The Sons of England Benevolent Society was founded in Toronto in 1874 as a mutual benefit association catering exclusively to Protestant Englishmen and their male descendants. Using the Sons of England as a case study, this paper attempts to reconcile British ethnic-national fraternalism with recent work exploring the function of voluntary association as a constitutive element of liberalism. While the political positions of British organizations were often contrary to the tenets of liberalism, these associations nonetheless incorporated core liberal principles such as voluntary initiative, self-help, and democracy as organizational objectives. By developing a concept of English brotherhood, adopting an educational and social ethos, and establishing a public identity as a patriotic society, the Sons of England, like other fraternal societies, helped structure a liberal social order. The society functioned in large part as a resource for the development and performance of patriotic masculinity, a gendered civic ideal that featured Anglo-Protestant men as a representative social category in Canada.
Men are educated in its lodges. In the principles of worthy manhood. In the duties which they owe to their Queen and Country, and the privileges they enjoy under British Rule. (Brochure advertising the benefits of membership in the Sons of England, c. 1898)¹

IN DECEMBER 1874, a small group of immigrant men from Toronto’s east-end organized the first lodge of what would become the Sons of England Benevolent Society (SOE). From this modest beginning the society expanded steadily, establishing dozens of branches in towns and cities across Canada and as far away as South Africa. In 1900 the SOE reported 14,665 Canadian members, with seven out of every ten living in Ontario (see Tables 1 and 2). The founders styled the SOE after the Odd Fellows and Foresters, successful internationally affiliated fraternal societies based loosely on the Masonic model. As did those organizations, the SOE offered a range of incentives to join, including the masculine sociability of lodge night, temporary financial support, funeral benefits for members and their dependents, and discount life insurance. Along with these inducements the SOE provided an overarching programme aimed at forging ethnic bonds among Englishmen and their descendants and championing Canada’s political and cultural ties with Britain.²

Mixed objectives such as these raise intriguing questions about gender and British ethnic fraternalism in late-nineteenth-century urban Canada.³ The Sons of England offers a case study with which to examine the rationale for British ethnic-national association in the context of mutual fraternalism. Historical interest in fraternalism has grown substantially over the past two-and-a-half decades. Much of this body of work situates the lodges in relation to the profound structural changes men experienced at the level of society and culture. Influenced by the pioneering studies of Mary Ann Clawson and Mark C. Carnes, historians have reconstructed the gendered world of fraternal societies as an

³ I have opted throughout for the general term fraternal society and hence fraternalism, which implies masculine exclusivity and fictive brotherhood, rather than the more specialized “friendly” society. The latter is common currency in Britain and Australia and is used primarily to differentiate mutualist societies from trade unionism and Freemasonry. See Dan Weinbren and Bob James, “Getting a Grip: The Roles of Friendly Societies in Australia and Britain Reappraised,” Labour History, vol. 88 (May 2005), pp. 90–91.
institutional form that provided opportunities for masculine friendship, sociability, and moral improvement removed from the feminine domestic sphere and an alienating marketplace. Building on this work, recent scholarship focuses more closely on the interconnections between the worlds of the individual member, his family, his association(s), and the wider community. Tracing the linkages among masculinity, family life, and citizenship, this work complements – if indirectly – another distinct body of research that places an emphasis on fraternal voluntarism in the developing liberal order of the late nineteenth century. It does so by highlighting how voluntary societies were involved in the production of masculine subjectivities and in the dissemination of values and beliefs defined according to hierarchies of gender, class, ethnicity, race, and religious affiliation, which were crucial to the liberal project.

Despite the interest in the role of fraternalism in shaping a hegemonic liberalism, researchers in Canada have been reluctant to include extended discussions of British patriotic societies in their analyses. Darren Ferry cites, for example, the conceptual difficulties involved in lumping national or sectarian societies together with more inclusive voluntary associations. Certainly, with strict ethnic-national and religious criteria for membership, British patriotic organizations could be profoundly reactionary and divisive. Moreover, in defending Canada's ties with British institutions, patriotic societies like the Orange Order and the Sons of England envisioned a narrow, unicultural model of Canada that diminished the place of non-English speakers, Catholics, and racialized peoples in the national fabric. Yet, while it is tempting to regard these organizations as


5 Koelinger, “‘Let Us Live’.”


7 Ferry, Uniting in Measures of Common Good, pp. 10-11; see also McNairn, The Capacity to Judge, pp. 102-103.

“outsiders” resisting a more inclusive liberal order, there are compelling reasons for considering them in a rather different light. With their emphasis on shaping a patriotic masculinity and promoting British ties and the imperial project, British ethnic-national fraternal societies presented Britain as the model of modern progress. This model not only provided the essential institutional framework for Canada’s expansionist system of governance, but also supplied it with a set of self-legitimating, common-sense political and cultural assumptions that were central to the making of the liberal order. As Adele Perry has suggested, “imperialism and patriarchy” contributed substantially to this project by “privatizing” women and devaluing non-Western peoples, and thus defining white British-Canadian men as representative “liberal subjects.”

The promotion of patriotic masculinity in the context of fraternal voluntarism was an important part of this process. As developed by the Sons of England, patriotic masculinity encapsulated ideas and values associated with “worthy” manhood, with purposeful citizenship, with English and British identity, and with membership in the British Empire more broadly. Central to this construct was a concern for the impact of economic hardship on patriarchal masculinity and English manhood, which entailed the rejection of older modes of social welfare, notably middle-class charity. Based on the principles of voluntary association and mutual aid, the SOE cultivated a cooperative ethos predicated on English brotherhood and on that basis offered economic support aimed at preserving individual respectability and independence under conditions of liberal capitalism. In addition to these economic priorities, the SOE pursued the development of a masculinized British-Canadian citizenship, which it in turn connected to a wider goal of defending and promoting an Anglo-Protestant conception of Canada and Canada’s vital place in the Empire. The society pursued these objectives in its literature, its lodge activities, and a range of public practices that projected an image of modern, Anglo-Protestant manhood as a representative social category in Canada.

This study concentrates on the SOE’s activities in Toronto, where the society was founded, headquartered, and certainly most vigorous (see Table 1). More generally, however, Toronto was important for its regional status as a centre of British
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associational life. The city’s early history as an administrative centre on the edge of empire and its subsequent development as a major English-Canadian entrepot for the flow of capital and immigrant labour, largely from Britain, had positioned it by mid-century as a major radiating node of British culture in a wider, more heterogeneous colonial space. Accordingly, the taproot of the city’s flourishing culture of fraternal voluntarism, while connected to trends in “democratic sociability” throughout the North Atlantic world, drew much of its sustenance from Britain. Alongside numerous fraternal societies such as the Freemasons, Odd Fellows, Foresters, Maccabees, and Knights of Pythias, several British ethnic-national organizations were active in the city at the time the SOE was founded in 1874. The long-established Orange Order was one of Toronto’s largest and most visible voluntary organizations; the smaller St. Andrew’s, St. George’s, and St. Patrick’s societies had provided charitable services to British immigrants since the mid-1830s; and by the 1870s the Hibernian Brotherhood, Irish Protestant Benevolent Society, Caledonian Society, and the Cornish Society had also appeared. By examining the SOE in the context of this local culture of voluntarism, this study also contributes to an understanding of the dynamics of transatlantic, urban-based cultural transfer in shaping the liberal order, a phenomenon connected in no small measure to the activities of patriotic fraternal societies.

**English Brotherhood: Gender, Class, and the Benefits of Mutual Aid**

During the late nineteenth century, a major impetus for mutual benefit fraternalism was its use in supporting the gendered organization of waged labour, men’s control of waged work, and by extension the male breadwinner ideal. For lodge members, these preoccupations touched a range of experience that posed varying challenges to gender and class identity, from the family home to the worlds of work and leisure. As an important and popular leisure activity for


middle- and working-class men, fraternal lodges afforded new possibilities for
the development and articulation of gender and a coherent framework for mas-
culine belonging through the concept of fictive “brotherhood.” As an expression
of a lasting bond of male friendship, lodge brotherhood rested on the conjoined
principles of individual self-help and mutual aid, which frequently entailed a
measure of middle-class patronage and cross-class cooperation. In the case
of the Sons of England, the concept of English brotherhood worked to resolve
tensions in gender and class discourse over economic respectability and inde-
pendence as well as ethnic pluralism in an urban labour market. By offering
filial support and ethnic “protection,” the SOE assumed competitive market
conditions and men’s role as the family’s primary economic agent, which his-
torians have identified as being crucial to the shaping of liberalism and liberal
identities.

Recent research on the meanings of lodge brotherhood has tended to empha-
size class heterogeneity among fraternal society memberships, noting that arti-
sans, labourers, clerical workers, professionals, and merchants often mingled
in the lodges. The class character of the Toronto Sons of England appears to
bear this out. The society was mixed from its inception, if weighted towards
wage-earners. Of the original nine members, five were skilled artisans, one
was a labourer, two were bookkeepers, and one was a shopkeeper. This var-
ied pattern in microcosm was typical of the Toronto lodges as they expanded
in the 1880s and 1890s. A directory published in 1888 indicates that crafts-
workers represented over half the total Toronto membership of some 1,980
men. The next largest group, constituting a fifth of all members, consisted
of those reporting professional or white-collar occupations. Slightly fewer
numbers were unskilled labourers (see Table 3). Variations in occupational
patterns were more pronounced in individual lodges. The contrast between
a high proportion of craftworkers and other occupational categories is most
marked, for instance, in the two oldest lodges, Albion and Middlesex (with a
few exceptions, English place names were selected for individual subordinate
lodges); yet all of the lodges were weighted towards skilled and white-collar
workers or professionals. In five lodges (Albion, Brighton, Surrey, Stafford,
and Worcester), approximately three-quarters of all members fell within one
of these classifications; in two lodges (Warwick and Windsor), two-thirds

16 On the fictive bonds of brotherhood and the importance of male friendship, see Carnes, Secret Ritual; Hoff-
man, “Civility.”
17 Ferry, Uniting in Measures of Common Good, pp. 11, 15; see also E. A. Heaman, “Rights Talk and the Liberal
Order Framework” in Constant and Ducharme, eds., Liberalism and Hegemony, pp.148-149.
18 See Weinbren and James, “Getting a Grip,” pp. 91-92.
19 King (The Early History, pp. 9, 14) lists the name, age, occupation, and place of origin of the nine original
members as follows (particulars of birthplace are found on pp. 24-26): G. F. Carrette, 41, bricklayer, Vaux-
hall, London; G. B. Brooks, 33, book-keeper, Nottingham; E. Smith, 31, cooper, East London; N. Patrick, 32,
box-maker, Bethnal Green, London; G. Patrick, 26, box-maker, Bethnal Green, London; T. West, 41, book-
keeper (place of birth not recorded); C. Buckner, 30, plasterer, London; S. Buckner, 32, labourer, Stepney
did. For the remaining lodges, approximately four-fifths of all members were craftsmen, white-collar workers, or professionals. Together, these men dominated leadership positions in the lodges; however, craftsmen were the most numerous, maintaining just under half of all lodge leadership positions (see Tables 3 and 4).

The mixed-class character of the Sons of England suggests that class interest was likely muted. That being said, the high proportion of wage-earners helps explain the importance placed on mutual aid. As historians have shown, mutual benefit fraternalism was a relatively affordable and therefore popular source of financial protection for wage-earners during the mid-to-late nineteenth century. Thus the marked presence of artisans in the society and in positions of leadership was an important factor in shaping the culture of the society and its overarching institutional identity as a resource for the preservation of masculine economic respectability. Probably the most notable of the SOE’s artisanal leaders was its long-serving secretary, John W. Carter, who occupied the position from the early 1880s to the early 1900s. The founder of a painter’s union in Toronto and the first president of the Canadian Labour Union, Carter had experience in both trade unionism and local politics in Britain and Canada. He is known to have belonged to the Odd Fellows and Knights of Labor as well as the Sons of England. His involvement with the SOE dates from at least 1878, when he first appears on record as a delegate from Lodge Albion (No.1) at the annual meeting of the Grand Lodge. As the only permanent executive member, his leadership at the highest levels of the organization over the course of several decades was a crucial factor in its development.

It would be oversimplifying the case, however, to characterize the link between economic respectability and honourable English masculinity at the heart of the SOE’s self-image as an organic consequence of the society’s working-class character. In large measure, this image was also bound up with ongoing efforts on the part of the SOE leadership to market the society in the 1880s and 1890s. Indeed, the notion of the SOE as a resource for the preservation and development of respectable English manhood against the emasculating pressures of economic hardship attained its fullest expression in the first full recounting of the society’s founding, John S. King’s The Early History of the Sons of England, which was published in 1891 to advertise the society and its life insurance programme. A physician and long-time leading member of
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the society, King represented the middle-class element of the SOE. King was a notable figure in Toronto voluntarism, and his club affiliations – a common feature among middle-class men during this period – extended beyond the SOE to include the Toronto Reform Association, the Freemasons, the Knights of Pythias, the Ancient Order of United Workmen, and the Select Knights. He was centrally involved in the formation of the Toronto branch of the Knights of Pythias and penned a brief historical pamphlet for that society in 1890. Much of King’s history of the SOE is a compilation of materials and individual affidavits recounting the milestones of the society’s earliest days. In presenting this material, however, King places a heavy emphasis on the principles and values that informed the attitudes and activities of the society’s first organizers as a means of appealing to potential new members.

King depicts the early leadership of the SOE as constructing a rationale for its mutual benefit system that combined a fundamental concern for the impact of economic hardship on respectable English manhood and the status of Anglo-Protestant men in Canada. Thus he indicates that the first objectives of the SOE as set out in 1875, in the midst of an economic slump, were to assume the cost of funerals for members and for their wives and children; to provide assistance for members out of work or unable to work because of sickness; and to supply medical services to members in need. The society financed these benefits by various means including entrance fees, fines, donations, and interest on capital. This “shared risk” approach to financing the society’s package of benefits, King notes, ensured that paying members could “demand relief, not as a charity – not as a gift – but as a right to which [he is] justly entitled, from having when in health and plenty, laid up a store against adversity.” In this way, shared risk and the right to benefits safeguarded the masculine integrity of individual members as honourable Englishmen who personified virtues of foresight, thrift, independence, and dignity.

Reflecting the economic downturn in which the society was founded, the original context for this narrative was the local system of ethnic paternalism and immigrant charity that was a major element of privately funded and privately administered social welfare in Toronto. As King’s history and other SOE literature would describe it, the society was a direct response to this

24 King, The Early History, p. 28.
25 Ibid., pp. 28-31. By 1888 initiation fees were on a graduated scale: from $3 for members 18 to 30 years of age to as high as $15 for members between 55 and 60. Bi-monthly fees were likewise graduated from 10 cents at the low end to 25 cents at the high end. Members falling sick after 12 months’ membership could expect $3/week in sick benefits, dropping to half that after 13 weeks and terminating after 39 total weeks. The death of a wife brought a $30 funeral benefit; of a child, $7; and of member, $75. By 1885, optional life insurance was also offered with coverage of between $500 and $1,000. See Sons of England, Annual Register and Business Directory of the Sons of England Benevolent Society, for the Dominion of Canada (Toronto: Timms, Moor, & Co., 1888), n.p.
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system, particularly the work of the middle-class St. George’s Society, an English “national” association that had provided relief and other services to impoverished English immigrants since 1834.26 This resistance to elite charity is suggested in the appeal for new members printed in the society’s first circular and duplicated in King. “There is a noble society formed here and elsewhere that is doing good work among Englishmen, namely, the St. George’s Society,” the circular reads.

But are we, as Englishmen, if visited by sickness or distress of any kind, to be compelled to solicit charity? No man with the principles of a man can receive charity without feeling degraded. Let us then, as Englishmen, and as Englishmen loving our country and our countrymen, have a Society from which we can when in sickness or distress claim aid as our right and not as charity – a Society from which we can receive aid without feeling under any obligations to any man.27

Modified slightly, this statement was enshrined in the preamble to the SOE’s first constitution of 1875 and reprinted in subsequent editions.28

In an effort to underscore the importance that the SOE attached to distinguishing English manhood from abject economic dependence, King includes founding member George B. Brooks’s testimony of his encounter with the Toronto St. George’s Society’s annual “Christmas Cheer” distribution in the difficult winter of 1874. Brooks, who at the time was a recent immigrant and a shopkeeper, recalled witnessing the charity distribution from a distance and his sense of indignation at the “Poor-Law-Guardian haughtiness” directed towards many of those receiving donated food baskets. In particular, he bitterly resented that “Englishmen in Toronto were then the only people out of all nationalities who had to parade their wants and sufferings to the gaze of others and be made the recipients of charity in a public manner.” According to Brooks, waiting in line were “a large number of men, women, and children, presumably English.” The “evident shame” he observed written on their faces as they received these gifts he reduced to a masculine emotion: “Surely Englishmen are the equals in manliness and self-respect of any other people, and that some of them probably through no fault of theirs, should be publicly degraded once a year, no matter how excellent the intention, was both a pity and somewhat of a scandal.”29

In addition to its concern for economic respectability, King’s historical narrative unfolds as an argument framing the spirit of mutuality embodied in English brotherhood as a logical outcome of English patriotism in an ethnically

28 Ibid., p. 30. An editorial in the Ontario Workman, the organ of the Toronto Trades Assembly, echoed this sentiment, praising the SOE for managing to bring English workers together “for their mutual improvement” (p. 33).
heterogeneous urban industrial society. According to King, the problem was especially urgent given the stubborn independence of the typical Englishman. As documented in The Early History, the founders of the SOE had worried that it was too difficult for Englishmen to mitigate their deep sense of independence and to organize along “national” lines. King reports, for instance, that founding member George F. Carrette had initially balked at the idea of an English society, claiming that “it is a hard job to get Englishmen to combine or hang together, as they are too independent.” Carrette’s mind was changed, however, after a discussion in the street with Brooks, who related how he had heard “some remarks . . . in [his] store against Englishmen”; he then asked Carrette if he “did not think it time for Englishmen to combine for their own protection.” According to King’s account, at their first meeting the founding members agreed that the SOE would be “not only a benevolent society, but also a gathering point around which Englishmen could rally.” Consequently the SOE’s first public circular emphasized that the English were remiss in failing to organize a mutual benefit society when Irish, Scots, Germans, and men from “other countries” had already done so. It therefore suggested that by joining together as “a band of brothers” Englishmen could realize the benefits other national groups already enjoyed.

The problem of the independent Englishman was apparently such that it merited repetition in the preamble to successive reprints of the SOE’s constitution. “There is a charge – and to some extent a truthful one – that Englishmen will not unite for their mutual good,” read a typical passage in the preamble to the 1888 edition. “Men claiming a different nationality from ours have been greatly benefited by uniting. Is it not logically certain that we, if united, shall derive mutual benefits, and increase in strength, prosperity and usefulness?”

The narrative of working-class economic respectability and ethnic brotherhood found in King’s and other SOE publications reinforced notions of the pre-eminent place of men as primary economic agents in liberal capitalism. Further indicative of this was the SOE’s life insurance programme, which extended the principles of brotherhood and mutuality to the modern business model of the private insurance company. Initiated in 1884 by Thomas Skippon, who had conceived of a life-insurance fund for the members of his own lodge (Middlesex), the Grand Lodge co-opted the idea and the “beneficiary,” as it

30 King, The Early History, p. 11.
31 Ibid., p. 15. The SOE’s original by-laws from 1875 would stipulate that “no person should be admitted a member of the Society unless an Englishman born or the son of English parents and a Protestant” (King, The Early History, p. 28). Deliberations at the earliest meetings of the Grand Lodge pondered the question of whether Welshman should be permitted to join – a prickly debate that ended with lukewarm support for their admittance. Discussion also took place over whether or not a member could be married to a Catholic. Eventually membership criteria would deny this possibility, as was also the case in the Orange Order. See Archives of Ontario [hereafter AO], “Minutes of the Grand Lodge of the SOE,” January 24, 1877, F1155, MU 2864; on the Orange Order’s prohibition, see Houston and Smyth, The Sash Canada Wore, pp. 126.
was called, was operating the following year.\textsuperscript{34} The founding of the beneficiary represented an important milestone for the society, since it would offer a more comprehensive social security programme and serve as an important tool for promoting the SOE as an alternative to such popular and financially powerful organizations as the Odd Fellows and Foresters, in addition to the more expensive commercial insurers.\textsuperscript{35} By 1885, the SOE was actively promoting its plan, noting that the beneficiary was a less expensive choice than traditional modes of insurance since, unlike those companies, the society did not need to cover extensive overhead costs. Perhaps the most attractive advantage of the scheme, argued King, one of the most active promoters of the programme, was to be found in its guarantee that a member’s dependents “would not be left to the cold charities of the world, but would have a legitimate claim to an amount sufficient to keep them from absolute want, and to place them outside the pale of pauperism and prevent their becoming the recipients of charity.”\textsuperscript{36} Advertisements for the plan in society literature played upon these themes. “Brother!” began one such notice in the back pages of King’s history. “Do you belong to the Beneficiary? If not, why not? LIFE IS UNCERTAIN! A few cents per week may save your mother, wife or child, from many an anxious moment! A few cents now will put them in a position to breast the tide of adversity, and enable them to earn an honest living!”\textsuperscript{37}

Here men were cast not only in the role of main provider but as the primary agents of their families’ livelihood and property. Thus, in ensuring that men maintained their position as chief wage-earners, the SOE conceived of modern manhood in terms that assumed the structural inequalities and challenges inherent in industrial capitalist society, including ethnic competition, but did not entail a deeper criticism of liberal capitalism. Predicated in large measure on the economic challenges men faced, the SOE’s masculine ideal represented a response to these conditions that was designed to appeal to wage-earning men. This programme did not emphasize class identity, however. Rather, what emerged from this economic discourse was the idealized figure of the thrifty, self-mastered, patriotic Englishman for whom the society offered a range of benefits based on the principles of voluntarism, ethnic brotherhood, and shared risk.


\textsuperscript{35} That the SOE’s life insurance represented a competitive strategy was made clear during hearings of the Royal Commission on the Relations of Labor and Capital in the mid-1880s. During one exchange, commissioner Samuel R. Heakes, a Toronto trade-unionist later turned anti-labour Tory, questioned Toronto merchant tailor John Smith, who was then a member of the Toronto SOE’s Kent Lodge, on the financial practices of the lodges and the role of government in regulating them. In one response Smith noted that the Foresters had come to resent the Sons of England for undercutting them on rates. See Canada, Report of the Royal Commission on the Relations of Labor and Capital in Canada: Evidence – Ontario (Ottawa: Queen’s Printer, 1889), pp. 132, 137.

\textsuperscript{36} Report of the Grand Lodge (1885), pp. 16-17, 21, 22.

\textsuperscript{37} King, The Early History, pp. 8, 52; see also Anglo-Saxon, January 1889, p. 176. On widows and the value of husbands’ benefits during this period, see Bradbury, Working Families, pp. 186-187.
Training Men for Citizenship

In addition to promoting this gendered ideal, the Sons of England, like other fraternal societies, also strove to remould and “train” members as “social beings” – which is to say, as men who recognized themselves as integral and responsible members of a larger community as well as members of a lodge brotherhood.38 To that purpose, the SOE attempted to nurture personal qualities deemed essential to worthy and productive citizenship by employing a mixture of democratic engagement, institutional regulation, and didactic ritualism.

This civic purpose informed John King’s characterization of the SOE as a “political institution.” Eschewing partisan connections, King explained the SOE’s political objectives in patriotic terms, entailing simply “the preservation and perpetuity of the British Empire” and “loyalty to the Crown and country under Protestant rule.”39 Vital to this politics, and paralleling the economic rationale for the organization, was a patriarchal concept of imperial citizenship: the idea that England’s “sons” scattered throughout the world were duty-bound to defend the empire and its core institutions in their own countries. This patriotic injunction explains the society’s emphasis on educating members to be “worthy” men capable of such a responsibility. In spite of such claims to a higher civic purpose, this politics would occasionally draw the Sons of England into controversies with distinctly partisan overtones. During the 1880s, SOE-affiliated publications, notably the short-lived Anglo-Saxon, and lodge meetings, including the Grand Lodge (which appears to have preferred to adopt a more temperate position on contentious issues than the local lodges), debated Irish Home Rule, reciprocity, and Imperial Federation.40 Perhaps the most public intervention into a partisan political matter was the response of the London SOE to the Quebec government’s Jesuit Estates Act in March 1889. At a general meeting of the London lodges, a motion was passed that condemned “Ultramontane and Jesuitical doctrines and methods” as being committed to “the destruction of the civil and religious liberty of the people of Canada” and as a threat to “the undoubted right of every British subject of Canada and every Son of England.” With the thinnest of non-partisan veneers, the meeting announced that the London SOE would support any political candidate who explicitly advocated the separation of church and state as part of its platform.41

Obviously, such controversies blurred the line between supporting crown and empire and advocating a party line. In general, however, the SOE leadership encouraged members and individual lodges to view the preservation of the

38 On the role of voluntary associations in “training” men for citizenship, see Weinbren and James, “Getting a Grip,” p. 95; McNairn, The Capacity to Judge, pp. 68-69; Kealey and Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be, p. 110; Kealey, Toronto Workers, p. 121.
39 King, The Early History, p. 17.
41 Globe, March 9, 1889, p. 1; on this incident, see also Miller, Equal Rights, pp. ix, x, 63.
British Empire as an objective that transcended ordinary politics and spoke to a community-wide British identity. The society’s internal practices were designed to encourage the pursuit of civic virtue in this latter sense by moulding members into patriotic citizens. A basic element of this training involved engaging members as active participants in lodge life. Like many fraternal associations, the SOE attempted to ensure a wide base of involvement by placing a high value on a democratic form of self-governance enshrined in a written charter or constitution. In practice, this meant that members were involved in democratic processes such as nominating, voting, and other parliamentary procedures (for guidance the SOE constitution advised members to consult Cushing’s Manual of Parliamentary Usage); it also demanded that members present themselves and their thoughts openly in various forums. At the subordinate lodge level, during bi-monthly lodge nights, ordinary members took part in the nomination and election of executive officers, witnessed and administered oaths and rituals, delivered speeches, and debated various issues. Select members also attended the annual Grand Lodge as sub-lodge delegates. Established in October 1876, the Grand Lodge functioned as a large assembly, hosting representatives elected from the executive of each subordinate lodge, who in turn elected the Grand Lodge officers. The meeting of the Grand Lodge began as a two-day event, later expanding to four days, and was eventually held every February in a different lodge city. It was the prerogative of the Grand Lodge (later the Supreme Grand Lodge after the establishment of a branch in South Africa in 1881), to make, alter, or rescind society bylaws, and its various committees tabled reports and debated a host of matters from the life insurance scheme to preparations for upcoming events. While engaging members in lodge activities, these formal practices paid homage to the principles of justice, legitimacy, and self-determination.

The quasi-legal apparatus empowered by the constitution and governed by the Grand Lodge was intended to safeguard the society and in particular to regulate the actions of individual members for their own betterment. Central to these objectives was the all-important rule of secrecy. “Though the Society is a secret Society,” explained the preface to the SOE’s register of members from 1888, “there is nothing in that secrecy except to enable us to protect each other and prevent imposition; our language of signs and grips enables our members to travel to places where we have lodges, make themselves known as members of the Order, when they will find a brotherly influence surrounding them, receive

42 On lodge democracy, see Weinbren and James, “Getting a Grip,” p. 95; see also Kealey, Toronto Workers, pp. 104, 121.
44 Ibid.
46 On the powers of the Supreme Grand Lodge and the other lower-level bodies, see Sons of England, Constitution (1890).
advice, and if needed pecuniary assistance.” As Stefan-Ludwig Hoffman has argued, lodge secrecy served the important purpose of erecting a “social-moral boundary” that justified social distinctions and exclusivity. This boundary in turn prevented external meddling in the interest of preserving the high ideals and earnest objectives of the society.

Within this basic framework, society bylaws further encouraged good behaviour on the part of members, censured their transgressions of respectable norms, and sought to preserve organizational unity. Reflecting the impact of a resurgent temperance movement of the 1870s, the SOE’s first bylaws (1875) stated that no meetings were to be held in “any tavern, inn, saloon or public-house.” Sub-lodges were empowered to levy fines against members who attended meetings while intoxicated or who drank or frequented drinking places while receiving benefits. Although social drinking was occasionally part of the SOE’s leisure activities, subsequent regulations explicitly prohibited “habitual drunkenness.” Members could expect a fine, suspension, or expulsion for feigning “sick or disabled,” for perpetrating “domestic unkindness,” or for engaging in “immoral or criminal conduct of any kind,” as well as for lesser indiscretions such as “using profane or other improper language, wilfully persisting in disturbing the harmonious and peaceful working of the Lodge, or refusing to obey the Presiding Officer, after being twice called to order, [or] maligning the Society, the brethren, or objects thereof.”

Similar to those of other organizations, the SOE’s rituals and status distinctions served a powerful didactic function in training members to be worthy citizens. Echoing the objectives of Freemasonry and Odd Fellowship, SOE leaders designed the initiation ritual to represent the symbolic passage of men from one state to another: a candidate became a member of the brotherhood by submitting his individuality to the collective will, by solemnly agreeing to the terms and conditions set forth by the society, and by accepting the principles of fraternal cooperation and faithfulness. Witnessing and taking part in the secret elements or “mysteries” of the ritual thus committed the fledgling member to accepting his new identity and discharged him from the world of his former self. This process was intended not only to be transformative but also to serve an educational purpose. “We are all agreed that our ritual is one well calculated to create a
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47 Sons of England, *Annual Register* (1888), pp. iv-v. When he visited another lodge, a member was to provide his name, the name of his home lodge, and the current password (sub-lodge presidents informed members of the password, which the rules dictated should be changed quarterly) to both an inner and outer guard stationed at the main entrance. Authorized visitors gained access to the full meeting. Once there, and with the sanction of the presiding officer, visitors were entitled to vote on lodge business and to address the welcoming assembly. See Sons of England, *Constitution* (1890), p. 55.


49 King, *The Early History*, pp. 28-29.

50 See *ibid.*; on temperance culture in mid-to-late nineteenth-century Canada, see Craig Heron, *Booze: A Distilled History* (Toronto: Between the Lines, 2003), pp. 61-71.


lasting impression upon the mind of the candidate at the time of his initiation,” noted the official Sons of England journal, the *Record*, in 1896. “Its lofty sentiments and ethical admonitions are such as to appeal to the finer instincts of true manhood and citizenship.”53 Learning and abiding by the rules of the brotherhood instructed members in how to abandon old worldliness in favour of a new social consciousness and being, which historians have argued often assumed the proportions of a “civic religion.”54 “We, who are members of a national society, bound together by the triple tie of fraternity, patriotism, and mutual interest, should cultivate a brotherhood in its real signification,” stated another editorial in the *Record*. “We should be exemplars of that sentiment – so that it might worthily be classed as a part of one’s religion – which dominates selfishness and personal motives for the well being of all.”55

Status degrees were meant to encourage this psychological transition by democratically rewarding service, achievement, and leadership qualities such as a capacity to speak well before the lodge.56 By 1890, the SOE had introduced membership distinctions based on a two-tiered hierarchy, the Red and White Rose degrees. The Red Rose degree denoted ordinary members; these were subdivided into “charter” members and “financial” members. The former paid a flat-rate initiation fee regardless of age and were not entitled to benefits, while the latter paid graduated fees according to age entitling them to draw upon the collective resources in the event of need.57 The White Rose degree imparted prestige and entitled the bearer to enhanced benefits; it was bestowed following a favourable vote of the lodge members and payment of an additional fee. Separate White Rose degree lodges were also formed as vehicles for the most active members.58 By ensuring that the degrees were based on merit and in theory open to all who aspired to them, the SOE’s internal hierarchy reinforced the principles of democracy, equality, and progress and thus reflected the Masonic ideal that “enlightenment and self-improvement could be achieved by sustained effort over time.”59

53 *Record*, October 15, 1896, p. 4.
55 *Record*, September 15, 1896, p. 5.
56 Weinbren and James, “Getting a Grip,” p. 95.
The SOE designed these practices to forge a sense of civic commitment as a crucial dimension of lodge membership. A core objective was to encourage personal responsibility and a commitment to individual improvement, not merely as trappings of membership in the society but as fundamental elements of one’s inner being and sense of self. By the 1880s and 1890s, the SOE’s growing profile permitted the display of these qualities and, ultimately, a public claim for the significance of committed, male, Anglo-Protestant citizenship.

**Patriotic Masculinity on Display**

Often influenced by Tocqueville’s writings on the vibrant associational culture he observed in the United States, historians have long insisted that one of the goals of voluntary associations was to provide individuals with a “pathway” to a public world in which they were able to appear as committed citizens and pursue a range of collective goals.60 Bryan Palmer has argued similarly that mutual benefit fraternal societies, with their emphasis on a member’s “moral and material capacity to override class difference in a lifestyle of respectable deferment,” represented “a purposeful theatre and an active agency of social importance.”61 For the Sons of England, “worthy manhood” in the form of patriotic masculinity gained much of its meaning and purpose in the various public activities in which members were regularly engaged, ranging from informal recreation and sporting activities to stylized civic interventions such as funeral processions, patriotic parades, and celebrations. At their core, these activities spoke to a willingness to belong to an association of like-minded men and to represent that association proudly. More broadly, they made political claims about what and whom Canadian society ought to value, as well as where it ought to place its primary loyalties.

By the end of the century some of the social and cultural processes involved in constructing this image of modern Canada found their most potent expression in the public activities of fraternal associations. Stepping out beyond the curtain of secrecy that shrouded lodge night and the mundane practices of the regular meeting was an important dimension of fraternal voluntarism. For organizations of various stripes, social and recreational activities often served very practical purposes and were looked upon as much-needed wellsprings of institutional vitality. “A healthy lodge is like a healthy boy,” advised the Sons of England Record. “[I]t must be doing something all the time. Should the routine work become stale and monotonous, a little change is a remarkably good tonic. A social or literary evening, a debate, a picnic, or anything of an interesting nature will arouse both officers and members from the fatal lethargy which has preceded the disintegration of several lodges, whose only trouble was disinclination to work.”62

In Toronto, SOE lodges planned numerous recreational activities such as lodge

---

62 *Record*, June 15, 1896, pp. 4-5.
anniversary dinners and regular dances, which often featured special musical and comic performances. These provided an opportunity for heterosocial mixing and networking between lodges, and invitations were often extended to members from across the city. During the summer, picnics and steamer excursions on Lake Ontario were popular activities engaging members from numerous lodges and their families. In autumn and winter, members were invited to lectures sponsored by individual lodges, often on topics of political and military interest. In January 1891, for example, local lodges in conjunction with the Supreme Grand Lodge engaged Toronto police magistrate and well-known imperialist George T. Denison to speak on the “annexation” issue; in the winter of 1897, Lodge Surrey sponsored a lecture series presented by a former member of the Royal Navy, H. J. Wickham, who discussed “the British Navy, past and present” and complemented his talks with battle diagrams and slides. In addition to providing entertainment and relaxation, these activities thus expressed a commitment to valued ideals and institutions, from group solidarity and family life to crown and empire.

For the Sons of England, however, the performance of patriotic masculinity was not merely an exercise in respectable deportment. Members embodied their identities as men, and this opened their activities to more varied cultural signification. It was not unusual, for example, for society picnics to feature more dynamic, rougher sporting and leisure activities in which members demonstrated physical strength and masculine vigour and which occasionally pushed at the boundaries of Victorian respectability. In August 1877, the Globe reported that the three Sons of England lodges from Toronto, then totalling some 500 members, held a picnic with members of the lone Oshawa lodge at Shaw’s Grove, on the outskirts of Toronto. The afternoon featured numerous games and contests “well known to athletic England,” including racing, jumping, quoits, archery, and a greased pig chase. The temperance-minded Globe noted that the day was far from staid, with the open sale and consumption of beer and some minor rowdy incidents. In time, organized amateur sport became a regularized element of the society’s array of extra-lodge activities. By the 1880s, members were taking part in annual sporting events and contests such as the tug-of-war competition sponsored by the defending champions, Lodge London, at Toronto’s Baseball Park in August 1893 and the Sons of England Cricket Club, which competed in a local men’s league. These activities were open to public observation and were

63 Ibid.; Record, January 17, 1897, p. 4.
64 Anglo-Saxon, December 1888, p. 166; Record, November 15, 1896, p. 5.
65 Record, January 15, 1897, p. 8.
68 Globe, August 14, 1877, p. 4.
69 Globe, August 4, 1893, p. 8.
70 Globe, May 19, 1883, p. 7.
reported in local newspapers. In their performance, members adopted modes of behaviour and physical expression that embodied what were understood to be English values and attitudes such as fair play and manly qualities such as competitiveness, toughness, and skill, which were important building blocks of heterosexual masculinity in Canada during the late nineteenth century.71

Above all, though, it was the SOE’s more formalized ceremonial practices that drew the most overt linkages between the values of patriotic fraternal association and the place of Anglo-Protestant men in Canadian society. Here the embodiment of patriotic masculinity found expression in both individual deportment and in highly stylized forms of collective representation. During these events the wearing of uniforms and regalia and careful orchestration, military bearing, and marching conveyed a range of ideals, including brotherhood and organizational unity, earnest commitment, and civic duty, as well as British patriotism.72

The symbolic reinforcement of brotherly devotion and organizational unity was perhaps no more evident than during the society’s funeral processions. Like the Freemasons, who adapted an elaborate funeral as part of their society’s attraction to potential members, the SOE put considerable effort into funerary display.73 As outlined in the society constitution, the SOE funeral service rehearsed the principles of brotherliness and faithfulness while emphasizing the dignity and respectability of the departed and his survivors. To maintain a spirit of solemn modesty and solidarity, funeral guidelines dictated that “No regalia be worn” by any member except “the black silk funeral rosette, with purple ribbon, six inches long, two inches wide, with gold fringe, with emblem and S.O.E.B.S. stamped in gold, and white gloves.” Only the costume of the marshal who led the cortege was distinguished from the others by its rose-draped collar and staff “trimmed with black and blue ribbon.” Adding a slight element of drama, the rules dictated that the order of procession “shall be that officers and members walk in front of the hearse, officers walking last. On arriving at the cemetery, the procession shall open, permitting the funeral cortege to pass through their ranks, then the officers first and members follow to the grave.”74 If Masonic-style initiation rituals marked the “metaphoric” death and rebirth of a candidate as a member of the brotherhood, society-led funeral services recognized the departed member’s transformed “being” as a lodge brother.75 They expressed respect for him through the public demonstration of brotherly solidarity, stoicism, and quiet dignity in difficult and emotionally charged circumstances while underscor- ing an abiding attachment to patriotic values. Participants and neighbourhood onlookers, accustomed to the rituals of death and burial, were expected to be

72 On marching culture, see Craig Heron and Steve Penfold, The Workers’ Festival: A History of Labour Day in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2005), pp. 11-12.
73 Clawson, “Spectatorship and Masculinity.”
74 Sons of England, Constitution (1890), p. 84; cf. the Knights of Labor funeral rituals in Kealey and Palmer, Dreaming of What Might Be, pp. 299-300.
deeply impressed by these displays of unimpeachable respectability in death and the strength of an associational kinship that lasted to the grave.

On a larger scale, various parades celebrating patriotic occasions – St. George’s Day, the Queen’s Birthday (the official holiday of the society), and Dominion Day – conveyed more explicitly the linkages among brotherly solidarity, masculine respectability, and patriotic commitment. In Toronto, as elsewhere in urban Canada, patriotic occasions commanded citizens’ attention while laying claim to city space.76 It was often under the auspices of voluntary associations that patriotic occasions were observed in Canadian towns and cities.77 Onlookers recognized certain organizations for their distinctive regalia and came to expect their participation every year.78 A vivid example of such an event sponsored by the SOE was a parade held in May 1894 in honour of the Queen’s Birthday and to raise funds for the General Hospital. A procession of an estimated 2,500 participants assembled at a downtown rendezvous and marched east to the Pavilion in the Horticultural Gardens, a frequently used mass meeting place. The cavalcade was led by the band of the Queen’s Own Rifles and followed by members from all of the local SOE lodges, as well as members of the Naval Brigade and the St. George’s Society. A reporter for the Globe noted that “citizens paid a tribute to the esteem in which the order is held by turning out in large numbers to witness the march” and that the gardens were “crowded with admiring people, hundreds of whom were present for the sole purpose of seeing the procession.”79 As this comment suggests, celebratory occasions were instrumental in foregrounding the patriotic male as a recognizable and valued figure. Processions of this type were therefore an important cultural and political field on which urban Canadian men asserted Canada’s status as a British community and Anglo-Protestant men as its flag-bearers.

This civic calling included promoting Canada’s commitment to the British imperial project.80 Among the many instances during which the SOE publicly voiced its support for the British Empire (which included a fawning reception for a visiting Joseph Chamberlain in Ottawa in 188781) the SOE-sponsored “Diamond Anthem” in commemoration of Queen Victoria’s diamond jubilee in 1897 stands out as a remarkable occasion. In advance of the celebrations of that year, the SOE leadership unveiled a plan whereby the entire SOE membership, from Newfoundland to Victoria, would engage in a patriotic thanksgiving service, taking advantage of the fact that the anniversary of the Queen’s accession day (June 20) fell on a

77 See Heron and Penfold, Workers’ Festival, pp. 11-12.
78 See, for example, the description of the Foresters’ May 24th parade in Sarah Jeannette Duncan, The Imperialist (Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1971 [1904]), pp. 13-14. On the Foresters and parades, see also Heron and Penfold, Workers’ Festival, pp. 11-12.
79 Globe, May 28, 1894, p. 3.
Sunday. The scheme involved coordinating local church services in the singing of the national anthem at four o’clock meridian time in each locality and in that way generating a “wave” of patriotic singing from coast to coast. The idea was soon expanded to include the SOE’s South African lodges and eventually numerous places across the globe with no formal connection to the organization. The SOE headquarters in Toronto mailed a timetable and circular to dozens of locations detailing the itinerary for the day’s events, which included a church parade, a round of patriotic hymn singing at the church, a pause for the national anthem, a charity collection, and prayers for the Queen and the royal family.82

As for the SOE’s calendared events, the focal point for this occasion was the patriotic male in association. The local press emphasized the day’s associational spectacle and the more general feelings of patriotism it inspired. In Toronto, the scheduled events began with a large procession that mustered at three separate locations to accommodate the various city districts, meeting at various points along the route. To the music of the 48th Highlanders and with marchers four abreast, the parade advanced down Yonge Street, turning east on King Street to St. James Cathedral. Newspaper estimates placed the number of participants at about 3,000 and those belonging to the SOE alone at 2,600 to 2,700. The remainder was made up of the members of various organizations, including the St. George’s Society, the Irish Protestant Benevolent Society, the Sons of Scotland, the Orange Order, and the city council.83 According to the Globe, the parade passed through streets “thickly lined with citizens” and arrived at the cathedral where the doors were flung open and a naval brigade marched through the split ranks to escort the SOE officers back into the church. At the appointed time, after a few minor miscues and with the large crowd both inside and outside the cathedral (an estimated 6,000 to 7,000 occupied the church grounds and surrounding streets) waiting patiently in silence, the church bell tolled three times signalling when the anthem was to begin.84

All told, this westerly rolling “wave of song” touched perhaps as many as a hundred separate localities and numerous British ships at sea and port. The timetable lists eight participating localities in South Africa, five in Australia, three in West Africa, two in New Zealand, and one each in Fiji, Mauritius, and Newfoundland.85 With 85 localities, however, Canada was the main theatre of activity. Indeed, the significance of Canada’s leadership in the imperial community during the Anthem was not lost on the event’s planners. For them, the event dramatically brought home the possibilities of a global empire infused with the healthy vigour of its self-governing dominions and loyal possessions, at the head of which stood Canada in

82 Frederick Barlow Cumberland, A Sketch of How “The Diamond Anthem” Was Sung around the World through the Colonies of the Empire on the 20th June, 1897, the 60th Anniversary of the Accession Day of Her Majesty Queen Victoria (Toronto: Robinson-Arthubnot Press, 1898), pp. 1, 2. Cumberland reprinted this report in his History of the Union Jack: How it Grew and What It Is, 2nd ed. (Toronto: William Briggs, 1900); for a brief description of the event, see also J. Castell Hopkins, Queen Victoria: Her Life and Reign, a Study of Monarchical Institutions in British Countries and Her Majesty’s Influence (Toronto & Brantford: The Queen Publishers, 1901), pp. 503-504; Globe, April 15, 1897, p. 8.
83 News, June 21, 1897, p. 2; Globe, June 21, 1897, p. 5.
84 Globe, June 21, 1897, p. 5.
85 Cumberland, A Sketch of How “The Diamond Anthem” Was Sung, p. [i].
DIAMOND JUBILEE
OF
HER MAJESTY QUEEN VICTORIA,
SUNDAY, JUNE 20th, 1897.

ORDER FOR THE SONS OF ENGLAND JUBILEE SERVICE
AROUND THE WORLD.

1. Members of Societies will meet at their lodge rooms, or some convenient place, and, clad in their regalia, march in procession, carrying the Union Jack at their head, to the church selected.

2. Where there are two or more lodges in the locality they will attend one combined service, which shall be held in a church selected by the joint committee.

3. The President shall, on arrival at the church, deliver the Union Jack to the minister, to be draped upon the pulpit or upon the reading desk.

4. The service shall commence at 3.30 p.m.

5. The opening hymn shall be the "Old Hundredth"—"All people that on earth do dwell."

6. At 4 p.m. precisely, according to astronomical time, being the time at which the sun passes over each locality, the congregation will stand and sing the three verses of the National Anthem, "God Save the Queen," to be immediately followed by (1) The collect of thanksgiving for Her Majesty's accession to the throne; (2) The prayer for the Queen and Royal Family, as formerly used in the thanksgiving service on 20th June.

7. The rest of the service to be a usual Sunday afternoon service, but with an interval to permit of the National Anthem being sung as above, at the proper time, according to the time-table herewith.

8. The collection shall be given, as has been desired by Her Majesty, to some charitable purpose.

9. The closing hymn shall be, "The day thou gavest, Lord, is ended." No. 477, A. & M.

10. The lodges will invite the colonial and municipal authorities and all sister societies to attend the service.

By request.

Barlow Cumberland,
President Sons of England in Canada.

its position as the senior dominion. “Greater Britain,” effused the SOE president and chief planner, Barlow Cumberland, “has suddenly stepped forward on the field as an actual and integral part of her Realm and Empire.”

Here then was a vision of a modern Canada connected historically with Britain and propelled forward into new reaches of development and prestige in the context of a dynamic imperialism. By using the Diamond Anthem to connect the Sons of England to this project, Cumberland and the leadership of the SOE built on the organization’s established practices of public display. Respectable deportment, uniformed bodies, choreographed and military marching all signalled a commitment to patriotism and a willingness to subsume one’s individuality into the collectivity for a larger cause, while highlighting the Anglo-Protestant man as a representative figure.

Conclusion
When Ann Hathaway, a young immigrant from Warwickshire, observed the presence of British associations in Toronto during the early 1870s, she later recorded her disappointment in a published memoir. “‘Sons of England,’ ‘Orangemen,’ ‘St. George’s Society,’ no end of them,” she complained. Hathaway’s sense of annoyance was informed by a wish to see British immigrants throw off their “old country” attachments and embrace Canada and its potentialities in their own right. It was not the first time a British visitor would be shocked by the determined display of British identity in Canada. Indeed, the juxtaposition of the backward-looking Britisher and a progressive, modern Canada would inform both contemporary assessments of patriotic masculinity as well as later historical treatments. However, as Phillip Buckner has argued in reference to the latter, the celebration of such attachments does not mean that British patriotic societies were merely “organizations run by misguided colonials who showed an obsequious deference to everything British.” Buckner suggests, rather, that these organizations reflected the ambiguities of ethnic-national identity typical of almost any immigrant group.

Yet they were also not strictly about negotiating ethnic-national identity. By utilizing the institution of a mutual benefit fraternal association, patriotic societies like the Sons of England also strove to remould men in the context of a broader liberal order in which masculine subjectivities were tied closely to economic agency and civic identity. By offering mutual aid and life insurance, the society reinforced both patriarchal conceptions of waged work and the notion of working men as independent economic actors in liberal capitalism. Nonetheless, two factors have led to historiographical uncertainty about where to place patriotic fraternal societies: their divisive ethno-religious basis for organization and their public politics in support of a unicultural model of British-Protestant Canada ensconced in the

86 Ibid., pp. 1, 2, 7.
90 Ibid., pp. 185, 187.
British Empire. Jeffrey McNairn acknowledges this problem with reference to the Orange Order and various British national societies, though he suggests that these societies also often demonstrated a capacity for cooperation, with Catholics as well as with members of other ethnic-national groups. In that regard, McNairn tends to see these groups as part and parcel of a developing culture of liberalism in which voluntary association was a crucial form of social organization promoting a wider acceptance of the principles of individualism and democracy.

This ambiguity is more comprehensible if we consider the wider framework in which a liberal order was established in Canada during the last half of the nineteenth century in conjunction with the role of voluntary associations in fashioning a certain type of “social man.” The former process, as Ian McKay has argued, unfolded according to the “working model” of Britain as the “preeminent modern nation.” This happened at the level of state-building but also, McKay implies, at a lower level where deep cultural and political linkages between Canada and Britain were maintained. Voluntary associations were critical channels for these lower-level social, cultural, and political processes, as is borne out by the case of the SOE. The SOE’s educative and internal regulatory practices attempted to fashion an ideal of patriotic manhood that could be counted on to defend the institutions of the British imperial state. By locating individual and group value in the perceived certainties of British superiority and progress and by using urban public forums to make such assertions, the SOE claimed a representative place for Anglo-Protestant men in modern Canadian society.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1888</th>
<th>1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All Lodges (67)</td>
<td>All Lodges (204)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bramford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halifax</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto*</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winnipeg</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Does not include suburban jurisdictions.
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92 Ibid., pp. 102-104.
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### Table 2: SOE Membership, Revenues, and Expenditures, 1893 to 1904

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>All Sub-Lodges</th>
<th>Ontario Lodges</th>
<th>Ont. as % of Total</th>
<th>Total Cash Revenue</th>
<th>Total Cash Expenditure</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>11,756</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>35,437.05</td>
<td>29,061.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>12,546</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>127,856.80</td>
<td>82,781.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>11,858</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>120,802.25</td>
<td>76,918.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>12,094</td>
<td>9,758</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>123,383.83</td>
<td>104,033.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1897</td>
<td>12,948</td>
<td>10,023</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>131,664.59</td>
<td>107,703.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1898</td>
<td>14,098</td>
<td>10,246</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>138,380.35</td>
<td>110,126.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1899</td>
<td>14,452</td>
<td>10,236</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>142,807.89</td>
<td>113,521.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1900</td>
<td>14,665</td>
<td>10,412</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>155,463.00</td>
<td>124,644.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901</td>
<td>14,845</td>
<td>10,815</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>153,564.70</td>
<td>140,010.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1902</td>
<td>15,862</td>
<td>10,970</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>166,152.08</td>
<td>128,239.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1904</td>
<td>19,225</td>
<td>12,530</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>193,178.58</td>
<td>155,321.87</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Totals include adult male members and women’s and juvenile branches, when reported.


### Table 3: SOE Toronto, Occupational Profiles* by Lodge, All Members, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lodge No.</th>
<th>Site or Prof. or Skilled W/Collar</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Product Only**</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1 Albion</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2 Middlesex</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3 Kent</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6 York</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 7 Brighton</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10 Somerset</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 11 Surrey</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 13 Warwick</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 14 Manchester</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 27 St. George</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 31 London</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 32 Stafford</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 35 Windsor</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 45 Portsmouth</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 47 Worcester</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 57 Norfolk</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 65 Richmond</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1041</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** Did not provide occupational description but rather place of work or the type of product produced.

**Source**: Sons of England, Annual Register and Business Directory (1888).
## Table 4: SOE Toronto Officers and Managing Committee, Occupational Profiles by Lodge, 1888

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Lodge</th>
<th>Prof. or White Collar</th>
<th>Skilled Crafts</th>
<th>Unskilled</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. 1</td>
<td>Albion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 2</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 3</td>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 6</td>
<td>York</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 7</td>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 10</td>
<td>Somerset</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 11</td>
<td>Surrey</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 13</td>
<td>Warwick</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 14</td>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 27</td>
<td>St. George</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 31</td>
<td>London</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 32</td>
<td>Stafford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 35</td>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 45</td>
<td>Portsmouth</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 47</td>
<td>Worcester</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 57</td>
<td>Norwich</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. 65</td>
<td>Richmond</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTALS</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>215</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Categories adapted from Hershberg and Dockhorn, “Occupational Classification.”