office, 16 April 1896; *The Times*, 28 July 1896; for the response of Canadian authorities see PAC, RG 76, File 4730, Correspondence dated 8 July 1896 to 9 September 1896.

<sup>16</sup> GREAT BRITAIN, *Parliamentary Papers* (Commons) (hereafter *Parl. Papers*) 1896 (321) IX, Select Committee on Distress from Want of Employment, Report and Minutes of Evidence, testimony of Wilson Gates, p. 387. And *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report for the Year 1893*, and 1906. The Society continued to maintain its colony at Langley as a "Test Farm" and agricultural training centre. The Salvation Army and the Church Army also continued with the idea though aware it was commercially unfeasible. See "Colonists and Colonies — Hadleigh's Coming of Age", *All the World*, XXXIII (November 1912); "Springtime at Hadleigh", *All the World*, XXVI (April 1905); "Back to the Land", *Church Army Quarterly Paper* (Spring 1903).

Office, reported as much after a fact-finding tour of the Dominion in 1894:

All schemes of state-directed colonization formulated in England have not prospered. The failure of the Crofter experiment was generally acknowledged and the East London settlement is a case in point. It is doubtful if it is ever wise to plant home-bred people in isolated communities ... Canadian experience seems to decisively condemn this kind of philanthropic plan.<sup>17</sup>

As economic growth revived in Great Britain during the nineties the pressure to establish schemes of assisted emigration, state-supported or otherwise, lessened greatly. Emigration to the Dominion receded throughout the decade and this was reflected in the work of the societies which became virtually moribund.<sup>18</sup>

The acute depression which followed the Boer War changed all this as unemployment again became one of the most contentious issues in domestic politics. The downturn in the British economy coincided with a sharp upswing in the Canadian and created the preconditions for a massive increase in emigration to the Dominion. The take-off appears to have been 1905 after several years of declining wages and searing economic distress in Great Britain.<sup>19</sup>

These economic factors fuelled what developed into the greatest trans-Atlantic migration of British emigrants ever to occur. Some note should be taken of the campaign undertaken by the Department of the Interior's Immigration Branch to recruit British emigrants. The basic premiss of the campaign was that mass advertisement of Canada was crucial if British emigrants were to be attracted to the Dominion. The policy was to market Canada in much the same way as a commercial

<sup>17</sup> *Emigrants Information Office Annual Report, 1894*, p. 16.

<sup>18</sup> The Central Emigration Society and the National Association for Promoting State Colonization disappeared during the nineties, see *Emigration Statutes and General Handbook No. 12* (April 1912). The Salvation Army and the Church Army do not appear to have sent emigrants to Canada during the nineties, see SANDALL, *History of the Salvation Army*, p. 43; PAC, RG 76, File 17480, Correspondence between the Salvation Army and the Department of the Interior's Immigration Branch for July 1893; REFFOLD, *Wilson Carlisle*, p. 37. The East End Emigration Fund and the Self-Help Emigration Society remained active. Between 1882 and 1899 the Fund sent 5,623 abroad, the majority to Canada. *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1899*. Various annual reports provide the following figures for 1884-85: 1,104; 1894: 258; 1899: 96; 1900: 150; 1901: 189; 1902: 340. Between 1884 and 1893 the Self-Help Emigration Society sent 4,551 abroad, the majority to Canada. *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report for the Year 1893*. Various annual reports yield the following figures for 1885: 64; 1886: 214; 1887: 404; 1895: 234; 1898: 188; 1901: 192; 1902: 309. For figures on British emigration overseas see G. PLANT, *Overseas Settlement: Migration from the United Kingdom to the Dominions* (London: Oxford University Press, 1953). N. H. CARRIER and J. P. JEFFERY, *External Migration 1814-1950: a study of the available statistics*, General Register Office Studies on Medical and Population Subjects, no. 6 (London: HMSO, 1953). *Emigrants Information Office Annual Report, 1895, 1897 and 1899*.

<sup>19</sup> *Emigrants Information Office Annual Report, 1902 to 1905; Board of Trade Memorandum on the Position of Employment and Trade at the Beginning of 1906*; "The Unemployed and Emigration", *The Church Army Review* (November 1906); "The Home Labour Market", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 2 (January 1907); *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1907*; HARRIS, *Unemployment and Politics*.

product through extensive publicity reiterated in a variety of media, but mainly newspapers. "I am convinced", wrote James Smart, the Deputy Minister of the Interior, "that we may expect returns from our work ... just in proportion to the amount of common sense business advertisement that we undertake."<sup>20</sup> In August 1902 newspapermen from the *London Daily News*, *Daily Mail*, *Daily Telegraph* and *Daily Chronicle*, as well as reporters from the *Manchester Guardian*, the *Liverpool Post* and the *Glasgow Herald* were given a tour of the great North-West so they would write favourably about it when they returned home.<sup>21</sup>

Within the overseas offices of the Immigration Branch the opportunities afforded by the growth of imperialist sentiment — especially in the context of the Boer War — were not overlooked. Alfred Jury, the Canadian immigration agent stationed in Liverpool, urged that "the present is the most opportune time to get a hold of the English market because of the kindly feeling of this country toward Canada on account of her sending troops to South Africa and the preference given on English goods in our markets".<sup>22</sup> "The spirit of imperialism so much in evidence", concurred H. M. Murray, the Glasgow agent, "presented a unique opportunity for educating the English people about the possibilities of Canada".<sup>23</sup> Indeed it did and orchestrating the chorus of imperialist fever to maximum advantage became the means by which the Immigration Branch made the most of their advertisement campaign. Essay competitions promoted in British schools and designed to "remove groundless ... deeply rooted prejudices about the climate and potentialities of Canada" also stressed the importance of intra-Empire migration. As well, "the idea of lining up certain individuals and institutions like the clergy of the Established Church, headmasters of elementary and secondary schools, the public libraries, workingmen's institutes, the parish and village reading rooms" in order to develop "good connections" was accomplished by "advocating the immigration to Canada on national and imperial grounds". The erection of the Canadian Arch in London to celebrate the coronation of Edward VII "was received with the greatest appreciation by the British public and press", said James Smart, but "no other idea had been present ... than that of broadly advertising the Dominion". "There can be no doubt", he enthused, "that the Arch, a relief of Canadian products, has brought more clearly to the minds of the British public the vast resources and possibilities of the Dominion than had ever been done or is likely to be done under ordinary circumstances."<sup>24</sup>

<sup>20</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1903 (25) XXXVII, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Immigration Branch), Report of the Deputy Minister of the Interior, p. xlix.

<sup>21</sup> *Ibid.*, Report of the Superintendent of Immigration, p. 8.

<sup>22</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1901 (25) XXXV, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Immigration Branch), Report of the High Commissioner, p. 10, and Report of Alfred Jury, p. 29.

<sup>23</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1902 (25) XXXVI, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Immigration Branch), Report of H. M. Murray, p. 17.

<sup>24</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1903 (25) XXXVII, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Immigration Branch), Report of the Deputy Minister of the Interior, p. 9.



It would be easy to characterize this campaign as cynical but it is probably more accurate to describe it as opportunistic. For there can be little doubt it appealed to grass roots sentiments on both sides of the Atlantic. In Canada there was a decided preference for British immigrants, especially after the initial reaction to Sifton's policy of recruiting south-central Europeans. Frank Oliver, Sifton's successor as Interior minister, spoke for most Anglo-Canadians when he declared in the House in 1902:

It is necessary that settlement should be as much as possible of people not only much like ourselves but altogether like ourselves ... in other words that we should draw upon the British islands as much as possible ... and that every effort should be made to attract immigration from the British Isles.<sup>25</sup>

In Great Britain, of course, the Immigration Branch's message fell on welcome ears as far as the London organizations were concerned. At last, the colonies understood the utility of British emigrants.

The post-war emigration boom gave an enormous impetus to the work of these societies. This was especially true of the Salvation Army: from 1904 to 1907 nearly 32,000 men and their families travelled to the Dominion under its auspices.<sup>26</sup> A pioneer advocate of labour exchanges the Army established them on a trans-Atlantic basis with forty full-time officers stationed in Canada. Thus there was no secret to the Army's success providing as it did invaluable services to emigrants ignorant of how to arrange passage or how to secure employment abroad.<sup>27</sup> The Army's extensive operation attracted the attention of James Smart who was impressed with the services that the Army might economically perform for the Immigration Branch in recruiting and

<sup>25</sup> CANADA, PARLIAMENT, *House of Commons Debates*, II (1902): 3744. G. R. COOK and R. C. BROWN, *Canada 1896-1921: A Nation Transformed* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), chap. 4.

<sup>26</sup> It is impossible to determine with any exactitude how many emigrants crossed the Atlantic under the auspices of the Salvation Army; nor can it be determined how many were assisted to Canada and how many bought tickets from the Army simply because it appeared to be trustworthy. In all likelihood most emigrants just used the Army as shipping agents. My figures are tabulated from several sources found in PAC, RG 76, File 17480, correspondence. For the year ending 30 June 1905, 3,097 were brought across: see correspondence in March 1906 relating to questions raised in the House of Commons by Wilson Uriah, MP, and correspondence in May and June of the same year relating to questions raised by Ralph Smith, MP. In "Passing Comments on Last Years Work", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 1 (November 1906), the Army claimed to have sent across 17,000 emigrants in the previous three years, 12,000 of whom emigrated in 1906. In 1907, 15,000 had crossed to Canada, 3,015 of whom were assisted cases, according to "Organized Emigration", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 4 (September 1907). In the *Toronto News* of 11 August 1908 the Army claimed to have brought across 40,000 emigrants in the previous four years.

<sup>27</sup> See articles in *The Emigration Gazette*: "Our Information Bureau", no. 1 (November 1906); "The Army as an Emigration Force", no. 2 (January 1907); "Organized Emigration", no. 3 (March 1907); "Col. Lamb's Trip", no. 4 (September 1907). See also in *All the World*: "Emigration to Canada", XXVI (March 1905), and "Our Emigration Scheme", XXV (March 1904).

distributing British newcomers.<sup>28</sup> The arrangement entered into between the Immigration Branch and the Army required the latter to place advertisements in its newspapers the *War Cry* and the *Social Gazette*, each of which had a press run of 250,000 copies, promoting emigration to the Dominion. The Army was also to distribute official immigration literature and to conduct a lecture tour in Great Britain. In return, the Immigration Branch subsidized the rent of the Army's London office; financed an emigration periodical edited by the Salvationists; placed the Army on the Department's bonus-earning list; and finally gave a general purpose grant-in-aid to its emigration work. Beginning in 1903 the agreement was renewed annually with the result that the Army became an integral part of the overseas operations of the Immigration Branch.<sup>29</sup>

The other societies also formed important functional links with the Immigration Branch for it was thought that they too could be of use. They were placed on the bonus list and invited to link their work with the newly-installed system of commercial employment agents commissioned by the Immigration Branch to recruit agriculturalists for rural Ontario.<sup>30</sup> The Immigration Branch was not wrong to see in the societies a practical mechanism for recruiting newcomers. During the years 1904-7 the Self-Help Emigration Society dispatched nearly 3,000 emigrants to the Dominion.<sup>31</sup> During the same time the Church Army launched a vigorous emigration campaign in British newspapers and raised the funds to assist 4,000 cases.<sup>32</sup> The Church Emigration Society began publishing a quarterly devoted almost entirely to emigration and sent as many as 700 annually

<sup>28</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 17480, James Smart to W. T. R. Preston, 2 November 1903. The Army had previously solicited the Department of the Interior for assistance but had been refused: J. M. Burgess to T. Mayne Daly, 4 July 1895, and James Smart to Frederick Booth Tucker, 4 April 1902.

<sup>29</sup> *Ibid.*, Memorandum for Mr. Preston signed by Smart, no date. The file does not indicate how much the Army was paid for the fiscal year 1904-5; for the fiscal year 1905-6 it was granted £20 per month for office expenses, £2,000 for a lecture tour, and \$1,000 for distribution of immigrants in Western Canada. By October 1906 the arrangements became quite substantial as Commissioner Coombs laid proposals before Frank Oliver for which the Army requested £3,500. Asked to evaluate the Army's emigration plans for 1907 J. B. Walker, the Superintendent of Emigration in London, reported he was "deeply impressed with the quality and importance of the work which the Army is undertaking ... [and which is] ... assuredly calculated to bring us results much greater in proportion to cost than we could expect through the means of any other organization" (J. B. Walker to W. D. Scott, 5 December 1906, and Commissioner Coombs to Frank Oliver, 26 October 1906); Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 13 December 1906; Memorandum to His Excellency the Governor-General in Council, 23 March 1907, signed by Frank Oliver; Extract from a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 6 April 1907.

<sup>30</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 504791, Wilson Carlisle to W. D. Scott, 24 April 1906; File 3440, W. D. Scott to Wilson Gates, 17 February 1905; File 6775, W. D. Scott to W. A. Burris, 10 April 1907.

<sup>31</sup> *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report for the Year 1903, 1904, 1905, 1906 and 1907.*

<sup>32</sup> "Land Colonies at Home and Abroad", *Church Army Quarterly Paper* (Autumn 1905); "The Unemployed and Emigration", *Church Army Review* (Summer 1906); "The Emigration Season of 1907", *Church Army Review* (August 1907); "Some Emigration Figures", *Church Army Review* (February 1908).

to the Dominion.<sup>33</sup> Among the London societies the East End Emigration Fund experienced the greatest expansion: 13,000 persons were assisted between the years 1903 and 1907 and its annual budget grew from a modest £4,403 to £42,360.<sup>34</sup> Two interrelated factors explain the Fund's startling development: the close relationship with the Charity Organization Society and the implementation of the Unemployed Workmen's Act of 1905. Firstly the Fund acted as a conduit for the Charity Organization Society's emigration sub-committee and its district committees, forty of which were distributed throughout Metropolitan London. This association provided both money and emigrants. In 1907, for example, two-thirds of the 6,000 assisted cases came from the area worked jointly by the Fund and the Charity Organization Society, while one-third of the budget was subscribed by the latter and the district committees.<sup>35</sup> The association had further implications which became manifest with the establishment of the Central (Unemployed) Body. The Central Body was created to supervise the work of the London Distress Committees formed under the Unemployed Workmen's Act.<sup>36</sup> Immediately after its formation, its emigration committee was presented with a paradoxical problem. Although the Act recognized the need to provide assistance to the deserving unemployed, it was argued by some that to do so would "lead to the creation of a separate class of emigrants who if dealt with by an Unemployed Organization would not only not be helped by such an association but whose chances of success might thereby be seriously handicapped".<sup>37</sup> The emigration committee was thus persuaded to invite the city's emigration societies to submit their terms of co-operation. The decision was an important victory for the Fund, which was given considerable control over the work of the emigration committee as well as access to substantial fiscal support.<sup>38</sup>

Gradually, though, the emigration committee emerged as an independent and important factor in the emigration picture. Rev. H. Russell Wakefield, Chairman of the Central Body, believed as a matter of principle that the connection should be severed.<sup>39</sup> In February 1907 Central Body officials asked W. D. Scott, the Superintendent of Immigration in Ottawa what co-operation would be possible between the Central Body and the Immigration Branch. Scott then instructed J. B. Walker, the Assistant Superintendent of Emigration in London, to

<sup>33</sup> *Annual Report of the Church Emigration Society, 1907.*

<sup>34</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration, 1903-7.*

<sup>35</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1907.*

<sup>36</sup> *Preliminary Report upon the Work of the Central (Unemployed) Body for London (Unemployed Workmen's Act, 1905) to May 12, 1906, p. 34.*

<sup>37</sup> GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 10 December 1905.

<sup>38</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1906; Preliminary Report upon the Work of the Central (Unemployed) Body ... to May 12, 1906, p. 30.*

<sup>39</sup> GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 10 December 1905; *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, p. 44.

investigate the Central Body. Walker pacified his superior with the assurance that "a rigid selection of the cases selected is maintained".<sup>40</sup> The Central Body was placed on the bonus list and in March Walker appeared before the emigration committee to request that it also work with the commissioned employment agents.<sup>41</sup> In the summertime Walter Hazell, who was chairman of the emigration committee, journeyed to the Dominion with a small deputation to investigate how their charges were progressing and to explore the possibility of an independent distribution system. He returned satisfied with having found one. In November Scott wrote to confirm the arrangements reached in his office. Henceforth, immigration officials at the ports of entry would handle landing money for Central Body cases and direct them to places of employment.<sup>42</sup> For the first time, albeit at a bureaucratic level, government agencies had joined forces.

This was as far as it got, however, despite renewed efforts to interest colonial and imperial authorities in a system of state-subsidized colonization and emigration. In early 1905 Alfred Lyttleton, the Colonial Secretary, appointed H. Rider Haggard to investigate the Salvation Army's experimental farm colonies in the United States. He was instructed to proceed to Canada after his tour to discuss the subject with Lord Grey, the Canadian Governor-General, who was to put him in touch with those Canadian officials best able to provide advice as to the applicability of the scheme in the Dominion. Haggard was impressed with what he saw and reported that it could be carried out on a much larger scale with the combined efforts of the imperial government, the societies engaged in assisted emigration and the Canadian government — from whom he believed he had received encouragement.<sup>43</sup> By the time Haggard's report was delivered Lyttleton was gone and the Colonial Office, still soured on the idea of planned colonization, expressed no interest in getting involved. In time-honoured style the report was passed on to an inter-departmental committee headed by Lord Tennyson for further study. The Tennyson Committee's evaluation was very negative; reviewing past attempts as far back as the Colonial Land and Emigration Commission and the more recent ones such as the Barr Colony fiasco in Saskatchewan, it unanimously rejected Haggard's recommendations.<sup>44</sup> The committee, which was staffed by many people from the Emigrants

<sup>40</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 604526, W. T. Stutchbury to W. D. Scott, 7 February 1907, and J. B. Walker to W. D. Scott, 21 February 1907; GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 4 February 1907.

<sup>41</sup> GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 25 February 1907; *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, p. 44.

<sup>42</sup> PAC, RG 76 File 604526, W. D. Scott to W. Hazell, 19 November 1907; GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 2 December 1907.

<sup>43</sup> *Parl. Papers* 1905 [Cd 2562] LXXVI, Report on the Salvation Army Colonies in the United States and at Hadleigh, England, pp. ii-xxx.

<sup>44</sup> *Parl. Papers* 1906 [Cd 2978] LXXVI, Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to consider Mr. Haggard's Report on Agricultural Settlements in British Colonies, p. 533.

Information Office, had its own particular drum to beat and closed its report by making a pitch for a much expanded role for the Emigrants Information Office in supervising the work of the Distress Committees formed under the Unemployed Workmen's Act. These committees, it suggested, should receive a parliamentary grant subject to accepting advice from the Office as to where emigrants should go; alternatively, an annual grant for five years should be paid to the Office to oversee the passage of suitable emigrants. In either event, it wanted the name of the Emigrants Information Office changed to the "Emigration Office" and that it "be more recognized than it is now as part of the central machinery of government". Finally it endorsed the payment of salaries to members of the Office.<sup>45</sup>

There was little likelihood that this piece of jobbery would be implemented either. "To benefit individuals", observed Herbert Samuel, one of two dissenting commissioners on the Tennyson Committee, "is the part of Philanthropists; it is an axiom of public finance that national funds ought only to be spent to secure a national advantage. In this case I do not see that any national advantage appears." "Assistance is in effect", added H. C. M. Lambert, the other dissenting commissioner who was a Colonial Office representative to the Emigrants Information Office and Chairman of its Managing Committee, "granting a privilege to those who leave the country at the expense of those who remain."<sup>46</sup> When the Tennyson Committee Report was tabled in the House of Commons, Winston Churchill, the Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, promised only that state-subsidized emigration would form one of the subjects of discussion at the forthcoming Imperial Conference.<sup>47</sup> Clearly, the Colonial Office was keeping the advocates of assisted emigration at arm's length.

So too was the Liberal government of Campbell-Bannerman as evidenced by the single session allocated to the topic of assisted emigration at the Imperial Conference of 1907. There Alfred Deakin, the Australian Prime Minister, took the lead in pressing for a system of state-supported emigration which oddly enough was to take the shape of subsidies to the steamship lines. Displeased with the work of the Emigrants Information Office, he proposed that it should be linked with that of the Central Emigration Board — a successor to the Central Emigration Society — which came into existence in November 1906.<sup>48</sup> The Board was impressed with the centralized federalism of the Central Body and sought to improve upon it by amalgamating all organizations in the emigration field into "a unified, non-sectarian body working along lines of

<sup>45</sup> Ibid. See also *Emigrants Information Office Report*, 1906.

<sup>46</sup> *Parl. Papers* 1906 [Cd 2978] LXXVI, Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to consider Mr. Haggard's Report on Agricultural Settlements in British Colonies, Minutes of Evidence, pp. 561-62.

<sup>47</sup> *Emigrants Information Office Report*, 1906, p. 28.

<sup>48</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1907-8 (58) XLII, Colonial Conference Minutes of Meeting on Emigration, p. 155.

national utility ... whose machinery [would] be open to all classes and all public bodies desiring to put into effect their statutory powers relating to emigration".<sup>49</sup> Its president was the Duke of Sutherland; Sir Clement Kinloch-Cooke, a politically astute Unionist MP, was chairman; the ubiquitous Walter Hazell sat on the executive as did Deakin and a sprinkling of colonial officials. The Board was the most ambitious attempt yet at creating a system of imperial labour exchanges. The loquacious Deakin monopolized the floor at the session on emigration, but Laurier, characteristically, went to the core of the matter when he observed that while Canada had always conducted her own immigration affairs it went without saying she would welcome financial assistance from Great Britain. This remark was enough to end real discussion of the whole business. John Burns, the new president of the Local Government Board, brusquely reminded everyone that it was the settled policy of Parliament not to vote state funds for emigration to any or all of the colonies. Lord Elgin, the Colonial Secretary, who chaired the meeting promised Deakin only that he would take his suggestions "under advisement".<sup>50</sup> As it turned out the Imperial Conference of 1907 was as close as the advocates of state-supported emigration were to get; at the following conference four years later assisted imperial immigration was a dead issue. What occurred in the intervening years illustrates well the vagaries of imperial co-operation.

The rapid expansion of these organizations' work caused serious problems and W. D. Scott had repeatedly to issue reprimands concerning methods of selection and distribution. In the spring of 1907 several score of Salvation Army cases were inadvertently sent to a strike-bound mine in Cape Breton and ended up stranded and without work in Sydney, Nova Scotia. The incident was raised in the British House of Commons and provoked an official inquiry from Winston Churchill.<sup>51</sup>

Stranded immigrants were a prickly issue. Municipalities argued vigorously that they were the responsibility of the Dominion government. In 1902 and 1906 the Immigration Act had been amended to give municipal governments greater powers to deport indigent newcomers with less than two years' residency.<sup>52</sup> Scott felt strongly enough about this matter

<sup>49</sup> *First Annual Report of the Central Emigration Board, 1907.*

<sup>50</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers 1907-8* (58) XLII, Colonial Conference Minutes of Meeting on Emigration, pp. 177, 185. See also British Library, Add. Mss, vol. xliv, Burns Diary, Mss 46,324: "Laurier and others tired of Deakin ... Dr. Jameson bored with the whole thing ... Laurier by far the best man" (25 April 1907).

<sup>51</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 17840, Lord Elgin to Lord Grey, 27 March 1907, and Richard Hickey to W. D. Scott, 21 May 1907; File 604526, W. D. Scott to J. B. Walker, 26 April 1907; File 6775, W. D. Scott to M. Marquette, 23 May 1905; File 591428, W. D. Scott to Sir Clement Kinloch-Cooke, 23 April 1907; File 604526, W. Stutchbury to J. B. Walker, 27 May 1907; *Toronto Globe*, 16 May 1906.

<sup>52</sup> CANADA, PARLIAMENT, *House of Commons Debates*, II (1902): 3736-40; CANADA, *Sess. Papers 1906* (25) XL, Annual Report of the Department of Interior (Immigration Branch), Report of the Chief Medical Inspector, p. 161; 1906-7 (25) XLI, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Immigration Branch), Report of the Chief Medical Inspector, p. 124.

to bring it to the attention of M. Jones, chief clerk to the Emigrants Information Office, when this official visited Ottawa in the autumn of 1907. When Jones returned to London he circulated a memorandum containing Scott's "candid advice" regarding unsuitable immigrants to all the agencies engaged in assisted emigration. The most difficult case was that "of the man with no particular trade with a single wife [*sic*] and a young family of more than one or two children". These were cases, Jones pointed out, "in which great hardship is likely to be endured and the sending of such families should be discouraged in the highest degree". One such family had been in the immigration depot in Quebec City for six weeks.<sup>53</sup> Scott also instructed Walker to "impress upon the societies in the strongest language at your command the necessity of securing ... only the classes which the Department is attempting to induce to come here ... the trouble with a large proportion of those brought is that they refuse to accept work outside towns".<sup>54</sup> In future the societies were not to give cards of introduction to those unwilling to engage as farm labourers.

The sharp recession of 1907-8 brought this entire issue to a head. The financial panic notwithstanding critics blamed the massive unemployment on Ottawa's expansionist immigration policy for most of the unemployed were immigrants.<sup>55</sup> "Throughout the country", observed Castile Hopkins, editor of *The Canadian Annual Review*, "certain changes took place in the official and popular attitude toward this question. From a wide open country ... the Dominion became cautious in its policy. Farmers were still welcome but as to the rest the crowded towns and heavily-taxed charities spoke forcibly."<sup>56</sup> In this atmosphere complaints surfaced everywhere about the contribution of the London societies to the crisis. In Woodstock, Ont. a public meeting passed a resolution demanding the restriction of assisted emigration. The citizens of Chatham were furious at the refusal of some hundred Central Body cases to accept farm work after they had applied for civic relief.<sup>57</sup> Commentators did not make the distinction, believed important by the East End Emigration Fund, between the assistance provided by an "Unemployed Organization" and that proffered by a scientific charity.

<sup>53</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 604526, W. D. Scott to J. B. Walker, 14 December 1907, and W. D. Scott to M. Jones, 7 September 1907; *The Times*, 21 November 1907.

<sup>54</sup> *Ibid.*, File 752538, W. D. Scott to J. B. Walker, 14 December 1907.

<sup>55</sup> ONTARIO LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY, *Sessional Papers* (hereafter *ONTARIO, Sess. Papers*) 1916 (56) XLVIII, Ontario Commission on Unemployment Report, Comments of Vincent Bavesi, Chief of Staff of the Bureau of Municipal Research, p. 312.

<sup>56</sup> "Canadian Immigration and National Development", *The Canadian Annual Review*, 8 (1908), p. 118.

<sup>57</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 604526, L. M. Fortier to J. O. Smith, 28 February 1908; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 22 April 1911; letter of W. O. O'Brien, undated (April 1911); File 752538, S. Arnold to Frank Oliver, 9 March 1908; W. H. Baugh to W. D. Scott, 27 April 1908; Public Archives of Ontario, Whitney Papers, John Morrison, City Clerk, Woodstock to J. P. Whitney, 4 March 1908; *The News* (Toronto), 28 February 1908; *Mail and Empire* (Toronto), 11 and 26 March 1908.

It does not matter much ... whether the money which brings an emigrant here ... is furnished by the state or subscribed by charitably disposed persons. The fact we have had a weakling dumped upon us is the same in both cases and long ago we gave up the system of state-aided immigration.<sup>58</sup>

The idea that the "teeming masses" of London's infamous East End were being funnelled into the Dominion under the guise of philanthropy horrified many. The mayor of Oshawa complained directly to Frank Oliver, now Minister of the Interior, about the situation there where charity-aided cases flatly rejected farm work in lieu of municipal relief.<sup>59</sup> At this point a departmental investigation was set in motion which had serious consequences for the London societies. On 31 December 1907 Scott wrote to Walker that "in view of the difficulty we are now meeting with in this country ... and the fact that one half of those who are public charges, or likely to become so, were sent through one or other of the charitable organizations, I think it would be well to find out just how their operations are carried out."<sup>60</sup>

Walker's report arrived back almost by return mail. "In the work of these organizations", he declared,

no pretense is made of assisting the emigration of a man however competent, however industrious, however ambitious as long as he is in employment. In other words, the best class of labour is discouraged, and that labour which finds itself most frequently in the market, either from incompetence intemperance or indifference is the peculiar care of such organizations.<sup>61</sup>

The Church Army, according to him, was engaged "exclusively in operating amongst the lowest and most degraded classes to be found in England". The societies' methods of selection were no more trustworthy. "It is difficult", he said of the work of the Central Body, "to draw the line between the unemployed and the unemployable". Finally, the environment in which the societies carried out their work was not likely to provide suitable emigrants; this was particularly true of the area of London canvassed by the East End Emigration Fund.

Walker's report was accepted without qualification and officially published under the title, *The Aims and Methods of London's Philanthropic*

<sup>58</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, "Assisted Immigration", anonymous newspaper clipping, no date; L. HOUGH, *The Sowing — A Yankee's View of Canada's Duty to the Motherland* (London: 1909), pp. 81, 87, 156; "Canada Puts in Place New Barrier Against the Incompetent and Lazy", *Ottawa Free Press*, 20 April 1908; Basil STEWART, *No English Need Apply or Canada as a field for Emigration* (London: 1909).

<sup>59</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, W. D. Scott to J. B. Walker, 14 December 1907. For an example of how the East End of London was viewed see *Manitoba Free Press*, 29 August 1906; ONTARIO, *Sess. Papers* 1907 (35) XXXIX, Annual Report of the Superintendent of Neglected Children; 1906 (40) XXXVIII, Annual Report of Ontario Hospitals and Refugees, "Imbecility and Heredity the most Prolific Known Causes of Pauperism"; 1907 (41) XXXIX, Annual Report of the Inspectors of Hospitals for the Insane, Report of Dr C. K. Clarke, Superintendent of the Toronto Hospital for the Insane.

<sup>60</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, Memorandum of W. D. Scott to Frank Oliver, 9 December 1907, and W. D. Scott to J. B. Walker, 31 December 1907.

<sup>61</sup> *Ibid.*, J. B. Walker to W. D. Scott, 14 January 1908.



*Societies*.<sup>62</sup> In a cabinet report outlining the measures his department was adopting towards the societies, Oliver repeated the key criticisms of the Walker Report and announced that henceforth the societies would be brought under the supervision of the London office. Prior to the 1908 shipping season the Immigration Act was amended: emigrants assisted by a charity or with public money were now listed among the prohibited classes. Only with the written consent of the Assistant Superintendent of Emigration at Charing Cross (London) could such emigrants present themselves for admission at the ports of entry. In addition, all emigrants, whether they had been assisted or not, were now required to have \$25 landing money unless they were going to family, friends or assured employment.<sup>63</sup> Walker was replaced by J. Obed Smith, the Commissioner of Immigration at Winnipeg — Walker's new post.

What was the response in London to the regulations, the Walker Report and the recession? No one objected to the principle of inspection, believing investigative casework to be the foundation-stone of rescue work. As Walter Hazell put it, "they preferred to have the sanction of the Dominion". T. M. Kirkwood, the chairman of the East End Emigration Fund, wrote a confidential letter to Oliver promising not a word of public criticism of the new regulations. Robert Culver, the Fund's secretary, assured Obed Smith that the Fund would assume complete responsibility for its charges. Indeed, some of the societies believed the new inspection system would not affect their work since it was ostensibly to curb the entry of "the unfit".<sup>64</sup> Walker's report was another matter. Not a few feathers were ruffled by its coarse language and vulgar appeal to prejudice. W. F. Hamilton of the Church Army thought it "deplorable" that a public official could make such unfounded charges. Wilson Gates, the founder of the Self-Help Emigration Society repudiated the suggestion that their emigrants "could by any effort of the imagination be classified as undesirable". F. Morris of the Charity Organization Society rejected the report as "irresponsible".<sup>65</sup> "To say the very least", observed the London *Evening Standard*, "the criticism directed at London's foremost emigration societies was received with considerable surprise."<sup>66</sup> Sir Clement Kinloch-Cooke referred Canadian officials to the

<sup>62</sup> Walker's report is a long letter he sent to Scott. It was published afterwards as a pamphlet, but I never came across a copy of it in the Immigration Branch files.

<sup>63</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, Certified Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 25 February 1908; Frank Oliver to W. D. Scott, undated memo in April correspondence of this file.

<sup>64</sup> *Ibid.*, File 6775, T. M. Kirkwood to Frank Oliver, 2 April 1908; Robert Culver to J. O. Smith, 10 April 1908; W. F. Hamilton to J. O. Smith, 16 April 1908. For Hazell's comments see newsclipping in this file from the *Daily Telegraph*, 23 March 1908.

<sup>65</sup> *Ibid.*, File 6775, Robert Culver to Lord Strathcona, 1 April 1908; and T. M. Kirkwood and F. Morris, Chairman of the Emigration Sub-Committee of the Charity Organization, to Frank Oliver, 2 April 1908.

<sup>66</sup> *Ibid.*, File 504791, W. F. Hamilton to W. D. Scott, 8 April 1908; see also in this file newsclippings from *Toronto Globe*, 22 April 1908 and *The Montreal Gazette*, 22 April 1908. *Ibid.*, File 3440, E. C. Gates to W. D. Scott, 19 May 1908, and E. C. Gates to the editor of *Daily Telegraph* in April correspondence, and newsclipping from *Daily Telegraph*, 2 April 1908, where Robert Culver wrote to the editor that "the Charity Organization

laudatory Tennyson Report and offered his analysis of the real motive behind the Walker Report:

The Report was arranged and published to meet the exigencies of the economic situation in Canada and the near appeal to the constituencies. It must be remembered that the methods of the various societies, good or bad, were not only familiar to but had long been acquiesced in by the Immigration Branch ... and to the funds of one society — that perhaps of the largest immigration body — a subsidy for some time paid. I do not doubt Walker's Report was successful in transferring the venue of the agitation in Canada by diverting criticism to the methods of the societies here and therefore as an electioneering device may be said to have performed useful service.<sup>67</sup>

Kinloch-Cooke was justified in thinking the societies were being used as scapegoats, for the Immigration Branch continued to subsidize the Salvation Army. There was no reason to suppose their protégés any different from those of the London societies who had been singled out for criticism. In February 1906 Alfred Jury had written to Scott to warn him of the Army's indiscriminate recruiting methods: "The 'Army' collect the social and moral wrecks of society, of which we have enough of our own ... You will find that these chickens will come home to roost."<sup>68</sup> But the Army had become an important recruiter of labour for rural Canada so its services were retained. In February 1908 its grant-in-aid was increased to \$7,000 and in July an additional \$12,000 was contributed to cover the losses sustained when the reservations for several chartered vessels had to be cancelled. Nonetheless, during the 1908 shipping season the Army brought across 7,000 newcomers, nearly one-third of whom were assisted cases.<sup>69</sup>

Few in London paused to consider the varnished truth in Walker's report because it was viewed as a political attack. He was hardly amiss to argue that "emigration to Canada is not a solution of the London unemployed problem", or that "the class of persons assisted" was unsuitable because of their occupational background — or lack of one. Despite the fact that the Unemployed Workmen's Act was meant to

Society, or any other society working along the same lines, should be regarded as the patron of the incompetent, the intemperate and indifferent is a novel view calculated to excite something more demonstrative than a smile".

<sup>67</sup> Ibid., File 752538, Kinloch-Cooke's letter to the *Morning Post*, 2 April 1908, news-clipping; for his analysis of the political motivation behind the Walker Report see *Second Annual Report of the Central Emigration Board*, 1908.

<sup>68</sup> Ibid., File 17480, A. Jury to W. D. Scott, 7 February 1906.

<sup>69</sup> Ibid., Extract from a Report of the Privy Council, 2 January 1908: "That as the Salvation Army is greatly enlarging its operations and increasing its machinery for promoting immigration and for the successful distribution and placing of immigrants who arrive in the Western provinces, the grant-in-aid of this special work be increased to \$7,000". Brig. T. Howell to W. D. Scott, 9 July 1908; Memorandum To His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council, 13 August 1908. The grants were reduced for the following year when £1,500 was paid for the rent of the London office and advertising and \$2,000 for distributing immigrants in Western Canada: see Certified Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 21 June 1909; see also memorandum to Frank Oliver from W. D. Scott, 16 December 1909. For figures on numbers brought across see *Emigrants Information Office Report*, 1908.

assist only the *temporarily* unemployed working man, in practice it aided that class of worker who made up the hard-core unemployed and who was the bane of London social workers — the dreaded casual labourer.<sup>70</sup> Although, technically, casual labourers were not even considered unemployed since “their general condition as to employment could not be regarded as sufficiently permanent to count in this connection”,<sup>71</sup> they were the chief beneficiaries of the assistance provided by the Central Body. The administration of the Act was at direct variance with its declared objective simply because these were the workers most hurt by the distress and the least likely to find employment. With their medium-sized families they conformed precisely to the type Scott had cautioned about bringing across.<sup>72</sup> Placing them in Canadian agriculture in the belief that successful farming was, when all was said and done, a “test of character” proved an exercise in futility. The farms of Ontario, which thousands were deserting every year, provided an antidote to such mystification when they had to be worked twelve hours daily with not enough pay to support a family.<sup>73</sup> Even the more realistic expecta-

<sup>70</sup> HARRIS, *Unemployment and Politics*; on the casual labour problem see STEDMAN-JONES, *Outcast London*.

<sup>71</sup> *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, p. 27. PAC, RG 76, File 604526, F. Johnson to Canadian Government Employment Agent, 2 March 1908.

<sup>72</sup> *Preliminary Report upon the Work of the Central (Unemployed) Body ... to May 12, 1906*, p. 58; *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, p. 27. The Classification Committee confessed to considerable difficulty in classifying men according to their trades because many applicants were not always truthful. Most applicants, regardless of their trade, worked for the “going rate” of 7d per hour paid to casual general labourers. The Emigration Committee was anxious to encourage Distress Committees to send applications forward: “Neither special training, nor possession of any trade”, read their circular to the Distress Committees, “is essential” (*Preliminary Report...*, p. 35). The London philanthropic societies did not make scientific surveys of the socio-economic background of their charges but their annual reports suggest strongly that casual labourers made up the bulk of their protégés. In the Spring of 1906 the Church Army changed the name of its periodical *Church Army Quarterly Paper* to *Church Army Review*, “a periodical devoted to the ‘Unemployed, Outcast and Outsider’”. The East End Emigration Fund observed: “Another reason for concerning ourselves almost wholly with families is the enormous advantage that it is to the children that they should grow up healthy young Canadians before the bitter experience of want and starvation in England has told upon their constitutions” (*Annual Report*, 1907).

<sup>73</sup> “The Finding of a Homestead”, *Quarterly Notes*, no. 20 (October 1906); “Toward the Land of Hope”, *Church Army Review* (February 1907), for comments on the character-building function of their Hamstead farm colony. See PAC, RG 76, File 3440, newsclipping, *Daily Telegraph*, 29 July 1905. The *Telegraph* had sponsored a “Shilling Fund” to assist destitute families in West Ham. This article was written by one of its reporters and it contains many acute observations about the difficulties involved in transplanting city people to rural Canada: “yet on the average rate of wages paid it is folly to expect that a man without experience in tilling the soil or the management of stock can earn sufficient during the first year to support a wife and a string of children.” See also *Preliminary Report upon the Work of the Central (Unemployed) Body ... to May 12, 1906*, “Report on Visit to Canada”, pp. 49-55. The frequency of English greenhorns running into “dirt and debt”, as it was termed, was high. Not a few Englishmen were short-changed on their first contracts with Canadian farmers; see PAC, RG 76, File 604526, Letters of J. J. Roberts, 7 December 1908; Ernest Elliot, 19 September 1908; and W. Stutchbury to W. D. Scott, 27 May 1907.

tion that the farms would serve as a stepping-stone to the cities and towns was no answer either. Canadians had difficulties of their own in this regard; the addition of the London labouring poor made matters worse.<sup>74</sup>

It should, therefore, have come as no surprise that many charity-aided cases had become a burden on municipalities during the recession. Yet assisted emigration was still viewed by the societies as a way out of the impasse at home. In the spring of 1908 C. S. Loch and T. M. Kirkwood offered the following appraisal of the Unemployed Workmen's Act: "After three years in which resort has been made to old methods and new in providing employment ... emigration has once more proved to be a most, if not the most, effectual way of assisting families in distress."<sup>75</sup> "Of all the schemes propounded", concurred the Salvation Army, "emigration holds the field for relief of distress due to lack of employment." The Church Army reasoned that since the financial panic did not affect agriculture there was no cause not to continue with the work. The Central Emigration Board believed labour agitators were behind the regulations and that the unemployment in Canada had been "greatly exaggerated". The Central Body alone conceded the need for restraint.<sup>76</sup>

To this extent the Canadian intention to bring the work of all the societies under control was fatally underestimated. Throughout the winter and spring of 1908 numerous charity-assisted emigrants were deported for becoming public charges. Some had expressed a desire to return home, many had not. The frequency of forced deportations and "the very free hand" with which the Canadian government reputedly acted led to bitter exchanges between Ottawa and London.<sup>77</sup> In July of that year, Smith

<sup>74</sup> *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, pp. 145-49; *ONTARIO, Sess. Papers, 1916 (56), XLVIII*, Ontario Commission on Unemployment Report, chap. 3; James STRUTHERS, "Unemployment and the Canadian Welfare State 1914-1941" (Ph.D. dissertation, University of Toronto, 1979).

<sup>75</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 6775, W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 13 July 1908; *The Times*, 12 February 1908. For Loch's views on how the emigrant traffic ought to have been rationalized, see GLRO, Charity Organization Society Emigration Sub-Committee Minutes, 29 May 1902.

<sup>76</sup> "Our Emigration Policy", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 6 (Spring 1908); "The Land of Good Hope" and "The Future of Canadian Emigration", *Church Army Review*, February 1908; *Second Annual Report of the Central Emigration Board, 1908*; *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report, 1907*: "Emigration is the only remedy by which the surplus labour of one part of the Empire can be transferred to meet the needs of another and it is this work which the Self-Help Emigration Society is anxious to promote"; PAC, RG 76, File 604526, F. Johnson to W. D. Scott, 20 February 1908; GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 23 December 1907; *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, p. 54: "We therefore advise the utmost caution in sending emigrants, particularly until the financial position again becomes normal."

<sup>77</sup> *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund, 1908*: "The Dominion Government, in the matter of the deportation of those recent arrivals who under unusual pressure have failed to be able to support themselves, has acted with a very free hand, and that action has evidently been in accordance with Canadian public opinion ... Notwithstanding that our emigrants, consisting of families, mostly comprising small children, were sure to be the first affected by bad times, only 45 persons out of the 4,000 emigrated in 1906, and 247 out of the 6,100 emigrated in 1907 have formed portions of the hundreds who

wired Scott to urge an immediate cessation of such measures because of the damage to Canadian prestige. In particular, he wished to question several cases in which unusual severity seemed to have been exercised. One involved a man named Turner who, although regularly employed before the recession, had been deported, accompanied by his five children, upon losing his job because no work was immediately available. Surely, queried Smith, the deportation clause was never intended to remove a man who had so far established himself. Another case concerned a man named Pearce who was deported with his family five days before starting a job. These cases, Smith confided in a personal letter to Scott, had raised considerable discussion. Only by "somewhat strenuous efforts and a promise to lay the matter officially before you have I practically at the last moment had certain questions on these matters about to be put to the British government in the House withdrawn".<sup>78</sup>

Scott was unconcerned. He explained the Turner case as reported by the mayor of Oshawa. The man had refused farm work; for six months he had been a drain on the charitable funds of the town and eventually wound up on municipal relief. With this evidence, corroborated by local inquiry on the part of departmental officers, Scott felt obliged to consent to Turner's removal. In the case of Pearce, the municipality of Chatham had regularly asked for his deportation until Scott could no longer refuse.<sup>79</sup> Having given the municipalities the responsibility and power to deal with indigent newcomers it was hardly politic to override their decisions. By summer's end nearly two hundred Central Body cases alone had been returned and throughout the societies gave maximum publicity. Again Smith advised restraint: "All these societies have extensive and influential connections and I imagine you would not consider it advisable to do anything that would create amongst them a desire to openly revolt against Canada. They can certainly do the emigration cause a great deal of harm if they wish to do so."<sup>80</sup> Scott was still unmoved.

every week for months past have been sent out of Canada by the Government." PAC, RG 76, File 3440, E. C. Gates to W. D. Scott, 19 May 1908; File 604526, Clerk to the Central Body to W. D. Scott, 5 May 1908, W. D. Scott to Jas. Conner, 28 April 1908, James Winn to J. B. Walker, 4 June 1908, W. D. Scott to F. Johnson, 13 June 1908, W. Hazell to F. Johnson, 26 June 1908, W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 2 September 1908; GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 10 February, 16 March, 27 January, 11 May, 25 May, 19 June, 3 July, 26 October 1908.

<sup>78</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 604526, telegram from Torosus, 27 July 1908; Smith followed this with a personal letter to Scott dated 29 July 1908. See also GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 27 April 1908.

<sup>79</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 604526, W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 8 August 1908. GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 16 March, 19 June, 3 July 1908.

<sup>80</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 7 May 1908; *Report of the Emigration Committee Covering the Operations of the Committee from November 1905 to 30 June 1909*. During this period 8,277 people were emigrated, four percent (328) of whom were deported. "The Committee are of the opinion that persons threatened with deportation should have an opportunity of an appeal to a magistrate, and that longer notice that they are to be sent back to England should be given to them than the few hours usually allowed." (p. 3)

Possibly he viewed the indignation in London as self-serving cant. He could hardly have been impressed with the refusal of the Central Body to assist the distress victims in Chatham when invited to do so by the municipality; or with its rejection of the requests of some hardship cases to return home to England. In one instance a consumptive was advised to stay in Canada where his chances for a cure were better; in another case a homesick family was paternally chastised for expressing a desire to come home.<sup>81</sup>

Meanwhile, the newly-installed inspection system sharply reduced the numbers sent across. The activities of the East End Emigration Fund were "greatly curtailed". Average family size was reduced while the numbers assisted dropped to a fraction of the previous year. The Church Emigration Society lamented that "Canada had practically closed her doors" and sent far fewer than before. The work of the Church Army was "crippled" and it found it necessary to close its emigration department for the 1908 season. The Central Body informed the Local Government Board that the new system was "extremely trying" making it "impossible to emigrate to a large extent".<sup>82</sup> John Burns wrote directly to Laurier on the Central Body's behalf. The supervision exercised by the Local Government Board and the Central Body was very careful, he informed the Prime Minister. In this light, the regulations were too rigid; medical records had to be exceptional. There were cases in which whole families had been refused clearance because one member had not merely suffered from tuberculosis but had long since succumbed to it. This kind of standard amounted to harassment. Burns also requested Lord Crewe, the Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, to make a presentation to the Dominion to have the regulations relaxed in regard

<sup>81</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 604256, L. M. Fortier to J. O. Smith, 28 February 1908, and F. Johnson to W. D. Scott, 20 February 1908; File 752538, J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 14 September 1908; GLRO, Minutes of the Emigration Committee of the Central (Unemployed) Body, 24 February, 3 July, 16 March 1908.

<sup>82</sup> *Ibid.*, 19 June 1908; *Report of the Emigration Committee ... from November 1905 to 30 June 1909*. During the 1906-7 shipping season 1,800 cases embracing 5,415 people had been sent to Canada; in the following season with the regulations "rigorously enforced" 123 cases totalling 360 people were cleared by Smith at Charing Cross. In the 1908-9 season 170 cases representing 360 people were emigrated. *Annual Report of the East End Emigration Fund*, 1908: "The number of non-workers by reason of being underage which could be permitted in any immigrant family was strictly limited." The Fund sent 859 abroad in 1908 compared to 6,103 in 1907. *Annual Report of the Church Emigration Society*, 1908: in 1907 the Church Emigration Society emigrated 663 souls, in 1908 the figure had fallen to 438, in the following year it dropped to 250. *The Church Army Blue Book Report*, 1909: the Church Army had sent nearly three thousand newcomers in 1907, in 1908 only 160 were assisted. The *Report* for the following year cited no statistics, stating only that the numbers sent were small compared to former years. *Self-Help Emigration Society Annual Report for the Year 1908*: the Society termed 1908 a disappointing year, 155 were sent to the Dominion compared to 506 in 1907; in 1909 197 were sent to Canada.

to patently severe applications.<sup>83</sup> Frank Oliver replied: "There was no justification in a policy which transferred the unemployed from one area of unemployment to another." The Canadian government, he promised, would be only too glad to modify the regulations to meet any improvements in conditions.<sup>84</sup>

Conditions did not improve. The sluggish unemployment which persisted into the winter of 1908-9 was again attributed to excessive immigration. The situation on the West Coast was especially volatile for Oriental labour made the problem visible. Oliver was forced to promulgate additional regulations, whose object was to limit the previous exemptions from the landing money to *farm labour* coming from *approved countries*.<sup>85</sup> A memorandum issued in June 1909 elaborated the new policy but it was so poorly worded that serious misunderstandings resulted. Some believed the sole intention was to reserve the previous exemptions to emigrants from *approved countries*; overlooked was the attempt to reduce *occupational exemptions* as well. The misunderstandings did not come to light until February 1910 when fourteen miners threatened with debarment successfully challenged the memorandum in the Supreme Court of Nova Scotia. The memorandum, it was held, could not legally overturn the Order in Council of April 1908 which had established the regulations in the first place.<sup>86</sup> In March 1910 a new Order in Council was passed; this time it was made clear that only be settling on the land could emigrants from approved countries escape paying the landing money, now required of children as well as adults.<sup>87</sup>

The miners were not the only ones to "misunderstand" the memorandum. Obed Smith also believed that assured employment still provided exemption. His error did not become apparent until the end of March 1910 when a complaint was forwarded to Scott from the Department of Labour. The East End Emigration Fund had sent several families to the

<sup>83</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, John Burns to Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 1 June 1908; Lord Crewe to Lord Grey, 30 May 1908; H. C. Munro, Assistant Secretary, Local Government Board to Undersecretary of State Colonial Office, 27 May 1908. The medical examination proved to be a useful means of weeding out "undesirables". Obed Smith had considerable discretionary powers and used them to serve the Department's needs, i.e., to obtain agriculturalists: "will use discretion given to me with the greatest amount of caution. It is not my intention to make it known to any of the societies, but this will authorize me to give permission to land in Canada a family otherwise desirable, but being resident in a city or town for a long period." (J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 22 April 1908) See also W. D. Scott to J. B. Walker, 9 March 1908; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 13 April 1908; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 11 June 1908; J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 7 July 1909; see also Fred. E. Johnson (Clerk to the Central Body) to the Secretary, Local Government Board (undated), and *The Central (Unemployed) Body for London, Report of Emigration Committee on T. Clancy's Application for Emigration* (undated), both are in the June correspondence, 1908.

<sup>84</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, Certified Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 6 July 1908; Frank Oliver to W. D. Scott, 22 June 1908.

<sup>85</sup> *Ibid.*, Department of the Interior Memorandum, 5 June 1909.

<sup>86</sup> *Labour Gazette*, 11 (April 1910): p. 1194.

<sup>87</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, newsclipping from the *Westminster Gazette*, 10

Dominion Cotton Mills at Kingston; but why, inquired a local workingman, were charity-aided emigrants admitted when there was such little work available? Was it not illegal?<sup>88</sup> Scott and Oliver cabled blistering inquiries to Smith demanding an explanation while instructing him to "rigidly enforce" the requirement that assisted cases be willing to accept and be suitable for farm work. Not even if they could produce the landing money, it was now decided, could they obtain entry.<sup>89</sup> When the muddle in London was cleared up a storm of protest resulted. In the press the "new" regulations were presented in the worst possible light. Walter Hazell was given access to several prominent newspapers to publicize the "outrageous results" of having to cancel hundreds of passages because the regulations were applied retroactively.<sup>90</sup> Throughout the spring and summer the much harried Smith defended the policy as appropriate and necessary.<sup>91</sup>

Privately, though, he was worried: "Whatever the reasons for 'putting on the lid' I do not know ... I do know it will have a serious effect ... the sympathetic wellsprings are drying up."<sup>92</sup> W. S. Fielding, the Minister of Finance, also wrote from London to express concern; British ministers informed him that the rigidity of the prohibitions caused great embarrassment. Was it not possible, he asked, to permit families to be re-united?<sup>93</sup> Strathcona, the Canadian High Commissioner to Great Britain, on the other hand, believed too much of a fuss was being made and blithely advised Smith to stay out of the newspapers. Scott told his hapless subordinate to ignore the "unfavourable publicity".<sup>94</sup> Undoubtedly he would have been happy to do so but for the "serious agitation" which continued, the source of which was the dawning awareness that the Immigration Branch was determined to restrict

May 1910; Frank Oliver to Lord Strathcona, 23 May 1910; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 7 April 1910; cablegram, J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 19 April 1910; File 6775, W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 2 April 1910; File 3440, W. D. Scott to E. C. Gates, 2 May 1910.

<sup>88</sup> Ibid., File 6775, James Becking to "Dear Sir", 4 April 1910.

<sup>89</sup> Ibid., File 752538, Frank Oliver to J. O. Smith, 1 April 1910; cablegram, Torosus to Oliver, 2 April 1910; cablegram, Frank Oliver to Torosus, 2 April 1910; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 7 April 1910; File 6775, cable to "Fund Crimeless", 1 April 1910; File 604526, cablegram, Department of Immigration to Central Body, 2 April 1910.

<sup>90</sup> Ibid., newsclippings sent by Smith to give Ottawa a sense of the mood in London: see *Leeds Mercury*, 26 April 1910; *Morning Post*, 25 April, 3 May 1910; *The Daily News*, 6, 16 May 1910; *Morning Leader*, 11 May 1910; *Westminster Gazette*, 10, 6 May 1910; *Daily Chronicle*, 6 May 1910; *Edinburgh Evening Dispatch*, 14 May 1910; *Aberdeen Free Press*, 26 April 1910; many of these newspapers did not have a clear idea of what the regulations meant, some thought the prohibitions against assisted emigrants applied to all Englishmen.

<sup>91</sup> Ibid., Smith's comments to the *Morning Leader*, 11 May 1910 and to the *Westminster Gazette*, 31 May 1910: the *Gazette* story concerned a case in which a wife with children was prevented from joining her husband because he was not currently engaged in farm work in Canada.

<sup>92</sup> Ibid., J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 21 April 1910.

<sup>93</sup> Ibid., telegram undated received 11 July 1910.

<sup>94</sup> Ibid., Lord Strathcona to Frank Oliver, 13 May 1910; and W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 20 June 1910.



philanthropically assisted emigration and not simply, as officially avowed, that of "the unfit". The real issue was bared when Scott, replying to the question of why charity cases were treated differently from those receiving assistance from private individuals, made it plain that it was "the act of assistance" by a society which stigmatized the recipient.<sup>95</sup> It was something to know, observed Kinloch-Cooke, that what could not be performed by a society could be done by an individual. Herein, however, lay the entire point: it was not only the emigrant that was the problem but the associations providing assistance as well. "Among the emigration societies", noted the *Evening Standard*, "there are not lacking those who describe this action as part of a fixed policy to discourage all manner of assisted immigration."<sup>96</sup>

Consequently, channels were explored to have the restrictions lifted. Strathcona was invited to a conference to justify the policy but he made no apologies for the Canadian position.<sup>97</sup> Consideration was given to Colonial Office intervention; Walter Hazell spoke with Colonel Seeley, the Undersecretary of State for the Colonies, but prudently acknowledged it was a "delicate matter", after all the Canadian government was "perfectly independent".<sup>98</sup> The irrepressible Kinloch-Cooke with little regard for delicacy called for a royal commission inquiry.<sup>99</sup> Lord Crewe, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, consulted with Laurier but, when the Liberal leader was apprised of the situation, the familiar story of the events of 1907-8 was re-told with the counsel that the Canadian press, irrespective of party allegiance, was behind the regulations.<sup>100</sup> To a considerable degree the London societies were condescending to the Canadians. The adherents of "scientific philanthropy" especially were appalled at being identified as the alms-giving charities they were committed to reforming. They did not, therefore, take the full measure of the antipathy to "pauper" immigration in the Dominion. Aware of the outcry in English newspapers, Thomas Arnold, the secretary of the Associated Charities of Toronto, wrote to Oliver to offer encouragement. The English criticism was unfair in light of the events of 1907-8; the charities ought not to be licensed to send criminals, work-shys and unemployables.<sup>101</sup> The Immigration Branch was not, in any event,

<sup>95</sup> *Ibid.*, J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 4 June 1910; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 2 December 1910; particularly Sydney Fisher's letter to W. D. Scott, 20 July 1910; File 6775, J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 2 October 1908. See Kinloch-Cooke's comments in *The Times*, 30 May 1910, where he assailed the "illogical distinction" made between individual and collective assistance.

<sup>96</sup> For Kinloch-Cooke's comments see *The Times*, 30 May 1910; *Evening Standard*, 30 April 1910; see also the *Westminster Gazette*, 31 May 1910, where Smith was reported to have refused an applicant because "we cannot approve of one-eyed persons".

<sup>97</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, Note of Deputation from Emigration Societies received by Lord Strathcona, 11 May 1910.

<sup>98</sup> *Ibid.*, newsclipping, *Daily News*, 6 May 1910.

<sup>99</sup> *Ibid.*, newsclipping, *Daily Telegraph*, 28 April 1910.

<sup>100</sup> *Ibid.*, W. D. Scott to W. Laurier, 27 June 1910.

<sup>101</sup> *Ibid.*, Samuel Arnold to Frank Oliver, 1 June 1910; and *Hamilton Times*, 8 July 1910.

concerned that the excitement in London would adversely affect the flow of British emigration. During the 1910 shipping season it set in strongly towards the Dominion. Canada could now afford, in the words of one Interior official, "to pick and choose", and "in the picking and choosing the restrictions would naturally bear most heavily upon the least desirable ... the charity-aided emigrant".<sup>102</sup> The uproar in London produced one change in policy, the families of assisted cases were permitted to re-unite without having to go on the farm, but this concession brought matters to an "irreducible minimum".<sup>103</sup>

Significantly, the Immigration Branch never permitted the demand for the restriction of assisted immigration to affect negatively its relationship with the Salvation Army. During the 1910 season over \$15,000 was contributed to the Army, of which \$5,000 was earmarked for the recruitment of domestic servants. Between 1911 and 1914 an additional \$50,000 was granted as the Army returned to booking large numbers of emigrants.<sup>104</sup> Wisely, the Army began putting as much distance as possible between its emigration work and its rescue work.

It need hardly be said that the Emigration Department has no connection with the rescue work which is the glory of the Salvation Army ... If from mistaken ideas of philanthropy and in ignorance of the needs of a new country we had been for one year only dumping undesirables on their shores our existence in the shipping and emigration field would have had a speedy termination.<sup>105</sup>

The repudiation of its earlier work ought not to be taken too literally. In actuality little change took place. In February 1911 M. F. Annand, the Dominion immigration agent at Quebec City, complained to Scott about the Army's emigrants, few of whom were able to provide information as to job and destination except to say that they would begin farm work at \$15 per week.

You can imagine how long a man will stay on a farm, especially with a family, on \$15 per week, it is neither equity nor justice to admit such class of emigrants ... when unskilled mechanics are rejected because they do not comply

<sup>102</sup> Ibid., *Liverpool Courier*, 13 May 1910: according to Sydney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture, the immigration had been "beyond our most sanguine expectations". *The Times* reported that only three to four hundred people would be affected by the regulations. E. Blake Robertson to Mr Cory, Deputy Minister of the Department of the Interior, 3 August 1910; W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 28 April 1910.

<sup>103</sup> Ibid., W. D. Scott to Mr Cory, 11 January 1911; W. D. Scott to Frank Oliver, 21 February 1911.

<sup>104</sup> Ibid., 17480, W. D. Scott to Frank Oliver, 3 April 1910; Certified Copy of a Report of the Committee of the Privy Council, 17 May 1910; Certified Copy of a Report..., 22 August 1910; see also Statement of Grants for 1909-10, 1910-11, 1911-12; Certified Copy of a Report..., 7 August 1912; W. D. Scott to Mr Cory, 22 March 1912; Certified Copy of a Report..., 29 October 1912; Certified Copy of a Report..., 7 July 1913. From 1908-13 the Army emigrated 45,906 persons and their families, 38,465 of whom paid their own expenses, 7,227 of whom were assisted cases. *Emigrants Information Office Annual Report*, 1913, Appendix.

<sup>105</sup> "The Best Part of Canada to go To?", *The Emigration Gazette*, no. 15 (April 1913).

with the \$25 landing requirement. Many immigrants who come out under the Salvation Army tell inspectors without hesitation that they will only remain on the land until such time as they can secure a position at trade.<sup>106</sup>

Neither Scott nor the Army was moved. Canadian agriculture continued to provide the Salvationists with an illusory solution to industrial unemployment while reciprocally the Army remained the single most important recruiter of agricultural labour for the Immigration Branch.

The crisis that developed over assisted emigration ended all efforts at imperial co-operation. At the Imperial Conference of 1911 the subject of state-aided emigration was again raised but hurriedly dismissed. This time Burns observed that it would "interfere with the free choice by the Dominions of the class of emigrants they require". A resolution requesting the imperial government "to co-operate with any Colonies desiring emigrants in assisting suitable persons" was modified by Harcourt, the Colonial Secretary, to exclude the words "in assisting suitable persons" for fear it might look like a demand for state-aided emigration which was not the intention.<sup>107</sup> Assisted emigration was not, it should be understood, eliminated altogether. Smith cleared cases suitable for agriculture; in 1912 alone 2,000 emigrants were passed at Charing Cross. These were described as "the very cream of the poorer part of the agricultural population of Great Britain".<sup>108</sup> The London societies were transformed into agricultural labour bureaux for Canadian farmers; hardly the bureaucratic imperialism they had in mind. The Conservative administration which took office in 1911 did not change the societies' status, its profession of a higher imperial patriotism notwithstanding. Lord Marlborough, Chairman, Standing Committee on Emigration, Royal Colonial Society, pleaded with Robert Rodgers, the Minister of the Interior, for a reconsideration of their plight. He drew particular attention to the affidavit assisted cases were obliged to sign specifying that they remain at agriculture or face deportation. Surely, he argued, a man who had worked several years on a farm and could support his family ought to be allowed to seek alternative employment.<sup>109</sup> The request was refused. Inevitably, the societies were forced to look elsewhere, mostly to expensive Australia.<sup>110</sup> The final blow was administered in June 1914 when Smith was instructed to cease authorizing assisted passages. The reduction in the need for railway labour,

<sup>106</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 17480, F. Annand to W. D. Scott, 13 February 1911.

<sup>107</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1911 (208) XLV, Minutes of the Proceedings of the Imperial Conference 1911.

<sup>108</sup> CANADA, *Sess. Papers* 1912 (25) XLVI, Annual Report of the Department of the Interior (Immigration Branch), p. 75: between 1910 and 1914 approximately 12,500 people were processed by Smith at Charing Cross.

<sup>109</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, The Duke of Marlborough to Hon. Robert Rodgers, undated, and J. O. Smith to W. D. Scott, 27 July 1910.

<sup>110</sup> *Sixth, Seventh and Eighth Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1911-12), (1912-13) and (1913-14); Central (Unemployed) Body Register of Emigration Loans*, ref. 136. *Report of the Work of the Church Army* (1 October 1910 to 30 September 1911), also *Report* (1912), (1913); *Annual Report of the Church Emigration Society*, 1910 to 1914; *Sixth, 1911-12, and Seventh Annual Report of the Central Emigration Board*, 1912-13.

explained Scott, released large numbers for the farm. "It happens", replied Smith, "we have practically no cases at hand at the present moment and there will be no hardship in immediately putting into force the instructions you have given."<sup>111</sup>

There is food for thought in the experiences of these organizations. The reasons for their failure are clear enough and suggest something about the difficulties of translating social imperialist rhetoric into practice.<sup>112</sup> The assumption that an imperial labour market would somehow function more perfectly than had a national one turned out to be erroneous. Finance was a major stumbling block as governments — Canadian and British — were reluctant to create a truly "free" labour market (something the societies realized did not actually exist). More to the point "assisting" the unemployed to leave Great Britain was never a popular solution to unemployment. Wilson Fox, a Commissioner on the Tennyson Committee, put his finger on something the societies never liked to admit when he observed: "After all can it be asserted that the advocacy of a policy of emigration on a large scale is anything but a confession of failure; a confession that our social and industrial evils are impossible to remedy here?"<sup>113</sup> A similar point was made by the *Daily News* when it chastised the societies for their insistence on using emigration as a solution to social problems at home: "To let slumdom, sweating and unemployment bring forth their kind in Great Britain and to point to emigration as a remedy for any of them is to adopt a course of action in which the Colonies decline to co-operate."<sup>114</sup> The "progressive" outlook of these societies notwithstanding, it was difficult to mask their underlying intentions. Arnold White, a one-time member of the Emigrants Information Office, made a revealing comment when complaining about the lethargic approach taken to scientific colonization by the Office. "After the 'labour troubles' of 1885 [*sic*]", he lamented, "50,000 could have been selected and transported."<sup>115</sup> What differences existed between philanthropically assisted emigration and the traditional "shovelling-out-paupers" approach to economic distress? None really. Certainly not to Canadians, as Obed Smith, a transplanted Englishman, tried to tell British journalists when explaining why Canadian "patriotism" was offended by assisted emigration.<sup>116</sup>

<sup>111</sup> PAC, RG 76, File 752538, W. D. Scott to J. O. Smith, 17 June 1914.

<sup>112</sup> SEMMEL, *Imperialism and Social Reform*.

<sup>113</sup> *Parl. Papers* 1906 [Cd 2978] LXXVI, Report of the Departmental Committee appointed to consider Mr. Haggard's Report on Agricultural Settlements in British Colonies, p. 562.

<sup>114</sup> Editorial, *Daily News*, 6 May 1910.

<sup>115</sup> In "The Great Idea", one of the *Reports on the Social Work of the Salvation Army 1909-10*, White pointed out that "public opinion is now ripe for the compulsory detention of the vagrant, which is the essence of General Booth's scheme ... vagrant must be taught that if he wants to eat he must work, and that his personal comfort depends upon the productiveness of his labour. This, after all, is pure Bible doctrine." (ch. 5 on colonization, p. 59)

<sup>116</sup> "Refused by Canada Chorus of Protest Against New Regulations An Official Explanation", *Westminster Gazette*, 10 May 1910.

Finally, there was the manner in which some of the societies fell prey to the exigencies of domestic politics in Canada, illustrating once again the difficulties of reconciling national and imperial interests. In this particular round the charities were the clear losers.

## APPENDIX

It is not possible to provide a detailed, statistical profile of the numbers of people helped by the private agencies since no complete record of their annual reports exist. I have indicated in various footnotes the ebb and flow of the movement up until the crisis of 1907-8. In the year following the publication of the Walker Report the Emigrants Information Office began to keep a statistical record on the private agencies. A compilation is reproduced in Table 1. These statistics do not indicate where the emigrants went. However, Table 2 which deals with Central Body cases indicates the trend after the 1907 shipping season for those organizations brought under the supervision of Charing Cross.

Table 1. — EMIGRANTS INFORMATION OFFICE STATISTICS, 1908-1913.

<i>Society</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Non-Assisted</i>	<i>Assisted by Grant</i>	<i>Assisted by Loan</i>	<i>Total Assisted</i>	<i>Total Emigrated</i>
Central Emigration Board	1908	74	—	2	2	76
	1909	70	—	31	31	101
	1910	216	—	22	22	238
	1911	322	—	9	9	331
	1912	583	—	21	21	604
	1913	564	—	6	6	570
	Total	1,821	—	99	99	1,920
Church Army	1908	12	—	137	137	149
	1909	11	—	149	149	160
	1910	42	—	271	271	313
	1911	63	—	260	260	323
	1912	65	—	403	403	468
	1913	151	—	408	408	559
	Total	340	—	1,628	1,628	1,968
Church Emigration Society	1908	297	12	129	141	438
	1909	240	1	123	124	364
	1910	512	3	86	89	601
	1911	610	14	85	93	703
	1912	413	8	42	47	463
	1913	467	6	61	67	534
	Total	2,539	44	526	561	3,103
East End Emigration Fund	1908					859
	1909					669
	1910					1,300
	1911					1,349
	1912					1,456
	1913					1,569
	Total					7,202

<i>Society</i>	<i>Year</i>	<i>Non-Assisted</i>	<i>Assisted by Grant</i>	<i>Assisted by Loan</i>	<i>Total Assisted</i>	<i>Total Emigrated</i>
Self-Help Emigration Society	1908					170
	1909					200
	1910					552
	1911	249	127	89	216	465
	1912	256	—	97	97	353
	1913	261	—	85	85	346
	Total					
Salvation Army	1908	5,396	22	1,879	1,901	7,297
	1909	3,673	98	140	238	3,911
	1910	7,809	150	904	1,054	8,863
	1911	7,913	160	1,026	1,186	9,099
	1912	6,717	125	1,279	1,404	8,121
	1913	6,937	120	1,324	1,444	8,615
	Total	38,445	675	6,552	7,227	45,906

Source: *Emigrants Information Office Annual Report, 1913, Appendix.*

Table 2. — CENTRAL (UNEMPLOYED) BODY EMIGRATION COMMITTEE  
STATISTICS, 1905-1907.

<i>Society</i>	<i>1905-6 Season*</i>		<i>1906-7 Season**</i>	
	<i>Number of Cases</i>	<i>Individuals</i>	<i>Number of Cases</i>	<i>Individuals</i>
East End Emigration Fund	359	1,623	463 families	2,573
Self-Help Emigration Society	190	251		
New Zealand Government	86	151		
Salvation Army	35	155		
Church Army	2	12		
Church Emigration Society	2	9	2	11
Central Body (direct)	9	7 [sic]	812 single men 520 families	2,828
Total	683	2,208	1,797	5,413

Source: *Second Annual Report of the Central (Unemployed) Body (1906-07)*, p. 127.

\*Except for the New Zealand Government, all cases emigrated to Canada.

\*\*All cases emigrated to Canada.