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ABSTRACT

The Early Political Career of Angus MacInnis

Angus MacInnis was elected Member of Parliament for Vancouver-South in 1930 as a representative of the Independent Labour Party and on a socialist platform. During his first session of Parliament, he began a political career that would last twenty-seven years, and also played a prominent role in the development of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. The purpose of this study is to determine the nature of Angus MacInnis' early political career, both in Vancouver and in Ottawa, and to assess his role in the development of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in its formative years from 1932 to 1935.

The most important primary source of information is the Angus MacInnis Collection in the Special Collections Division of The University of British Columbia Library. This collection includes MacInnis' private correspondence and his scrapbooks; the records of the C.C.F. and its predecessors in British Columbia; and material of a general nature on the early socialist movement in British Columbia. Other primary sources in Vancouver include the labour press in the period 1915-1935, the daily press, records of Parliamentary debates and relevant government documents. Records of the national Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and several of MacInnis' contemporaries are found in the Public Archives of Canada in Ottawa. Also, associates of Angus MacInnis in the period under study were interviewed. Secondary sources include studies of the period, and biographies of contemporaries.

Because this study is only of Angus MacInnis' early political career, the 1935 federal election has been selected as the termination point.
This election was the first test at the polls of his Parliamentary efforts, and of his commitment to the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Had he and the C.C.F. failed, all his efforts in the preceding ten years would have been for naught. His personal success and the comparative success of the C.C.F. vindicated his efforts.

Angus MacInnis was first and foremost a socialist; not, however, of the doctrinaire, Marxian variety so typical of British Columbia, but rather pragmatic and Fabian in his approach, preferring constitutional to violent means. He was Canadian-born and understood Canadian problems to a much greater extent than did most of the British-born socialists in B.C. For this reason, Angus MacInnis was able to see the need for, and prospects of, a national, broadly based, constitutional, socialist party in Canada. Because of his pragmatism and his faith in constitutional methods, and because of early experience, he was adamantly anti-communist. As a member of Parliament, he showed himself to be conscientious, forthright and quick witted. He stood out in particular as a humanitarian in his defence of the victims of the Depression, especially the unemployed. He also indicated on many occasions his pragmatism and his faith in parliamentary democracy. In spite of these qualities, he was narrow in his interests, concentrating primarily on the failure of capitalism, the ineptitude of the Bennett government, the plight of British Columbia and Vancouver, and the condition of the unemployed.

Angus MacInnis' most lasting contribution in this period was not made in Parliament but rather in the C.C.F. To a great extent, it was because of his efforts that there was a strong socialist party in British Columbia when the C.C.F. began. His influence did much to bring the Socialist Party of Canada into the C.C.F., and to merge the two affiliates in the British Columbia C.C.F. into one party. As a political realist, he saw the need for a strong party structure, and did much to bring about such
a development in B. C. and Ontario. It was for this reason that he attempted to forestall any compromise on the C.C.F.'s anti-communism, because he knew that the communists would destroy the Federation. As a socialist, he saw the need for the B. C. socialists in the national federation, and did much, by his own efforts and by bringing the B. C. socialists into the C.C.F., to ensure that the C.C.F. retained its socialist goals.
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INTRODUCTION

The breakdown of Canada's traditional two party system in the 1920's and 1930's, and the continued inability of politicians to restore it introduced a variety of parties of ephemeral or long-term significance. Some were distinctly Canadian responses to Canadian phenomena, while others were Canadian reactions to worldwide conditions.

In the first category could be included the Union Nationale, Quebec's shield of nationalism fending off threats to the homeland, and the Progressives' Prairie revolt against the West's continued colonial status in the Dominion. A third reaction was the Social Credit movement which appeared in the early 1930's and took Alberta by storm in 1935. Coming at the same time as Fascist dictatorships in Europe, it bore some disturbing similarities to them such as excessive dependence on charismatic leadership, devotion to policy rather than comprehension of it, "anti-socialism," externalization of enemies and even hints of anti-semitism. In spite of these, it too was Canadian, part heir to the Progressive tradition.

A fourth movement was the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, a Canadian socialist response to the Depression. To many contemporary observers, it seemed to spring suddenly from the radical soil of Prairie politics in the summer of 1932. In fact, its roots went much deeper than the Depression on the Prairies, going back to the Progressives' revolt, the Winnipeg General Strike, the One Big Union, the Industrial Workers of the World, and even the Fabians and the Grange movement. It was a federation of workers, farmers and urban intellectuals who had
arrived at acceptance of a socialist solution to the Depression, and who agreed upon the necessity for a Dominion-wide Parliamentary socialist movement.

The delegates at the founding conventions of the C.C.F. in Calgary and Regina in 1932 and 1933 agreed on the need for the establishment of a "co-operative commonwealth" based on human need, not profit, but they differed on the means of achieving it. Some desired little more than moderate reforms within the existing structure while others wanted detailed plans for the destruction of all aspects of capitalism. Some had come to socialism through experience, others from reading. Some favoured a gradual, Parliamentary, Fabian approach, others wanted a revolutionary upheaval.

It would have been impossible to bring so many diverse elements into one unified political party; therefore the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, of necessity, had to be a real federation of provincial socialist, labour, and farm parties, united on a national platform, working together to achieve a "co-operative commonwealth."

At the extreme left of the C.C.F.'s political spectrum stood the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section). It was the most revolutionary (at least in print), the "purest" Marxian, and the most theoretical in its orientation of all the affiliates. It was also one of the strongest.

The Socialist Party of Canada in British Columbia bore little resemblance to most of the other labour or socialist parties in Canada. It was firmly rooted in British working class experience and nurtured in the class conflicts of the B. C. forests and mines. It had acquired a more Marxian vocabulary than its Eastern counterparts and had a fanatical devotion to its own interpretation of the truth. It regarded with
suspicion the large number of rural and middle class urban converts the C.C.F. was suddenly attracting across Canada.

For both geographical and political reasons the C.C.F. needed the Socialist Party of Canada in B. C. The Socialist Party was not convinced of the necessity of its membership in the C.C.F. Cut off from the rest of Canada, sectarian in its outlook, it feared the loss of its identity in the Federation. It would only come into the C.C.F. if it were assured its principles would not be sacrificed to political expediency. There were few people outside of its party ranks who could offer that reassurance. Conversely, many members of the farm and labour organizations of the Prairies and the East could not understand the B. C. socialists. It would require leadership from someone acceptable for his socialism both to the "purists" of British Columbia as well as the more moderate socialists in the rest of Canada to reconcile the two. Wallis Lefeaux and Ernest Winch were highly regarded in British Columbia, but were looked on with some suspicion in the rest of the Federation. J. S. Woodsworth, William Irvine and A. A. Heaps were national figures, but their commitment to socialism was still suspect in British Columbia circles. Only a British Columbia socialist who had reached a position of authority in the national movement without losing his basis of support in the provincial party could bring the B. C. socialists into the national movement. Angus MacInnis was the man.

Unlike most of his comrades in B. C., MacInnis was a native Canadian, which perhaps gave him a more realistic view of the possibilities for socialism in Canada than some of his associates possessed. His grasp of socialist theory and practice were denied by few. After successful terms as school trustee and as city councillor, he was elected to Parliament
in 1930 as a socialist candidate. His five years in Parliament were vindicated when he was re-elected in 1935, increasing his share of the votes from 50.1 per cent to 50.9 per cent, in a four way contest. He was instrumental in founding the Independent Labour Party in 1925, helped sustain it through the 1920's and remained an active member of its successor, the Socialist Party of Canada (British Columbia section). East of the Rockies he became known as a fearless spokesman for all he considered victims of capitalism. He was respected for his integrity, his ability as a parliamentarian, and his forthright, consistently-held positions. After 1930, through his efforts in Parliament and his constant travelling, he became a national figure in the Canadian socialist movement.

This thesis examines the early political career of Angus MacInnis in the socialist movement in British Columbia, in the formative years of the C.C.F. and in his first term in Parliament.
CHAPTER I

THE EARLY YEARS

Angus MacInnis' background was not unlike that of many Canadians of his time. He was born in rural Prince Edward Island of first generation Scottish parents, and took part in the migration to the cities that has characterized twentieth century Canada. Like so many Maritimers he "migrated" west where he was thrust into the labour market and learned the harsher facts of a capitalist economy first hand. Although he was relatively removed from the industrial strife of the society he lived in he saw enough of it to evolve a socialist outlook based on his own experiences rather than on the theories of others.

He was born on September 2, 1884 in Glen William, Prince Edward Island, the seventh of nine children. His father, Neil MacInnis, had left the Isle of Skye forty years earlier and settled in a rocky part of the island on a farm that barely met the needs of the MacInnis family. In a biographical sketch written for the files of the C.C.F. in British Columbia, Angus MacInnis told about his childhood:

The family was always poor. The farm was poor. My education was somewhat neglected as there was always something to plant, something to pick or something more important than education to be attended to.

In the spring there were potatoes to plant. In the fall there were potatoes to pick. In the summer we picked potato bugs. That job lasted nearly all summer because the bugs were prolific and healthy. The infant mortality was low. In fact, I have never heard of a potato bug in P.E.I. dying a natural death at any age.

Then there were berries to pick: wild strawberries (the best in the world), blueberries and raspberries. Berry picking began about the 1st of July and continued to the
end of September. But the worst picking of all was picking stones. Our farm, I believe, produced the best and most plentiful crop of stones on the Island—red, rough sandstone. There may be more backbreaking jobs for a boy than picking stones, but I have not heard of it.

If there were any time left after these things were attended to— I went to school. 2

Angus' education was terminated in 1896 when he was in the eighth grade. He left school when his elder brother died and he had to assume a larger share of the family's responsibilities. Four years after this, his father also died, leaving him in charge of the farm and the family until his two younger brothers were able to take over.

Although his formal education stopped at an early age, he continued to educate himself. There was little time or material to read around the house, but he soon mastered what there was, the Bible, the almanac and Burns' poetry. The story is also told of his walking five miles each week to a neighbour's farm to read Ralph Connor's Man From Glengarry as serialized in the Charlottetown Guardian. 3

Following the path of many Maritimers before and since, Angus MacInnis set out for Boston when he left the Island. He stayed a short time, working in a ship chandlery, and then returned to Canada. In the autumn of 1908 he rode the harvest trains west to Ninga, Manitoba. After the harvest was completed he headed further west to Vancouver where he delivered milk for an uncle who owned a dairy farm on Lulu Island. He left this job in 1910 and started to work for the B. C. Electric Railway as a streetcar motorman and later as a conductor. MacInnis held this job until he was elected to Parliament in 1930. 4
In British Columbia, Angus MacInnis found himself in the midst of the most turbulent class warfare in North America. By 1910 the worst violence in the industries of the eastern United States and the mines of the west was over. It was not the case in British Columbia. An economy based on quick profits from mine, sea and forest, and the absence of a large farming community and urban middle class, pitted workers and capitalists against each other. The strikes, industrial warfare and threats of the Industrial Workers of the World (I.W.W.), the Western Federation of Miners (W.F.M.), and the Socialist Party were matched in intensity by the lockouts, legislation, and strikebreakers of the Dunsmuir's, Mackenzie and Mann, and the government.

Perhaps because of the society he lived in, or else because of his own desire to educate himself, MacInnis became an omnivorous reader of history, sociology, economics and politics. Shunning light fiction and escapist literature, his tastes ran to such authors as Marx, Lenin, the Webbs, Morris, Thoreau, Debs and Macaulay, whom he especially admired. Reading to learn, not to escape or relax, appealed to his ambition and intelligence. He well realized the shortcomings of his education and was determined to make up for all he had missed.

Although he had been brought up on the Shorter Catechism in a Scottish Presbyterian atmosphere, his attachment to formal religion waned as his interest in humanity and socialism grew. In much the same way as J. S. Woodsworth, his socialism evolved from his religion. Since he made no dramatic break with the Presbyterian Church, he did not display that antipathy to formal religion characteristic of so many socialists.

He took no active part in politics for several years after his arrival in Vancouver, but must have observed the fortunes of the doctrinaire
Socialist Party and its more moderate rival, the Social Democratic Party. The former evolved between 1901 and 1904 out of various mergers and dissolutions among the tiny socialist sects that grew up in the mining communities along the coast and in the interior. After a visit to Canada, the British Fabian and economist, J. A. Hobson, said of the B. C. mines, "nowhere else in Canada is the labour question so prominent, nowhere else is the class sentiment between employer and employee so bitter." Given the socialist experience of these miners in the north of England, Scotland and the western United States, it is little wonder B. C. socialism had its start here.

By 1904 the socialists had two members in the legislature, J. H. Hawthornwaite and Parker Williams, and were acknowledged as the leading socialist movement in Canada.

Even at this early date the Socialist Party in British Columbia showed itself to be extremely theoretical and little interested in legislative action. It saw its mission as "not to further the efforts of the commodity labour power to obtain better prices for itself but to realize the aspirations of enslaved labour, to break the galling chains of wage servitude and stand forth free." It also objected to trade unions which "diverted working men from the true causes of revolution."

Because of the Socialist Party's antipathy towards trade unions and its emphasis on theory, non-socialist workers tried alliances with the Liberals, and organized several workers' parties. All these failed through lack of support. Even the Canadian Trade and Labour Congress' Canadian Labour Party proved no match for the socialists.

The Socialist Party concentrated on education rather than legislative action, ignored or antagonized possible labour support, and even refused
to affiliate with the Second International. Two prominent members of the
British Labour Party were appalled by the Socialist Party of Canada
during visits to the Dominion. In 1908 Keir Hardie said that its leaders
knew nothing of the modern socialist movement and "little of Socialism
itself." He also observed that the rank and file of labour in Canada
were getting sick of their "dogmatic, arid, blighting creed of withering
materialism." Ramsay MacDonald came in 1912 and wrote:

But the Socialists [i.e., the Socialist Party of
Canada]...are grinding away at their cold aggressive
academic formulae about 'class warfare', 'economic
determinism', 'a class conscious proletariat', and
everyone who does not agree with them is either a fakir,
or a scoundrel of some degree or other... This barren­
ness of the present Socialist propaganda is particularly
noticeable in British Columbia..... Within ten years
the legislature could be dominated by our people. But
unless there is a change, only a wild seething strife
will be kept up. 12

In 1907 several members of the Socialist Party broke away to form
the Social Democratic Party. They objected to the Socialist Party's
negative emphasis on propaganda and its opposition to trade union
activities. For a while the S. D. P. was quite vigourous in municipal
and provincial election campaigns, but soon its support declined and
both parties in the province sank into impotence.

Angus MacInnis watched all this but took no part in party politics.
As a union man he was probably more inclined to support the B. C.
Federation of Labour which was formed in 1910.

His detachment from politics was ended by the Nanaimo Strike of
1912. In spite of a long history of explosions in the Nanaimo coal mines,
little had been done to prevent gas leakage beyond hiring inspectors to
watch the gas level. When an inspector was fired for what the men
believed was reporting a dangerous situation, they struck. The company responded with a lockout and the hiring of new employees from as far away as China and Britain. By the time the strike ended, the miners' union was broken. Watching all this was a nominal Tory, Angus MacInnis, who realized that what had happened in Nanaimo could happen as easily in Vancouver. He no longer lacked interest in politics. He now began to attend meetings of the Social Democratic Party and took an active part by selling party pamphlets. As a trade unionist and as a realist, he avoided the doctrinaire Socialist Party of Canada whose members he found "too snooty."\textsuperscript{13}

In August of 1912 MacInnis' mother and a sister left Prince Edward Island and moved to Vancouver where the latter pooled her money with his to buy a home. The death of a brother whose wife had already died, left his two year old niece homeless a few years later. After she came to live with her Vancouver relatives Angus acquired a family.

During the years from 1911 to 1918 he lived quietly as a street-car conductor and student of socialism. His union, Pioneer Division, Local 101 of the Street Railway Employees Union, was in general a conservative one and had good relations with the B. C. Electric Railway Company. During the war this changed as the men felt squeezed by the rising cost of living. In 1917 and again in 1918 they struck successfully for wage increases and an eight hour day.\textsuperscript{14} Angus MacInnis was not a union official at this time although he did contest two executive positions in 1918.\textsuperscript{15} There is no record of his taking any significant part in the strikes of 1917 and 1918 beyond participating as a member of the union.

The year 1918 was important for the labour movement in Vancouver for more than the Street-railwaymen's strike. All across Canada, workers
felt threatened by the rising cost of living, conscription, and the attitude of what they felt to be a hostile government. Many workers were heartened by the Russian Revolution and felt the collapse of capitalism to be imminent.

In western Canada labour was now more militant than ever, and far more aggressive than in the east. Two courses seemed open to it to defend itself; either direct action with its weapon, the general strike, or a re-entry into political life with another labour party. The B. C. Federation of Labour decided on the latter, more moderate course at its annual meeting in February, 1918. In spite of the opposition of Joe Naylor, President of the B. C. Federation of Labour, Ernest Winch of the Longshoremen, and Albert (Ginger) Goodwin, of the smeltermen, the Federated Labour Party was approved by the majority of the delegates. These three and others argued that there were already two socialist parties in the province and a third would only divide the left's few votes further. Others replied that the two parties were almost extinct and lacked the support of organized labour.16

The new party was organized, an executive elected and a socialist statement of policy issued,

That the Federated Labour Party is organized for the purpose of securing industrial legislation and the collective ownership and democratic operation of the means of wealth production. 17

A. S. Wells, Secretary-Treasurer of the Federation of Labour, remarked that,

the platform, the shortest platform that any political party was ever launched upon, is most comprehensive, embodying as it does the ultimate goal of the working class movement, "the collective ownership of the means of wealth production," without which any party supposed to represent labour would be like a ship without a rudder. 18
The Federated Labour Party soon absorbed the Social Democratic Party, which found it compatible, and some of the Socialist Party. Although he was not a charter member of the F.L.P., Angus MacInnis came into it through the S.D.P. soon after the new party's founding. Many of those who could not accept the F.L.P.'s moderate brand of socialism turned to industrial unionism as represented by the One Big Union movement and its weapon, the general strike. During 1918 and 1919, the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council under its president Ernest Winch drifted towards the direct action platform of the O.B.U. Industrial unionism appealed to the increasing number of radicals in the labour movement. The moderate course of the F.L.P. seemed eclipsed by immediate action soon after the party's inception.

During these years Angus MacInnis was serving his political apprenticeship. From his later writings and actions it would appear unlikely that he supported industrial unionism or that he took any part in the rise of the O.B.U. During this period, he was active in the newly formed F.L.P. with J. S. Woodsworth, whose views he was later to share in many ways.

The newly formed party was strongly influenced in its formative years by J. S. Woodsworth who had recently resigned from the Methodist ministry and was conducting classes in Vancouver for the Longshoremans' Union and the Federated Labour Party. His desire for a militant, yet constitutional party had its effect on the F.L.P. By 1921, "Woodsworth's influence was predominant in the formulation of a manifesto which adopted completely the revisionist, or Fabian position...." The Manifesto read in part,

As stated in our platform, our ultimate object is a complete change in the present economic and social system. In this we realize our solidarity with the workers the world over.
While realizing the inadequacies of the present system of representative government,—and without losing sight of our ultimate objective—we believe in taking advantage of every opportunity to improve the conditions of the workers. 23

MacInnis would hardly have opposed this either as a student of Woodsworth's or later as an official of the F.L.P.

The Winnipeg General Strike began in May, 1919. On June 6, a Vancouver Central Strike Committee called a sympathetic strike in Vancouver. As a member of the union, MacInnis went off the job but did nothing else. At this time he was active in the F.L.P. bombarding City Hall with the petitions of the unemployed, but to no avail. 24

Although the O.B.U. was crippled by the Winnipeg Strike, it still appeared strong in 1920 and was able to force the disbanding of the B. C. Federation of Labour in March. However, it soon declined and by autumn it was irrevocably weakened—first by the withdrawal of the Lumber Workers' Industrial Union led by E. E. Winch, and then by the general economic slump which hit hardest the unskilled labour which comprised the bulk of its membership. The Socialist Party also had now passed its best days. Part of its membership had been attracted by the O.B.U.'s direct action appeal, some by Lenin, and some by the F.L.P. A few remained faithful, if out of touch with reality, as was evidenced by the increasingly theoretical tone of the S.P. of C.'s organ, the Western Clarion.

The provincial election of 1920 found the major remaining labour party, the F.L.P., able to field fifteen candidates while the Socialists could put up only six. When the results came in, Labour had elected
three—Sam Guthrie in Newcastle, Tom Uphill in Fernie, and Harry Neelands in Vancouver South, while the Socialist Party had elected none. The Labour candidates had received an average of twenty-five percent of the vote in the fifteen seats they contested while the Socialists managed only six percent.25

MacInnis himself did not run. Although none of the F.L.P. candidates in Vancouver (including J. S. Woodsworth and Tom Richardson, a former British M.P.) were elected, all received more votes than the Socialist Party candidates. It was apparent that "revisionist" socialism now had more appeal than the doctrinaire brand.

Through that winter, as during the one before, the Federated Labour Party continued its classes in the Columbia Theatre on economics, public speaking, history and politics. Woodsworth handled many of these meetings, but not all. Other teachers included David Rees of the United Mine Workers, and an active union leader, Tom Richardson; E. T. Kingsley, an old time Socialist in Vancouver, and Mrs. Woodsworth. "One of the first and most assiduous of the students who attended the classes, as the Labour World later phrased it, was the young streetcar conductor, Angus MacInnis, who was soon taking his place on the platform.26

One of labour's demands in this post-war world was a re-examination of the educational system. Socialist and labour leaders believed that because of lack of education the sovereign people were not being given a chance to exercise their franchise properly. Such seemingly disparate matters as the deplorable pay teachers received, the system's class orientation, compulsory military training, and lack of health instruction,
were seen now in a fresh way by newly class-conscious labour. Here was an area in which something positive could be done—not revolutionary in its means, but revolutionary in its results. The School Board was under popular control; why not elect labour members to it?

A fundamental tenet of most socialists was a belief that, given the facts, the people would do the right thing. This view assumed the ability of the people to discern their "true interests" from the constant red herrings drawn across their path. The best way to ensure conditions that would enable the people to make right choices seemed to be through control of education. Moreover, the F.L.P. early realized that it would have to gain experience in all facets of government if it were ever to rule.

J. S. Woodsworth wrote a detailed criticism of the educational system in the B. C. Federationist during the winter of 1921, saying, in part: "May I suggest to my fellow workers that we have too long overlooked the importance of our schools in moulding the views of our children." Other letters, articles, and editorials continued the same theme. A teachers' strike in New Westminster in February verified at least one of the complaints—the indifference of the school trustees towards teachers' salaries. In this, as in many matters, Vancouver was as bad as New Westminster.

The resignation of a trustee in Vancouver and the subsequent school board by-election in the spring of 1921 presented an excellent opportunity for the F.L.P. Because of his moderation and proven ability, both in the union and the Party, Angus MacInnis was chosen as the F.L.P.'s candidate. The B. C. Federationist on April 15, 1921, reporting the weekly F.L.P. propaganda meetings at the Columbia Theatre, said, "Sunday April 2 will be given over to the 'Problems of Education.' Comrade McInnis
the F.L.P. candidate for by-election for school trustee will speak." He failed in this, his first electoral bid.

The Federated Labour Party backed three candidates in the 1921 civic elections. These were MacInnis running again for the school board, and R. P. Pettipiece and W. R. Trotter for City Council. MacInnis alone was elected. His platform was three-pronged: free textbooks and some better system of providing finances; an end to the teaching of militarism under any guise to school children; and free use of school buildings for meetings.

He took his seat with the incoming trustees early in 1922. In a different, yet related field, he had been elected to the executive of the Street Railwaymen's Union in June as one of the three executive auditors.

MacInnis' record as a school trustee was, if not spectacular, at least sound. As the one labour representative among seven trustees, his influence was limited. He did, however, do his job capably enough to be re-elected in 1923. It is interesting to note that when he finally left the Board, the Chairman made the following remarks in his report:

I regret very much that Trustee MacInnis has decided not to offer himself for re-election. During his two years of service, we have highly appreciated his ability and unfailing devotion to duty. His sound judgement in all matters dealt with by the Board made him a valuable and agreeable member.

No other member of the Board was cited in this manner on his retirement from it. What is all the more significant was that MacInnis' socialism must have been known to the Board, and could not have been popular with the businessmen on it.
During his two years on the School Board, MacInnis was also busy with the general work of the F.L.P. For instance, the B. C. Federationist reported that MacInnis would be speaking at the "usual propaganda meeting of the Federated Labour Party, his subject: 'An Educational Survey from a Worker's Point of View.' As Comrade MacInnis is a Labour representative on the Vancouver Board of School Trustees, he should have something interesting to say on the educational activities of the ruling classes." 32

While he remained as active as ever in the F.L.P., MacInnis also had a share in the birth of a new political grouping. In December of 1921 the Workers' Party of Canada appeared in Ontario, and affiliated with the Third International. The first local in British Columbia was organized that fall, drawing in members from the O.B.U., the Socialist Party of Canada and the Federated Labour Party. Many lumbermen and former members of the I.W.W. also showed an interest in the new party.

When the Workers' Party called for representatives of all working class groups to meet, "in the first move towards working class political unity in Vancouver," delegates from twenty organizations gathered, including the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council, the F.L.P., the Unemployed Workers' Council and seventeen unions. 33 Angus MacInnis and Tom Richardson represented the F.L.P. MacInnis did little talking at the meeting, and declined nomination to a committee to organize the Labour Representative Committee that resulted.

He did, however, willingly go along with the work of the Committee, standing as its School Board candidate in 1923. 34 Besides the original measures, his platform this time advocated that all schools be maintained on a non-sectarian basis, homework be curtailed (as detrimental to health),
and self-supporting men and women be given preference for teaching posts rather than persons with other means of support. That he was elected easily, without the use of any newspaper advertising, is an indication of the powerful support he must have had behind him.

The year 1923 saw another step in labour's developing political role. The convention of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, although dashing the hopes of the Vancouver Council for a more active political role for organized labour, did instruct the local executive to organize a branch of the Canadian Labour Party in B.C.

The Canadian Labour Party had been established in Winnipeg in 1921 during the T.L.C. national convention held there that year. Vancouver was represented on the national executive board by Tom Richardson, although his Federated Labour Party was not formally affiliated with the party at that time. The ideological basis of the new C.L.P. was sufficiently close to that of the F.L.P.'s democratic socialism to be acceptable, for the C.L.P. manifesto called for "a complete change in our present economic and social system. In this we recognize our solidarity with the workers the world over." Its platform included such moderate demands as public ownership of utilities, disability and old age pensions, electoral and taxation reform, direct legislation, and the abolition of the Senate. Setting a precedent for a policy that was to be advocated for years, the executive officers at the C.L.P. convention had been "requested to confer with the Hon. T. A. Crerar, the leader of the Progressive Party, to convey the willingness of the Canadian Labour Party to work with the farmers in the political field...." Such a union did not come to pass in the lifetime of the C.L.P. which remained strictly a workers' party. The dream, however, remained.
In the spring of 1924 the Canadian Labour Party was organized in Vancouver. It was virtually an expansion of the Labour Representative Committee of 1922 since it was composed of representatives from twenty-eight unions, the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council, the Federated Labour Party, and the Workers' Party. It saw itself as a co-ordinating body, wherein no attempt was made to merge parties and unions, except to run "C.L.P." candidates at elections.36

Angus Maclnnis had a very definite view of the relationship of the F.L.P. to this new party, which he set forth in an article in the B.C. Federationist:

While we do not agree that the manner of organizing which was approved by the convention was the best that could be taken, particularly having the present situation in mind, we shall, having decided to affiliate with the C.L.P. do our utmost to help it along the lines on which it was intended to function.

The Federated Labour Party is a parliamentary labour party, pledged to work along accepted constitutional lines as long as this form of activity is allowed us. We believe that by making use of the methods and institutions already at hand to which the people have become accustomed by use and habit, is the surest and quickest way for effecting our emancipation.

.... Present day society is too complex to expect a sudden turnover from capitalism to socialism but by education and organization we may hopefully look forward to a progressive transformation of private or corporate property into communal property. To this end we shall work, accepting every success and every advantage as stepping stones to further demands and further advances. 37

Maclnnis set forth the F.L.P.'s goals of constitutional activity, gradual progress and a feasible end achieved by moderate means. To the extent that the C.L.P. accepted these goals, to that extent was it compatible to the F.L.P. In this article, the first time Maclnnis' political thought found expression in print, the similarity between his views and
those of J. S. Woodsworth became apparent, especially in their acceptance of the realities of Canadian politics and their commitment to non-violent implementation of socialism in Canada.

As chairman of the F.L.P. from 1923-1925 and as an active unionist, it was to be expected that MacInnis would be on the executive of the Canadian Labour Party in Vancouver. When W. L. Cottrell was elected president, he was elected one of the vice-presidents along with Harry Neelands, the M.L.A. for Vancouver South and William Dunn, a fellow member of the Streetcar Railwaymen.

As soon as the "party" was formed it had to face a provincial election. With the B.C. Federationist supporting it, the F.L.P. nominated sixteen candidates distributed among greater Vancouver, the Island and the Interior. Nominated by Christiana Lorimer and Dr. Lyle Telford, MacInnis was one of the candidates in the multi-member seat of Vancouver.

The 1924 election saw "Honest John" Oliver's Liberal government, tainted by charges of corruption, taken on by a Conservative Party in open revolt against its leaders, and another "third party," the Provincial Party. The confusion might have been expected to help labour, but the results were disappointing. Only three labour members were elected--in Burnaby, Fernie and South Vancouver, and the percentage of the total vote received by labour slipped from twenty-five to eighteen percent.

The socialist gospel was falling on barren ground during the "Roaring Twenties." Capitalism seemed to be functioning admirably, there appeared to be plenty of work, wages were generally good, and the electors saw little need to change the system. After initial postwar problems from 1919 to 1921, the province settled down to nine years of prosperity. By 1922, the mines, forests and fisheries were producing as much wealth as
they had in 1918. Shipping grew stronger as the forest and mine products of B. C. as well as the grain of the Prairies poured out into the markets of the world through the port of Vancouver. By 1926, the value of mineral production surpassed all previous records, the fisheries were wealthier than ever before, and Vancouver was in the midst of the greatest housing boom it had ever known.

During the first months of 1929, almost all previous records for economic endeavour were broken; the employment index rose to 111.5; the value of manufactured, agricultural, fish and lumber products reached record heights; trading in oil and mining shares became frenzied; bank clearings in Vancouver approached the figure of three billion dollars; and the department stores not only permitted, but encouraged, the buying on credit of automobiles, radios, and the new mechanical and electrical aids.

It was not an auspicious decade for labour or socialist politicians. That Angus MacInnis did as well as he did do in municipal elections was due to his ability and the respect he had won, not to his position as a socialist.

In 1924 he did not do well. He came twenty-first out of twenty-seven candidates, ahead of two F.L.P. nominees, but behind two others. The election served only as experience for the F.L.P. and as a forum for its socialist propaganda. The Vancouver Province noted, "its [i.e. labour's] campaign has been educative rather than aggressive and the fruits may be reaped at a later election." The paper referred to MacInnis as "a tall man, spare of frame, spare of words, but using the ones that come to him with some vigour and colour...."

During the campaign, various labour men had presented their views to the Province on issues such as "beer by the glass" and the perennial favourite, the P.G.E. They were opposed to the Temperance League's support of "beer by the glass" and also to any extensive land grants for
the P.G.E. MacInnis was never invited to do so, a fact which may indicate that he was not considered one of labour's main spokesmen. Moreover, not once was an advertisement on his behalf seen in the Sun, the Province, or even the labour papers. It would seem his support was localized and dependent on an active, house to house, or person to person campaign. There was no strong effort made to appeal to Vancouver in general, since the seat was a multi-member one and his chances outside his own neighbourhood would be minimal. There was a lesson here to be learned. From now on educational work in general was to be coupled with the development of a political power based in the East End.

In 1924, Angus MacInnis started writing a series called "As We See It" in the B. C. Federationist and, occasionally, in the Labour Statesman. In articles on such topics as labour in politics, education, the British Government, unemployment, and the Russo-British Treaty, the development of his political thought can be followed.

At this point in his career, MacInnis showed more inclination towards theory than practice, but he was scarcely a doctrinaire socialist. For instance, writing about "Labour in the Political Field," he said:

We believe it an error to hold that the socialist revolution can take place only in a certain way. We further believe it an error to expect the complete collapse of capitalism. ...watching its partial and accumulative failure, what is to be done in the meantime?

Thus considered we will inevitably come to the conclusion that what occurred in Russia could not have happened in another country in the same way and by the same methods as were adopted in that country because of differing conditions.

It would seem, therefore, futile for any group to expect, or even hope for, a revolutionary change by sudden or violent methods.
Here is the counsel of moderation. It was a strange yet consistent voice in this age and this province where class lines were sharply defined, where socialism was not diluted for popular consumption but taken straight, where the Communist Trade Union Education League was heaping abuse on craft unions, international unions, and "revisionist socialism," and where the methods MacInnis counselled had apparently been discredited at the last election. This message of moderation was the same one MacInnis was to convey all his life and explains his aversion to Communist tactics. Perhaps it was more theoretical during the 1920's and less effective than it would be when he could call on greater experience, but it was fundamentally the same.

While counselling moderation, MacInnis was not one to be tempted from the goal of socialism by political expediency. Again, in his series on "Labour in the Political Field," he wrote:

Much discussion has been indulged in re the 1924 provincial election as to what form of political organization will appeal, if not to the reason of the workers, then to their imagination. And this is a question that is worthy of earnest and careful consideration, because there is a danger that in our efforts to form a party that will be acceptable to all shades of thought, or lack of thought, in the labour movement, we shall bring into being a party that will be useless as an instrument for effecting the emancipation of the working class. 46

And, again, writing on "Why You Should Join the Labour Party."

The struggle is not merely one of "bread and butter" although outwardly it manifests itself in that way, but a struggle for as full a life, both physically and spiritually, as co-operative effort can give.... The best and most that we can give is not too much for the end we have in view. He that is not with us is against us! 47

This he said at a time when John Oliver's Liberal government proclaimed that Labour would receive no special consideration as long as it supported its own political party. 48
MacInnis' moderate voice was also heard in 1924 on the Oriental Question. Although not a major issue, this controversy was to help to destroy the C.L.P. in two years. He wrote:

It is an international issue, and can be finally and permanently settled by the only party which has an international outlook—the Labor Party. 49

The issue was quite simple. They were opposed to all immigration until conditions here were better, but if Chinamen were to be here and compete with white men, they must do so at the level of white men, for the protection of the white men. 50

In terms of practical political organization, the early days of 1925 were dark ones for the C.L.P. in general and the F.L.P. in particular. Morale was down from the 1924 election, interest was flagging because of labour's repeated defeats and the member unions were losing members as interest in industrial unionism revived. A small item, at the bottom of the page of the Federationist, pointed this out:

With a view to making the business meetings of the Federated Labour Party, which are held the first and third Wednesdays of each month at 319 Pender Street West, as interesting as possible, it was decided at the last meeting that short papers would be read or addresses given on Labor subjects by persons connected with the Labor movement.... Comrade Angus MacInnis will lead off at the next meeting.... 51

As chairman of the party, it was MacInnis' duty not only to maintain the interest of the members, but also to define its role in the C.L.P. Was the F.L.P. a member of a federation, a larger "Labour Representative League," or had it sunk its identity in another party? The Communists, as the members of the Workers' Party began to call themselves after 1924, were inclined to view the C.L.P. as a party, with all the control over constituent parts that implies. Thus they supported the attempts to
organize C.L.P. branches in Vancouver early in 1925 although this was in
direct violation of the party's original aim. The Federated Labour Party,
which had been suspicious of the Canadian Labour Party all along, objected.

The dispute between the C.L.P. and the F.L.P. soon emerged in the
pages of the B.C. Federationist. H. W. Watts, editor of the Labour
Statesman, accused the F.L.P. of pettiness in objecting to the organization
of C.L.P. branches. Angus MacInnis replied on behalf of the F.L.P. After
pointing out the federal nature of the C.L.P., he charged that its constitu­
tion was being violated and said that only the F.L.P.'s interest in labour
solidarity prevented it from leaving the federation. 52 The F.L.P. had
had now stated its position and would watch the actions of the C.L.P. to
see if its trust in the Communists would be betrayed.

The effect of the Communists was being slowly felt in different
provinces. The Ontario branch of the C.L.P., dominant in the national
party, had elected Communists to four of its five executive posts. At
the 1925 B. C. Convention of the C.L.P. in May, the Communists had only
seven among the eighty-five delegates but they managed to submit five
resolutions and have them adopted.53 Although they failed to elect any-
one to the executive, they succeeded in alienating many of the non-
Communists in the party and in damaging the image of the C.L.P. in the eyes
of the voter.

The Communists were also active during the 1925 federal election
campaign. By their attacks on labour and socialist leaders, they did
little to help the C.L.P. Like the 1924 provincial campaign, this
election served a purely propaganda function for the C.L.P. The party did
so poorly that its five candidates in greater Vancouver lost their deposits.
It is interesting to note that Alfred Hurry, the C.L.P. candidate in
Vancouver South did not prepare the ground for MacInnis in 1930. He managed to gather only 2,764 of the 18,167 votes cast as Leon Ladner retained the seat for the Conservatives.

The fortunes of the socialist movement in British Columbia were not necessarily tied to the Canadian Labour Party. By the time of the 1925 campaign labour and non-communist socialist elements had seen the need for a political re-alignment without the disruptive presence of the Communists. The C.L.P., as long as it performed a useful function, must be maintained, but the non-communist majority must be strengthened to face the united but numerically weak Communists.

MacInnis, as chairman of the F.L.P., saw this as clearly as anyone. Four years later, just after his election to Parliament, he wrote:

...if there was any doubt as to the correctness of our position in withdrawing from the Canadian Labour Party, the attitude of the Communist Party was all that was necessary to dispell that doubt. How the "United Front" is going to be maintained by a continued abuse of J. S. Woodsworth, A. A. Heaps and others who have given the best years of their lives to the movement is something most of us find very hard to understand.

It was primarily the methods they used that turned MacInnis against the Communists. To him, the end did not justify the means.

In September, 1925, during the federal election campaign, the F.L.P. invited delegates from all the non-communist elements in the C.L.P. to attempt a new political alignment. There is no evidence that any official representatives of unions attended this meeting or that the unions were even interested. Delegates from the F.L.P., the S.P. of C., as well as the South Vancouver and New Westminster Labour Party Clubs gathered in the Socialist Party of Canada Hall. Addressing the meeting,
the chairman of the F.L.P., "Comrade MacInnis, briefly outlined the purpose of the meeting, namely to try and amalgamate the various existing Political Labour Groups in some organization that will appeal to the great mass of workers." The idea of a federal structure was soon abandoned. The delegates decided to band together in one party within the C.L.P. The implicit reason would seem to be to meet the communist challenge more effectively. A committee, chaired by MacInnis, and composed of members from all the organizations represented except the South Vancouver party, was set up to draft a constitution.

Within two months a constitution was approved and the "Independent Labour Party" came into being with MacInnis as chairman. Membership was open to all who could accept the party's manifesto on democratic socialism, who were nominated by two party members, and who did not belong to another political party. Since the only other non-capitalist party was the Communist, the disruptive element that plagued the C.L.P. was automatically eliminated. There was now one force equal to the communist group in the C.L.P. rather than many small ones swayed by it.

At the same time as the organization of the I.L.P. and its consolidation of the non-communist left in Vancouver was in progress, Angus MacInnis was making a second attempt to gain a seat on City Council as alderman for Ward Eight, the district around his own Mount Pleasant neighbourhood. A previous attempt in 1924 had ended in failure in spite of the efforts of an active Ward Eight Ratepayers' Association run by fellow socialist Robert Skinner. At that time he had received 708 votes to the 1308 of the winner, F. P. Rogers.
Besides MacInnis, the C.L.P. nominated W. Deptford for the School Board and R. P. Pettipiece and W. J. Scribbens for City Council. The party's platform was ambitious considering the limited number of candidates. It advocated public ownership of utilities, abolition of the ward system, abolition of the property qualification for civic candidates, and substitution of day for contract labour in public works. MacInnis alone was elected, although Scribbens and Pettipiece came close to winning. MacInnis won because his name was better known than were those of the other candidates, because he had an efficient, experienced organization in the Ratepayers' Association, and because his ward extended into the East End.

Before the end of 1925 the newly formed Independent Labour Party, under MacInnis' chairmanship, was formally accepted by the South Burnaby F.L.P., and by the Broadview and New Westminster Labour Party branches. South Vancouver F.L.P. adopted the party's manifesto, but decided to defer action on final amalgamation. The S.P. of C., going its own way," approved of the manifesto, but decided not to amalgamate or disband." By early 1926 there were branches of the party in North Burnaby, South Vancouver and Collingwood. The party's constitution, finally and officially adopted by the delegates of all the constituent parts, was presented to the members by MacInnis. The new party also officially affiliated with the C.L.P. An executive was elected consisting of one member from each of the seven branches. MacInnis was not among those chosen, as he had been chairman during the nominations. However, this was not important because he had succeeded in welding several little parties into one stronger one, and there were plenty of men in the new party to continue what he started.
Within a month of its beginning, the I.L.P.'s executive was able to report the establishment of a branch in Mount Pleasant and another in Port Alberni which expanded the I.L.P. from a Lower Mainland to a British Columbia party. The I.L.P. was represented as a body at the C.L.P. provincial convention in May, 1926. The resolutions at this convention were, as usual, communist inspired, but the executive elected was entirely of I.L.P. men, W. H. Cottrell, W. W. Lefeaux, R. H. Neelands and J. Sidaway.

The I.L.P. held its own annual convention in November. By that time the party had one hundred and forty-seven members in ten branches. Dave McCormack and Harry Neelands were elected president and secretary respectively. The party Angus MacInnis had done much to found the year before was now building a solid base outside the C.L.P. with its communist ties. The I.L.P. now took in all democratic socialist groups in B. C. except the scattered remnants of the Socialist Party of Canada.

In October 1926 MacInnis again stood as aldermanic candidate in Ward Eight. This time the C.L.P. ran candidates in four other wards and for the School Board. Among the five Labour Party aldermanic candidates MacInnis was again the only one successful, while A. V. Lofting won a seat on the School Board.

The Independent Labour Party held its second annual convention early in January, 1928. Angus MacInnis, active as chairman of the Resolutions Committee and mover and seconder of many of the motions, was elected President of the party. An interesting "letter was read from Com. William Ivens, general secretary of the I.L.P. in Winnipeg in which he suggested that the various groups, east and west, keep in touch with each other as much as possible with a view to eventually forming a Dominion wide party."
Shortly after this, the C.L.P., B. C. Section, held its own convention. Seventy-seven delegates were present from all over the province, including six from the I.L.P. and eleven from the Communists. The resolutions were in the main, Communist inspired, numbering thirty or so. Among them was a call for Oriental enfranchisement which was only adopted after a bitter debate. Although adopted, said the Labour Statesman, "we cannot see how the mass of organized labour can support this action." 64

For years cheap Oriental labour had been brought into B. C. by the federal and provincial governments and by various companies. All encouragement given to Oriental immigration was seen by the unions as an attempt to undercut them with cheap labour, and toleration was expendable for the B. C. worker as long as Orientals, particularly Chinese, remained an economic threat. Before long, the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council severed its connections with the C.L.P. and the unions still in the party contemplated the same action.

The I.L.P. (including MacInnis) had no objection to the principle of Oriental enfranchisement, but, in this instance, saw the resolution as a divisive Communist move. The unions were opposed to Communist control of the C.L.P., and based their threat of withdrawal on this as much as on their animosity to enfranchisement. Several months later the Labour Statesman commented:

"Activities of the Communists have created such conditions that the delegates feel that to tolerate them any longer will tend to split the unions wide open and discredit the political wing of the labour movement." 65

On June 1 the unions all withdrew from the C.L.P. leaving the Independent Labour Party and the Communists alone in it.
In April, before the unions pulled out of the C.L.P., the I.L.P. had met to consider the enfranchisement motion. While MacInnis acted as chairman, H. W. Watts, editor of the Labour Statesman and John Sidaway, another Street Railwayman, moved that the motion be supported. By a vote of 17-11 it was. The I.L.P. was still trying to work inside the C.L.P. 66

June brought a different situation. Of the original six C.L.P. candidates endorsed in Vancouver City for the July provincial election, only MacInnis and Robert Skinner had not withdrawn in opposition to the franchise policy. The provincial executive of the I.L.P. met June 6 and resolved "it would be in the best interests of the political Labour Movement that the Independent Labour Party withdraw its affiliation from the Canadian Labour Party." 67 The motion carried. MacInnis, along with Neelands and Skinner of the executive and F. A. Bourne, was asked to draw up an I.L.P. platform for the coming election. Although it had not been stampeded out of the C.L.P. by the Communist advocacy of Oriental enfranchisement, the I.L.P. was politically astute enough to realize this was unpopular and not to mention the issue on the platform.

A special convention of the whole party was called to decide on the executive recommendation to withdraw from the C.L.P. A letter from the Communist Party urging that the I.L.P. not withdraw was read and discussion followed on the executive's motion. As president, MacInnis acted as chairman and so took no part in the discussion. However, as the chief executive member, he was ultimately responsible for the motion to withdraw. When a vote was called, 34 members were present. Of these, eighteen supported the motion and ten opposed. The executive's actions were approved although not overwhelmingly. The convention finally endorsed MacInnis and Skinner as the I.L.P. candidates in the provincial election. 68
The Independent Labour Party now stood alone, out from under the shadow of the Canadian Labour Party. It was much smaller, poorer and weaker than the C.L.P. had been but by breaking with the Communists the I.L.P. disassociated itself from a dangerous and unpopular partner. The I.L.P.'s weaknesses were readily apparent, while its new strengths resulting from its departure from the C.L.P. would only emerge with time.

The I.L.P. ran six candidates in the 1928 provincial election and supported three incumbents. Besides MacInnis and Skinner in Vancouver, it nominated people in Burnaby, Comox, Alberni and Nanaimo. It also backed Harry Neelands in South Vancouver, Sam Guthrie in Newcastle and Tom Uphill in Fernie. The party put on a brave front but it lacked sufficient public support. Without funds it could not advertise or rent halls for meetings. The daily papers, full of election appeals, were remarkably free of I.L.P. ads; in fact the Liberals and Conservatives even covered the pages of the *Labour Statesman* with their solicitations. Labour candidates had the support of H. W. Watts, editor of the *Labour Statesman*, who printed many of their articles, but to little avail as they were only preaching to the converted in the *Labour Statesman*. Relying mainly on personal and party contacts, the I.L.P. candidates' circle of influence was very small.

Alderman Maclnnis, by virtue of his position, was at least known in the city. He received some unexpected support from one of Vancouver's dailies, the *Star*:

Even Labour has done the unusual thing—it has put forward some candidates of undoubted strength and ability. Alderman Angus Maclnnis is a man who is making his mark. Courageous, devoted, single-minded—he is a power to be reckoned with. He and Harry Neelands of South Vancouver are steadily raising the prestige of Labour.
Two days later, in an editorial calling for split ticket voting in the multi-member Vancouver riding, the Star repudiated the Liberal and Conservative appeals to "Vote the Solid Six" and said, "the Star insists on keeping Alderman Angus MacInnis in the picture as a distinctly able, honest and fearless—and possible—man."70

In spite of this slight yet favourable publicity, the I.L.P. could not even help the two incumbents, Neelands and Guthrie. Uphill alone won, and with minimal I.L.P. aid. All other candidates were defeated. An educational campaign had been going on for years, but the labour-socialist alliance (or what was now left of it) was still a long way from power. The Conservative leader, Dr. Tolmie, on a "time for a change" platform, reduced the contest to a two way battle. The I.L.P. lacked the funds as well as the popular support and organization to compete in the same league as the Grits and Tories, while there were still the old Communist and Oriental bogeys to be used by the opposition if the I.L.P. showed strength. The main problem, however, was the weakness of the party. Small, poor, but vocal, it could not reach out to the electorate as effectively as the two "old line" parties.

The results of the election, which showed a Conservative win, were so bad that the Labour Statesman did not even print them. MacInnis' defeat must have been especially disheartening. A civic minded citizen, of proven ability on the School Board and the City Council, he came thirteenth out of fifteen in all polls in the city but one. Only his running mate, Robert Skinner, and an independent named Pelten did worse. There was, however, one gleam of hope in his performance. In one poll, Nightingale School, near his home, he came ninth. This should have provided a clue to his main asset—personal contact and a local organization. To have come ninth in his best poll was hardly encouraging, but it
was indicative of the fact that although the I.L.P. might be weak, Alderman Angus MacInnis was not necessarily so if he made himself known to the electorate, stood on his reputation, and extended his power base and organization.

The I.L.P. was unquestionably down, but it was not yet ready to quit. It was back for the 1928 civic elections, the first for Vancouver after amalgamation with South Vancouver and Point Grey. MacInnis' old Ward Eight was now an expanded Ward Seven which ran from Ontario to Knight and from Terminal to the Fraser River. He and Alex MacDonald, Labour councillor in South Vancouver for many years, were the only I.L.P. candidates when nominations closed on October 5. This election, as usual, saw no MacInnis advertisements in the daily papers, nor in the *Labour Statesman*, although in the latter he wrote several articles, including one on the advantages to labour of political activity. Able now to call on greater political experience, he no longer spoke in such abstract terms as he had in 1924. Now it was Alderman Angus MacInnis, practical and experienced politician, not candidate MacInnis, theoretician, speaking. His opponent in Ward Seven, Dave Hall, advertised in all the papers, including the *Labour Statesman*. In the latter he made a point of mentioning his support of labour's interests, but in vain. MacInnis' supporters, including a particularly strong Women's Organization under Mrs. J. Lorimer, Mrs. J. A. Clark (later on the School Board), Ann McGorgan and others who had supported him since 1921, had covered the Ward completely. When the results came in, Alderman MacInnis was elected by the largest margin in the city.
A study of the polls in this election again showed that, as in the July provincial election, MacInnis' main support was in his own neighbourhood. Four polling stations were set up in the Ward. He carried three of them with ease and only lost the fourth by sixteen votes (680 for Hall, 664 for MacInnis). This latter was set up at the Fraser School, Sixteenth and Manitoba in the western part of the Ward in an area not included in his old Ward Eight. Of the other three polls, the one closest to his home gave him almost seven hundred votes over Hall. This would indicate that there were many electors who would vote for Angus MacInnis, the individual, as alderman, who would not vote for him as an I.L.P. candidate for the legislature. In the provincial election, his own assets were of little benefit to the Independent Labour Party as long as it remained financially and numerically weak.

In early 1929, entering his fourth year as alderman, MacInnis was named chairman of the Board of Works where he could put into practice his promise to substitute day for contract labour in public works. The Star remarked that "no happier choice than that of Alderman MacInnis for the Board of Works could have been made. He has courage and ability; more important still, he has character and integrity." 73

As an alderman, MacInnis' political star was rising. Unfortunately, he could not transfer his growing strength to the struggling I.L.P. Membership was on the decline and branches were disappearing. The Labour Statesman still supported the party, but the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council was wary of any further political entanglement after its experiences with the C.L.P.
The I.L.P. held its Third Annual Convention in May, 1929. Twenty-nine members attended. Of these, ten were from MacInnis' branch in Mount Pleasant. Little business was conducted, although a motion to re-join the C.L.P., whose B. C. branch had dissolved that March was defeated, and a propaganda committee was finally set up. W. W. Lefeaux replaced MacInnis as president, John Sidaway was elected vice-president and Harry Neelands was again chosen secretary. 74

That summer, the old idea of a national labour party, planned and hoped for by socialist and labour politicians for years, was again revived. The Rev. William Ivens of Winnipeg again suggested it. The first "Western Conference of Labour Political Parties" met in Regina October 26-29, 1929. J. W. Bartlett, representing the Independent Labour Party of British Columbia, was elected chairman, and later B. C. representative to the Conference's national executive. The I.L.P. was looking beyond B. C. to a larger socialist political unit. Although undeniably weak at home, it was the only non-Communist socialist party left in B. C. The party did not yet have an audience in B. C.

The I.L.P. in British Columbia seemed near extinction. Only the desire of the members to preserve it, to see it through to the next election, and the feeling that the educational program must be kept up until the people saw the light, could carry it through.

As a functioning political organization, the I.L.P. reached its lowest ebb in late 1929 and early 1930. No minutes were kept of any meetings from May 19, 1929 to October 5, 1930, at which point a re-vitalized party gathered. The paper, the I.L.P. News, was started by John Sidaway in February of 1930, primarily for propaganda use in the federal election that summer. It was anything but self supporting, relying on donations from readers and the party faithful, but it did struggle along until the election and it did serve its purpose.
On May 16, 1930, Canada's Sixteenth Parliament was dissolved and writs for a general election were issued. The I.L.P. saw this election as an excellent opportunity. Angus MacInnis was an experienced, active trade unionist. He had carried the party's banner in two provincial and six civic campaigns and had served with distinction not only as an alderman but also as a school trustee. He was now much better known in Vancouver than any other I.L.P. member, and was widely respected for his proven ability. His political successes had provided him with a realism many of his less successful campaign mates lacked, yet his commitment to socialism had not been fundamentally altered. He had served as secretary of the F.L.P., had helped organize the C.L.P. and done as much as possible to make it a success, and had initiated the I.L.P. His opposition to Communism and support of legitimate constitutional change were well known. MacInnis, both on his own merits and in the absence of any other labour candidate, was the logical choice for the I.L.P.

Due to lack of funds and of candidates of MacInnis' calibre and popularity, the I.L.P. decided to contest only one riding. Vancouver South was chosen. It was composed of a large working class district in Vancouver City east of Nanaimo Street and old Vancouver South as well as traditionally Liberal Point Grey.

With the experience of a decade of provincial, federal and civic elections to call upon, the I.L.P. could now improve the calibre of its campaigning. MacInnis' core of supporters, especially the women, was expanded. All the human resources of the I.L.P. were thrown into the fray by Harry Neelands, the campaign manager. An appeal for funds, which made obvious the I.L.P.'s extreme financial need, appeared in the Labour
Statesman which offered its usual support. The same edition carried an open letter signed by the three labour members of Parliament, Woodsworth, Heaps and Adshead, pointing out what labour had done in Parliament and what could be done, given more members. It ended with the plea, "send us needed reinforcements." 76

All of the above was important, but not as much as was the absence of a Liberal candidate in Vancouver South the day nominations closed. Because of this, the Vancouver South Liberals and the strongly pro-Liberal Sun threw all their support behind MacInnis. 77

The reasons for the Liberal failure to field a candidate are not altogether clear, but it would seem that the Liberals preferred to see a labour man returned rather than run the risk of allowing the Conservatives to benefit from a three way split. Again, seeing Canadian politics in terms of two parties, they may have felt that MacInnis was basically Liberal since he was progressive and certainly not Conservative. Elsewhere, too, where there was some advantage, support for a non-Liberal was Liberal policy in this election. For instance in Alberta, one Labour and five U.F.A. candidates were unopposed by a Liberal candidate, and in Manitoba, all Liberal-Progressives but two and both Labour candidates faced no Liberal opposition. 78 Mackenzie King at this time assumed that the absorption of the mass of the Progressive members into the Liberal Party would soon be followed by the swallowing of remnants—the U.F.A., the few remaining Progressives and the Labour members. Thus, it would be better to elect a good Labour representative—and potential Liberal—than to assure a Conservative victory in Vancouver South in a three way split.

Support for MacInnis came easily for the Liberals. Mackenzie King, in the Maritimes at the time, composed a telegram to MacInnis which, sent
or not, showed that he had no compunction about supporting MacInnis.

May I extend to you and through you to the Labour and Liberal electors of Vancouver South the very hearty congratulations of my colleagues in the government and myself upon your selection as the candidate of the Liberal party in the constituency.

...I shall be grateful if you will say to the people of the constituency that if returned to power, the present administration will do its utmost to merit the confidence thus expressed by the citizens of the Dominion. 79

Dr. J. H. King, Mackenzie King's B. C. lieutenant, assumed that MacInnis was a Liberal candidate. Writing to his chief at the end of June, he stated that there was a full slate of Liberal candidates in the province, but made no mention of Angus MacInnis as an independent, labour, or I.L.P. candidate.

Ian Mackenzie, who succeeded Dr. King as British Columbia's representative in the Cabinet after the latter's appointment to the Senate, was inclined to support MacInnis as a labour representative. Mackenzie was considered a radical in the Liberal group in Parliament, and in the B. C. legislature when he sat there. 81 At one point, writing to C. A. Woodward, he referred to the fact that "we who stood under the Liberal Banner in 1924 owe much to labour support..." 82

It would seem that not only federal but also local Liberals saw more advantages in supporting a labour representative, in the hope that he might really be a Liberal, than in assuring the return of a Conservative.

MacInnis did not reject Liberal support, but made it clear he was not being bought by the Liberal Party. The Province, covering his opening meeting under the heading, "He's a Socialist and Proud of It," reported:

Ald. Angus MacInnis, tacitly endorsed by the Liberal Party as candidate in Vancouver South scorned and scored Liberals and Conservatives alike....
Socialism (says he) is the fundamental basis of the Labour Party. I must work for it. Time and again I have declared it fundamental. There is no solution to our economic difficulties except in the ownership of the means of production, and production for use instead of profit. Human needs before property rights.

That there is no relation between himself as Labour candidate in Vancouver South and the Liberal Party, Ald. MacInnis was careful to assert. He said of the offer of a Liberal nomination: 'With all due regard, I could not accept. I told those who offered this that it would be better to stay at home than to go to Ottawa with any strings attached.'

In effect, he had the best of both worlds. He ran as a Socialist, with no strings attached, yet he was sure of Liberal support. Although Leon Ladner, the Tory incumbent, and the Vancouver Province, attempted to revive the old name "Liberal-Conservative" to attract the Liberal vote, it was not used by the Tory candidates in the other Vancouver ridings. Nor was this idea accepted by the Liberals of Vancouver South.

Robert Cromie, editor of the Sun, threw his support behind MacInnis. MacInnis was worked into most of the Sun's pro-Liberal cartoons, usually surrounded by Liberals and in one case, his picture appeared officially with all the Liberal candidates, although captioned "Labour-Independent." He also received the glowing editorial coverage reserved for Liberals. On July 11, an editorial appeared in the Sun, under the heading "Vote for Angus MacInnis:"

A vote for Alderman Angus MacInnis in Vancouver South is a vote for the spirit of tolerance and justice that should characterize every Liberal.

In this campaign, Alderman MacInnis has voiced doctrines to which the Liberal Party may not subscribe. But the Liberal Party believes in his right to hold these opinions, to voice them on the hustings, and to carry them to Parliament.

One cardinal principle of Liberalism is the right of minorities. If the House of Commons is to be truly representative of the Canadian people, labour cannot be left out.
And while Alderman MacInnis may not label himself as a Liberal and even reject official Liberal support, it is unthinkable that as a progressive minded member of a progressive party he should oppose in Parliament the progressive program that the Mackenzie King government has laid down.

For the rest, Alderman MacInnis has shown himself in civic affairs to be capable and efficient, a practical man devoted to the solution of problems in a practical way.

The Province newspaper can jibe at Angus MacInnis' Labour-Socialist tendencies because that newspaper believes in autocracy and favours for the favoured few.

But Angus MacInnis at Ottawa, tied to no party and voting for the measures that mean dollars and cents for Vancouver will be a more useful member than five Leon Ladners sitting in opposition and compelled by his Eastern-controlled party to vote against measures that are good for Vancouver.

He will give Vancouver South able and sincere representation.

And he will carry to Parliament the voice of a party that has reached such dimensions that it can no longer be ignored in the councils of the nation.

Although MacInnis was pleased by this endorsement, he was also disturbed by the apparent assumption that he would support the Liberals automatically and, some day, join them. The next day, in a letter to the Sun, he made his own declaration of political independence.

I am not in this contest because I have political ambitions or because I want a job. I could get far more pleasure out of life in much quieter ways, which would much better suit my temperament. And I am not particularly concerned as to whether or not I get Liberal support. I would rather be right than be an M.P. However, I am in this fight now, and naturally I want to win.

One thing the Liberals in Vancouver South should remember: a vote for Ladner is a vote for Bennett and a Conservative Government, and consequently, a vote against Mackenzie King. To refrain from voting will have the same result. A vote for the Labor candidate is not necessarily a vote for King, but most certainly is not a vote for Bennett.
The Labour Group in the House have criticized the Government as well, as impartial /sic/, as they have criticized the Opposition in the House, but they have never played the game of the Conservative Party.

He then went on to state that he held the tenets of the Labour Party, gave a list of prominent city figures as endorsements, and said that he felt he could best keep the respect of his friends in the Liberal Party by being true to his principles. 84

As MacInnis did not reciprocate Liberal help, the I.L.P. fought its own electoral battle in its own unique way. Years later, Angus MacInnis recalled:

In the campaign the emphasis was on education in the tradition of the old Socialist Party of Canada. I remember one meeting held in the Selkirk School in Cedar Cottage.... /W. W. Lefaux spoke on money, Jack Harrington on Inca civilization/.... The election was scarcely mentioned but Jack did refer to the fact that Comrade MacInnis was a candidate in the forthcoming election and it was a duty of socialists to vote at elections whenever possible. 85

The I.L.P. News felt that Ladner had tried unsuccessfully to make an issue out of unemployment but that MacInnis had brilliantly destroyed that manoeuvre. When the Conservative candidate accused MacInnis of "bolshevism," the News was sure Ladner had lost since the presence of Bennett, the communist candidate, made a lie of this. Clearly Ladner was clutching at anything to discredit MacInnis. 86 Since the lack of other I.L.P. candidates, the Sun's support, and the absence of a Liberal seemed suspicious the News denied the existence of any deal with the Liberals. "In short, the Independent Labour Party entered this election campaign on its own initiative. It consulted no one.... The decision to run one candidate was made not by choice, but by financial necessity." 87
The I.L.P. platform was a socialist manifesto, stating the real issue of the campaign to be, not British preference as the Liberals advocated, not the Conservative policy of "blasting" into world markets, but "how to distribute the total of production equitably among those who helped to produce it—according to their needs." It is interesting to note the constant use of the pronoun "we" in the pamphlet, referring to the plans of a Labour government on taking office.

The mannerly, polite tone of "we respectfully solicit your vote and influence for Angus MacInnis" contrasted sharply with Ladner's violent warnings of the danger of electing a communist. MacInnis' largest ad appeared in the Vancouver Sun and set a tone of moral righteousness that seemed out of place in this campaign. It consisted of a quotation from one of MacInnis' speeches, "I will devote my energy and my life to furthering the social uplift cause of the workers, but I propose to proceed as I have always done, on constitutional lines." At the bottom of this appeared the twin questions, "Could Anything Be Clearer?" and "Could Anything Be More Worthy?"

The final meeting of the campaign was held before the largest audience yet seen in the constituency. Here were gathered many of MacInnis' fellow socialists in the F.L.P. and the I.L.P. They included Dr. Lyle Telford, W. A. Pritchard, Robert Skinner, John Sidaway, R. H. Neelands, W. W. Lefeaux and others. W. A. Pritchard, reeve of Burnaby, spoke longer than anyone else because, as the I.L.P. News reported, this was "his first appearance in the campaign." He and Mr. Gallagher also "teamed up to sing a duet half way through the proceedings. The nature of the meeting veered somewhat from that of the other meetings where time allowed detailed analysis of social conditions. Reference was made to the personal qualities
Naive it may seem, especially in the face of the Conservative electoral machine, but the traditional Socialist campaign went on beside the efforts of the Sun and the work of the Vancouver South Liberals. Moreover, MacInnis never attacked King's policies as violently as Bennett's and he did not reject any Liberal help offered. He was practical politician enough now to accept help from whatever the sources, and, in fact, was adept (or lucky) enough to receive Liberal aid for nothing. After he had won the seat, he was able to go to Ottawa free of any obligations to the Vancouver, provincial or federal Liberals.

It is a moot point whether he would have been successful July 28 had the Liberals run a candidate or even had the Sun oppose him. The I.L.P. would probably have been unable to meet the Grit and Tory opposition just as it had been unable to meet it in 1924, 1925, 1926 and 1928, and MacInnis, running on his own merits solely, would have lost. As it turned out, he carried most of the East End polls, a few in South Vancouver and many in Point Grey. What difference a Liberal candidate would have made in the core East End polls is a matter of speculation. The Liberals who did vote Tory rather than Socialist would have cut Ladner's vote and it is remotely possible that MacInnis with his solid, well organized base in the East End, might have won anyway. On the other hand, he might have lost as disastrously as did Alfred Hurry, the C.L.P. candidate in 1925.

Reflecting on his victory, MacInnis could count as his assets the I.L.P. organization and campaign, the funds available, his own political
experience and reputation and strong Liberal support. He had built up experience over the years in some nine elections of which he had won six. It was an enviable record in one decade of political life.

He had helped build the Socialist movement in B. C. and kept it Fabian in its approach. Radical groups rose and fell, while MacInnis' parties, first the F.L.P. and then the I.L.P., learning from their mistakes, gradually grew in strength. A patient propaganda campaign and grass roots level organization in the East End of the city were now showing results. The I.L.P. and its successor, the Socialist Party of Canada, were able to enter the C.C.F. in 1933 from a position of relative strength. This position was built up to a large degree by Angus MacInnis through the 1920's.
CHAPTER II

ANGUS MACINNIS AND THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT WITHIN

BRITISH COLUMBIA, 1930-1932

Angus MacInnis' election to Parliament had given the Independent Labour Party in Vancouver a prominence it had never known. Had he lost, the party would probably have followed its predecessors into oblivion, but his victory helped revive interest in its socialist message. As interest in the I.L.P. increased, the waning enthusiasm and the pessimism that had characterized the party the year before were replaced by a new optimism. Socialist predictions about capitalism were being borne out by the Great Depression and the party now felt it had more reason than ever to preach the gospel of socialism.

The Depression of the 1930's upset the Canadian economy because the markets for Canada's primary products contracted. Canadian prosperity had been built on the export of farm, forest, mine and sea products to the rest of the world, but loss of purchasing power, imposition of protective tariffs and economic warfare closed many of these markets in the years after 1930. This meant that thousands of men in the forests, mills, and mines lost their jobs; that fishermen and farmers lost their markets; and that building, transportation and service industries contracted as demand decreased internally.

The Depression hit British Columbia particularly hard because of its overdependence on the export of lumber, paper, sea products and minerals, and because wheat from the Prairies no longer flowed out through its ports. The forest industries were hard hit because the U. S. market for
newsprint (about half of which came from B. C.) fell 30 per cent from 1929 and 1933, Canada's lumber sales to the United States fell from $58.6 million to $13.1 million, the Asian market for Canadian lumber closed, and Great Britain began to buy its lumber from the Soviet Union in the same period. On top of this, the province's large construction industry was paralyzed when investment funds dried up in 1929 which, in turn, further affected the forest industry. The waterfronts in Vancouver, New Westminster, Prince Rupert and Victoria grew quieter as, first a world wheat glut, and then a decline in purchasing power overseas, diminished Canada's wheat sales. Finally, the fishermen packed 2,000,000 cases of salmon in 1930 but could not sell them, while coal and hardrock mines cut back production, laid off men and cut wages.¹

For Vancouver, this meant that thousands of unemployed workers flocked to the city from the mining and forest camps of B. C. as well as from the Prairies to swell the city's relief rolls. At the end of 1930 there were about 7,000 men on relief. Within a year there were 2,558 families, 4,664 single men and 175 single women on relief—all of them residents. By 1933, 34,000 people were receiving help from the city of Vancouver.²

In human terms, the Depression was even worse than any statistics can show. Men who had held steady jobs all their lives now had none; young people leaving school had no prospects at all, and so thousands of "knights of the road" drifted across the country in a futile search for work. Many came to Vancouver because they knew that, even if they could not find work, they would not freeze to death. Hobo "jungles" grew up in the city. Men lined up for free meals from the Salvation Army and the churches that ministered to them. On one occasion in 1932, the Rev. Andrew Roddan of First United Church in Vancouver counted 1,252 men in
The unemployed were confused, lost, and angry at a society which they felt had treated them so unjustly. They easily became receptive audiences for the communists who seemed to be the only people who cared. The first result of this occurred late in 1929 when the communists organized the unemployed workers to attack the city relief office. After four days of marching and fighting, the police arrested several leaders of the demonstrations and cancelled any further parades.

When Angus Maclnnis returned to Vancouver from his first session of Parliament in October, 1930 to finish his term of office as alderman, he was immediately faced with the problems of the Depression as they affected Vancouver and as they would affect the city for the decade.

City Council did not know how to deal with the masses of men flooding into Vancouver in 1930 and feared a repetition of the 1929 disturbances. To make matters worse, as relief costs grew, the city's revenues from tax assessments fell, and neither the provincial nor the federal governments felt it was their duty to help the city. Towards the end of 1930, several suggestions were made to City Council to solve the problem, such as turning the jobless back at the B. C.-Alberta boundary, charging them all with vagrancy, and covering the cost of unemployment relief by levying a tax on one day's wages on all those working. At a meeting of the City Council Finance Committee on December 19, Angus MacInnis suggested "that the Federal Government be asked to impose a levy on the nation's wealth because 'we can't deal with the problem and provide decent food and accommodations'."

While the Finance Committee was debating the relief problem, police and the jobless fought in the streets. An inflammatory speech by William
McEwan, communist leader of the Unemployment Association, started a riot around Victory Square which resulted in eight arrests. An attempted march on City Hall was halted, but McEwan was able to see the Finance Committee of the Council where he heaped abuse on the City administration, the police, business, labour, and all politicians, including the I.L.P. alderman, Angus MacInnis. McEwan was particularly abusive to MacInnis, whom he called a "yellow socialist." MacInnis had already seen enough of Communist activities in the socialist movement to recognize their tactics. Referring to McEwan, he said:

If I may interrupt this—I was going to say gentleman but I'll change it to communist—who toils not, neither does he spin yet seems to keep himself better fed and clothed than the men he claims to represent; my reputation in the city will stand any villification you may put on it....

.... I think we're taking too much notice of this man's point of view. He confines himself to sabotage and villification. 6

MacInnis would come into contact with the unemployed and into conflict with their leaders again.

This was his last act on the City Council. At its final meeting the old Council paid tribute to Alderman MacInnis and Mayor Malkin who was also retiring. The mayor, who was president of Malkin's Foods, a wholesale food distributing company, and a prominent local Tory, congratulated MacInnis for his work as an alderman:

His worship presented Mr. MacInnis with a handsome initialed travel bag expressed deep satisfaction at the alderman's rise in civic affairs and wished him further success as representative of Vancouver South at Ottawa.

Mr. MacInnis said that he had never found anyone whom it gave him more pleasure to work with than Mayor Malkin. 7

This was an excellent example of Angus MacInnis' ability to work with those whose political views he did not share. He could work with a
Conservative in governing Vancouver, yet remain a respected member of the Independent Labour Party. It was this experience in practical politics that set him apart from his comrades and which broadened his vision.

MacInnis' election to the federal House combined with the widely held belief that capitalism was failing resulted in renewed interest in socialism in general and the Independent Labour Party in particular. Political success and the Depression had halted the party's slow decline in membership and, although it was still virtually insolvent, a new mood of optimism was evident at its annual convention in October.

The Independent Labour Party now had two contacts with socialist groups in other provinces. Firstly, through the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties, which had held its second meeting in Medicine Hat in September, it was in touch with the socialist movements in the other western provinces. Secondly, through Angus MacInnis' parliamentary activities, it now learned more about the activities of the farmer and labour groups represented by the "co-operating independents" in Parliament. Through both of these outlets its interest in Canadian affairs was increasing, thereby laying the foundation for a more durable national party than the Canadian Labour Party had been.

The I.L.P. was represented at the Medicine Hat Conference by W. J. Bartlett, Conference president and John Sidaway, vice-president for B. C. In his report to the local membership, Bartlett stated that the resolutions approved by the Conference placed more emphasis on co-operation than on socialism, and made no mention of state control of the means of production. These resolutions included support for expansion of various social services such as blind and old age pensions, public ownership of
hydroelectric sites, the return of natural resources to the western provinces, state aid to medicine, and opposition to cadet training in schools. These policies were not as socialist as the I.L.P. would have liked, but for the present the advantages of regular meetings with other western socialist parties outweighed any disadvantages arising from this weakness. Following Bartlett's report, the members were exposed to a more national perspective as Angus MacInnis reported on the activities of the "Ginger Group" in Parliament during the previous session. Following his report, he was asked "to co-operate with the Provincial Executive in furthering the interests of the party," a proposal to which he readily agreed. The meeting closed with the election of officers—W. J. Bartlett as chairman, Robert Skinner as vice-chairman, and Harry Neelands as secretary. All were long time I.L.P. members, were active supporters of MacInnis in his recent campaign, and shared his moderate outlook.

That fall the I.L.P. nominated W. Deptford as its candidate in South Vancouver to replace the member from South Vancouver. In its new found optimism, it also nominated two other candidates for aldermen, three for the School Board and one for the Parks Commission. As N. H. Watts, the editor of the Labour Statesman was aldermanic candidate in Ward Six, there was excellent coverage of the I.L.P.'s campaign in the paper. All the effort produced results little different from previous years; only Deptford and Harry Neelands on the School Board were elected.

Angus MacInnis took a small part in this campaign. This civic election campaign ended his direct links with Vancouver politics. From now on he was the elder statesman of the I.L.P. and from his seat in the House of Commons, its main link with other socialist groups across Canada. Naturally his outlook became more national and less concerned with the immediate problems of the small socialist party in British Columbia.
By June, 1931 when Maclnnis returned to British Columbia from his second session in parliament it was obvious that the changes that had come over the I.L.P. would be lasting ones. Its announcements of meetings were now appearing regularly in a special column, "I.L.P. Notes," in the Labour Statesman. Further, pressure was building up within the party for a complete reorganization necessitated by the sudden surge of new members. It was noted in the I.L.P. News along with a list of members joining and clubs organizing, that "we are riding on the crest of a wave and everything indicates that the next election is going to be extremely successful for labour." In June, the executive decided to hold a reorganization meeting. One of the matters to be discussed was the complete overhaul of party machinery which had become essential with the rapid proliferation of branches. Also to be settled were the questions of a party paper, changes in policy and the relationship of elected representatives to the party.

All of these matters were discussed at the meeting on June 21. However, of greater importance than these purely procedural matters was the presence of Ernest Winch and his subsequent election to the newly created position of party organizer. A dynamic organizer and a dedicated, if doctrinaire, socialist his efforts strengthened the party structure immeasurably. As president of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council in 1918 he had worked closely with such radicals as Jack Kavanagh, Victor Midgley and Bill Pritchard in the growth of the O.B.U. and in the organization of the Vancouver Sympathetic Strike of 1919. Winch led the loggers into the O.B.U. in 1919 but pulled them out in 1920, thus helping
to precipitate the O.B.U.'s disintegration in B. C. He stayed out of active politics during the 1920's, although remaining a nominal member of the F.L.P. and the I.L.P. Only towards the end of the decade did he become active in politics again when he helped to organize a branch of the I.L.P. in South Burnaby.

During July, 1931 the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties held its third annual convention in Winnipeg. The I.L.P. was represented by J. W. Hope who became Conference vice-president. The most important results of the meeting were the decision "to formulate a campaign for the abolition of the present social system and its replacement by a system of production for use and human welfare," and an invitation to eastern labour parties to meet with the members of the Conference in Regina the next year. This convention was more socialist in tone than its predecessors, calling for the organization of workers to strive for the abolition of capitalism and its replacement by the co-operative commonwealth, as well as various socialist and welfare measures. This conference again served to show the underlying unity of purpose of the western Canadian parties and it was evident that there was greater unanimity on socialist principles than there had ever been before.

Angus MacInnis did not attend this conference in Winnipeg. From the end of July he had been speaking across the country, starting in Nova Scotia and gradually moving west. In "With the Workers in Many Places in Canada," he told the readers of the Labour Statesman:
There is considerable more required of a labour member of Parliament than a whirlwind campaign at election time, the taking of his seat in the House of Commons and taking part in the discussions as opportunities offer. One of the things expected of him is that he will give a part of his time to the preaching of the gospel of socialism in other parts of Canada.

That fall MacInnis spoke extensively around Vancouver to many of the newly organized I.L.P. clubs, and to the party executive at the nomination meeting for candidates in the 1933 provincial election.

In addition to frequent speaking engagements he found time to write for the Labour Statesman occasionally. In the autumn he was in the East Kootenays on a brief speaking tour, but did not do much campaigning around Vancouver in the civic election which saw all the I.L.P. candidates defeated.

Late in 1931 the I.L.P. held its fifth annual convention in Vancouver. One hundred and twenty delegates gathered, many of them from clubs newly organized by Ernest Winch who reported that there were approximately one twenty-thousand members in four clubs throughout the province. He also stated that the party would never really be strong until it had a proper national affiliation. The convention went on record as "suggesting that the Provincial Executive forthwith assist in undertaking the formation of a Dominion-wide 'Independent Labour Party.'" It was also in favour of "members elected to public office making some contribution to the party either in time or cash from their indemnities." After a stormy debate, the name of the party was changed from the "Independent Labour Party" to the "Independent Labour Party (Socialist)" so as to leave no doubt as to its true socialist nature.

Simultaneously with the Independent Labour Party's indication of
its willingness to work towards the creation of a national party, events were taking place in the rest of the country that would make the winter of 1931-32 a turning point for Canadian socialism. In Parliament the co-operating independents were showing themselves an effective minor opposition group as they hammered away at the Bennett government (see chapter IV), In several eastern universities—especially Toronto and McGill—the League for Social Reconstruction came into being, first attracting notice in the April edition of the *Canadian Forum*. The League was led mainly by university professors at McGill and the University of Toronto, including Frank Underhill, J. King Gordon, Frank Scott, E. A. Havelock and J. F. Parkinson with J. S. Woodsworth as honorary president. Woodsworth's presence signified the League's affinity with the "Ginger Group" in Parliament. Branches of the L.S.R. soon appeared all over Canada, including Vancouver and Victoria.

In the west, particularly in Saskatchewan, farm and labour political groups were beginning to work more closely together. No doubt the example of farmer and labour members in Parliament provided a stimulus for the local organizations.

In January, 1932 the United Farmers of Alberta took the first step towards the organization of a national federation. A resolution was passed at the annual convention calling on all like-minded groups to meet to discuss the possibility of establishing a "co-operative commonwealth" in Canada. They defined the co-operative commonwealth as

>A community freed from the domination of irresponsible financial and economic power, in which all social means of production including land, are socially owned and controlled by either voluntarily organized groups of producers and consumers, or—in the case of the major public services and distributive enterprises as can be conducted most efficiently when owned in common—by public corporations responsible to the people's elected representatives.
Two months later J. S. Woodsworth introduced the first of his "Co-operative Commonwealth" resolutions into Parliament,

...the Government should immediately take measures looking to the setting up of a co-operative commonwealth in which all natural resources and the socially necessary machinery of production will be used in the interests of the people and not for the benefit of a few. 21

Concurrently, the labour parties in the Western Conference had been in close contact as they prepared for the annual meeting in Regina that summer. Ernest Winch kept the I.L.P. (Soc.) informed of events in the other western provinces. In his April report he was able to say that "the provincial executive was actively carrying out the instructions of the Convention relative to the formation of a Dominion wide party and the coordination of all existing Socialist organizations."22

Labour parties were planning for a Dominion wide consolidation of socialist and labour organizations while the U.F.A. was calling for the "co-operative commonwealth" that J. S. Woodsworth had been advocating for years.23 It appeared that farm, labour and Parliamentary groups were now seeking the same ends. On July 1, the U.F.A. executive, meeting with its M.P.s and M.L.A.s gave effect to its January invitation with a call for such a conference in Calgary, August 1. The Saskatchewan I.L.P. was to have been the host to the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties in Regina at the end of July. However, it had united with the United Farmers of Canada (Saskatchewan Section) and, as the Farmer-Labour Party, had responded to the U.F.A. call, re-scheduling the Western Labour Conference to Calgary, July 31.24

In Ottawa, the cooperating independents and several representatives from the L.S.R. met on the last day of the 1932 session. In a brief meeting, J. S. Woodsworth was chosen president of the "Commonwealth Party"
and he and Robert Gardiner were asked to draft a tentative plan of organization. As the new party was a federation of existing parties, organization would have to be on a provincial basis. Agnes Macphail was given Ontario to organize, M. J. Coldwell was put in charge of Saskatchewan, while Robert Gardiner had Alberta. Manitoba and B. C. were to be organized by the local I.L.P. organizations rather than their Parliamentary leaders.  

Macphail, Coldwell and Gardiner were presidents of their respective political parties so there was no real difference between the bases of organization in any of the provinces, because in each one, the existing party was to be the nucleus of the new party.

Angus MacInnis played a minor role in these events although he was the one link between the party in British Columbia and the nascent national organization. When the session ended, he and his wife Grace, the daughter of J. S. Woodsworth, left for a speaking tour through western Canada. This, their first trip together since their marriage the previous January, was typical of many. Arriving in Winnipeg on May 30, they found themselves in the middle of a provincial election campaign. They both addressed several meetings around Winnipeg for the I.L.P., and at one in St. Boniface Mrs. MacInnis spoke in French. After a brief visit to Kenora, Ontario, they spoke in Regina, Prince Albert, Saskatoon, Moose Jaw and Swift Current in a five day period. From Saskatchewan they went to Calgary and then north to Jasper and followed the C.N.R. line to Prince Rupert. They spoke at Burns Lake, Smithers and Prince Rupert, organizing party branches at the two last named places. There was little press reaction to their visits, as they were still speaking to a relatively small audience.
From Prince Rupert they returned to Vancouver to find that the Independent Labour Party (Socialist) was now the Socialist Party of Canada (B.C. section). The change of name had been suggested by Winch in April and approved by the party in June while the MacInnises were speaking on the Prairies. The new name not only simplified the cumbersome I.L.P. (Soc.), but expressed the party's more radical outlook.

It is interesting to note that all the talks given by the MacInnises were given under the auspices of the local socialist or labour parties. The Western Labour Conferences had done much to bring these parties together and show them their mutual interests while national figures like Angus MacInnis fostered this and gave these scattered little groups a much larger perspective.

On June 13, while the Western Conference was still planned for Regina, the I.L.P. (Soc.) had met in Vancouver to choose a delegate. J. L. Hope, B.C. vice-president of the Conference, was the logical choice. Not only was he experienced in the Conference, but as a railway worker he had a railway pass, a decided asset since the party was able to pay his expenses only to the extent of $25.00. Hope submitted his own draft of a plan for a socialist state which the party approved for submission to the conference. He was also instructed to press for the name "Socialist Party of Canada" for the new national party.28

Angus MacInnis, as Socialist Party representative in the Commonwealth Party, went to the conference in a dual capacity as a national and as a provincial party representative, and the Socialist Party thus had two delegates at the Conference. He received his notification of the Conference from J. Hutchison, secretary of the Western Conference who added "if there are any other bodies in your province or indeed elsewhere, whom you think are in sympathy, kindly advise me, or indeed urge then to
Hutchison seemed to feel that MacInnis had contacts unknown to the Socialist Party or that he was in some way independent of the party. As it turned out, no other delegates from B.C. went to the Conference.

The delegates to the fifth annual Western Conference of Labour Political Parties gathered in Calgary, July 30. The next day they were to be joined by the farm delegates. The groups represented by the 105 persons were the Socialist Party of Canada from B.C.; the Canadian Labour Party, Dominion Labour Party and United Farmers of Alberta from Alberta; the Independent Labour Party, Co-operative Labour Party and United Farmers of Canada (Sask.) from Saskatchewan; the Independent Labour Party from Manitoba; the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees; the League for Social Reconstruction and the Commonwealth Party.

On the first day of the session the Western Labour Conference did little more than decide to maintain itself one more year, and to work more closely with the new Federation. It also elected members to three committees (municipal politics, publicity and economic planning) and re-elected its executive for another year.30

The real conference was held the next day, July 31. This was the "Joint Conference of Farmer-Labour, and Foundation of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Farmer-Labour-Socialist)." MacInnis and Hope pressed for the name "Socialist Party of Canada," as instructed, but were defeated. A.R. Mosher of the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees expressed what must have been the sentiment of many of the delegates when he said "I am committed to a national Labour Party and am not prepared at this juncture to subscribe to a Socialist Party."31
The Conference went on to accept the broad statement of policy introduced by M. J. Coldwell of the Resolutions Committee. This consisted of resolutions calling for: formation of a national federation of organizations interested in a "co-operative commonwealth;" correlation of the political activities of member organizations; organization of provincial councils composed of representatives of member organizations in the provinces; a Dominion Council composed of national officers and delegates from provincial councils; financing through affiliation fees; the name "Co-operative Commonwealth Federation (Farmer-Labor-Socialist);" and an undefined "program of socialism." No specific statement of policy was attempted, but an organizational structure was agreed on and an executive elected. The obvious choice for president of the Provisional National Council was J. S. Woodsworth who was more responsible than any other delegate present for this inter-provincial and, it was hoped, national Canadian socialist federation. Norman Priestley of the U.F.A. was chosen secretary, and five vice-presidents, one from each of the provinces west of Quebec, were elected, including MacInnis for British Columbia. The conference ended August 1 and the delegates returned home to begin organizing for the actual founding convention of the C.C.F. in Regina the next summer.

The S.P. of C. was disappointed at the failure of the Conference to adopt the name it proposed, but the very existence of a national federation based on a "program of socialism" and the presence of a member of the S.P. of C., Angus MacInnis, on its executive, probably mitigated the consequences of this failure. Nevertheless, the refusal of the delegates
to commit themselves to all the name "Socialist Party" implied must have made the B. C. Socialist Party uneasy.

As long as the principle of socialism was accepted, the S.P. of C. would accept the name. Since it would be the undisputed nucleus around which the C.C.F. in B. C. would have to be built, any newcomers would have to satisfy its members of their commitment to socialism before they could be admitted. Now began the task of building the C.C.F. in British Columbia.

This task was not made any easier by the attitude of Ernest Winch and other doctrinaire socialists in the party. Winch's return to active politics had changed the I.L.P.; his organizational ability did much to strengthen its structure, and his ideological convictions confirmed it as a socialist rather than a labour party. He had also been interested in participation in the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties, had been in frequent correspondence with the leaders of other labour and socialist parties in the West and had done much to set up the Calgary Convention. However, after the Convention, he opposed affiliation with the new federation. Mrs. D. G. Steeves, a contemporary in the party and Winch's biographer says:

For some time he had used his powerful influence against affiliation with the C.C.F. He feared the revolutionary purpose of socialism would be bogged down in the reforms advocated by the farmer-labour-socialist federation. He felt that the movement would be overwhelmed by an influx of emotional converts, uneducated in socialist theory, possibly seeking political preferment. 33

Winch's viewpoint seemed to be that although socialism in British Columbia had not always been successful in winning votes, it had kept its purity. It was a trust not to be betrayed for temporary political advantage, but to be guarded and protected until it could finally
triumph. He could see little value in the work of angry farmers and university theorists. This attitude persisted and as late as 1935 he said:

...I disagree that the "primary task at this time is the election of candidates to the House of Commons;" that is never our primary task which is the "making of socialists" something very, very different. Votes alone, or a majority of representatives in parliament will never bring socialism. Unfortunately, there is too great a tendency for the C.C.F. to become a vote-catching political (parliamentary) party which, if persisted in, may give too well grounded a justification for the oft repeated charge that it is the "third party of capitalism." 34

In many quarters, socialists in British Columbia were thought throughout the 1930's to be more radical than their eastern counterparts. For instance, the Winnipeg Free Press noted at the 1934 Convention in Winnipeg:

It appears that some parts of Canada are better soil than others for growing radicals. B. C. is furthest to the left on the map and also in politics. Its most vociferous spokesman is Comrade E. E. Winch, the Burnaby bricklayer, who has a shock of gray hair, a carrying voice and a lot of self-confidence. 35

This opinion was shared by many, both inside and out of the C.C.F. Why this was so is not clear, but the revolutionary socialist tradition in the province, the nature of the economy of British Columbia, and the working class British origins of much of its population must be taken into consideration.

As was seen in the first chapter, there was a dogmatic tradition in the British Columbia socialist movement that went back to the early years of the century, which made it revolutionary and Marxist rather than evolutionary and Fabian in its outlook. Also the Socialist Party of Canada compensated for its electoral failures before and after the war by
extolling the virtues of education of the masses. Although the party 
faded in the 1920's, its dogmatic spirit never really died in such men 
as Ernest Winch and W. W. Lefeaux, who returned to lead the socialist 
movement in the 1930's. The change of name from "Independent Labour Party," 
with its connotations of moderation, to "Socialist Party" with its connota­
tions of dogmatic purity, indicated a revival of the old spirit in the 
1930's.

The nature of the British Columbia economy must also be taken into 
consideration, although its connections with dogmatic socialism are less 
easily defined. Unlike the Prairies or Ontario, there was no large, 
conservative, rural, land-owning class, nor a large urban middle class 
to soften the edges of class conflict. Socialists pointed to B. C. as 
a "typically" capitalist society, with massive profits accruing to 
capitalists, unemployment a constant spectre for workers, and a high 
degree of class feeling, particularly in mining, fishing, and forest 
towns. 36 For some socialists in B. C. a Marxist approach seemed much 
more appropriate to conditions in the province than did the milder, more 
evolutionary outlook of Prairie and Eastern socialists.

Finally, there was the British working class background of many 
socialists in British Columbia. A relatively high percentage of British 
Columbia's population was born in the United Kingdom. The 1931 census 
showed a total population of 694,263 people in the province of whom 
181,873 were British born and 374,734 Canadian. 37 For the city of 
Vancouver with a total population of 246,593, the British born numbered 
73,337 and the Canadian 128,396. 38 Although definite data is lacking, 
the percentage of British immigrants in the socialist movement would seem 
to be higher. 39 Few of them understood the distinctly Canadian problems
they were now facing because they had always had British or B. C. perspectives. This was reinforced by the labour and socialist papers in British Columbia which carried more news from Britain and Europe than from the rest of Canada, and displayed the overseas news more prominently.

The executive of the Socialist Party in 1933 consisted of W. W. Lefeaux (lawyer), E. E. Winch (unemployed bricklayer), Robert Skinner (sanitary and food inspector), and G. Palmer (unknown). The first three came to Canada from Britain in the first decade of the twentieth century and, except for trips back to Britain, stayed in British Columbia. Winch and Lefeaux were members of the Socialist Party of Canada before World War I while Skinner came into the socialist movement through the Federated Labour Party at about the same time as Angus MacInnis. Although there is no information on Palmer, the backgrounds of the others, particularly Winch and Lefeaux, were quite similar. Angus MacInnis was not representative of the Socialist Party in that he was a native Canadian, had lived east of the Rockies, was interested in Canadian problems, and was willing to work with Eastern and Prairie radicals in the formation of a Dominion-wide socialist party.

A perusal of the early socialist press in British Columbia and a study of the fortunes of the various socialist parties in the province shows how dogmatic and unpopular they were. In effect, they would not compromise their principles and preached to a steadily dwindling flock of the converted. Only a few socialists were able to avoid the dogmatic point of view. One of these was Angus MacInnis. This small group was realistic enough to see that real, not abstract, problems required practical solutions. They set themselves to the solution of these through education and practical politics. All socialists could agree on the
importance of the former, but to many the latter looked like a sellout to capitalism. Angus MacInnis, first as a civic official and later as an M. P. had broadened his vision to include all of Canada. He could see the value of a socialist national party, and realized that it would have to be built with the people available. Never losing sight of the ultimate goal, he was ready to accept reality rather than set up an ideal situation along the way. Here he and Ernest Winch disagreed. Angus MacInnis saw the value of Eastern professors and disgruntled farmers. Their knowledge of socialism may not have met Winch's standards but MacInnis realized it was substantial enough to support a national movement. Winch's mistrust probably came from disillusionment when the O.B.U. collapsed, or from the reluctance of the delegates at Calgary to accept the name "Socialist Party" or even from his own frequent lack of success in bids for civic posts. Later on, after he was elected M.L.A. from Burnaby, his views were more tempered with realism. However, late in 1932, he could see only the old threat of "reformism." From August, when Hope's report was received, until December, Winch was against affiliation with the C.C.F. and what he believed to be its potentially reformist destruction of revolutionary socialism.

It can only be assumed that MacInnis opposed this attitude and favoured affiliation, especially since he saw the value of C.C.F. and was in a position to act as a positive (i.e. socialist) influence on it. This will have to remain an assumption, as there is no evidence that MacInnis and Winch clashed over the issue. There is nothing in the B. C. Clarion, the Labour Statesman (which was becoming increasingly less interested in socialist politics) or the S.P. of C. minutes to indicate any such
Maclnnis seemed to be confident that affiliation would take place in spite of Winch's opposition. In a letter written to a Prince George correspondent who was seeking information on the procedure to be taken in organizing a C.C.F. branch, he said that it must be through the Socialist Party of Canada as:

...at the present time the Provincial Council for the Province of British Columbia is presumed to be the Provincial Executive of the Socialist Party of Canada (formerly the Independent Labor Party) as this party was the only organization represented from the province. 41

The provincial executive of the S.P. of C. met in September, but decided to defer until the next meeting the question of affiliation with the national C.C.F. as results of a poll among members were still incomplete. 42

In October the decision was finally reached—the party would affiliate. By a vote of 325 to 51, the thirty-one branches decided to go along with the C.C.F. 43 Ernest Winch noted in the November "Party Notes and Comments" that,

Affiliation with the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was approved by the members; the Party retains its identity having by affiliation merely signified its willingness to associate for united action with other parties whose objective is socialism. The form and tactics of a united socialist party is the main question to be thrashed out at next year's convention. 44

Ernest Winch did not remain adamantly opposed to the affiliation, and soon jumped to the defence of the party's decision. Dissatisfaction with the party's action was especially high in the Vancouver Centre branch where a group of die-hard socialists refused to accept the affiliation. Retaining the old name of the "Socialist Party of Canada," they seized the party headquarters for themselves. Winch's newspaper tirades against them hinted that their dissatisfaction was related to the fact that none
of them were nominated as C.C.F. candidates in the forthcoming provincial election. His own candidature made it easier to support the C.C.F.\textsuperscript{45}

It was with a great deal of satisfaction that Maclnnis returned to Ottawa that fall. His Socialist Party had taken its first tentative steps towards membership in the national party. In spite of their fear of loss of principles and doubts about the degree of socialist knowledge in the East, the party members had voted overwhelmingly for affiliation and a Dominion wide socialist movement.

The British Columbia C.C.F. was in capable hands and Angus MacInnis was free to devote himself to national organization. The West was taken care of, but if the C.C.F. was to be anything more than just another Western protest party, it had to move into Ontario, Quebec, and the Maritimes. In the fall of 1932, with enthusiasm for the new movement running high, Ontario was covered by Agnes Macphail, William Irvine and A. R. Mosher. Since Quebec was virtually closed to socialism, the C.C.F. had to restrict itself to several clubs and parties in Montreal. Spreading the message of socialism in the Maritimes was the responsibility of Angus MacInnis. He was a Maritimer by birth, an active unionist and well known as a spokesman for labour. He had spoken in Nova Scotia before, but never with the message of a new party that he and E. J. Garland brought late in 1932. Several talks were given in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick which were well received but uneventful. The only incident occurred in Glace Bay, N. S. where an ugly shouting match erupted between MacInnis and J. B. McLachlan, communist secretary of the United Mine Workers' District 26.\textsuperscript{46} No branches were organized, but contacts with local labour leaders were made and the ground sown for
future C.C.F. planting.

Safely established as the nucleus of the C.C.F. in B. C., the Socialist Party of Canada was in a position to choose any future members wishing to join the Federation. There was great interest in the C.C.F., and many applications for membership. The Depression had bred a number of groups in the province determined to establish a new order. All were clamouring for membership in the C.C.F., but were suspect in the eyes of the S.P. of C. These groups included the "People's Party," headed by J. E. Armishaw, President of the United Farmers of B. C.; the "Four Point Plan" of Col. H. E. Lyon; the Co-operative Council of B. C., led by Messrs. Haskell and Ricketts; and the "Army of the Common Good."47

Somewhat different from the other groups, yet not different enough as far as the S.P. of C. was concerned, was the Reconstruction Party. It was based on a mildly socialist platform that avoided the rigidly Marxian terms of the Socialist Party, and so was of questionable purity in the eyes of the latter. However, since it was the strongest and most broadly based of these groups, it was the best to bring within the C.C.F. fold. This brought up a basic problem for Socialists,

It [the Reconstruction Party] was a "middle class" gathering and was rather looked down upon by the older socialists of the city, some of whom did not consider that any good was to be expected from comfortable... idealists, unversed in Marxian dialectic, meeting to chat and drink tea. 48

The Reconstruction Party had its roots in the British Columbia branches of the L.S.R. which appeared in early 1932. These started as study groups in Vancouver and Victoria and were composed of students, teachers and others interested in changing the existing order. In contrast to the pattern in the East, faculty members in the
university were not a motivating force. Due to the Depression, the university staff had been reduced greatly, and a heavier academic load was thus placed on those remaining.49 Also the Kidd Report (recommending among other things, that the university's activities be curtailed) was the product of an environment not conducive to radical political activity by academics. The Vancouver branch had started producing pamphlets before the Calgary Conference, offering the L.S.R.'s analysis of society and declaring that the "basic principle regulating production, distribution, and service, was to be the common good rather than private profit."50

Although it was not represented at the Calgary Conference, the L.S.R. in B. C. was impressed with the results of that meeting. Apparently, it did not realize that the Socialist Party was the C.C.F. provincial council in B. C. and so, when it decided to become a political party late in 1932 it attempted to join the C.C.F. directly. J. S. Taylor wrote to J. S. Woodsworth and reported that the Political Action Committee of the L.S.R. had decided to form the "Commonwealth Party." Discussing the party, he said, "we shall formulate a platform somewhat along the lines of the L.S.R.; the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation; and such other lines as may be considered to be attractive particularly to British Columbians."51

To Norman Priestley, secretary of the C.C.F. the L.S.R. had sent its $25.00 affiliation fee and the following resolution:

Resolved that the Vancouver Branch Number One of the League for Social Reconstruction desires to remain, in the main, an Academic Group, but that it is definitely in sympathy with the desire to establish in British Columbia a Political Party constitutionally able to affiliate with the Co-operative Commonwealth Party of Canada, and--to this end--desires to express its sympathy through its Political Action Group, directing this group to discover if it is able to nucleate an independent Commonwealth Party
for British Columbia, and to encourage its progress and growth by bringing other organizations into line.52

The Commonwealth Party was joined by representatives of some other groups in forming the "Reconstruction Party." Besides middle class socialists of long standing, they included monetary reformers such as the president of the Vancouver L.S.R. Branch Number One, Dr. W. G. Cumming; theosophists, crypto-communists, Col. Lyons' "Four Pointers," and a few Socialist Party members who were determined to guide this new party away from the enticing shoals of reformism.53

The first executive of the Reconstruction Party included Ronald Grantham, editor of the Ubyssey; Frank Mackenzie and Professor Frank M. Buck (the only faculty member active in the organization), all from the university; W. A. Pritchard, former O.B.U. leader and reeve of Burnaby at this time; Mrs. D. G. Steeves, one time Dutch legal advisor for the League of Nations and now a Vancouver lawyer, Austin Trotter and J. S. Taylor.54

The application of the Reconstruction Party for membership in the C.C.F. was referred by Priestley to the Socialist Party of Canada in B. C. At the first meeting of the S.P. of C. executive in 1933, a committee of five, consisting of W. Lefeaux, Robert Skinner, A. J. Turner, Ernest Winch and A.M. Stephen, was struck and sent out to meet representatives of the Reconstruction Party.55 This meeting was arranged for early February, after the completion of the Socialist Party convention in late January.

The Convention was the most successful yet with 113 delegates and officers gathered, representing 1600 members in forty-six branches.56 MacInnis was present and took an active part in the discussions. As the party was concerned about the attempt of the Reconstruction Party to bypass it in affiliating with the C.C.F., a resolution was passed, calling
on the executive "to instruct Angus MacInnis, M.P., to press for a monopoly of C.C.F. political activity in the province for the S.P. of C." 57

The party had little to worry about. When the National Council met the next week in Ottawa, the ratification of affiliation from the Socialist Party of Canada was readily accepted, while it was resolved that "the Co-operative Commonwealth of B. C., Vancouver, be advised by the Secretary to submit their application and platform to the Provincial Council...." 58

On February 11, the Provisional C.C.F. Council for B. C. met with representatives from the Reconstruction Party. 59 According to Mrs. Steeves, one of the Reconstruction delegates, it was a memorable event,

As one of the delegates to that august meeting, the writer well remembers the forbidding looks cast upon us by Ernest Winch. He seemed to regard us more as repellent insects brought in pinned for scrutiny than as proper applicants for the socialist movement. It took him and some of his associates some time to get reconciled to our presence in the C.C.F. This was natural for they had "borne the burden and the heat of the day." 60

In Ottawa, Angus MacInnis was following the events in B. C. with the interest of one who saw the importance of the S.P. of C. and of its merger with the Reconstruction Party. Robert Skinner, who was both vice-president of the S.P. of C. and a member of the Provisional Council, wrote in February informing him of the situation in British Columbia. MacInnis replied:

I sympathize with your difficulties in your efforts to co-operate with the League for Social Reconstruction, the People's Party, et al. Go as far as you can without sacrificing principles. It is important to get these people into our movement for to educate them and use them, but we must be careful that we do not allow them to use us. We must be the leaven that leavens the whole lump. Socialism must be kept to the forefront. We cannot pussyfoot... it seems to me that the case for socialism can be so put that no one with the least tendency towards progressivism need be frightened. 61
He had seen the L.S.R. in the east and had appreciated its value. He believed its counterpart in B. C. could be useful. MacInnis was practical politician enough to realize that the Reconstruction Party with its broader electoral appeal, was an excellent vehicle for the Socialist Party as long as the socialists did not sacrifice their principles for easy votes. They had to avoid the extremes of political oblivion with principles still intact, or political success based on expediency.

MacInnis' advice was heeded. On March 12 a provincial C.C.F. constitution had been approved. Its object, "to associate and co-ordinate the activities of approved organizations who accept the fundamental principles of the C.C.F." [sic], was consistent with Socialist Party goals and desire for autonomy. The Provincial Council was to consist of three members from each "political body" and one from each "non-political body" with the provision that, "for the present year the Provincial President and Secretary-Treasurer of the S.P. of C. shall act in similar capacities on the provincial council of the new body," in addition to the three regular representatives of the S.P. of C. This would ensure socialist control of the ideological purity of the party. Also, "candidates for election to public bodies must, before being so announced, receive the approval of the Provincial Council following an examination by a committee formed for this purpose;" i.e., to judge the candidate's "knowledge of the fundamental principles of socialism." Again, an exception was made for the eight S.P. of C. candidates nominated two years earlier who would not be subject to this examination. In effect, the S.P. of C. absorbed the Reconstruction Party. It assumed executive control and became guardian of ideological purity, yet maintained its autonomy. This was a crucial first step. 62
The first joint executive was soon elected—Robert Skinner (President), Jack Price (Secretary-Treasurer), Arthur Turner and Mrs. C. Lorimer were from the S.P. of C., while W. A. Pritchard, Col. H. E. Lyons and H. B. Smith represented the Reconstruction Party. The executive was not up to full strength, but the basic idea of S.P. of C. control had been implemented.

The Reconstruction Party pressed for the admittance of some of the other splinter "parties," but the socialists adamantly refused to agree. It was as well they did. Col. Lyons soon quarrelled with the C.C.F. leaders and left to form his own "Independent C.C.F.," while the monetary reform advocates drifted away. 63

In April, Angus MacInnis again wrote Robert Skinner, who was now president of the C.C.F. Alluding to the difficulties of the compromise they both knew was necessary, MacInnis observed:

> It is rather too bad that we are not having the unstinted co-operation of Lefeaux, Winch and Stephen. I think they are very short-sighted. The movement will have to build out of the materials we have at hand. We cannot make our material and then create our organization.

He then went on to warn Skinner of the dangers of overambition and the advantage of a real education program:

> There are two things that we must beware of. Firstly, activity and office seeking without understanding of the fundamentals of economics. The second thing that we must avoid is education without activity. To suppose that we can formulate a program and put it into effect because it is reasonable and feasible without a struggle, and without changing the basis of human society, is childish. And it is equally childish to think you can educate to people /sic/ in various abstractions, and that the New Social Order will fall as ripe fruit into our hands, and that all we shall have to do is administer it.

He reiterated the need for a reasonable, open-minded attitude on the part of the socialists:
...if we are going to work together it should be done whole-heartedly and without reservation. 64

MacInnis was taking a definite position in this debate within the Socialist Party. He was siding with those who, although emphasizing the need for purity of socialist principles, were politically astute enough to realize that the S.P. of C. would never achieve electoral success as a small, doctrinaire party.

The Socialist Party was now faced with a dilemma it had never known before. The dilemma was not, however, unique to British Columbia. It had been or would be experienced by socialist parties everywhere. On the one hand, the party could welcome all support, run the risk of ideological impurity and strive for political success. On the other, it could continue as it had in the past, guarding its ideological purity jealously, and judging success in educational rather than in electoral terms. For years, disheartening electoral failures were seen as splendid opportunities to spread propaganda. The question now was, were the lessons of many failures to be heeded and a program with voter appeal put forward? The choice before the Socialist Party was whether to remain a peripheral movement far removed from the temptations of power, or to live up to its name as a party, and try to broaden its base of support in order to win control of the government.

Members of the party had shades of opinion ranging from blind acceptance of Marxian dogma to desire for power at any cost. Angus MacInnis was in the middle of this spectrum. He had been able to achieve electoral success without loss of socialist principles. He had been elected to the executive of his union, to the Vancouver School Board, to City Council and to Parliament because of proven ability rather than adherence to any of the tiny parties he belonged to from 1912 on.
Angus MacInnis' socialism was as firmly based on Marx as was that of any member of the Socialist Party, and he was respected by the party for his knowledge. For instance, in his reply to the budget speech in 1933, he declared:

...everytime profits are created, unemployment is also created, because profits are made out of the surplus that the working class produces, the surplus value over and above what they receive in wages; and because over a cycle of time these surplus values accumulate to such an extent that industry has to slow down in order that they may be consumed when production is not taking place.

* * * * * * *

The function of a socialist state is to abolish class society, to do away with class interests and class antagonisms. Its function is to foster co-operation and to organize the productive forces of the country in order to maintain a standard of living based upon the natural resources of a country, the efficiency of the mechanical means of production, the technical knowledge, understanding and willingness of the people to work. 65

At the risk of boring his fellow parliamentarians with a Marxian analysis of surplus value, the nature of profits and unemployment, he made a very favourable impression on the Socialist Party in British Columbia. The Commonwealth gave almost three pages to a verbatim transcript of the speech in its first edition, while Ernest Winch indicated his approval with a remark on the speech in the B. C. Clarion in July. 66

Angus MacInnis' conception of the nature of socialism did not differ from that of Winch or the other "scientific socialists" in the party. Where differences arose was over the means of establishing a socialist society. MacInnis had the advantage of contacts with political reality denied most of his comrades. On the School Board, in City Hall and in Parliament, he believed that he could apply solutions consistent with socialism to problems. At the same time, he never forgot that he was dedicated to the destruction of the capitalist system, but that it would take time and education to accomplish this properly and to provide an
adequate substitute in socialism. The Socialist Party had been "educating" for years when the Stock Market crashed in 1929 and its predictions were proven correct. Suddenly socialists had an audience, were listened to and believed. This was unexpected, however, and they reacted negatively to support from the politically uneducated middle classes. Blinded by the apparent scientific truth of Marxian analysis, they could not adapt it to the reality of 1930.

Angus MacInnis could do so. Already a more experienced politician than his I.L.P. comrades when he left for Ottawa in 1930, the gap between him and the majority of the members of the I.L.P., and later the Socialist Party, was widened farther when he saw that there was nascent support for socialism all over the country—on the farms of the Prairies, in the mills of the East, the mines and forests of the North and the universities and suburbs of the cities. This support, if truly socialist, he was willing to use. If not, there was no loss, as the socialists could continue the old education campaign and wait for another tomorrow.

MacInnis could see the potential value of a large middle class suddenly confronted with economic reality. He was willing to accept its support, if it were real, and work with it towards the common goal. A party composed of workers only was futile in Canada. Farmers, professors—all who were willing to co-operate with the socialists, no matter what their class outlook—were suitable allies.

Affiliate with the C.C.F., MacInnis said in 1932, this is our golden opportunity on a national scale. Merge with the L.S.R. and the socialists in the Reconstruction Party, he repeated in 1933. Preserve the essential socialist goals and do not compromise the party's socialist principles, or jeopardize its autonomy during the crucial testing period, but accept all legitimate support available. Also, do not hesitate to
work wholeheartedly with other groups to achieve the common goal.

His position was consistent with his career to this point. He could not agree with the doctrinaire socialists as they blindly refused to realize that this opportunity would not be repeated. Education had worked and still had a role, but political reality had to be faced and utilized.

Both groups (they could hardly be termed factions) turned to him for support. W. W. Lefeaux, in early May wrote:

It seems we are getting into a terrible jam on account of this affiliation.

...I wish you were here to train and educate them, that is if, of course, they are susceptible to the latter. I am still of the opinion that the affiliation is a mistake. 67

Before MacInnis could reply, he heard from Skinner again. He, too, was having trouble with the newcomers, but he had a more positive outlook than Lefeaux:

It was found that the original plan of having only two parties—S.P. of C. and the Reconstruction, would not work or rather was working to the detriment of the S.P. of C.

...I am afraid that the C.C.F. will nose out the Socialist Party, if that takes place then we must control the C.C.F. I shall be glad to have your suggestions in connection with this plan.

Skinner was also pleased to tell Angus that he was still very popular in Vancouver, "for as Bouchette says, MacInnis the 'Statesman' says so and so." 68

Both sides had turned to him for advice. To Lefeaux, the party's theoretician, he replied:

...let us work with them as far as possible, adhering all the time to our own point of view that amelioration through modification will not ameliorate. Actual experience is the only thing that will convince
most of them. Unfortunately, abstract reasoning or other people's experiences are of very little use to the ordinary individual.

He pointed out to Lefaeux the political advantage of the merger which would give the socialists the power base they needed to win the province:

I believe the Socialist Party can, because of our affiliation with the C.C.F. and other groups that compose it, reach thousands of people that we otherwise could not reach. I do not think there is much use trying to reconvert the converted.

He then made his main point, the point that would appeal most to Lefaeux who was afraid the Reconstruction Party members would smother the socialism of the S.P. of C. MacInnis pointed out that the socialists had the responsibility to see that this did not happen.

Of course such associations cannot be entered into without a certain amount of compromise and in compromising we should differentiate between what is essential and what is non-essential. Let us make use of the contacts that this opportunity gives us. "

He wrote Robert Skinner the next day. His advice here, co-operation with the Reconstruction Party without sacrificing socialist principles in so doing, was similar in content. Apparently, the new members had been complaining to Woodsworth that MacInnis was behind their difficulties with the Socialist Party. As representative of the B. C. section on the National Council he would naturally be concerned about the progress of the C.C.F. in the province, but as he stated to Skinner, "...As you well know, I did not interfere with the local situation except to impress on the Socialist Party the necessity of co-operating as far as possible without sacrificing principle." This was as succinct a summation of his relationship to the B. C. party during this period as he could present.

His main point was a reiteration that the Socialist Party must control the C.C.F. Beside this, any other issues were of secondary importance, "...as to the C.C.F. nosing out the Socialist Party: I am
not particularly concerned. What we need is a revolutionary party; the name does not matter. As you say, we will have to control the C.C.F."

A dispute between Ernest Winch and William Pritchard over who should get the provincial C.C.F. nomination in Burnaby also was touched on by MacInnis. The two men had been allies in the days of the O.B.U., with Pritchard in the Winnipeg strike and Winch in Vancouver as President of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council. They had fallen out when Winch left the O.B.U. with his loggers causing it to collapse soon afterwards. When Winch returned to the I.L.P., Pritchard stayed aloof, although he still considered himself a socialist. Then Pritchard joined the Reconstruction Party and did much to keep it socialist. However, he was still coming in the back door, as far as the Socialist Party, and particularly Winch, was concerned. Pritchard felt that he, not Winch, deserved the Burnaby nomination, since he had been reeve there. Winch had been nominated some two years earlier, and he was not going to give this up, especially to Pritchard. Angus MacInnis had been a practicing politician long enough by this time to realize that Winch was more important to the cause than Pritchard, and that the party would have to appear appreciative of members of Winch's calibre for them to stay. Burnaby seemed a possibility on election day, a prize to who ever contested it. As it turned out, Winch won easily on polling day, a result which MacInnis found entirely fitting:

...Winch has during the last few years borne the brunt of the fight and is certainly entitled to some consideration, even if such consideration should militate against electing a representative. I think that loyalty should be rewarded even in the Socialist movement.
By May the mutterings in the Socialist Party had died down. Robert Skinner, fully backed by MacInnis, was able to integrate the Reconstruction Party into the Socialists' conception of the C.C.F. Both parties retained their autonomy, but both could now work together, not at cross purposes. The Reconstruction Party members who had first appeared at the March executive meeting were fully accepted by May when the new provincial constitution approved by the Socialists in March, was finally adopted.

The question could be asked whether Angus MacInnis was important in the acceptance of the Reconstruction Party. It must be admitted that opposition to the party's acceptance was limited to a few Socialist Party leaders—such as Winch, Lefeaux, and Stephen. At no point was there a concerted effort by the Socialist Party members to stop the Reconstruction Party. It was more a matter of hesitation and doubt on the Socialists' part than outright opposition.

MacInnis' career and his experience on a national level showed him that co-operation was possible with socialists who did not meet the rigid standards of the Socialist Party in B. C. His main task, then, was to assure his comrades in the Socialist Party that an alliance with the Reconstruction Party was not going to entail any loss of purity. Calling on his experience on a civic, provincial and national level, he was able and willing to do this.

Had MacInnis opposed any alignment with the Reconstruction Party, the situation might have been different. He was one person to whom both moderates and radicals in the Socialist Party could turn with confidence. He was a national figure and a successful politician in 1933, yet had not lost the support of the Socialist Party at home. If he had not been able to reassure the Party, it is unlikely that it would have accepted the
newcomers. His support of Robert Skinner's policy was enough to tip the scales from mistrust to tolerance and, later, to acceptance.

Angus MacInnis was at this time a B. C. leader of the C.C.F. with a national outlook. His main concern was for a national, united party. It is unlikely he really favoured the idea of a federation of provincial federal groups, but accepted it as a step towards a unified party. He saw that the many small, mutually suspicious socialist parties across the country had to be brought together, and their similarities emphasized before they could co-operate. Then, their base of support had to be broadened. Angus MacInnis showed that both of these could be done without loss of socialist principles. In 1925, he had helped unite the various socialist "sects" of Vancouver into the Independent Labour Party. In 1932 he saw his party, now the Socialist Party of Canada, affiliate with the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. Further, it united with the middle class socialists of B. C. in 1933, vastly increasing its potential appeal. He predicted in July, 1933 that the next logical step would be total merger of the two affiliates into a B. C. party. The final step would be the end of the C.C.F. as a federation of provincial bodies and the creation of a truly national party. Only in this gradual way could a Canadian socialist party be built.

Once the C.C.F. executive had accepted the Reconstruction Party, it realized that the federation needed a proper newspaper. The Labour Statesman, although still carrying an occasional political article, was more interested in labour than socialist problems. The B. C. Clarion was too theoretical and doctrinaire for the middle class socialists now joining the movement. On top of this, it was constantly in financial
difficulties. What was needed was a socialist paper to compete with the dailies, a paper not only to educate, but also to entertain and to reach the widest possible audience. W. A. Pritchard had had some editorial experience, and proposed the Commonwealth which appeared in May 1933 under his editorship. The Reconstruction Party thus had a new stake in the movement, although some S.P. of C. members—notably Ernest Winch—would have nothing to do with the paper. Winch not only disliked the editor personally, but also mistrusted the idea of a limited company, independent of control by the C.C.F. executive, running the paper.

The first edition appeared May 17, 1933. It was an eight page paper, with almost three pages devoted to a verbatim transcription of MacInnis' Budget Speech. The editorial and most of the rest of the paper were devoted to local matters. Columns by "Idle Roomer" and "Flare Pistol Pete" (Barry Mather and Ted Ward), Pritchard's editorials and music reviews, and the paper's novel slant on public affairs soon won the Commonwealth many readers.

On their return to Vancouver that spring, the MacInnises gave a series of talks in the interior of British Columbia. An indication of the interest in the C.C.F. early in 1933 and the demand for the MacInnises as speakers was given by the Commonwealth when it reported:

Several meetings have already been arranged throughout the country on their behalf as they travel westward to their Coast home. Salmon Arm asks for three days in which they might cover the district. Kamloops also is asking for dates, and the CCF organizations throughout the Okanagan Valley are already preparing for an extended itinerary.

MacInnis' visit to Salmon Arm was eagerly awaited by the local Socialist Party branch.
the area, it was well received, "The Maclnnis' visit here was a success. We enjoyed it very much." Then, remarking on the forthcoming Regina Convention, the same man said, "I believe it will be a great success and that the socialist dog can continue to wag the C.C.F. tail." This comment summed up the hopes of the Socialist Party of Canada in B. C.

Referring to MacInnis' visit to Penticton, the Commonwealth only said:

The people in the District feel that the movement has been benefited considerably by these visits. The speaker handled all questions in his usual and effective style and everybody was satisfied with the results.

Everywhere they went, the MacInnises were able to draw large, interested audiences and, although they were unable to expand the Socialist Party of Canada, their presence and message did bring some members of their audiences into the C.C.F. movement through the C.C.F. clubs.

Socialist members of Parliament were rare enough in 1933, so meeting one as articulate and interesting as Angus MacInnis must have had quite an effect on an audience already inclined towards a socialist party, yet still hesitant about the "Reds" who might be found there.

The party realized MacInnis' value, not only on the road, but also in Parliament. Ernest Winch in his "Party Notes and Comments" in July said, "Angus MacInnis, M.P., is touring the Okanagan holding a large number of meetings. Did you read his speech on the Budget? Some speech! Good for Angus and the Movement!" 

The MacInnises returned to Vancouver in time for the July meeting of the S.P. of C. when the delegates and resolutions for the Regina Convention were chosen. B. C. had been allotted sixteen delegates. Of these,
Ernest Winch was to lead the eight representatives of the Socialist Party, accompanied by Robert Skinner, Sam Hay, James Elliot, Lyle Telford, William Duggan, Fred Dalgleish, and Bern Stehelin. The Reconstruction Party sent W. A. Pritchard, Mrs. D. G. Steeves, Frank Mackenzie and Mildred Osterhout. The remaining four, all members of the S.P. of C., were George Stirling from Salmon Arm, George Williams from Kamloops and the two MacInnises.

Eight resolutions were approved for submission to the Convention. The Socialist Party of Canada went on record as: reconciled to the name "Co-operative Commonwealth Federation" as long as socialist principles were maintained; opposed to any coalition with any capitalist government; eager to submit British Columbia's type of party organization (federal structure, socialist leadership) for adoption by other provinces; in favour of just social measures; in favour of repeal of Section 98 of the Criminal Code and Sections 40-41 of the Immigration Act; in favour of action taken to secure the release of all political prisoners; in favour of C.C.F. co-operation with the Canadian Labour Defence League; and in favour of trade with the Soviet Union.

This meeting closed by adopting a motion that the Western Labour Conference be discontinued as the C.C.F. was now in existence. J. W. Hope had drifted away during the past year, and the Party now had enough confidence in the new Federation to agree to disband the Conference. It had been preserved the year before as a precautionary measure against the failure of the C.C.F. to fulfill its promises, and so was no longer needed.
CHAPTER III

ANGUS MACINNIS AND THE NATIONAL C.C.F., 1932-1935

The Regina Convention, which gave birth to the C.C.F. party, has been studied from many perspectives before and it is not the purpose of this study to repeat what has already been said. Here the emphasis will be on the participation of Angus MacInnis in particular and the Socialist Party delegation in general.

By the time of the 1933 convention, Angus MacInnis was a national figure in the Canadian socialist movement. He was one of the small group of "co-operating independents" in Parliament; he was known to labour and socialist groups across the country as a strong opponent of the capitalist system and a sincere, but not doctrinaire socialist; and he was an active member of the National Council of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. MacInnis saw the need for a Dominion-wide socialist federation and was political realist enough to accept support from many sources to build the federation. However, as a member of the Socialist Party of Canada, he held views considerably to the left of those held by members of other parties in the federation. From his position on the C.C.F.'s National Council, he was in a position to ensure that the federation would not become a sterile educational sect, nor would it sacrifice the socialist principles of the S.P. of C. to political expediency. It was not an easy position to take.
The 131 delegates at the Convention represented twelve labour, farm and socialist organizations in seven provinces. Unlike the Calgary Conference, no labour unions were present in Regina because the C.C.F. was a federation of provincial organizations, and there was not really a national organization with which a national union could affiliate. For this reason the Canadian Brotherhood of Railway Employees, which had been represented at Calgary was not at Regina.¹

A pattern soon emerged in Regina: the ever-present socialist conflict between radicals and reformers. This placed the Socialist Party of B. C. delegates, with their Ontario Labour Conference allies at one extreme, and the U.F.O. and U.F.A. farmers at the other. The rest of the delegates allied themselves with one or the other of these groups on different issues.

The farm groups were suspicious of the radicals and were determined not to lose their autonomy in an organization that seemed dominated by such men. Robert Gardiner, M.P., leader of the United Farmers of Alberta delegation, was quoted as saying: "The U.F.A. is not going to give up one iota of our autonomy." W. H. Hannam of the United Farmers of Ontario objected to the "amalgamation" of his organization into, rather than its "federation" with the C.C.F. The Manifesto he said: "reads more like the document of a Socialist Party than of the Co-operative Commonwealth."²

The B. C. Socialist Party delegates must have been pleasantly surprised by this development, for any federation that the reformists would object to must be more radical than they had previously thought. The presence of Angus MacInnis on the National Council and his introduction of the Labour Platform of the Manifesto, and Ernest Winch's activities on the Resolutions Committee must also have encouraged them.
Ernest Winch stood out as the most radical of a very radical delegation. MacInnis agreed with most of his views, but on two occasions opposed them. The first was when Winch and William Moriarity from Toronto called for the deletion of the sentence "we do not believe in change by violence" from the preamble of the Manifesto. W. A. Pritchard argued that "nothing achieved by violence was worth the energy expended." When Winch retorted that he favoured adopting "whatever means were necessary to achieve the objective," Angus MacInnis declared "if the people will not use their intelligence to mark the ballot, I would not trust them to use any other means." The motion to delete was defeated.

On another occasion, Fred Fix of the O.B.U. managed to have Ernest Winch introduce a general motion in favour of political action through industrial unionism to the Convention. This motion would have pledged the C.C.F. to industrial rather than political action to achieve its ends. It was quickly talked out by J. S. Woodsworth and Angus MacInnis.

On both these occasions Winch took extreme positions which MacInnis knew were not necessary to preserve socialist principles and which would alienate more people than were necessary. If the C.C.F. did not emphasize its commitment to change by constitutional means, it would be indistinguishable to the electorate from the Communist Party and so would lose much potential support. Also, men like Woodsworth and MacInnis were sincere democrats who believed that a violent revolution would result in a fascist dictatorship if it failed and a communist one if it succeeded. The whole question of industrial unionism, direct action, and the O.B.U. were irrelevant to socialism and would only lead to the same cul-de-sac as had developed in 1919. MacInnis would see no reason for following a policy that had already failed and so dismissed it.
On other occasions, MacInnis found himself in complete agreement with Winch and the Socialist Party in defence of what he believed were essential principles of "socialism." This was a word that conjured up frightful images for the U.F.O. and, to a lesser extent, the U.F.A. delegates. Towards the end of the Convention, W. H. Hannam, the U.F.O. educational secretary, expressed his opposition to the socialist nature of the Manifesto, then pleaded for "five or six definite statements of reform we could present to the farmers back home." While William Irvine, M.P., and G. H. Williams (both Prairie socialists) were willing to conciliate the Ontario delegates in the interests of unity, MacInnis was disturbed by an attempt to dilute what he felt was an excellent Manifesto. He saw the question as simply "capitalism vs. socialism." This undiplomatic summation was too blunt for another delegate, J. L. Whittley of Montreal, who could see only disaster for the C.C.F. in Quebec on such a socialist platform. However, in spite of the protests of Whittley and Good, the other delegates were satisfied with the Manifesto and it passed easily.

On two other occasions MacInnis and the B. C. delegation found themselves opposed to the farm delegates, but now in a minority.

The first issue arose in the debate over the wording of the section on social ownership in the Manifesto which said "in restoring to the community its natural resources and in taking over industrial enterprises from private to public control, we do not propose any policy of outright confiscation, but what we desire is the most stable and equitable transition to the Co-operative Commonwealth." The Winnipeg Free Press, which followed the Convention closely, reported that MacInnis was the leader of those who wanted no compensation after confiscation, and that
he was supported by the rest of the B. C. delegation. One Regina newspaper reported that, in the debate on compensation after nationalization, MacInnis had declared himself against compensation since it would only benefit the class the C.C.F. was pledged to dispossess. He said there were at present three classes—those controlling the means of production, those with nothing and an intermediate group "who have some equities." However, "before we get control..., the great majority of this intermediate class will be in the dispossessed class and will be glad to join us." He then contended that the compensation clause should be eliminated and that "if we are going to order our program to suit the Regina Star, we should pass a resolution saying we are going to join the Conservative Party." 7

The second issue was the application of the principle of confiscation to agriculture. Socialism as supported by MacInnis now became especially frightening to most of the Prairie delegates when it appeared that it included the collectivization of farms. To M. J. Coldwell of Regina, socialization meant public ownership of the means of production and monopolistic industries, not the collectivization of everything, including the family farms. MacInnis saw the exclusion of land from public ownership as preferential treatment for farmers:

If the farmer wants a co-operative commonwealth in which everything is socialized but himself, then he better have a co-operative commonwealth of his own. If the farmer is going to enjoy the benefits of co-operation, he will have to come half way. 8

Agnes Macphail of the U.F.O. was appalled by the possibility that she might have to support not only confiscation of farms, but this without compensation:
I could not associate myself, she said, in any way with a movement that does not want to compensate the people. As president of the Council of the U.F.O., if this amendment goes through, I am rather afraid we shall disassociate ourselves from it /the CCF/. She then left the hall.

A little later, during the debate on Labour motions, MacInnis said with a wry smile obviously intended for Miss Macphail: "I could threaten to leave if this measure is not accepted, except for the sobering thought that you would probably get on very well without me." It was some time before Agnes Macphail would again speak to Angus MacInnis.

MacInnis' most important official role at the Convention was to introduce section seven of the Manifesto, a "National Labour Code to secure for the worker maximum income and leisure, insurance covering illness, accident, old age, and unemployment, freedom of association and effective participation in the management of his industry or profession." It was brought in on the first night, and quickly approved the next morning. It was not a particularly contentious platform, and it would appear that MacInnis introduced it, not because he formulated it, but because he was one of the few real workingmen in the higher councils of the party.

In the end, the farmers saved their farms, the C.C.F. renounced violence, and those in favour of compensation defeated MacInnis and his allies. The Manifesto as finally accepted was a document that the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section) could be proud of, and at the same time moderate enough to be accepted by all the delegates but one. The one dissenter was W. C. Good of the U.F.O., whose opposition was a warning of trouble to come. Although Angus MacInnis played a small part in the drafting of the Regina Manifesto, its acceptance vindicated his contention
that a Dominion-wide federation of farm, labour and socialist parties was possible, and that this federation could make a genuinely socialist appeal to the electorate. It now remained for the electorate to accept or reject this socialist alternative to the Liberal and Conservative Parties.

The electorate's assessment of the C.C.F. was still to be made, but for the present the C.C.F. delegates from British Columbia were pleased with the results of their labours. For one thing, three representatives from B. C. sat on the National Executive, an achievement satisfying to both the Socialist and Reconstruction Parties. These were Angus MacInnis, M.P.; George Williams of the S.P. of C., a Kamloops railway employee; and W. A. Pritchard of the Reconstruction Party, editor of the Commonweal th. Also, the Regina Manifesto was a socialist document that left no doubt as to its intentions, for it closed with the declaration that

\[
\text{No CCF government will rest content until it has eradicated capitalism and put into operation the full program of socialist planning which will lead to the establishment in Canada of the Co-operative Commonwealth.}
\]

The Commonweal th, with its editor on the National Executive, declared its complete support of the Manifesto and the Federation. An article on the "History and Aims" of the C.C.F. gave a description of the Federation that would have satisfied members of both the Socialist and Reconstruction Parties.

Is the CCF a political party? This question is one which speakers find it necessary to stress continually as the old diehard Liberals and Conservatives would like to create the psychological background among the people of Canada that it is. A proper definition of the CCF might be: a union of all political parties whose leaders and supporters seek by peaceful and constitutional means to take the dying breath from Capitalism and to set up a new social order in Canada that will be for the benefit of all the people and whose basic principles shall be the production of goods and planning of the State for use and not for profit.
Ernest Winch was now one of the most ardent promoters of the Federation. Where once he had opposed not only national affiliation but also provincial merger, he now effused:

Here are presented principles revolutionizing and regulating society--so sound and practical that the wonder will be, not the eagerness with which they will be seized upon, but that never before has there been a widespread demand with the insight and courage necessary to secure their adoption.... Peace and Prosperity will be the order of society whilst war, unemployment, and insecurity will be as unknown as they are unnecessary. 14

Angus MacInnis had seen the tiny Independent Labour Party grow into the larger Socialist Party of Canada and then move into the mainstream of Canadian politics. Affiliated with the C.C.F., it now had a broader national outlook and greater purpose; and, in the Reconstruction Party's middle class appeal, it had greater potential strength in British Columbia than it had ever known. The minutes of the September executive meeting noted:

On behalf of Comrade Mrs. Grace MacInnis and himself, Angus MacInnis, M.P., presented the Party with a framed photograph of the Regina Convention delegates. In doing so, he expressed his satisfaction with the results of the Convention and the part which the B. C. delegates had taken therein. 15

The Reconstruction Party had much to be pleased with from the Convention too. The National Convention had authorized the party to "adopt" the orphan C.C.F. clubs to form the Associated C.C.F. Clubs of B. C. 16 These clubs had appeared during the period between the Calgary and Regina Conventions more or less spontaneously and remained autonomous until they were taken in by the Reconstruction Party. In an atmosphere of general interest in the new Federation, crowds all over the province flocked to hear speakers such as the MacInnises, the father and son Winches, and Dr. Lyle Telford. They stayed to form the autonomous clubs.
Unlike their Ontario counterparts, these clubs found a compatible niche ready for them in the C.C.F. and identified immediately with the Reconstruction Party. Their presence tipped the precarious balance between Socialist and Reconstruction Parties to the latter by giving them a definite numerical superiority within the B. C. Federation.

W. A. Pritchard was elected president of the Association of C.C.F. Clubs, which was formally organized on August 25, 1933. The Socialist Party accepted this and sent Arthur Turner and Mrs. Grace MacInnis with greetings to the fifty-eight delegates from the thirty Reconstruction Party branches and C.C.F. clubs gathered at the organization meeting. Turner expressed the Socialist Party's new acceptance of the clubs when he said:

We must make due allowance for different concepts, as inevitably appear in all human movements, but so long as the common objective is the social ownership of the means of life, we are prepared to consider of less importance the means by which we arrive at the conclusion.

Now the C.C.F. combined within itself all socialist groups except the "party of direct action" (which was never far away), Col. Lyons' "Independent C.C.F. Party" and the breakaway Vancouver Centre Socialist Party branch members who had refused to join the C.C.F. in 1932. The Socialist Party was in a definite minority within the C.C.F. but saw little threat to its socialist principles which now seemed firmly implanted in the Federation. However, it decided to take no chances. Conscious of its minority position within the Federation in British Columbia, a resolution was passed in September "That the Party delegates, by previous arrangement, do not split votes on the election of Party members to official positions within the CCF."
The attitude behind this view was expressed by Ernest Winch in the B. C. Clarion several months earlier.

The function of the Socialist Party is to create a working class consciousness—to make socialists—for the ultimate purpose of acting as an effective instrument in the transformation of society from its present form to one based upon a co-operative commonwealth. Within the Federation, it must constantly fulfill this function, insisting at all times upon a consciousness of the class nature of the struggle, the ruthlessness of the warfare, and the impossibility of temporizing either with the capitalists as a class or the effects of this system based upon exploitation. 21

There was still some suspicion of the clubs which justified (to the S.P. of C.) the continued existence of the Socialist Party within the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. It was for this reason that the C.C.F. fought the 1933 provincial election under the banner:

CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH FEDERATION

Socialist Party - Reconstruction Party

In the period after the Regina Convention, the Vancouver Sun commented on the C.C.F., which was now becoming a force in British Columbia politics. It still felt that the members of the new Federation were just "Liberals in a hurry" and would follow the path of the Progressives:

Liberalism always needs revitalizing. And that would appear to be Mr. Woodsworth's true function, rather than leading a revolt that will tend to split the Liberal forces and assist the election of the Tories and the reactionaries who are the natural enemies of both the Liberals and the C.C.F.

J. S. Woodsworth, Angus MacInnis, et al., are exceedingly valuable and able men, but.... 22

The Sun was sure their true role was in the Liberal Party. The Sun's editorial office still had not grasped the significance of the Federation.
It soon would, however. But for the present the Sun was content to report objectively on the C.C.F., although it never missed a chance to point out the Federation's weaknesses or follies. In the middle of August J. S. Woodsworth came to British Columbia and spoke with MacInnis and Pritchard at a C.C.F. rally in Vancouver, launching the party's campaign in the provincial election. The Sun, under the heading "CCF to Free Canadians" gave extremely detailed coverage to the C.C.F. president's talk before some 7000 interested listeners. They were hardly partisans, however, for

...much of the audience melted away as soon as Mr. Woodsworth finished. Those who remained came very close to howling Mr. MacInnis down. They were frankly bored with his explanation of his economic theories and after trying to clap him down resorted to the direct demand that he "sit down."

Mr. MacInnis fought back stubbornly, told some of them that if they did not sit down they'd be thrown out, and said the reason they didn't want to hear him was because they did not have the brains to understand. He gradually regained ascendency and finished his speech in quiet. 23

The Federation learned several lessons here. Firstly, anytime Woodsworth spoke, it would have to be at the end of the program, since his name drew many more than just the party faithful. Also, MacInnis showed his ability to subdue a hostile audience; Pritchard received a much more respectful hearing after MacInnis had tamed it.

For the rest of the year, the name MacInnis seldom appeared in the columns of either the Vancouver dailies or the C.C.F. press, and when it did it was usually in connection with some meeting he would be addressing. During the provincial election campaign, Mrs. MacInnis spoke as far afield as Port Alberni and Nanaimo (October 15-22), as well as the various provincial ridings around Vancouver. Her husband, although not travelling
so far, was able to report some forty-five meetings and radio broadcasts from September to December, a normal number for the period covered.

When he addressed a meeting in North Vancouver where Harley Anderson of the Socialist Party was running, MacInnis was frank about the party's objectives: "The C.C.F. is not a political party which is going to bring plenty and prosperity to everyone..."not a"pedlar of paradise," but the question to be decided was "do we wish to continue the competitive struggle or do we want a co-operative society." He spoke elsewhere, but not as frequently as he had in former campaigns. With the two Winches, Dr. Lyle Telford, William Pritchard, Victor Midgley and others at the provincial level, there was little need for him, although he did address meetings when he was called upon. This election was noteworthy for the medley of parties that appeared and the cacophony of voices that were raised. Dr. Simon Fraser Tolmie's government had proven so inept at handling the effects of the Depression in British Columbia that it declined to run as the Conservative Party and disintegrated into Non-Partisan, Union Conservative, Independent Conservative and Independent candidates, while the United Front of Farmers and Workers (the Communists), the Socialist Party and the Independent C.C.F. all entered the fray. However, the only two parties that entered enough candidates to form a government were the Liberals and the C.C.F. The entry of the C.C.F. into the campaign and the response its socialist appeal received pushed the Liberal Party far to the left on a platform of "work and wages" in a straight socialist-capitalist contest. The campaign was a hard fought one with the Vancouver Sun and Vancouver lawyer Gerald Grattan "Gerry" McGeer heaping invective onto the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in general and Lyle Telford and the two Winches
in particular. Angus MacInnis was not an immediate threat so escaped the Liberal wrath. 26

After all the votes were counted on the night of November 2, the results showed that the Liberals under "Duff" Pattullo had won 31 seats in the Legislature with 37.3 per cent of the vote to become the new government, while the C.C.F. with seven seats and 31.5 per cent of the votes, formed the Opposition. 27 Six of the C.C.F. victors were Socialist Party of Canada members and the seventh, the Rev. Robert Connell, was chosen C.C.F. House Leader and Leader of the Opposition. The Federation had polled 119,367 votes, had emerged as one of the two major parties in British Columbia, and proved to all but the most rigid purists that the Socialist Party had benefitted by its affiliation to the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. For the first time in Canadian history, the C.C.F. had become the official opposition in a provincial legislature. This election had been crucial for the new party. Although its enemies were pleased that it had not done better and its more ardent supporters had expected a sweeping victory, it had proven itself. To rise out of relative obscurity in the first provincial election it had contested, to secure 30 per cent of the vote and become the official opposition in the Legislature, was an impressive achievement. It showed that the C.C.F., in spite of the obstacles thrown in its way, could succeed where the old Socialist Party had not.

Angus MacInnis made two observations on this election. The first was the fundamental change in the pattern of Canadian politics shown in B. C. "...the issue, for the first time in a Canadian political campaign was Socialism vs. Capitalism. The C.C.F. in this campaign accomplished at least one thing: they have proven the identity of interest of the two
old parties." He also noted that the base of support was not built up overnight. "All but one of the candidates elected are members of the Socialist Party of Canada which is affiliated with the C.C.F. The only significance that need be attached to this is that these candidates ran in constituencies where Socialist organization and education had been carried on, in some cases, for many years."  

He wrote several other articles at this time. One was published in the *Commonwealth* on the topic "Dirty Politics." Taking a statement from the president of the Canadian Legion that politics were too dirty for the Legion, MacInnis investigated why and decided that capitalism was to blame.

It seems to me quite illogical to accept and approve of the present competitive system, a system of everyone for himself and the devil take the hindmost, and at the same time to complain that the system is not run on high ethical principles. Capitalism is the enslavement of one class by another. This is the original sin, the fundamental crime, the prolific mother of the whole detestable brood of all the lesser evils that afflict mankind. It is quite useless to complain about dishonesty, graft, patronage, inefficiency, and to shout "dirty politics" and yet still to insist on maintaining their source-capitalism.  

He also submitted an article to the *Canadian Forum*, the first he had written for a national magazine. It was a socialist assessment entitled "Where Do We Go From Here?" Basing his argument on the premise that the present economic order could not last, he offered four alternatives.

First, restoration of the present system to, let us say, something approaching its pre-depression or pre-war efficiency. Not that the 'golden age' was anything to write home about as far as the majority of the people were concerned. Second, a more or less rapid decline to more primitive forms of production, and lower material and cultural standards of living. Third, a total collapse of the political and economic structure and a sanguinary struggle between the classes for supremacy. Fourth, an orderly transition from the present system with its competitive struggles to a system based on planning and cooperation.
His reasons for rejecting the third alternative (violent revolution) illustrate once more his difference of opinion with Ernest Winch and the more radical socialists of British Columbia, and his affinity with J. S. Woodsworth and the dominant constitutionalist section of the C.C.F.

We are firmly of the opinion that force begets force and that one of the first results arising from the advocacy and use of force will be the creating of an opposite force. The mere acceptance of the theory of force as the only means to the end desired makes any other approach to the problem impossible. If we accept the theory we shall, consciously or unconsciously, use the means that best fit in with the theory. We must decline to accept this alternative. First, on the ground that it does not fit in with the customs, tradition and psychology of our people, and secondly that there seems to us a better way and a more reasonable out. 30

Angus MacInnis was now receiving more attention from the non-socialist press, both locally and nationally, in feature articles. The Province concluded a full page, perceptive, and generally sympathetic discussion of him with:

One of the leaders of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, Mr. MacInnis has pronounced views on social questions. He thinks very firmly that Socialism is the answer to the problems; in fact, Mr. MacInnis has a high opinion of the possibilities of mankind despite history—even despite the history of Socialism.

Angus MacInnis can explain Socialism and Socialism explains Angus MacInnis. He would have made a good lawyer or preacher or University professor or doctor—he could have shone in one of these non-commercial professions—but the opportunity was not his; thus he became a Socialist. For Angus has ideas, capacity, intelligence, courage. Too interested in abstractions for a career in commerce, too ambitious for a contented existence as a humble toiler, too courageous to submit to the obscurity imposed on him by fate, perhaps too idealistic to be practical—thus a Socialist.

So we have Angus MacInnis, M.P., who came here twenty-five years ago in search of fame and fortune. He has achieved something of fame. As for fortune, well, he doesn't
think much of fortune now—even if his Socialistic ideas are ever realized a fortune won't be worth anything to anybody. 31

Saturday Night magazine also took notice of him. In a rather effusive "human interest" type of feature, Wilfred Eggleston wrote; "Behind the Scenes With the CCF." In the course of short commentaries on each of the C.C.F. members, he said

Angus MacInnis has two obsessions: class warfare of the Marxian tradition, and fine china. He is satisfied that the present economic order bears within itself the seeds of inevitable decay; and it is as difficult for Mrs. MacInnis (Grace Woodsworth) to drag him past a china shop as it is to circumvent a confirmed alcoholic bound for a tavern.... (But) he is the kind of doughty fighter a new movement needs. He is a determined debater; and if his opponent gets rough, he gets rougher.... 32

Eggleston concluded with pocket definitions of each man (e.g. Woodsworth—humanitarian, Garland—advanced Liberal, Irvine—political evangelist, etc.), calling MacInnis "a Marxian Socialist," the only one of the members so termed.

The C.C.F.'s first election campaign was not the 1933 B. C. provincial election, but an October 23 federal by-election in the north-eastern Saskatchewan riding of Mackenzie. The seat was vacated by the Progressive incumbent, N. H. Campbell, who resigned early in 1933 to accept an appointment to the Federal Tariff Board. In contesting this election, the C.C.F. hoped to inherit the former Progressive votes. Lewis St. George Stubbs, a Winnipeg judge who had been removed from the bench early in June decided to run.

Because of his close ties with the Manitoba I.L.P. (another founding body in the C.C.F.), his outspoken defence of the poor and the helpless in his court, and his reputation as a radical, Stubbs appeared to be an
excellent prospect for the C.C.F. An urban Winnipeg riding might have been easier to win, but the Mackenzie by-election presented itself and seemed to be an excellent prospect for the Federation, so some of the C.C.F.'ers in the riding invited him to run.

Angus MacInnis was on his way home from Ottawa at the time and stopped in the district to preside over the nomination meeting. He took an interest not only because this was the C.C.F.'s first electoral test, but because Lewis St. George Stubbs was a personal friend who had presided over the civil ceremony when Angus MacInnis had married Grace Woodsworth the year before. In an article for the Commonwealth he pointed out the significance of Stubbs' nomination on June 8. The riding was rural, had always had a farm member before and had insisted on constituency autonomy, binding its member to reflect constituency interests solely. In spite of this, the nominating convention accepted Stubbs, an outsider from the city, and "almost unanimously refused to pass a resolution limiting the responsibility of their member to the wishes of his constituents."

Angus MacInnis was very impressed by this. He had seen the difficulties of trying to mold a cohesive political party out of farm Members of Parliament who opposed the ideas of cabinet government, caucuses, and parties who supported the ideas of recall, referendum and constituency autonomy. The farmers' renunciation of the principle of constituency control here heralded a great breakthrough that would enable the C.C.F. to avoid that mistake of the Progressives. Referring to the problem of constituency control of Members, MacInnis said to Myron Feeley of Preeceville, Saskatchewan, who had helped in Stubbs' campaign:

Constituency autonomy has been a cardinal principle with your farmer's organizations for so long, I understand, that it might be difficult to get them to accept
a greater measure of central control.... Personally, I believe that the principle of a certain amount of central control in this regard (i.e., like B.C.), if judiciously exercised, is good. 36

Grace MacInnis sent "Notes From MacKenzie" in the next issue of the Commonwealth, in which she described the actual nominating convention. Five candidates were nominated, but Stubbs won handily with 92 of the 131 votes cast. Perceptively, she noted:

...only two things can beat Mr. Stubbs in MacKenzie:
Heavy campaign funds from the old parties might turn the scale in their favour. Or untrue and alarming statements, such as were broadcast during the recent Calgary by-election might go far to defeat the CCF. 37

She was not far off on both these counts, although there was more to the defeat than could be laid at the door of these two factors alone.

Stubbs campaigned all summer and fall against a Liberal, a Conservative and a "United Front" (or Communist) candidate, competing with the latter two to inherit the Progressive votes. In theory the "United Front" took in all "progressive" forces but in practice, it meant the Communists alone. During the course of the campaign, William Lyon Mackenzie King, H. H. Stevens and J. S. Woodsworth endorsed the Liberal, Conservative and C.C.F. candidates respectively while the Liberals and Conservatives made full use of their financial resources. In the end, Stubbs was defeated by the Liberal candidate, a Wadena lawyer named J. A. MacMillan whom he trailed by 1614 votes. 38

His defeat was due to several factors. One was the scare campaign employed by the Liberals and Conservatives to which MacInnis referred bitterly in a letter to Stubbs, "they had (I was going to say stoop, but they did not need to stoop as their tactics were at that level) to adopt such tactics as appeal to fears and prejudice." 39 However, it is more likely that the crucial factor was, as both Angus MacInnis and the editor
of the Winnipeg Free Press suggested, the fact that whereas in 1930 the Progressives had united all the anti-Liberal votes, now his support was split three ways, with a Liberal victory the result. 40

Discouraged by his defeat, Stubbs turned to Angus MacInnis for advice in November. In his reply MacInnis pointed out the natural Liberal tendencies of the riding and the low level of campaigning employed by the opposition which he contrasted with Stubbs' honest efforts.

Taking a longer view of the question of the moment than Stubbs, MacInnis counselled patience:

We are now building our own political organization and undoubtedly we will make many mistakes, but techniques and discipline will have to be learned. Disappointments we will have in plenty, but the goal we have as our object is worth many disappointments. There are no defeats in life unless we accept them. Our great difficulty is that we see only the immediate present. The needs of tomorrow may require what today we may consider defeat. A few years from now the result in MacKenzie may be considered a good thing by all of us. 41

A month later he again wrote to Stubbs, giving advice on several matters. To the unhappy former candidate he also gave his own statement of faith in democracy and in the great abstraction "the public."

Your query or your doubt 'whether the public is worth worrying about' amused me. I have thought the same on many occasions. I feel sure that everyone working in the cause we are interested in, if they are at all sincere, have had the same thought. As you say, the public is fickle, it is easily swayed, but on the other hand it never had a chance. Education has always been in the hands of the ruling class, and the continuance of their rule depended not on enlightenment but ignorance. The slaves of less modern times were not educated. In fact it was illegal to do so. The modern slave is educated? /sic/ because it became necessary for the economic interests of their masters that they should be. 42

Stubbs soon recovered from his despondency and was back in active politics in the next Manitoba provincial election. In 1936, his votes totalled more than that of the next ten candidates in the ten member Winnipeg
riding. He sat as a member in the Provincial Legislature until 1948.

In his correspondence to Stubbs, MacInnis showed political realism and faith in democracy, two characteristics of his political career. In a small way, his writings to Stubbs revealed his basic motivation from the time he entered politics until he retired—a belief that a better social order was possible, that it could be achieved constitutionally, and that the people should always be free to choose. He was willing to take the long, arduous route to the Co-operative Commonwealth, and believed that the end was only justified if the means used to attain it did not destroy its original promise.

As a member of the National Council, Angus MacInnis was called upon to deal with the disintegration of the Ontario C.C.F. that took place in February and March of 1934. His actions were followed closely by the Socialist Party in B. C. which was not in complete agreement with what resulted. The five Ontario C.C.F. delegates from the Labour Conference whom the B. C. Socialist Party delegates had met in Regina seemed to Winch and his companions the only other true socialists in the Federation. Their organization's apparent suppression by the C.C.F. clubs in Ontario was seen as a warning to the members of the Socialist Party in B. C. that unless action was taken soon, they would follow their comrades into oblivion. The reformists would control the Federation completely and the C.C.F. would then be drawn away from its socialist goal.

The Ontario C.C.F. organization showed superficial similarities to that in B. C., except for the affiliation of the United Farmers of Ontario. As in B. C., Labour and Socialist groups voluntarily banded together with the C.C.F. "clubs" as autonomous groups in the Federation.
The former were knowledgeable, if sometimes doctrinaire, socialists of long standing, while the latter were newcomers attracted by the solutions socialism offered to the problems raised by the Depression. Furthermore, the socialists in both provinces had more executive power in the Federation than their numbers warranted. Finally, each of the affiliates was left independent in the federal structure of their Provincial Councils.

There the similarities ended. The Socialist Party of Canada in B.C. was an organic unit with a great deal of control over its branches, while the Labour Conference in Ontario was a completely artificial creation with little control over the branches of its constituent members. The B.C. Socialist Party had much more influence in the B.C. Federation because of its leadership and experience than did its Ontario counterpart, and consequently it was able to influence policy much more. The Communist Party was more active in Ontario, especially in Toronto where repressive activities of the police in defence of "British liberties" managed to create civil rights issues that placed many in a position of sympathy to it. Lacking a single strong non-communist socialist party of the S.P. of C. (B.C.) variety, the line between the Socialists and the Communists in Ontario was badly blurred. The many little parties in the Labour Conference fell across the whole political spectrum from reformist to communist. The Communists were able to infiltrate a few key sectors in the Socialist parties and also the C.C.F. clubs with an effect far out of proportion to their numerical strength. As long as joining the C.C.F. entailed membership in a club or party, rather than directly with the Federation, these clubs or parties protected the actions of their members, who benefited from affiliation in the Federation while at the same time
acting independently. "Boring from Within" had been successful in the Canadian Labour Party in the 1920's, and could be again. Finally, there were no conservative farmers in the B. C. Federation of the kind whose opposition even to the trappings of socialism was so apparent in Regina. The U.F.O. entered the C.C.F. on its own stringent conditions and left as soon as it realized that it was more than another farm-oriented reform party.

Of the three constituent members of the Ontario C.C.F., the United Farmers of Ontario (U.F.O.) was the oldest and most firmly established. Founded in 1919, it was still a potent, if declining, force in the 1930's. Its membership had stood as high as 60,000 in 1921, but was down to 7,000 in 1932. Agnes Macphail, president of the U.F.O. and one of the "Co-operating Independents" in Parliament, had been in the C.C.F. from its inception. In 1932, she and William Irvine of the U.F.A. were given the responsibility of bringing the U.F.O. into the Federation. With the aid of the Farmers' Sun, edited by Graham Spry and Alan Plaunt of the League for Social Reconstruction, they succeeded. At the end of November, 1932, the U.F.O. declared its willingness to join, subject to the condition that it be allowed to retain its autonomy, and that its affiliation to the C.C.F. be limited to the declared policies of the U.F.O.

The Ontario Labour Conference was a federation itself. It was an artificial creation, but several of its constituent members were older than the U.F.O. On November 27, 1932, delegates from the Labour Party of Ontario, Socialist Party of Canada (no direct relation to the B. C. Socialist Party), Independent Labour Party and other smaller groups such as the Jewish Socialist Verbund, the Fellowship for a Christian Social Order, L.S.R. and the Labour Debating Society met to organize the Ontario
Conference of Political Labour and Socialist Groups. This organization was intended to unite all non-farm organizations in the C.C.F. A resolution passed at the meeting

Resolved that the delegates representing the various Labour and Socialist groups at this Conference agree to accept as the basis of co-operation the Manifesto laid down by the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. It is further recommended that the various units undertake the formation of a Provincial Council to be affiliated with the National Body. 46

Unlike the Socialist Party of Canada in British Columbia, the Labour Conference was not the founding member of the C.C.F. in Ontario and was not, therefore, in a position to accept all comers on its own terms. Also, unlike the B. C. party, it was a federation of a number of independent labour and socialist parties.

The United Farmers of Ontario and the Labour Conference were composed of organizations interested in joining the C.C.F. However, they both represented special groups in the community and were in no position to attract the thousands of middle class city dwellers who flocked to meetings to hear J. S. Woodsworth, Agnes Macphail, Angus MacInnis and others outline the "Co-operative Commonwealth." Many wanted to take some part in its building, but not through the rural U.F.O. or the labour and socialist Labour Conference.

At one meeting in Toronto 1,000 people expressed an interest in the C.C.F. Woodsworth asked Professor Frank Underhill and D. M. Lebourdais to set up an organizing committee to decide what to do. Lebourdais hit upon the idea of the Clubs. 47 A plan was quickly drawn up for the Clubs which provided for a "Provincial Association of C.C.F. Clubs which, as the U.F.O. and Labour Parties, will form a unit in the Provincial C.C.F." 48 Thus, the thousands of newly won "converts" to the C.C.F. were allowed
to set up their own organization, the Associated C.C.F. Clubs of Ontario. This disappointed the Labour Conference which had wanted to bring all non-farm groups into the Conference. 49

The C.C.F. structure in Ontario had been set up in haste and soon developed serious troubles. Early in 1933, all that was evident was that there was a C.C.F. provincial organization in Ontario with what seemed to be three broad bases of support. At the National Council meeting in January, Angus Maclnnis successfully moved:

That this meeting endorse the action of the President and the other members of the Dominion Council in organizing Ontario local groups to form a Provincial Association to affiliate with the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. 50

In spite of his endorsement of Woodsworth's work in Ontario he remained sceptical of the value of the Clubs. This is revealed in a letter J. S. Woodsworth wrote to Bert Robinson of the Ontario Socialist Party of Canada:

... On December 22, he \[MacInnis\] wrote the secretary of the Labour Party of Toronto as follows:

'You are no doubt aware that I did not attend the meeting in Toronto on the 19th, not that I was altogether opposed to what was being done, but because I was not quite satisfied with the logic of my own position. If I were to take part in organizing C.C.F. Clubs in Toronto and then oppose the organization of such clubs when I reached British Columbia.... 51

Angus MacInnis' support was given on the assumption that the first priority of the C.C.F. was to organize, particularly in Ontario. He would have preferred to see the organization done through existing parties, but realized that it could not be done. The Federation would have to accept that the people attracted by the name "Co-operative Commonwealth Federation" would not have been attracted by "Socialist Party" and it would have to use these converts as best it could. In spite of this, he obviously disliked the idea of independent clubs, with members unversed
in socialism, setting up their own organizations. In British Columbia the Clubs were in constant contact with the Socialist Party, and so maintained a higher degree of doctrinal purity than did the Ontario Clubs. Also, in Ontario, the Labour Conference and Clubs had equal representation on the C.C.F. executive, while in B. C. the Socialists controlled the executive.

At the same National Council meeting, the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section) affiliated with the C.C.F. as the nucleus of the Federation in British Columbia. The Reconstruction Party was directed to affiliate with the National Organization through the Socialist Party, not on its own. This saved the C.C.F. organization in British Columbia from Ontario's problems by creating one, rather than three founding groups. Maclnnis must have felt that the Labour Conference would play the role of the Socialist Party in B. C., acting as the socialist "leaven" for the U.F.O. and the Associated Clubs. It is unlikely he would have introduced the motion had he known how unlike B. C. the conditions in Ontario were. The Labour Conference was too loosely organized and susceptible to communist infiltration, the Clubs were equally weak and less knowledgeable of socialist doctrine, while the U.F.O. could never fully accept a socialist federation.

The Ontario Labour Conference was officially organized in February, 1933 with a "Committee of Twelve" as its executive. In April a series of resolutions were adopted which, although consistent with C.C.F. policies, emphasized similarities to Communist positions. Some of these included a demand for the freeing of Tim Buck, a trial for the Portsmouth Prisoners, opposition to deportations from Canada, and to Fascism in
Germany. The resolutions ended with a call for working class unity, a standard communist but not C.C.F. appeal. 52

At the same time, Bert Robinson of the Socialist Party, wrote J. S. Woodsworth and Angus MacInnis about proposed May Day demonstrations in Toronto. From the nature of the resolutions passed at the April meeting and the reactions of both Woodsworth and MacInnis, it would appear that the Labour Conference was, at the very least, working with the Communists at this time.

J. S. Woodsworth answered:

Our experience in Canada, repeated again and again, has been against anything like co-operation. For years I tried my best to co-operate and every time was double-crossed. The Communist Party is out for its own ends and will use one to the limit and then ruthlessly turn and denounce him. 53

Angus MacInnis was of the same mind:

A working class united front is not only desirable but absolutely necessary, if we are to get anywhere, but it seems to me that those who are continually talking about the united front are the very people who make such a thing impossible....

.... I do not see that the Socialist Party of Canada (Ontario Section) can advance the Socialist movement in the least by co-operating with them. In fact, the opposite result, a detriment to our movement, can only result from any co-operation with them. 54

MacInnis' antipathy towards the communists was based on harsh experience. His early relations with them as an ally within the Canadian Labour Party and later as a foe convinced him that they could not be trusted. In 1931 he expressed this feeling towards the communists who had managed to infiltrate the I.L.P.

...the party of direct action have one or more members of the party, who of course are members of the I.L.P., in every branch of the I.L.P. to influence our members against such methods and tactics as are fundamental principles of our party. Then on the strength
of being members of the I.L.P. they ask for the privilege of the floor at our meetings to speak against the policies the Party advocates. I have noticed this on several occasions lately. They invite us to act with them in the "united front" while at the same time we are labeled as a bunch of fakers and lied about as a matter of policy. 55

The Labour Conference was already showing its weaknesses, and was also moving into conflict with several leaders of the national organization. Woodsworth and MacInnis would not have hesitated to go to Toronto for May Day if they had not felt the Labour Conference's communist associations would harm the movement and that their presence would make the associations legitimate.

Representatives from thirty-three C.C.F. Clubs met in May to formally organize the Ontario Association of C.C.F. Clubs, and to elect an executive. As soon as this was done, the three sections of the Ontario C.C.F. were able to elect a Provincial Council, composed of three representatives from each. From this was chosen the Ontario C.C.F. executive—Agnes Macphail of the U.F.O., president; J. Walter and D. M. Lebourdais of the Associated Clubs, vice-president and treasurer respectively; and Bert Robinson of the Labour Conference, secretary. Unlike the B. C. Socialist Party which controlled the provincial C.C.F. executive, the Labour Conference had only one third of the Council positions and one quarter of the executive. It could be outvoted by the combined efforts of the other two sections.

By the autumn, the U.F.O. and the expanding Association of C.C.F. Clubs were drawing closer together in opposition to the Labour Conference. In September, Elmore Philpott, President of the Association of C.C.F. Clubs, introduced proposed changes in the structure of the C.C.F. which would
change the basis of affiliation from the three present affiliates to many constituency organizations, and give the Provincial Councils rather than the sections the power to discipline individual members and organizations. It was also proposed that any former officer of the Communist Party should be excluded from the C.C.F.\textsuperscript{57} These proposals were probably a result of the communist sympathies shown by some organizations in the Labour Conference, such as had been seen the previous April. The Clubs and U.F.O. executives also wanted the power to prevent any growth of communist influence in the Ontario C.C.F.

The Labour Conference leapt to the defence of the C.C.F.'s federal structure and was supported in this by Woodsworth.\textsuperscript{58} At an emergency meeting late in October A. E. Smith, the communist leader of the Canadian Labour Defence League, called for the resignations of Elmore Philpott, president of the Association of C.C.F. Clubs and D. M. Lebourdais, treasurer of the Provincial Executive, because of the two motions.\textsuperscript{59} The Labour Conference members were angry at the attempt of the Clubs, composed of persons they considered inferior in socialist knowledge, to destroy the Conference. Arthur Mould of the Labour Party of Ontario, expressed this in words that could have been used by the Socialist Party of Canada in B. C.

\textellipsis\ But to suggest that they \textit{the leaders of the Association of Clubs} are able, capable or even possess the necessary knowledge (and that is not said disparagingly) to properly understand and build a working class struggle against Capitalism, is foolish. Left in their own groups, they can do a lot, but to lead a mass group, as one of your Western men said "they have a lot to learn."\textsuperscript{60}

Woodsworth agreed that the federal structure of the C.C.F. should not be tampered with, and talk of re-organization ended. All seemed quiet, but the Ontario organization had shown its weakness. A. E. Smith's
presence at the Labour Conference meeting demonstrated its susceptibility to infiltration by communists. They could, and soon would, tear the C.C.F. apart from behind the shelters of some of the Club branches and smaller parties. There they would be protected by the weaknesses of the Associated Clubs and the Labour Conference from any threat of discipline.

Early in 1934, the pressures within the Ontario C.C.F. proved too strong for its structure. It collapsed in mutual recrimination and confusion, and was only saved from complete destruction by the action of the National Executive. When the executive stepped in, it decided to end the Association of C.C.F. Clubs and the Labour Conference, substituting constituency organizations. MacInnis' role in this, the destruction of the federal structure of the Ontario C.C.F. was noted by the Socialist Party of Canada in British Columbia which felt it had been betrayed by MacInnis and the C.C.F., and that it too would be destroyed.

The catalyst in the disintegration of the Ontario C.C.F. was A. E. Smith. He was arrested for sedition early in 1934. Immediately members of the C.C.F. in several of the Toronto Clubs and the Socialist Party of Canada (Ontario Section) took up his defence. An "A. E. Smith Defence Fund" night was called for February 18, 1934 at Massey Hall in Toronto.

This development raised sharply the question of the C.C.F.'s relations with the Canadian Labour Defence League and other Communist organizations. At a C.C.F. Provincial Council executive meeting on February 17, a resolution was passed ruling against any C.C.F. participation at the Massey Hall meeting. Several Labour Club representatives refused to accept this decision and appeared with Smith at the meeting, joining him in his denunciations of Woodsworth and other C.C.F. leaders.
The U.F.O. was so disturbed by this pro-communist defiance of the C.C.F. that it began seriously to consider leaving the Federation.

J. S. Woodsworth immediately called on Elmore Philpott, as president of the Association of C.C.F. Clubs, and Arthur Mould, chairman of the Labour Conference executive, to discipline any member clubs not taking action against Communists or sympathizers. He was anxious not to see the C.C.F. destroyed in the same way the Canadian Labour Party had been. "As you are well aware, the Labour Party in Ontario has been split before by the tactics of the Communists and we do not propose to have our Dominion-wide movement imperilled by a small section of one of the constituent groups."

Events soon moved to a climax. Thomas Cruden, president of the S.P. of C. (Ontario Section) tried to expel the Communists in his party but was himself deposed. The St. Paul C.C.F. Club in Toronto refused to expel its secretary, Wilfred Jones, who had denounced Woodsworth along with A. E. Smith, and was supported in its defiance by four other Toronto clubs. The National leaders of the C.C.F. wrote to Agnes Macphail in her capacity as president of the Ontario Provincial Council of the C.C.F. to "...protest against the co-operation by members of the C.C.F. organizations which oppose the C.C.F. and seem determined to disrupt the organization. We call upon the provincial council of Ontario to take immediate steps to rid the C.C.F. of individuals or organizations who are not in sympathy with the program of the C.C.F., or who refuse to support loyally its constitution." She immediately suggested a Provincial Council meeting to "read out the organizations that will not conform to the constitution drawn up in Regina." On February 24 Philpott had the Association of C.C.F. Clubs executive pass a resolution expelling the Labour Conference
from the C.C.F. The U.F.O. was expected to take similar action immediately, which would mean an automatic two-thirds majority on the Provincial Council in support of the resolution. It did not bother to do so, since it left the C.C.F. a few days later.

Philpott's move was a rash one. He assumed that the U.F.O. and the Clubs held a majority of the votes on the Provincial Council and could use this majority to expel the whole Labour Conference. Instead, the Association of C.C.F. Clubs should have first disciplined its own members and given the Labour Conference a chance to do the same. Woodsworth felt Philpott's action was wrong procedure, particularly as it was done in such a way as to deny the Labour Conference an appeal to the National Council. However, the action was taken and he asked the Labour Conference to accept it.65

J. S. Woodsworth's first public response was to issue a statement to the Canadian Press on February 26, 1934, repudiating the actions of Smith's C.C.F. supporters:

At the time of the Regina Convention last summer, it was decided that the CCF would not co-operate with the Canadian Labour Defence League. Notwithstanding this, some members of the CCF Clubs and the Ontario Labour Conference persisted in associating themselves with communist tactics.

The matter came to a head a few days ago when certain individuals claiming to be supporters of the CCF appeared on the same platform at Massey Hall when A. E. Smith stated that representatives of the CCF in the House of Commons are responsible for the charge of sedition laid against him....

Neither the Labour Parties nor other groups in the CCF propose to allow a few Communist sympathizers to discredit or disrupt the movement. 66

Woodsworth's next task was to solve the problem which was now aggravated by the Associated Clubs' action. He sent Angus MacInnis and
E. J. Garland from the Dominion Council to Toronto to help in the reorganization. MacInnis at this point felt that there should be a meeting of the provincial council to discuss the matter of the Labour group's place in the C.C.F.; if necessary he was willing to have some members of the National Council present. "The matter of discipline rests with the provincial council, but there is an appeal from the provincial council to the annual Dominion convention. Certainly the Labour people should not be expelled indiscriminately."67

By the end of the week the U.F.O. had had enough and had withdrawn from the C.C.F. Elmore Philpott followed because, although not a member of the U.F.O., he was a candidate in a rural riding, and could not alienate potential rural support. This left the one remaining member of the Provincial Council, the Associated Clubs, leaderless. A meeting such as the one suggested by MacInnis was now out of the question.

Woodsworth, supported by the National Council, finally decided to suspend the Ontario Provincial Council before the C.C.F. in the province was completely destroyed, and to reorganize it, not on the unsuccessful federal basis, but on a constituency one such as Philpott had urged six months earlier. The obvious advantage of this change would be that it would unify the structure of the C.C.F. by destroying the artificially created Labour Conference and Association of C.C.F. Clubs.

Assessing the debacle in the Ontario C.C.F., J. S. Woodsworth concluded that "to attempt to allocate blame is futile." The Labour Conference was a breeding ground for interparty rivalry; the U.F.O. lacked any corporate sense in the C.C.F. and was only a conditional affiliate; the Associated Clubs were created from emotional enthusiasm and had inexperienced leaders, and were therefore vulnerable to communist
infiltration; while the Provincial Council was incapable of controlling the activities of the affiliated bodies.

By March 18, a new constitution was tentatively agreed to by both labour and socialist parties and clubs, and a convention was called for April 14. The announcement of the convention was sent out on April 2, signed by Angus MacInnis "for the National Council of the Co-operative Federation." Delegates were invited from each of the former organizations in the Federation, with one delegate for each 25 members. This effectively limited the power of the tiny socialist and labour sects that had held so much power in the Labour Convenence. A draft copy of the proposed constitution was sent outlining the new conditions of membership and structure of the provincial council.

Article III - Membership in the organization shall consist of groups whose members are willing to subscribe to the principles and programmes of the CCF and adhere strictly to its constitution.

Article IV - The Provincial Council shall consist of eleven members elected at Provincial Conventions.

This ended the artificially created Labour Conference and Associated Clubs sections of the Federation and, by making the federal constituency branches the bases for membership, abandoned the federal nature of the Ontario C.C.F.

By the middle of March, Angus MacInnis was getting inquiries from British Columbia about the Ontario upheaval. Robert Skinner was concerned about the situation. From what he read in the newspapers, it looked anything but encouraging. "Frankly, I am worried in regard to news from Ontario. What on earth is the matter? Why has Philpot (sic) resigned? Many clubs and branches are asking what it is all about."
MacInnis replied, "I do not think you need feel perturbed over the situation in Ontario. A situation developed there in which it became imperative that the National Executive should take a hand. Steps are now being taken to re-organize on a different basis, and I think the ultimate result will be that we have a much stronger organization in Ontario than we had before."  

In an article in the Commonwealth on "The C.C.F. in Ontario," MacInnis endeavoured to quiet suspicions that the National Council was destroying the federal character of the movement in Ontario. He explained the Council's actions by saying that "what has happened to date, though regrettable, need not be taken as anything but growing pains incidental to a growing movement." The U.F.O. was too conservative, the Clubs were created out of necessity, "there was danger in bringing them into the movement, because of their lack of understanding of the implications of the C.C.F. programme, but undoubtedly the danger in not taking them in was even greater." The only members of the Federation in Ontario who understood and accepted socialism were the many weak parties that made up the Labour Conference. From the beginning, the Clubs and the Labour Conference disliked each other, while the U.F.O. was uncomfortable in the movement. "To make matters worse, the Labour Conference and some of the Clubs became the happy hunting ground for the 'borers from within,' otherwise the communists, who are never so happy as when they are wrecking something." In the end, J. S. Woodsworth, the national president, with the support of the National Council, had to intervene.  

MacInnis felt closer in spirit to the parties in the Labour Conference, in spite of the communist infiltration, than he did to the conservative U.F.O. or the newly formed Clubs. No attempt was made to draw any sort of
comparison between the C.C.F. in Ontario and in British Columbia.

The Convention to organize the new Ontario C.C.F. was held in Toronto on April 15 with Angus MacInnis acting as chairman. The U.F.O. was gone, and MacInnis asked anyone else not agreeing with the C.C.F. to leave. This was intended to eliminate the extreme left wing which, with the extreme right gone, would leave the Federation to the moderates. In spite of his request, delegates from the Toronto clubs that had precipitated the disintegration, and from the Socialist Party of Canada stayed, although they did not take a very constructive part in the deliberations. The rest of the delegates present were from non-communist socialist parties and from C.C.F. Clubs, many of whom were incensed by the seemingly highhanded methods of the National Council. Vigorous debate on the new constitution revolved around the question of changing from membership through an affiliated club or party, to individual membership in a constituency organization, but it was finally accepted. The constitution, when finally approved, provided for membership limited to "political groups and component clubs" with no mention of Labour Conferences or Club Associations, disciplinary action by the Provincial Council, and a more unified executive elected by the provincial convention. When elections were held for the new executive, John Mitchell of the Hamilton Labour Party became president and Graham Spry of Ottawa vice-president.

Woodsworth expressed satisfaction with the outcome of the Convention. The most important result was that the Labour Conference and the Association of C.C.F. Clubs were abolished, while "the individual Labour Parties and individual C.C.F. Clubs will carry on very much the same as usual."
He also hoped the small Socialist Party would go, but did not think there would be any other losses. He was not disappointed. On April 16, it announced that its five branches were pulling out of the C.C.F. since they felt "socialists" had been eliminated from it. Woodsworth did not miss the forty-two members of this party, which he referred to as "near Communists and chief disturbers of the peace."74

The U.F.O. and the Socialist Party of Canada were gone, to the great relief of many, although the disruptions did affect the C.C.F. adversely in the June provincial election. On the other hand, a major Communist infiltration, such as the one that had destroyed the Canadian Labour Party, was avoided. The Party (it was no longer a federation) emerged from the April Convention more united and potentially stronger in the long run. Writing to Robert Skinner, Angus MacInnis expressed confidence that the worst was over in Ontario:

... The Ontario situation took considerable time, but I believe we have it now fairly well organized and from all indications, it is going strong. In any event I am quite satisfied that there is enough CCF sentiment in the province of Ontario to make the CCF a permanent movement. They do lack the socialist background that is so necessary to a movement such as ours, but they are continually holding meetings and getting the best speakers available. 75

Events in Ontario were seen by the ever-vigilant Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section) as a rehearsal for the destruction of the federation in British Columbia. The Socialist Party's fears were stimulated by the knowledge that, like the Labour Conference, they were outnumbered by the expanding Club section. In fact, Ernest Winch reported in January 1934, that "many S.P. of C. members were joining the Clubs." That they were outnumbered by the Clubs was bad enough, but to be outnumbered in their Federation by persons with an inadequate knowledge of socialism was worse.
Arthur Mould's assessment of the future of the C.C.F. Clubs was more optimistic than Winch's. Mould believed that the Club members were valuable because they had enthusiasm and free time. Winch could only ask, referring to the B. C. Clubs, "is our party failing to educate its members and the public or are some of them congenitally incapable of assimilating our teachings—as presented by us?" 76

To the Socialist Party in B. C., it seemed that the federal structure of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation was under attack by the right. The party believed that it had an important role to play in the Federation, and that it could not play this role in a unified party because it was impossible "to bring about a fundamental unity between Socialists whose aim is the complete abolition of wage slavery, and the miscellaneous aggregation of gassy or groggy fumblers groping their way to an understanding of what ails them." 77

The S.P. of C. (Ontario Section) left the Federation in April, and had contacted Ernest Winch by early May. At the May executive meeting, Miles Sumner moved "that Comrade Angus MacInnis be asked for a report relative to the recent events in Ontario and his part therein." 78 Sumner was a friend of Winch's, a fellow member of the South Burnaby branch of the Socialist Party, and had rejoined the socialist movement with Winch in the late 1920's. It is quite likely that the motion was introduced by Sumner on Ernest Winch's instigation.

At the same time, Winch wrote the C.C.F. Dominion Secretary, Norman F. Priestly:

.... Our information is to the effect that the Dominion Council has imposed a "Party" form as distinct from the "Federative" which is the accepted constitutional basis of the CCF.
We are also informed that properly affiliated parties have been denied representation. Is this correct?

Our membership is very anxious to get the official version as there appear to be vital principles at issue. 79

After consulting Woodsworth, Priestley replied that the Ontario movement had a form chosen by the members, with political labour parties and clubs affiliated as in the other provinces, and that "no properly affiliated bodies are denied representation," although he understood the Socialist Party had withdrawn. 80 He did not say that the Labour Conference was unlike the B. C. Socialist Party in that it was too weak to discipline its member units and was a completely artificial creation that collapsed a year after its inception.

The minutes of the June S.P. of C. executive meeting noted laconically that information had been received from the Dominion Secretary on the Ontario situation. 81

There was much more interest among B. C. socialists than the two items in the minutes or Winch's letter implied. Victor Midgley had attended the May executive meeting which had asked MacInnis for information. Knowing that the request was not entirely an innocent one, Midgley gave MacInnis some advice.

My suggestion is that you request the Executive to suspend judgement until you can make your explanation in person. I am of the opinion that some of our comrades are only looking or waiting for a good excuse to make a break in the organization in B. C. and therefore think that a written "explanation" might be taken as ammunition to serve their purpose.

With some judgement has already been made, and you have been found guilty of throwing out "progressive and radical groups of workers from the CCF." 82

Robert Skinner, too, saw a group in the Party still trying to find an acceptable reason to jettison the Federation. It had long been chaffing
at the bit imposed by the C.C.F. and now saw a chance to break free. The moderate socialism of the greater part of the movement was bad enough, but this action of MacInnis in helping to destroy what purported to be the only revolutionary element in Ontario was more than the radical wing could accept. Led by Ernest Winch, it was prepared to pull out of a Federation that seemed incapable of true socialism. As Skinner reported to MacInnis:

.... The elder Winch is now convinced that a split is inevitable and is shaping his programme with that in view so that the Socialist Party will come out a working organization. Now after a great deal of thought I am convinced that the only solution to this internal struggle for power is complete merger. At the Federal Convention a strong opinion from B. C. will press for a united CCF party and let the stragglers do what they like. I am sorry that E. E. insists on machine work and that he allows personalities to cloud his judgement.

Skinner's wish for a united party probably arose from his experience as president of the Federation Executive in B. C. He realized that the similarities between the two confederates were more important than their differences and that a complete merger would make the federation into a real party.

Winch, on the other hand, was reacting as he had the year before when the Socialist Party was contemplating affiliation with the C.C.F. and merger with the Reconstruction Party. His natural mistrust of the right wing in the C.C.F. was reinforced by what had happened in Ontario. He must have felt that the Socialist Party was weakening and would soon disappear, to the detriment of the whole Federation, unless it acted soon.

MacInnis answered Midgley soon afterward. He was not completely surprised that the Socialist Party was inquiring about the Ontario
situation because he had received "a letter from a representative of the Ontario leftist group asking for the name and address of our Provincial Secretary in B. C." He accepted Midgley's advice and then stated that the policy was that of the National Council, which would be responsible for justifying it to the National Convention in July. With a reference as applicable to British Columbia as it was to Ontario, MacInnis wrote, "had it not been for the impossible people in the left and also in the right wing of the movement, we would be much better prepared for the Ontario elections than we are now." 85

He had further thoughts after hearing from Robert Skinner and, apparently, Ernest Winch. A few days later, he again wrote Victor Midgley:

As you suggested, before I received Winch's letter
I thought it would be better to withhold my report till
I got to the Coast. However, after receiving Winch's
letter, I decided to make a report, a copy of which I am enclosing herewith. You will notice it does not refer exclusively to the Ontario situation. 86

By June Ernest Winch must have decided to bring up the Ontario question at the Convention in Winnipeg rather than pull the Socialist Party out of the Federation. He was now an opposition M.L.A. in Victoria and felt that the C.C.F. would soon form the government. He would consider it better for the Socialist Party to remain in the C.C.F. to keep the Federation's socialist principles intact than to return to the futility of educational campaigns in the political wilderness. Ernest Winch's verbal revolutionary ardour continued as before, but his actions, now that he was an M.L.A., began to show a finer grasp of political reality. He must have realized that complete merger with the Clubs was not only inevitable but also wise, and that the Socialist Party could enter into
such a union more easily from a position of strength. The best way to ensure this would be for the Socialist Party to maintain itself intact by defending the federal nature of the C.C.F. while quietly preparing for a union. This is the only way that Winch's fiery words in 1934 can be reconciled with his acceptance of the union in 1935. Skinner's assertion that he seriously considered secession cannot be discounted, particularly if he felt the Socialist Party or its principles were threatened, but the difference between his words and actions, and the failure of a threat by the Clubs to materialize, make it unlikely.

The Socialist Party, at this time, had ambivalent feelings towards the Clubs. Some leaders may have anticipated severing ties, particularly after they first heard what had happened in Ontario, but few members were willing to go so far. While they might make revolutionary statements, they realized that the differences between the two sections were becoming meaningless. There was much greater co-operation between the Socialist Party and the Clubs than there had been in Ontario, while the Socialist Party controlled the Federation's ideological purity, and its executive. The last election had been the most successful in the career of the socialist movement in B. C. and the future held more promise. While lacking a high regard for the Associated C.C.F. Clubs, the Socialist Party members were still willing to stay in the C.C.F. In June, the Clarion congratulated the Commonwealth on its first anniversary, while issuing a warning:

> While taking this occasion to express our friendship and goodwill towards the Commonwealth and its staff, may we also affirm our belief that there is need for the B. C. Clarion as representative of the Socialist Party, the foundation member of the CCF. It must always be kept in mind that the CCF is a Federation, not a Party. Its strength lies in this fact. For the first time in Canadian history, Farmer, Labour and Socialist Parties have formed
a common front under the common name of the CCF. To preserve their identity as representatives of various social groups and still to unite against the common enemy, Capitalism, is the plan upon which success will be based in any future effort. 87

The month before, the Clarion had described the Socialist Party's role in the C.C.F. in the same terms MacInnis had used in 1933, "...it can act as leaven to the 'lump'--the heterogeneous mass that is groping towards clarity of thought." 88

Angus MacInnis' last public reference to the Ontario re-organization came late in June in an article in the Commonwealth "Ontario Reorganization (Angus MacInnis Replies to a Questioner)." He pointed out that the National Council, not J. S. Woodsworth, was responsible for the decision to reorganize and would have to defend its decision to reorganize to the Convention in July. He closed with the comment, "Let us build now the best we know and we can leave the future to take care of itself." 89

In July, the Socialist Party Executive decided that MacInnis' report should be "tabled until his return to Vancouver," signifying that the emergency was over. 90

By this time the C.C.F. in British Columbia was preparing for the National Convention in Winnipeg in July.

At the June executive meeting the Socialist Party's delegation was chosen. It was composed of the executive, W. W. Lefeaux, H. Gargrave, Sam Hay and Ernest Winch; the editor of the B. C. Clarion, Harold Winch; R. B. Swailes, M.L.A. for Delta; A. M. Stephen who had worked closely with Lefeaux and the Winches before; and N. Cooper. With the possible exceptions of Cooper and Gargrave, it was a radical delegation. Robert Skinner was ninth choice in the balloting for delegates and so became first
alternate delegate, since the party was entitled to eight representatives. As a former vice-president of the Socialist Party and as the incumbent President of the Federation, Skinner was one of the most obvious choices as a delegate. That he was not selected would appear to be of some significance; it seems highly probable that the reason for leaving him off the delegation was not unrelated to the fact that Robert Skinner was Angus MacInnis' most frequent correspondent in Vancouver and, presumably, the closest to MacInnis of all the Socialist Party members. His decline in status would seem to indicate that the executive of the party felt that the attitude he and MacInnis had adopted was unrepresentative of the Socialist Party.

Because he was first alternate delegate, Robert Skinner replaced W. W. Lefeaux in the delegation when the latter dropped out in July. Angus MacInnis had been worried about what the Socialist Party would do in Winnipeg and was pleased that Skinner was now included in the delegation. He wired: "Would urge you to come if at all possible. Need you to show Winch does not represent entire Socialist Party viewpoint."

Skinner's delegate status was confirmed at the July Socialist Party executive meeting, but it is unlikely the feeling against him was any less than it had been before. As MacInnis pointed out, he represented the opposite point of view to Ernest Winch's. At the same meeting, the executive passed motions "that the delegates be instructed to support the FEDERATION for the organization and oppose the PARTY formation," and that the delegates would vote as a bloc for A. M. Stephen as the party's nominee for the National Council. Both of these motions could be construed as directed at Angus MacInnis who had helped destroy the federal structure of the Ontario C.C.F., and who was the party's
representative on the National Council. The possibility of secession was not mentioned, as the party dedicated itself to the C.C.F.'s federal structure and its own survival.

The Convention opened in Winnipeg on July 17, 1934. Angus MacInnis arrived sometime before the B.C. delegation and immediately took up his duties as a member of the National Council. At one Council meeting he averted a possible conflict between the Associated Clubs and the Socialist Party from B.C. Dawson Gordon, secretary of the Clubs, argued that the Council should deal with conflicts between the two sections of the B.C. Federation. MacInnis disagreed and convinced the National President, J. S. Woodsworth, to discuss the matter privately with the Rev. Robert Connell.94

Once the Convention started, the B.C. delegation quickly made an impression. The Free Press ran a feature on "The CCF in Convention."

There are people from six provinces at the Convention ... but the province producing the best set of characters is British Columbia. In B.C. there are a lot of English and Scottish Marxists who have none of the timidity of the Canadian-born when it comes to saying they are socialists.

Ernest Winch came determined to find out about the Ontario situation as quickly as possible. No sooner had J.S. Woodsworth given the Opening Address than, "a thorough review of the internal friction in the party ranks in Ontario" was suggested by E. E. Winch. He moved that "a special committee should be appointed to investigate and report." Angus MacInnis supported Winch and urged discussion of the Ontario situation by the Convention. He believed "it should be fully discussed after it had been investigated by the special committee. The Ontario problem had to be solved sooner or later."95

MacInnis was willing to debate the matter, and seconded Winch's motion. The chairman, E. J. Garland, ruled the motion out of order as
the matter had already been referred to the Committee on Organization. MacInnis was chairman of this committee, and had convinced Ernest Winch of his sincerity by supporting Winch's motion, so the matter was not brought up again until the President gave his report.

The C.C.F. knew that there would be a federal election within the next year, and that it would have to present a practical program if it wanted to be considered a legitimate aspirant for office. The Regina Manifesto was a declaration of principles rather than an election platform, so the Federation had now to put together an "immediate program" which would outline the C.C.F.'s proposed policy upon assuming power.

As in Regina, Ernest Winch and Angus MacInnis again clashed on the methods of the C.C.F. Winch was disappointed at the moderate tone of the program. He attempted to alter the Federation's pledge to use constitutional means by interjecting the words "if possible" into the platform, saying that the workers might find themselves with their rights taken away, yet still tied to a moderate program. Many rose to protest Winch's extreme proposal, among them Angus MacInnis who could see no reason for trying to prepare for some future and quite different set of circumstances from those now existing. This approach made sense to the delegates and Winch's proposal was easily defeated.

A peace plank was introduced with the words "the CCF is unalterably opposed to war." Angus MacInnis was politically experienced enough to realize that this was an impossible stand to take and successfully substituted,

We recognize that modern war arises from the clash of interests in a world economy based on competition; therefore the establishment of permanent world peace depends upon abolishing competition and building the Co-operative Commonwealth. 97
On the final day, J. S. Woodsworth gave a full report on the Ontario situation. He explained the background to the National Council's intervention, and the danger that the Ontario C.C.F. might have been destroyed beyond recall by the Communists who were able to function more easily behind the Clubs and small parties in the Labour Conference. When he finished, Ernest Winch began debate on Mr. Woodsworth's report. He emphasized that he knew the national chairman would not purposely misrepresent the situation, but he felt that it was unfortunate for the Convention that it had heard only one side of the question. Recalling the reference to the "disruptive elements" in the Ontario C.C.F., he added the Convention should realize that it could not have a revolutionary socialist party without some communists.

He was immediately attacked by William Ivens, a Manitoba M.L.A., chairman Garland and several members of the Ontario delegation. When a motion to accept the National Council's report was moved, it was accepted overwhelmingly with few but Winch opposing it.

Ernest Winch was not the only delegate from B. C. heard by the Convention. The Rev. R. Connell "made an eloquent plea for a greater unity within the movement," which must have struck Winch as ironic later. Also, Robert Skinner presented the B. C. report, speaking for the Clubs as well as the Socialist Party. Finally Angus MacInnis' eloquence prompted "J.S.M." of the Free Press to comment: He is worth listening to—several times he cut through a fog of words and put a spotlight on the heart of a question.

Angus MacInnis returned home with the rest of the B. C. delegation, spending part of August at a C.C.F. summer camp near Vancouver and the
rest of the month speaking around Vancouver. One group he addressed was
typical of an increasing number of unified party clubs, the "Victoria
Road S.P. of C. and C.C.F. Club." This hybrid was something Ernest Winch
noted at the August executive meeting with dismay, as he watched the
Socialist Party branches being absorbed by the Associated C.C.F. Clubs.
He told the executive that he had not been impressed by the Winnipeg
Convention and reported that "in general the Convention was far from
being revolutionary and tended towards the right." As he said nothing about
Ontario, it seemed that he was satisfied that the Dominion Council had
acted correctly. Angus MacInnis pointedly did not endorse Winch's critical
assessment, and no one else seemed worried about it or the Ontario
situation. 101

Much more important was the future of the Federation in British
Columbia. The numerically small Socialist Party benefitted by the present
federal organization and had been willing to fight for it at Winnipeg.
The Clubs were now becoming equally determined that the structure should
be changed. The Victoria District C.C.F. Council had tried to introduce
a resolution at the Convention that would have made the federal constitu­
cy the sole basis for representation at conventions rather than giving
the Associated Clubs and the Socialist Party eight delegates each. 102
The resolution was never presented but it expressed the feeling of many
of the Club members. The Associated Clubs did not force a confrontation as
its Ontario counterpart had done because it saw no need to do so in view
of developments within the Socialist Party, whose sense of cohesion was
gradually failing. As has been noted already, many Party branches were
joining the Associated C.C.F. Clubs. Also, as Ernest Winch protested
before the August meeting of the executive that the eight Socialist Party
delegates at the Convention had not stuck by their resolution to vote together. MacInnis had received ten of the sixteen B. C. votes to Stephens' six during the voting for the Dominion Council, showing that two of the Socialist Party delegates had considered Angus MacInnis' presence on the Council more important than party cohesion. It would only be a matter of time before the party disappeared unless it merged soon.

This question of complete merger of the two affiliates was brought up at the second provincial convention of the B. C. Co-operative Commonwealth Federation early in September. A resolution was passed calling on the executives of both the affiliates to hold a referendum on the question. 103

The Socialist Party held a mass meeting in October to discuss the question of a complete merger. The results were recorded in the executive minutes for November: 586-328 for union. However, Ernest Winch noted, this was 23 short of the two-thirds majority needed, so no merger was imminent, although the Clubs were almost unanimously in favour. 104

At the Party's annual convention in January, Winch showed himself as strongly opposed to the merger as ever. In his annual Secretary-Treasurer's Report, he said:

The merits of the proposed amalgamation from the viewpoint of economy cannot be denied. ITS MERITS FROM THE STANDPOINT OF THE SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IS THE REAL ISSUE WHICH MUST AT ALL TIMES, BE KEPT DEFINITELY AND CLEARLY IN MIND. 105

The same executive of Lefèaux, Gargrave, Winch and Hay was returned, but this time a motion was passed by the convention calling for another referendum on the merger. Apparently Winch's views were those of an increasingly small minority in the Party. MacInnis' prediction of July 1933 that the two sections would join completely was nearing fulfillment.
During the winter a committee under W. A. Pritchard drew up a constitution agreeable to both parts of the Federation. Any Socialist worries that they might be destroyed by the new Party (for such would the Federation be after the merger) were laid to rest with the provision that,

Should the socialist members find that the merger results in a constitution not acceptable to them, they shall be at liberty to withdraw and reform a strictly socialist group. 106

In April, a second referendum on the question of a merger was held. Again the Clubs voted overwhelmingly in favour. This time the Socialists agreed 417-182, with nineteen out of the twenty-nine branches voting in favour. 107 The final consummation was to take place in the summer.

Between the time of the Winnipeg Convention and the final merger of the Associated Clubs and the Socialist Party, the latter entered into a brief but stormy alliance with the communist "League against War and Fascism." The disruption of the C.C.F. that resulted from such an alliance in Ontario did not occur, but it did the B. C. Federation little good.

The plight of the relief camp workers, which will be discussed more fully in the next chapter, brought the Socialist Party and the Communists together. Motions were passed at the November, 1934 executive meeting to investigate the League and also to work with it, at the League's request, to protest against disenfranchisement of relief camp workers. 108 At the Annual Meeting in January, Winch referred to the proposed alliance with the League and said:

...although the action taken is contrary to the position taken by the Dominion and B. C. Provincial
Conventions of the CCF, it is in complete accord with the declaration of principles of the S.P. of C. itself which is signed by every member when joining. 109

MacInnis was not present and so it is impossible to determine his reaction to this defiance of the Dominion Council. On January 17, an official agreement was signed between the Socialist Party and the Communists, but was limited to support of the relief camp workers. 110

The agreement worked well for a while, although it is unlikely it was approved by the C.C.F. Provincial Council. As it was a limited agreement and did not involve stands contrary to any C.C.F. positions, it was accepted at first. Within a few months, it became less beneficial. In May, the C.C.F. Executive issued a statement that said:

.... Since, in large measure, the policies and particularly the tactics of the Communist Party do not coincide with those of the Federation, we feel that no good purpose could be served by considering them further. To us, the differences are fundamental, irreconcilable. 111

By May the Communists were misrepresenting the C.C.F. and the work of its members to the relief camp strikers. A clean break was finally made, seemingly without any opposition from Ernest Winch. MacInnis was pleased and said in a letter to Robert Skinner, "If we do not get busy that bunch will wreck us, and we will have a military dictatorship upon us before we know where we are at. 112

At the merger convention of the Clubs and the Socialist Party, it was finally decided that there would be no further co-operation between the C.C.F. and the League against War and Fascism, although individual members were free to co-operate. 113 Ernest Winch did not protest very vigourously as his earlier ardour for the Communists had cooled. His biographer suggests he lost interest in international affairs as he became immersed in the problems of B. C. and so drifted away from the Communists. 114
It is unlikely Angus MacInnis had enough influence with the Socialist Party executive to cause the renunciation of the communists. However, as a long time anti-communist who had seen the Ontario Federation almost destroyed, he would be pleased that the C.C.F. in B. C. was spared the worst of Ontario's experiences. He also realized that any C.C.F. association with the communists would be used against the party by the Liberals and Conservatives. 115

In order to dispel any doubts as to the C.C.F.'s attitude towards co-operation with any communist organization, Angus MacInnis introduced the following resolution at the 1935 Dominion Council meeting in November:

...that we should not co-operate with them i.e. Communist organizations/ on any basis whatsoever and further that the National Secretary notify the provincial councils that the policy of the CCF must be adhered to. 116

A vigorous debate ensued in which MacInnis cited the recent problems of the C.C.F. in B. C. in dealing with the communists to emphasize the need for such a statement. In the end, the motion was passed almost unanimously. "To emphasize the point," MacInnis reported this action directly to the B. C. Provincial Executive in December 1935. 117

Although the S.P. of C. had voted in April to merge completely with the Clubs, in June Ernest Winch was still blustering against such a merger.

In a letter to J. G. King, the C.C.F. Dominion assistant secretary, he asked:

Will the outcome result in a straight socialist expression or a definite vote-catching respectability? The Convention to be held on July 27 and 28 will decide, but this I know that, if the outcome is NOT for SOCIALISM, then the CCF in B. C. is split wide open with a section going into the Communist Party and another section into the Socialist Labour Party which is already organizing in the province. 118
Winch's thunderous pronouncements had little effect on events now.

In spite of his predictions, the Convention was held successfully on July 27-28 in Vancouver. Angus MacInnis arrived on July 25 after taking part in the federal election campaigns of J. S. Woodsworth and Stanley Knowles in Winnipeg and H. W. Herridge in Nelson.

The troubles of the year before, even the Socialists' attitude at their Convention in January, seemed forgotten. The two parties spent the first day in procedural wrangling, prompting MacInnis to remark, "we are showing great incapacity for agreement." Although they sat in the Convention as separate blocks (Clubs to the right, S.P. of C. to the left), there was little doubt of the final outcome, especially since the Socialist Party was theoretically free to withdraw at any time.

Ernest Winch, speaking for the Socialist Party, presented a summary of its history and activities and turned its assets over to the new Co-operative Commonwealth Federation Party. Dawson Gordon did the same for the Clubs.

With all seven of the C.C.F. members of the Legislative Assembly, as well as eleven of the sixteen federal candidates present, the delegates exercised their right to absolutely frank discussion of the position of the executive and the parliamentary members to such an extent that Angus MacInnis and the Rev. Robert Connell expressed surprise at hostilities displayed to elected C.C.F. members by some rank and file members. Connell seemed shocked by the hostility shown, remarking:

The sort of thing an elected representative has to put up with within the ranks of the C.C.F. is enough to discourage any man from wanting to seek office.

MacInnis, too, must have come in for some scathing criticism, for the Commonwealth felt the need to come to his defence editorially after the Convention:
Perusal of Hansard will speedily convince readers that contributions to House debates from the (up to now) tiny C.C.F. group, compare most favourably with any from the bigger political guns, and that among them the speeches of our local member Angus MacInnis, certainly are not the least notable, based as they are on material gathered by the most careful research.

.... A federal member has to relate his actions in the House to national C.C.F. considerations and not merely to the wishes of his more immediate constituents in a particular riding or province.

If such considerations are always borne in mind, criticism is much more likely to be just and therefore more calculated to receive the careful attention which only just criticism merits. 122

The Socialist Party managed to elect five of the seven members of the new executive. W. W. Lefeaux became vice-president and W. E. Turner was elected treasurer, while the new chairmen of the publicity, organization and radio executive committees were H. Gargrave, E. Winch and L. Telford respectively. 123 Ernest Winch was satisfied with the new party which had Socialists in crucial positions. In a letter to Angus MacInnis after the Convention he asked facetiously, "Did the Clubs absorb the S.P. of C. or vice versa?" 124 He obviously accepted the union of the Socialist Party with the Reconstruction Party, which justified all of Angus MacInnis' efforts of the preceding three years. After all the suspicion, opposition, and thundering, Ernest Winch reconciled himself quite easily to the destruction of the C.C.F.'s federal structure and the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section).
CHAPTER IV

MEMBER OF PARLIAMENT, 1930-1935

Angus MacInnis' first session in parliament was dominated by the attempts of R. B. Bennett's Conservative government to end, or at least mitigate, the problems of the Depression. He watched with increasing dismay as the Conservatives' "cures" and "palliatives" had little effect on events. An early willingness to give Bennett a chance turned into a conviction that the Conservatives were no more able than the Liberals to rise above their nineteenth century liberalism to see the disintegration of capitalism. Only the "co-operating independents," out of which evolved the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, shared MacInnis' socialist analysis of the causes and solutions for the Depression.

Elected as a member of the Independent Labour Party of B. C., MacInnis was its sole representative in Parliament. He was, strictly speaking, an independent. However, as a labour representative, he joined J. S. Woodsworth and A. A. Heaps, both of Winnipeg, as a "party" of three.

These three were a part of the co-operating independents of farmer and labour representatives who had survived King's blandishments and the 1930 election. Of the once powerful Progressive group, little was left; the original sixty-five were now reduced to twelve. Most of these had deserted the Progressives in 1924 when a budget amendment of J. S. Woodworth's, similar in tone to one of Progressive leader Forke's the year before, forced them to finally choose between the government or the
principles they were elected on. Prime Minister King and Robert Forke had urged them to defeat the amendment by supporting the government, while Woodsworth had maintained that the purpose of the motion was simply to show the similarities between Socialist and Progressive principles. The amendment was defeated 204-16, but it resulted in eleven of these sixteen M.P.s refusing to consider themselves followers of Forke any longer. They were immediately dubbed the "Ginger Group" and joined Woodsworth and William Irvine of the Labour "party" in the amorphous "co-operating group," although they did not act as a formal party. A formal agreement to work together was not drawn up until before the 1930 election. The preamble to that document stated:

Whereas, we the Farmer and Labour groups in the House of Commons, Ottawa, in conference assembled, find that we have much in common and recognize that we are engaged in the common fight against a strongly entrenched system of special privilege, which is functioning through the party system, recognize the advisability of each group retaining its identity in Parliament, thus enabling the group to give voice to the distinctive viewpoint held by the electorate represented by them, and also that in working together, we may assist in the development of a co-operative system of administration.

The group that MacInnis joined in 1930 was little different from that which had supported Woodsworth from 1924 to 1930. Several members had gone, including the Labour member for Calgary East, A. B. Adshead and the United Farmers of Ontario representatives, W. C. Good and Preston Eliot. Aside from MacInnis the only new member in 1930 was Michael Luchkovich, a school teacher from Vegreville, Alberta who represented that constituency from 1930 to 1935. The other labour members of the group were Woodsworth, A. A. Heaps and William Irvine. Like Woodsworth, Irvine had been a minister (Presbyterian, not Methodist) and had left the Church to become active in politics. He was elected from Calgary East
in 1921 as a Labour member, was defeated in 1925, then returned as a U.F.A. member in 1926, sitting for the rural constituency of Wetaskiwin. He was an indefatigable orator and author, writing several books and numerous pamphlets. Although he considered himself a socialist and remained a member of the C.C.F. all his life, his notions of monetary reform put him much closer to social credit than to socialism. In contrast to Woodsworth and Irvine, A. A. Heaps was an upholsterer by trade. He had been a Winnipeg alderman and an active participant in the Winnipeg General Strike. He was arrested for his strike activities, but was subsequently acquitted. His first bid for a federal seat came in 1923 when he unsuccessfully contested a North Winnipeg vacancy. He reversed this decision in 1925, however, and remained in the House as member for Winnipeg North until 1940.

The House leader of the U.F.A. members was Robert Gardiner who, with Woodsworth, was considered one of the dual leaders of the "co-operating independents." Like many of the U.F.A. members, Gardiner was a farmer who had been elected to Parliament in 1921, from Medicine Hat. He moved over to Acadia in 1925 and remained the member for that constituency until 1935. When Gardiner became president of the U.F.A. following Henry Wise Wood's resignation in 1931, he moved it to the left in its political orientation, doing much to set the foundations for the Calgary Conference in 1932. The other U.F.A. members in the House of Commons in 1930 were E. J. Garland (Bow River), G. C. Coote (Macleod), D. M. Kennedy (Peace River), W. T. Lucas (Camrose), A. Speakman (Red Deer), and Henry Spencer (Battle River). All were farmers who had been active in the U.F.A. or in municipal politics prior to their election in 1921. Spencer, Coote, Speakman and Irvine were interested in monetary reform and social credit,
as were many members of the U.F.A. provincial government. This interest eventually benefited William Aberhart who used social credit to destroy the provincial and the national U.F.A. political organizations. Speakman and Coote, who objected to the Regina Manifesto because of its socialist nature, were not socialists at heart and were much closer to W. C. Good than to Robert Gardiner at the Regina Convention. All the United Farmers of Alberta members were defeated by Social Credit candidates in 1935, and only Garland, Gardiner, Spencer and Irvine remained active in the C.C.F. Irvine eventually returned to Parliament in 1945 as the C.C.F. M.P. for Cariboo.

The two Saskatchewan co-operating independents, who still called themselves Progressives, were A. M. Carmichael (Kindersley), a former Pentecostal missionary and teacher, and M. N. Campbell (Mackenzie), a farmer. Campbell resigned from the Commons in 1933 to become vice-chairman of the Tariff Board, while Carmichael withdrew from politics after his defeat in 1935. Neither was very active as a member of the "Ginger Group."

The final member of the co-operating group was Agnes Macphail, who sat for Grey Southeast from 1921 to 1935, and for Grey Bruce until she was defeated in 1940. She had been the first woman to take a seat in the Canadian House of Commons when she was elected for the United Farmers of Ontario, and she was the last of the "Progressives" left in Ottawa in 1935.

Among the members of the "Ginger Group" only MacInnis and Heaps were workers and unionists who could speak to Parliament from personal experience of urban industrial society. Woodsworth and Irvine, although they had both temporarily joined the working class, had been clergymen;
Luchkovich, Macphail and Carmichael were teachers; while Garland, Gardiner, Speakman, Kennedy, Spencer, Lucas, Coote and Campbell were all farmers.  

For Angus MacInnis, who had known only Vancouver and British Columbia politics, the parliament of Canada was a new world. He was given little time to anticipate the adjustment from civic to federal politics, however, as the Bennett government fulfilled one of its electoral promises by summoning a special session early in 1930 because of the "necessity for dealing with exceptional economic conditions with the resultant unemployment." Its reaction to the Depression was first, to administer a "palliative" of federal grants totalling twenty million dollars to the provinces for public works and then to effect a "cure" consisting of higher tariffs to protect Canadian industry.

The bustling, efficient millionaire Prime Minister Bennett dominated this session. A demoralized Liberal opposition could not possibly object strenuously to the policies of a government so recently established by the will of the electorate. The Liberals had no policies to offer as alternatives, so could only oppose the government's methods and wait for Bennett to make his own mistakes. The labour members did not object to the Conservatives' seeming awareness of the problem of unemployment, but they did point out that the government could, indeed should, go much further. Beyond this, the co-operating members took only a minor part in the debates of the session.

The new member from Vancouver South soon noted with amazement the dexterity with which Liberals and Conservatives changed positions. Such flexibility confirmed his own view that the two parties were really playing
a game of "ins vs. outs." Referring to the Liberals' support of a Labour motion that they had opposed when they were the government, he said to the House: "I am rather confused by the agility with which honourable members on either side can change their point of view as they change their respective positions in the House." 9

He kept up contact with Vancouver through the pages of the Labour Statesman, where he described his reaction to events in Parliament in a regular column. In his first entry he stated that "it was all very interesting and amusing to the new members." 10 He then went on to convey his impressions of the formalities and functioning of Parliament to his constituents. His attitude of wonder contrasted sharply with that of J. S. Woodsworth, the nine year veteran who, in his own column, was impressed by the enthusiasm of the new members. The following week, MacInnis was appalled by the rigidity of the party system, saying that "the party system of carrying on the administration of the country's affairs is about the silliest thing imaginable." 11

Once the session was prorogued, MacInnis returned to Vancouver to complete his term on the City Council. The emergency session in Ottawa had been too short to permit him to demonstrate any parliamentary skills or even to provide him with the opportunity for observation of normal parliamentary procedure.

The Second Session of the Seventeenth Parliament opened in March, 1931, with the members gathered to hear a Speech from the Throne, which called for a broad scheme of national development, including provision for old age pensions, aid to agriculture, technical education, and highway construction. 12 In his first column for the Labour Statesman MacInnis
made light of the pomp and ceremony surrounding the opening of the session as he noted that "the annual Parliamentary talk-fest began on Monday, March 16, with the hoary custom of moving that an address be presented ...." He went on to summarize various speeches, with little interpretation. Throughout the session, however, he gradually introduced more analysis, and, by the time the last column appeared, he had developed an informative, interesting and very readable style.

Angus MacInnis' first major speech was his reply to the Address from the Throne. The novice parliamentarian, disturbed by the apparent cynicism in the Commons, remarked:

I spoke of it to certain of my colleagues in this corner; it is a matter which might occur to every new member of Parliament. I refer to the seeming ineffectiveness and unbusiness-like manner in which the affairs of this country are handled. They told me that in time I would become used to this way of doing business. As a matter of fact, they realize the ineffectiveness of our Parliamentary method and have become cynical. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that if what has happened here during this week is any criterion of the expedition with which our economic ills are going to be remedied, that the betterment of our condition is in the dim, distant future.

The MacInnis wit, which Parliament was to see much of over the next twenty-six years, flashed when he said:

Now, Mr. Speaker, I like to be appreciative; it gives me a pleasant feeling. I have perused very carefully the Speech from the Throne to see if it conveys anything to call forth my appreciation.... I did not find very much, but for the little I did find I express my appreciation to the government.

He concluded his speech with a declaration hurled at the House that,

The unemployment problem situation is becoming more acute and will continue to be so, and no amount of palaver in this House will solve it. 14

His maiden speech brought several interesting reactions, apart from the normal partisan praise and disparagement in the House. One reference
to it was contained in a letter from Bert Speed, a close friend and the business agent of MacInnis' branch of the Street-railwaymen's Union:

The stand you have taken in the House at Ottawa is very pleasing to everyone, no matter where I go, complimentary remarks are passed regarding your attitude and we are very proud of you. I read your maiden speech and the large majority of the membership have also, and I must say that it was very good. Angus—you are progressing rapidly, and the Sun Paper has many nice things to say about you, and the special feature about the whole matter is, It's All True. 15

Shortly after the speech, the Tory Ottawa Journal referred cynically to MacInnis' naivete:

This to the older observers of things political, is what is irreverently called "old stuff."

.... When he grows older, and a little wiser and gets to know Ottawa better he will discover that there is a lot more government in Canada than the House of Commons and, that, taken all in all, that government is not so inefficient. He will see then, we hope, that the function of the House of Commons, or one of its chief functions, is that it gives a lot of people the soothing impression (quite necessary in a democracy) that they really have a hand in the government and that this permits those who really govern—the Cabinet and the permanent Civil Service—to get on with their work. That they make a fairly good job of their task is the history of Canada to testify. 16

He was also being closely watched by another newspaper which gave a more favourable assessment of him. The Vancouver Sun was impressed by what it still probably regarded as its own creation. Under the heading "Angus MacInnis Wins His Spurs," it reported:

Angus MacInnis, M.P. for Vancouver South, is recognized in Eastern Canada as one of the strongest men in the Labour Party in the Dominion.

His reputation for fearless thinking, plain speaking and personal integrity has followed him from the Council Chamber in Vancouver to the House of Commons in Ottawa.

Angus MacInnis, in private life, is a quiet, studious, almost painfully diffident individual. He makes friends slowly and carefully. He is the very reverse of flamboyant.
But on the floor of the House he is a giant. His methodical marshalling of logic; his ready command of homey expressions; his harsh, honest voice and his tall, gaunt, Lincoln-like figure make him a commanding personality when he rises to address Mr. Speaker. 17

All through this first full session MacInnis was learning the arts of a parliamentarian. This was apparent in his articles for the Labour Statesman which became more informed and showed a deeper respect for what he earlier saw as "hoary customs." At the end of March, he tried to make his first motion after a forty minute blast at the government. Unfortunately, he still had a few things to learn. He was quickly informed that forty minutes was the maximum time allotted to each speaker, during which time the motion must be moved. In spite of a vigourous defence of his actions by himself and Woodsworth, his motion never saw the light of day. 18

During a debate on economic research, MacInnis made excellent use of his "command of homey expressions" when he outlined, in almost parable form, his conception of socialism in relation to other ideologies:

All Honourable members who have ever had any experience in raising poultry will know that if fertile eggs are secured, put in an incubator and subjected to a heat approximating 103 degrees, at the end of 21 days, baby chicks will hatch. The Labour Party feels this is the way human society should go. Our friends the communists, who are in favour of revolution believe that if you increase the heat a few more degrees, you might get the chicks in fifteen days, but the only thing that would happen would be that you would cook the eggs. My friends the conservatives...believe you can keep these chicks alive in the eggs after the 21 days are over, or if not, that possibly you could catch them and put them back in the shell after they come out. 19

Labour was setting itself up in an unequal struggle with the wily King and his all-embracing Liberal Party for possession of the "middle way," the path of moderation.
On June 1, two and a half months into the session, Prime Minister Bennett finally brought down his Budget. It was a bitter disappointment for all those who had hoped for an imaginative approach to the unemployment problem. Retrenchment, backed up by tax hikes and cost cuts, was all the government could offer.

MacInnis entered the budget debate two weeks later. He refused to congratulate the government for an excellent budget, because he could not convince himself that it was such. He noted "the outstanding and unpardonable fault, which is the omission of any reference to unemployment." He then levelled his attack on a government which had been elected to cure unemployment, but which, apparently, was not even trying to do so. To demonstrate the seriousness of the situation, he focused attention on Vancouver's plight when he showed that the city, receiving only 1.3 per cent of the unemployment revenue, was unable to cope with the 10 per cent of Canada's unemployed who flocked in. Late in June, Bennett suddenly realized the Depression had definitely not been cured, especially on the Prairies. His balanced budget went out the window, and he introduced the "Unemployment and Farm Relief Bill" conferring sweeping powers on the Cabinet. The U.F.A. supported the government in this measure while the Labour members joined the Liberals in opposing the act, but to no avail. This occasion, not the last time the group split on a vote, showed MacInnis that farm and labour representatives would have to be welded into a more cohesive party. His earlier belief in minimal party discipline must have been tempered as he saw the impotence of a "co-operating group" and the need for a real party. In twenty-four divisions that session, the group had voted together only sixteen times. The most serious splits were over opposition leader King's amendments to the Throne Speech and the
Budget, when the Labour members voted with the Liberals and the U.F.A.
with the government.

During this, his second session, MacInnis had made his presence
known in the House, quickly establishing a parliamentary personality with
his dry, mordant humour, quick wit, unflagging industry and fearless
defence of labour. He was improving his oratorical skills, joining
Woodsworth and Heaps as a leading spokesman for Canadian labour. As he
acquired national interests and gained national prominence, he realized
that the work of the small, vocal group of farm and labour radicals would
have to be expanded. By the time he travelled home in July, he had
acquired a national perspective and was thinking in terms of a Dominion-
wide socialist party whose purpose would be first to consolidate, then to
expand the work of the small group in Parliament.

The third session of Parliament which assembled in Ottawa on
February 4, 1932, was to be brief. Both King and Bennett still seemed
oblivious of the depths the Depression was reaching. The labour members
were not heartened to see them again fighting the old battles of high
versus low tariffs, and lauding the merits of a balanced budget. The
Prime Minister seemed unable to meet the emergency. The Throne Speech
offered little, except tacit admission that the government's existing
policies were not working. The main emphasis was on balancing the budget,
cutting expenditures (such as civil service salaries) and increasing taxes.
On the other hand, the Leader of the Opposition was still under the shadow
of the Beauharnois Scandal and seemed incapable of effective opposition.

Into the void created by the ineffective Liberals moved the "co-
operating independents," covering the order paper with bills, motions and
amendments. Of the twenty-four divisions during the session, nineteen were the result of the efforts of the farmer and labour members.

As soon as the Throne Speech was accepted, the de facto opposition began its attack. Alfred Speakman's motion to establish a "Social and Economic Research Council," which had been talked out the last session was agreed upon. A. A. Heaps then moved that hours of labour be reduced in order to reduce unemployment. The motion was quickly defeated, but Heaps' seconder, Angus MacInnis, in the course of his speech, was given a chance to drive a wedge into the unity of the government members. He noted a change in attitude shown by H. H. Stevens who alone among the ministers, conceded that any alliance between producers and distributors was not in the public interest. Then the U.F.A. monetary reformers, George Coote, W. T. Lucas and H. E. Spencer, unsuccessfully called for amendments to the Bank Act and the Finance Act, as well as for the abandonment of the gold standard.

The Ginger Group struck at the Liberals as well as the government. The western Liberal members who were familiar with the desperate conditions on the Prairies were growing restless under King, giving rise to hopes among the U.F.A. members of a resurrected Progressive Party. A U.F.A. motion favouring currency inflation was supported by all of the independents and only King's strong insistence on party unity prevented western Liberal support for the motion.

Angus MacInnis did not sponsor any motions himself, but supported many, including Woodsworth's vain attempt to delete the notorious Section 98 from the Criminal Code. This section, rammed through Parliament at the time of the Winnipeg General Strike to deal with British subjects who took part in the Strike, provided for very broad definitions of seditious
intent, put the burden of proof on the accused, and increased the maximum penalty upon conviction from two to twenty years in prison. The Liberals had tried to repeal the section several times during the 1920's but were always defeated in the Senate where the Conservatives had a majority. With a Conservative government in power, Woodsworth's attempted deletions were stopped in the Commons.

MacInnis also seconded J. S. Woodsworth's first "co-operative commonwealth motion" in March:

That in the opinion of this House the government should immediately take measures looking to the setting up of a co-operative commonwealth in which all the natural resources and the socially necessary machinery of production will be used in the interest of the people and not the benefit of the few. 26

He was the only other member of the Ginger Group to speak on the motion before it was talked out. In reply to the charge hurled by John MacNichol (Cons., Toronto-Davenport) that Woodsworth and his followers just wanted to destroy and not to build, MacInnis answered:

It is because we want to build up and not to tear down that we are taking part in this debate. It is for that reason that we have introduced the resolution. We realize today that the present economic system is tumbling about our ears and that nothing is being done about it.

Our contention is that the economic system is breaking down not because of lack of efficient administrators but because of inherent defects in the system. We bring this resolution forward in an effort to provide wider scope for improvement and to better the welfare of the people in general.

He then gave an economic history of capitalism, emphasizing that the reason for the Depression was that markets which once took up capital in investments had now dried up, there was thus no more profit in production, so plants closed down, workers became unemployed, and purchasing power
shrank even further. Any blame for the Depression fell on the capitalistic system, he argued, not on the Liberals or Conservatives who happened to be governing at the time. 27

MacInnis was also actively championing the interests of his constituents, constantly bringing before Parliament the plight of a Vancouver unable to assume the responsibility for the vast number of unemployed thrust upon it, with no help from the Dominion government forthcoming. He pointed out that the municipality of Burnaby was almost in receivership, and that Vancouver city had to raise $700,000 of the $900,000 spent on relief annually from its own meagre, shrinking resources. 28

During the session he sat on a committee to investigate the Civil Service Commission and to recommend improvements in the Service. The committee was originally composed of four Conservatives, two Liberals and J. S. Woodsworth. Woodsworth asked to be relieved of his duties on the committee in March because of pressure of work and suggested that Angus MacInnis replace him. This suggestion was agreed to by the chairman, James Lawson, thereby exposing MacInnis to the all-party committee procedure for the first time. The report that was finally produced recommended measures to improve efficiency, such as giving more hiring authority to local authorities; to correct contradictions in the Civil Service Act; and to cut down on expenses by hiring within the Civil Service. It also recommended that the three main officials be pensioned off. The committee was unanimous in its recommendations, and MacInnis commented that it was wise to have many different views represented, where Liberals, Conservatives and socialists could work together without loss of principle.

.... I think it is a better report than could have been brought in by the four Conservative members of the committee; I think it is a better report than could have
been brought in by the two Liberal members of the committee, and I am almost convinced that it is as good a report as could have been brought in by the Labour member of the committee. 29

The Budget was brought down on April 11, and received with universal disdain by the opposition. Angus MacInnis waited patiently and finally had his say, two days before the debate ended. In characteristic fashion, he started with:

Mr. Speaker, making and listening to budgets is a rather disappointing occupation at the present time. The Minister of Finance has received so many compliments and congratulations regarding his presentation of the budget that I am sure he will pardon me if I sympathize with him instead of congratulating him. 30

He then proceeded to attack Bennett's policy of handouts instead of positive action to combat unemployment.

The session finally ended on May 26. It had been conceived of as an interim one, in the hope that a later session, following the Imperial Conference which was to be held in Ottawa in July, would supply the remedies to the Depression in the form of increased export inducements. Indeed, the Conservative government was pinning all its hopes on an advantageous conference. The hesitation of the government to act decisively during the interim session was matched only by the Liberals' seeming inability to offer constructive alternatives. The real task of opposition had fallen to the Ginger Group members who had analyzed the Depression and were prepared to offer solutions to it. Not only were they more positive than the Conservatives and Liberals, but they now acted in greater harmony than ever before. Only three times had they not voted together; once on Bennett's use of closure to terminate a debate, and twice on the question of cuts in the salaries of civil servants. They were acting increasingly like a party, and so it seemed most natural when they met on the last day
of the session with some of the L.S.R. professors to lay the foundations of a nationwide "Commonwealth Party." Under the leadership of J. S. Woodsworth, this new party was to be set before the delegates at the Calgary Convention of the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties in July.

By 1932 the Depression was reaching its lowest point. Richard Bennett's attempts to "blast into world markets" had failed as the price for Canada's primary products continued to fall and as the U. S. tariff walls climbed higher. The increased tariffs introduced by the Conservative government as a "cure" for the Depression had helped only Eastern industrial interests, and even the manufacturers were feeling the effects of decreased purchasing power in Canada. Now that it had become obvious that Canada could not take on the world economically and survive, that it had to trade to exist, the Prime Minister proposed an Imperial common market in which all countries would lower their tariffs on each other's products and raise them on goods from outside the Empire. Bennett did not propose Imperial Free Trade, but mutually advantageous trade agreements.

He had proposed such an economic union at the Imperial Conference in London in 1930, but had not pressed a decision on the Labour government of Great Britain, the most important producer and market in the Empire. Between the time of the 1930 Imperial Conference in London and the Ottawa Conference in 1932, any chances for such an economic union were destroyed. Britain sacrificed her position as one of the financial bastions of the world by devaluing the pound and abandoning free trade, all in the interests of expediency. By 1932, economic survival, not Imperial sentiment, was Britain's guiding principle. For Canada, this meant that Britain bought wheat and forest products from the Soviet Union, because it was cheaper.
By the time the Conference opened in July, 1932, Bennett had managed to advertise it as the new panacea that would solve all Canada's problems. The primary producers would have a large, guaranteed market in Britain, and the industrialists would maintain their protected market in Canada. Unfortunately, the Conference did not produce such simple results. Partly because of personality clashes, particularly between Bennett and Stanley Baldwin, a consequence of Bennett's aggressiveness and abuse of his position as chairman, and partly because of national self-interest on the part of all the participants, the Conference was little more than a marathon haggling session. In the end, Canadian wheat and forest products still had a free market in Britain, but little else was secured. As a result, most of the Prime Minister's speech to Parliament explaining the results of the Conference, was taken up by a list of the 262 adjustments to be made to the Canadian tariff schedule. Explaining the limited and singularly undramatic results of the Conference, the Prime Minister said,

... When we remember that the British Empire, as we know it today, has within its boundaries one-quarter of the human family, representing every shade of economic diversity, it would have been folly to expect that we should have secured at the outset the maximum benefits in preferential trade of which the Empire is capable.

... Despite the unpatriotic efforts made by some to create the impression that the primary interest of each of the delegations was to benefit its own empire state at the cost of all others, I can tell you that, while naturally and properly each delegation did its best for its own country, we all realized no agreement could be lasting or beneficial which was one-sided and we tried, while advancing our own positions, to be constantly mindful of the positions of the parties in the negotiations.

Although Bennett did not return from the Conference completely empty handed, by the time Parliament reassembled in October he had placed all his faith in yet another panacea that would do as little as the first
to lift the Depression. On top of this, he now had a rejuvenated Liberal opposition to face and a "new party", the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, where once had sat co-operating independents. Formally, Angus MacInnis was still a member of the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section), one of the affiliated parties in the C.C.F. While retaining his autonomy, like the other M.P.s, he now worked within a more definite structure.  

The Session, which began in early October, ended the following May. During this time, the C.C.F. members were actively consolidating the new federation conceived in Calgary in July. They were less active in the House than they had been, and Angus MacInnis, M.P., temporarily took second place to Angus MacInnis, C.C.F. leader. During this lengthy session he contented himself with attacks on the government or with questions on behalf of his labour or Vancouver supporters. His efforts produced few dramatic results, but showed him to be a diligent, and conscientious opposition member.

The interest of several U.F.A. members, especially George Coote, William Irvine and Alfred Speakman, in monetary reform, resulted in a draft motion introduced early in 1933, signed by the members of the Ginger Group and calling for investigation and reform of the whole monetary system. The sustained interest in the issue on the part of the farm members was not apparent among the labour representatives, and signing the motion was the limit of MacInnis' action. He remained uninterested in the U.F.A. advocacy for monetary reform, believing that it represented only a small part of the whole socialist program.

In his second appearance on the floor, in reply to the Throne Speech, MacInnis questioned the value of the much lauded Imperial Conference,
contending that it should have had a broader frame of reference. He pointed out that the treaty would not increase purchasing power in Canada, and that, by helping to form a small, exclusive economic club, Canada was cutting itself off from the rest of the world, which would then have to resolve itself into small trading units, and thus matters would be made even worse. He then went on to attack the government's assertion that conditions were improving as a "specimen of unadulterated piffle" and outlined to the House how serious conditions really were, not only in Vancouver, but in the world in general. He concluded with a plea for evidence of some sort of economic planning by the government. During this speech, comparing the promises the Prime Minister had made in 1930 to reality as seen by the Conservatives in 1932, he said:

Let me tell him the Socialist Party never promised anybody anything. We have simply tried to analyze society as we have found it, and we have pointed out to the people that it is they who produce the wealth of the world.... 34

When Woodsworth's annual Co-operative Commonwealth resolution was again introduced early in February, it was seconded by Agnes Macphail, then vigourously debated by supporters (Coote, Heaps and Garland) and opponents (John MacNicol and Gordon Wilson, both Ontario Tories, and Henri Bourassa). The next morning MacInnis joined the debate, devoting the greater part of his speech to the charges of Bourassa and the Conservatives speakers of the day before. Combining socialist analysis with his command of "homey expressions," he denied that the C.C.F. plans were unconstitutional and explained class conflict in terms of lambs and wolves, declaring that there was no chance for co-operation unless the former were inside the latter. He also denied MacNicol's charge that the Federation was Communist-inspired, drawing on some of the literature used by William Bennett, Communist candidate in Vancouver South in 1930, which called the
Labour Party "a worse enemy of the workers than the avowed capitalistic parties."  

MacInnis was disturbed by the government's drift towards repressive measures during the Depression. Bennett's call for the "iron heel of ruthlessness" to stamp out agitation and his use of armoured cars and squads of police to guard the Parliament Buildings when he met with delegations of the unemployed seemed to indicate an outlook not averse to police state methods. MacInnis pointed out that these measures were useless if conditions were not improved:

> It seems to me that with the lessons of history before us we should pay heed to this experience and teaching in order to understand that the only way to meet force is to make conditions such that force cannot exist.  

When the Minister of Justice asked for increased appropriations for the R.C.M.P. in order to be ready to crush probable uprisings, MacInnis disagreed and said that expansion of the police alone would not keep peace and order unless the conditions breeding disorder were removed too.

In replying to the Budget early in April, MacInnis maintained that all of Bennett's attempts to cure the Depression would fail, just as the "Canada First" policy of 1930 and the "Imperial Preference" policy of 1932 had failed. There was great hope that the World Economic Conference would succeed, but MacInnis predicted it too would fail "so long as production and distribution remain on a profit making basis." He then gave an uninterested House the Marxist analysis of surplus value, profits and unemployment, and closed with a blast at both Bennett and King, alleging that their interest in solving unemployment was greater when they were out of office than when they were in.
The speech may not have impressed the House, but it had a great effect on his constituents. It was reprinted verbatim in the first issue of the Commonwealth, mentioned in the B. C. Clarion in July, and praised by Ernest Winch in the June 11 minutes of the executive meeting of the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section).39

After his Budget speech, MacInnis was seldom heard from again before the session ended in the middle of May and the C.C.F. members left for the Regina Convention.

The 1934 session opened on January 25 with an address from the Throne that, as usual, left the C.C.F. members unimpressed. Angus MacInnis, who had been willing to give the government every chance in 1930 was now discouraged. This year he said:

...there is very little in the Speech from the Throne that is of any great importance. It is mostly made up of platitudes that do not amount to anything. 40

His disappointment was also evident in his "Latest News from the Ottawa Front" in the Commonwealth. Long gone was his early wonder of 1930. Now his accounts of speeches by King and Bennett showed his scorn for their efforts.41

After the brief lull of 1933, the C.C.F. members came back to life. Hansard was covered with their bills, motions and amendments, numbering twenty-eight in all. Of the twenty-seven divisions in the session, thirteen were provoked by the C.C.F. and nine by the Liberals. Virtually every member of the C.C.F. put at least one motion or amendment on the order paper, few of which were passed, but all of which were evidence that the C.C.F. was trying to set itself up as a viable alternative to the Conservatives, and had no intention of remaining a permanent third party in a state of perpetual opposition.
MacInnis' first chance to speak came when, in support of Heaps' annual unemployment motion, he painted a grim picture of conditions in Vancouver. The plight of the west coast metropolis had been, and would remain, a constant theme of MacInnis' as long as the Bennett government left it to fend unsuccessfelly for itself.

J. S. Woodsworth's presentation of the Co-operative Commonwealth resolution was also indicative of the change that had come over the C.C.F. since the Regina Convention. Instead of abstract theories and hypotheses, he could quote policies of the Federation embodied in the Regina Manifesto. And the formerly harmless "co-operating independents" were now attacked not as abstract threats or idle dreamers but as actual menaces to the two main parties. John Vallance, Liberal member from South Battleford, ridiculed the C.C.F.'s first electoral efforts, especially the Mackenzie by-election in Saskatchewan, while MacNichol of Toronto cited MacInnis' references to socialization of land as an example of the threat C.C.F. socialism posed to all.

MacInnis, who did not speak on Woodsworth's motion, launched a general attack on the utter lack of government policy, especially concerning the relief camps. He felt this issue revealed how completely the government had degenerated since 1930 when it at least had a plan. He also turned on the Liberals who were opposing the C.C.F. support of the relief bill the government did bring in, justifying the C.C.F. position on the grounds that "since it will pass in any event, we want it to be as satisfactory as possible. That is the difference between ourselves and the Liberal opposition." He also had little but scorn for his fellow Vancouverite, the Hon. Ian Mackenzie, who tried to obstruct this bill, but who had, in turn, remained mute when he was in Vancouver.
at the time the Pattullo government had introduced its Special Powers Act in March. 45

The Budget was brought down by the Minister of Finance, the Hon. E. N. Rhodes, on April 18, but it was May before the member from Vancouver South rose in reply to it, in much the same terms as the year before:
"There is nothing much in the budget this year which one need get excited about. There is nothing in it that one need strenuously oppose, and there is certainly nothing in it that can give the slightest hope to thousands of our people who have been living in misery the last four or five years."

In MacInnis' view, the Bennett government was not even trying to solve the problems created by the Depression while Roosevelt, for all his faults, was at least doing something.

.... Certainly no other government has been as energetic in its efforts to increase the purchasing power of the masses as has the government of the United States. I am not concerned now as to whether or not the steps they have taken will ultimately meet the desired end, but they surely indicate that President Roosevelt realizes the importance of a better distribution of wealth. He then quoted a speech by Roosevelt during which the U.S. president indicated that his next goal was an increase of wages and a shortening of hours....

That is a very different attitude from that taken by this government. No steps have been taken by this government towards that end, that is towards the shortening of hours and the increasing of wages.

Bennett's party that had, before the election, promised to cure unemployment, had not raised the taxes to do so and was prouder of its ability to satisfy its bondholders than to keep its election pledges. 46
Speaking on behalf of the Canadian seamen put out of work by cheaper Oriental labour, MacInnis attacked the government's policy of subsidizing the C.P.R. which hired so many of its crewmen in the Far East. As far back as 1931, he had attempted to have the Canadian Shipping Act amended with a fair wage clause, and in 1933 his plea that the government at least investigate conditions on the Empress ships before giving subsidies was politely listened to, then ignored by the government. However, it is unlikely that his consistent defence of the seamen went unheard in Vancouver, Montreal or Halifax.

MacInnis was also becoming the spokesman for the unemployed single men in the relief camps. Early in the session, he drew the House's attention to the deterioration of conditions in the camps. A month later he blasted the government for its evasive responses to requests for figures on the number of men in the camps. His calls for improvements to at least the government standards for lumber camps brought down the wrath of several government members including Stitt from Nelson and Cotnam from Renfrew North. Neither could accept MacInnis' great concern for the plight of anyone not working. He kept up his defence of the relief campworkers throughout the session, even attempting to ensure them of their vote, but to no avail. His motion was defeated by the combined efforts of the Liberals and the Conservatives, 43-10.

All of these were relatively minor matters; none of them rated a headline and only a few were noted in the Vancouver papers, but all were essential. Although overshadowed by the Ontario controversy in the Federation, his representation on behalf of the men in the relief camps, as well as the men competing with cheap foreign labour in government subsidized companies, and his attacks on the deficiencies of the Liberals
and Conservatives were more significant in the long run. Working closely with Woodsworth, he and the other C.C.F. members were proving themselves a party which could well become a viable alternative to the Conservatives and the Liberals.

In the dying days of the session MacInnis revealed his attitude on two of the more basic roles of an M.P.—pork barrelling and electoral practices. Speaking on a Public Works Act, MacInnis was conspicuously subdued in pressing the claims of his constituents for a larger share of the disbursements. He simply asked whether armouries were needed in Vancouver more than better facilities for T. B. patients. Also, recalling his experience as an alderman, he pointed out the advantages to both the workers and to the city of day labour, working under government engineers, compared to contract labour on public works.

The next day a debate began on a motion to delete the words "persons in receipt of pay disqualified" from the Dominion Election Act. Quebec Liberal and Conservative opposition to this clause, which would exclude from voting anyone who received payment for electioneering on behalf of a party, showed MacInnis new depths of cynicism about electoral practices. Appalled, he rose and said:

As one listens to the statements made by the Secretary of State (Cahan from Montreal), one would despair of making progress through democracy. As I listened to his remarks I was satisfied I lived in the wild and wooly West and not in the liberal and ultra-religious city of Montreal.

Amid a minor uproar the Speaker called for order and MacInnis continued:

Order is right. I am not particularly concerned with this section because I do not pay my workers. As a matter of fact, they sacrifice something in order to do the work. However, if there is any further proof needed that the clause should stand as it is now, or that there should be very little modification....
He did not finish the sentence but his implication was that the cynical abuse of electoral practices justified keeping the offending words in.

When the 1934 session ended, the C.C.F. members could be satisfied with their performance in the House. The Conservative government was showing little ability in coping with the Depression, and the Liberals were not offering radically different proposals, as they knew that they could win the next general election by profiting on Bennett's mistakes. The C.C.F. members felt that, as the only real alternative to the present government, they were in a strong position to form the next official opposition, if not the government. As the Conservative government's mandate ran out, they were busily preparing for the next election.

For Angus MacInnis this entailed not only securing his own nomination but also the selection of high calibre candidates in the remainder of the province. The latter task was largely beyond his personal influence, since it was the responsibility of the local branches to nominate, and of the provincial party to approve candidates. He could, however, give advice when he saw fit, as he did in May, 1934, when he wrote to Robert Skinner and urged restraint in the nomination of candidates. It was becoming evident to MacInnis that there would be no election in the near future, as "things" cannot be worse for the Conservative government than they are at the present time." He showed canny political sense when he said:

If the election is postponed for a year our candidates, if nominated now, might become a little stale before election and there is also the danger of building up an enthusiasm now that cannot be maintained until the day of the election.

He also pointed out that it would be better not to be too hasty in the choice of candidates lest better ones appear later.
The sense of urgency about local nominations in B. C. was quelled somewhat as concern mounted over the Ontario situation. Some suggestions from branches for submission to the nominations committee were solicited by the Socialist Party executive, however. The Victoria Road branch responded by nominating Maclnnis and Wallis Lefeaux in Vancouver East. This first nomination was soon followed by many more.52

MacInnis had indicated a preference for the new Vancouver East nomination as far back as February. Redistribution had altered Vancouver South, creating Vancouver East out of the working class eastern portion of it. All that remained of the original riding was Point Grey and South Vancouver. There was potential support in the latter, but little in traditionally Liberal Point Grey. Furthermore, if he contested the re-defined Vancouver South riding he knew that he would not receive the support of the Vancouver Sun or the constituency Liberal organization that had proved so helpful in 1930. The Liberal Party had given up any hope of converting Angus MacInnis. The hope that he might be a "friend" of the Liberal Party had proven false. As a member of the C.C.F. he was a member of the party that posed the greatest threat to the Liberals in British Columbia. Also, the Liberal strategy of not opposing potential "friends" was to be abandoned. In 1930 the Liberals had not opposed eleven candidates, presumably in the hope that they would come into the Liberal Party. None of them had. By 1935, seven of these were in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation and were recognized as rivals fighting for control of the government.

When asked his preference, Angus MacInnis was political realist enough to state that Vancouver East was his first choice because it would be the "best bet for any C.C.F. candidate." Besides, he confided: "the East End is my spiritual home." He would not push his candidacy on the
party or the constituency, however. Before he left in February for Ottawa, he had told John Stringer of the Candidate Selection Committee: "I would rather not state a preference, as I was in favour of leaving it to party management and accepting party discipline." Combining political astuteness with a broader vision than simple re-election, Maclnnis displayed his respect for party discipline and his belief that the party members would make the best choice. It should be noted, however, that the selection of someone else to contest Vancouver East was only remotely possible in view of Maclnnis' performance as an M.P. and prominent party leader. It was highly unlikely that he would have been refused any nomination he wanted, but his ready submission to party discipline showed his willingness to put the interests of the cause before his own.

Robert Skinner, acting independently, urged MacInnis to submit his name for Vancouver East. He also hinted that Dr. Lyle Telford, editor of The Challenge, was after it and that "already the forces are lining up within the movement." It would not be surprising if the bidding were high for the almost sure seat of Vancouver East.

For the past four years, Angus MacInnis had served the party well in Ottawa. He was too valuable an asset for the C.C.F. in B.C. to lose. His experience and proven ability had to be given every opportunity since his defeat at the polls would be as much the party's loss as his own. To provide for the expression of the party's will, five others were nominated to contest the nomination, but three of these quickly withdrew.

The Vancouver East nomination meeting, held at the Cedar Hall, was the first C.C.F. nomination for the 1935 election. It was a short meeting for it required only one ballot for MacInnis to secure the nomination over W. W. Lefeaux and A. Hurry.
"Parm's Potato Patch," a column in the Commonwealth, expressed what must have been the feelings of many in the party early in the New Year:

The Liberal and Conservative Parties need hardly bother spending any money or effort in placing candidates in the Federal Riding of Vancouver East. Angus MacInnis M.P., as the C.C.F. representative, is a cinch to win. His efforts, therefore, can be directed towards securing the election of others in this province. 56

By this time another problem was developing which engaged MacInnis' attention—the plight of the relief camp workers. MacInnis and Ernest Winch, together with Jack Price and Ernest Bakewell, two C.C.F. M.L.A.s, were the Socialist Party representatives negotiating with the relief camp workers who had flocked to Vancouver at the end of 1934. 57

Fed up with the semi-military discipline, isolation and demoralizing "wages" in the work camps, some fifteen hundred of the inmates had descended on Vancouver in December, 1934 to publicize their plight. They were persuaded to return to the camps, after seeing various social agencies, a Socialist Party committee, and all the Federal M.P.s from Vancouver.

Angus MacInnis was deeply impressed by the grievances of the men. It was not the actual physical conditions that bothered them, since these were adequate. It was rather the inability to organize or present grievances, the demoralizing effects of the twenty cent a day "allowance," the isolation and the general feeling that they had been written off by the rest of society. These were the tinders of discontent that would respond most quickly to the communist match. With Woodsworth, Heaps and the other C.C.F. members, MacInnis fought for recognition of the basic rights of these men such as the franchise and redress of their grievances,
in order to prevent communist seizure of the initiative. For Angus MacInnis, much of the 1935 session was spent trying to convince the government that changes would have to be made in the camps, or it would really have to cope with the revolution it professed to see in every complaint.

As the relief camps smouldered, the Prime Minister suddenly announced that he had found a solution to the country's problems and set about to end the Depression in time for the 1935 election. In a series of five radio talks to the country in early January, he outlined his own "New Deal" which would set the country on the road to recovery. He argued that during the worst of the Depression, all he could do was to try to maintain the system, but now that prosperity was returning it was time to reform the system, "and to my mind, reform means government intervention. It means the end of 'laissez-faire.'" He told Canadians that "our task --simple in theory, difficult in performance--is to replace in the old system those elements which are worn out, broken down, obsolete, and without further utility, so that the system may work. Perhaps some may call this "radicalism." The socialists who had heard the Conservatives say that their "co-operative commonwealth" would lead to communism must have been amazed to hear Bennett say: "Do not forget that in the history of social reform it is difficult to name a time when reactionary interests have not sought to block progressive measures by the specious argument that by them, personal liberty was endangered." Their credulity was stretched to the breaking point to hear the millionaire Prime Minister, head of a government closely tied to the financial interests of St. James and Bay Streets, warn of "selfish men, and this country is not without them--men whose mounting bank roll looms larger than your happiness,
corporations without souls and without virtue...." However, he tempered this by telling the "selfish men" that "their ready compliance with our programme would serve their interests better than any ill-timed opposition to it." It would serve their interests because "the keystone of the capitalist arch was the profit system, and the profit system it will remain." 

Prime Minister Bennett announced that the reform program had already begun—the Bank of Canada and the Marketing Act of the 1934 session were indications of what was to come. The government now proposed to introduce social and unemployment insurance, the forty-eight hour week, a national minimum wage, strengthening of the Dominion Companies Act and anti-trust laws, and establishment of a National Economic Council to aid the government.

It is not difficult to imagine the amazement of the C.C.F. members who saw some of the reform programs and the principle of economic planning that they had been advocating for years arrogated to itself by the government. But Bennett's reformation was only partial, since this effort was not being put into the establishment of a "co-operative commonwealth," but into shoring up of the old order. A government that had seemed oblivious to the causes and the effects of the Depression suddenly—with an election due—seized the initiative with an elaborate reform program designed to mitigate the worst effects of the Depression.

Angus MacInnis was in Vancouver when the broadcasts were made and was asked his opinion of them by the Province:

"When the Prime Minister says the 'old order' has gone, I fully agree with him," says Mr. Angus MacInnis. For the last five sessions I was trying to point that out to him. However, I suppose it was then too far away from an election for him to notice it.
The word reform is rather elastic and I'm not quite sure what the Prime Minister means by it. Reform, to be of any value at the present time, would have to be very far reaching. The world's position is this: the profit motive, the only motivating force in capitalism, is gone because of its industrial development of the world. In place of the profit motive we must put something else. The C.C.F. says that the only motive that will meet the situation now is use. That means not reforming the present system but abolishing it. If this is what Mr. Bennett means by reform, I welcome him.

Unlike Woodsworth, other C.C.F. members and the Liberals in their criticism of Bennett's "New Deal," Angus MacInnis did not concentrate on the possibility that the legislation might be unconstitutional. Instead, he attacked it because it attempted to piece together capitalism again, instead of accepting that capitalism was finished and must be replaced by the "co-operative commonwealth."

The House assembled for the final session of the Seventeenth Parliament on January 17, 1935. While the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition lashed each other verbally for several days, the member for Vancouver South bided his time. Late in the evening of January 22 he rose to address the House. He expressed briefly his satisfaction at the "evident swing to the left" in Canada, but said, "...while there is no reason why the proposals in the Speech from the Throne should be opposed by anyone, yet there is no reason why we should feel any elation over them because they cannot improve the conditions of the great mass of the people at the present time." He was convinced that what the Prime Minister was doing would, in the end, prove futile because he proposed to do nothing more than "rescue capitalism and make it work." As he had been saying for four years, there was only one solution to the problem, "that is the social ownership of the means of production, and their co-operative ownership by
the people as a whole." During the debates on Bennett's New Deal, MacInnis did not have as much to say about the proposed legislation as the other C.C.F. M.P.s because he was more interested in the plight of those who needed help immediately.

After what he had seen in Vancouver during December, it was obvious to MacInnis who needed most immediate help: "I wish to take advantage of the opportunity offered by the debate to draw attention to the forgotten men. I am referring now to the men in the national defence concentration camps." He then outlined the plight of the single unemployed in the camps and stated, "we shall have to treat the unemployed man as a human being just as we treat members of the chamber of commerce or the Canadian Manufacturers' Association; otherwise there is nothing to our so-called "new deal." 66

Although he was not the first to comment on the situation which existed in the relief camps, MacInnis did much to make it an issue in the House. This, his first warning to the House, came a full three months before the situation deteriorated to Mayor McGeer's having to read the Riot Act in Vancouver in April and five months before the Regina Riot. Murmurings had been heard about conditions in the camps, but these were easily ascribed to "agitators," a term used to describe everyone from the men unhappy with camp food to communist revolutionaries. There was no more than a hint of trouble in January, 1935 when MacInnis made his plea. Not until June did it reach frightening proportions, and it was not until 1936, following the Liberal victory, that the camps were finally closed.

Meanwhile, MacInnis had presented his bill to grant absentee balloting privileges to relief camp workers. 67 On second reading, support from the Liberals, especially the British Columbia members, was strong, but the motion was finally defeated 37-19. 68
Throughout the session the C.C.F. members took an active part in the debates on Bennett's New Deal legislation. Angus MacInnis pointed out to Bennett that when Roosevelt first introduced his New Deal, there was little opposition from capitalists because they were obviously at fault for the Depression, and expected the end of the system. However, when it became obvious that capitalism was not going to be destroyed, that they were to be allowed to keep their power, they began to strike back at the New Deal, and eventually rendered it impotent. He warned Bennett that the same would happen in Canada if he simply tried to rescue the old order rather than replace it with a "co-operative commonwealth." He pointed out, referring to the Unemployment Insurance Bill, that "the further the great reform program progresses, the less we find there is in it." He found it easy to support Liberal Ian Mackenzie's motion of want-of-confidence in the government on February 25, contrasting Conservative pre-election promises with post-election failures.

Like other members of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation, he wanted the government's legislative program to be as effective as possible and offered advice or constructive criticism on most of the bills. Although they did not like the reasons for Bennett's introduction of the bills, the C.C.F. members could not oppose them because they were measures the Ginger Group had been advocating for years. Angus MacInnis' speeches reflected his membership in a party that sensed popular support turning its way. The Conservatives' measures seemed ineffectual to the C.C.F., and the Liberal Opposition offered no alternatives. Internal disputes within the Federation seemed under control, an election was coming and the C.C.F. was preparing itself for it with an almost religious fervour. A fever of optimism impelled the C.C.F. members as they strove to make the
bills as utilitarian as possible prior to what they were sure would be the collapse of capitalism. They realized they would not form the next government, but as they saw events pushing the older parties inexorably towards the Co-operative Commonwealth, many in the C.C.F. believed their hour of triumph could not be long delayed.

While he took a small part in the debates on the government's proposals, Angus MacInnis saw the situation in the work camps deteriorating. The debate on National Defence Supply (the camps were under the jurisdiction of the Defence Department) gave him another opportunity to raise the problem. He returned to the question of the relief camp strikers in Vancouver, informing the House that Dominion policy, as outlined by the Prime Minister to the Attorney-General of B. C., was to starve the men back into the camps. This attitude and the unwillingness of the government to consider the complaints of the men prompted him to declare:

> It seems to me that although these men are on relief they should not lose all their rights of citizenship. They are on relief through no fault of their own; it is the fault of society, and that being the case, I believe when there are repeated complaints those complaints should be investigated. 73

The second time he brought up the question of the relief camps, he got little response. 74 On a third occasion, he read to the House a report by several British Columbia clergymen who had visited the camps in 1934. They found, as he had maintained, that the camps were physically satisfactory, but psychologically harmful. In existence in some cases for four years, yet still considered "temporary," lacking adequate organization and grievance procedures, under semi-military discipline, the camps gave little hope to any of the inmates. They felt that they were, as MacInnis
phrased it, "the forgotten men" of Canada. The ministers and MacInnis agreed that the situation was ready for a communist-inspired explosion.\(^75\)

In fact, the Relief Camp Workers Union, affiliated with the communist Workers Unity League, had been hard at work among the men all winter.\(^76\)

During a spring recess of the House, MacInnis went to Vancouver where he found a worsening situation. The camp workers had again struck on April 4 and were concentrating in a hard-pressed Vancouver. The swelling ranks of the men frightened Mayor McGeer who was sure a general strike and paralysis of Vancouver were the strikers' goals. The city was in no position to supply the needed relief and the Federal government seemed deaf to Vancouver's requests. Parades, sit-ins and tag days organized by the men were well received in the early weeks. However, by the end of the month, clashes with the police, disruptions of business and traffic and a growing hostility by the public were symptomatic of the deeper problem, which Vancouver could not, and Ottawa would not cope with--the need for more relief money.

On April 23, several thousand men congregated in Victory Square and announced they would not move until relief was forthcoming.\(^77\) Mayor McGeer decided that this was the beginning of a communist revolution. He read the Riot Act from the Cenotaph, ringed the Square with mounted police and threatened to call out the militia. Harold Winch's timely intervention prevented a riot. After appealing vainly to the mayor to change his tactics, Winch managed to persuade the strikers to march out peacefully, and he was able to mollify the chief of police. Several days later, a mass rally at the Arena, presided over by C.C.F. president Robert Skinner, saw some 16,000 people pledge support to the relief camp strikers.\(^78\)

There is no record that Angus MacInnis took a major part in these events, although his fellow members of the Socialist Party--including the
two Winches, Dr. Lyle Telford and Robert Skinner, were active. He met with the men again, however, and decided to redouble his efforts in Parliament, especially when he saw that men like Arthur Evans, a local communist, were attempting to turn the grievances of the strikers into a political weapon. On the way East for a speaking tour of the Maritimes, he made a point of stopping off in Ottawa to inform the Minister of Defence of the situation in Vancouver.

The Session resumed in Ottawa on May 20, four days after further demonstrations had broken out in Vancouver. Two days earlier, the strikers had occupied the City Museum and extracted six days' relief from the city authorities. Mayor McGeer attacked the federal government for its lack of aid to the city, Premier Pattullo maintained that the camps were under federal jurisdiction and, therefore, were a federal responsibility, while Prime Minister Bennett said the Dominion government could not take action unless so requested by the provincial government. With the city authorities, the provincial and federal governments and even the local unions against them, the strikers felt increasingly isolated behind the communist leadership. As they became more estranged from the rest of the community, they and their communist leaders became a standing threat to the country. By ignoring their legitimate grievances and letting effective leadership pass into the hands of the communists, the Bennett government was fostering the revolutionary conditions that it feared most.

On May 21, a concerned Angus MacInnis read to Parliament a message from the City of Vancouver council requesting Dominion intervention. He asked Prime Minister Bennett if he had any statement to make. Bennett replied that the Federal government could not interfere, as provision for
the unemployed was a provincial matter.\textsuperscript{81}

The next day, MacInnis moved that the House suspend its normal business and hold an emergency debate on the situation in Vancouver. The speaker ruled the motion out of order. The Prime Minister said the matter was neither urgent, recent nor the concern of the government. MacInnis moved against the speaker's ruling, but it was sustained 82-62. The Commons row, provoked by MacInnis, make the front page of the \textit{Sun} and prompted the \textit{Commonwealth} to comment: "This raises the question: what is a matter of urgent public importance?"\textsuperscript{82}

By the end of May, the communist organizers and their disgruntled followers had decided to launch an "On to Ottawa Trek" to protest directly to the government. A civic tag day to raise the necessary money was held, resulting in $6,000 in contributions. On June 3, the first "army" of 600 men, led by Arthur Evans, climbed aboard a C.P.R. freight train and headed east. A further 400 followed the next day.

By the time the "army" reached Regina on June 13, its numbers had swollen to just under 2,000, as men left the camps of eastern B. C. and Alberta to join the trek. By this time the railway had asked the government to enforce the no-trespassing provisions of the Railway Act. Several hundred R.C.M.P. officers were concentrated in Regina to stop the trekkers, and clear them off railway property.

The day before, J. S. Woodsworth had received a telegram from M. J. Coldwell, a leading C.C.F. figure in Regina, reporting that the local C.C.F. Council had pledged unanimous support to the trekkers and that the people of Regina "generally condemn Federal attitude and police preparedness as highly provocative." It urged that Woodsworth press the
government to countermand its orders stopping the marchers in Regina and to remove the federal and railway police concentrated there. The wire ended with the plea, "kindly use your efforts to bring the authorities to sanity."\(^{83}\)

Impelled by the note of urgency in Coldwell's wire, Woodsworth moved that the House start an emergency debate on the situation. In support, MacInnis pointed out that, even if the situation in May had not been, this one was recent, urgent and of public importance. Using the defeat of MacInnis' motion as a precedent, the Speaker ruled the motion out of order, and was again sustained 85-57.\(^{84}\) The Minister of Justice said that the government's policy assumed that the trek was communist-led and communist-inspired, that it was a threat to peace, order and good government and that it would be dealt with as such.

On June 20, two government representatives, Agriculture Minister Weir and Railways Minister Manion, travelled to Regina to meet the leaders. Following this meeting, a delegation of eight strikers, led by Evans, went to Ottawa to confer with the government. The meeting quickly broke down, with Evans shouting that Bennett was a liar and Bennett, referring to the trek leader's prison record, calling Evans a thief.

Angus MacInnis showed little sympathy for Evans and the other leaders, in marked contrast to his interest in the plight of the relief camp workers themselves. His deep mistrust of the communists was also apparent in a letter he sent to C. G. MacNeil, secretary of the C.C.F. in B. C.:

As you will have already noted by the press, the representatives from the Relief Camp Strikers have been here and gone. Mr. Bennett would not grant them anything. Indeed I am not at all disappointed as I was firmly convinced that he would not. Taking the developments of the past few months as a whole, I think our communist friends
are accomplishing just what I thought they would accomplish. They are giving the powers that be every excuse to use force and to abolish what little democracy we have left.

He then went on to explain that Evans and his friends avoided the C.C.F. members while making it appear that they were seeking assistance, but were being refused or ignored.

The Prime Minister gave a detailed account of his meeting with the strikers' delegation when the House met on June 24. After outlining the threat to the country, he said:

...the government is fully seized of the seriousness of the situation, and it believes as firmly as it is possible to believe that the present movement of these marchers upon Ottawa in defiance of the law is in reality an organized effort throughout Canada to effect the overthrow of constituted authority in defiance of the law of the land.

MacInnis rose immediately and asked whether "owing to the admitted seriousness of the situation," the Prime Minister would set aside some time to discuss the matter. Bennett replied: "I do not think that would serve any useful purpose at the moment, but I will give it my consideration"—effectively nipping any potential debate in the bud.

Two days later, in the last few minutes before the day's adjournment, MacInnis rose to speak again on the relief camp workers. Quoting extensively from the Macdonald Report, the result of a Royal Commission set up to investigate conditions in the relief camps, he was able to substantiate much of what he had said before. The Commission confirmed the allegations that the hopelessness, isolation, low pay and military discipline made the camps breeding grounds for trouble, and that the government's negative approach would only lead to a clash. As the clock moved around to six o'clock, MacInnis was stopped in mid-sentence and the House adjourned. The members were not interested in the situation.
The clash he had predicted came in Regina on Dominion Day. A mass meeting was called by the strike leaders in Market Square. No sooner had the speakers started to address the crowd of about 4,000 than R.C.M.P. and city police moved in from either side of the Square. A riot resulted which, before it was quelled three hours later, left one city detective dead and more than a hundred persons wounded.

The next day, Bennett finally agreed to J. S. Woodsworth's request that the House discuss the recent Regina Riot. MacInnis rose to speak first, initiating a stormy debate on the government's policy. Constantly interrupted by hecklers, he blamed the government for the problem:

Mr. ANGUS MACINNIS: ...I believe the people of this country will lay the cause of the tragedy directly at the door of the government.

Mr. SPENCE: That is your own doing.

An HON. MEMBER: You are responsible.

Mr. MACINNIS: I am ready to assume any responsibility that is coming to me. ...I contend that these men in the camps have rightful and just claims which have been ignored by this government.

An HON. MEMBER: Communist claims.

Mr. MACINNIS: An hon. member says "communist claims" but let me tell him that the way to make a communist is to act in the manner in which the government has been acting.

An HON. MEMBER: You ought to know how to make them.

Mr. MACINNIS: The hon. member ought to know how to make them because his leader is making them every day and there is no protest from that side of the House.

Mr. SPENCE: Shut up! they ought to hang you first.

The calibre of debate improved after these initial outbursts. MacInnis closed his speech with the plea:

Cannot all parties in the House get together and try to do something for these men, men who, we are quite convinced, are only objecting to the very conditions we would object to ourselves.
The debate raged for the rest of the day, with little solved but much said as the session neared its end. The House was finally dissolved on July 5, having passed into law Prime Minister Bennett’s New Deal. As the members returned home to prepare for the coming election, the strikers were sent back to the Coast by the government.

Although he returned home in July, it was not until September that MacInnis began campaigning actively for the forthcoming election. With a solidly based organization behind him, he did not have to fight the same sort of battle he had conducted in 1930. Then, he had been the one standard bearer for the tiny, impoverished Independent Labour Party. In effect, he was elected on his civic reputation and with Liberal support. Now, he was one of sixteen C.C.F. nominees in B.C. and 118 nominated across the nation. Then, it had been an uphill battle, with an inexperienced, weak party organization and little public backing, although there was the Liberal support. Now, he was running in one of the "safest" C.C.F. seats in Canada, in a province where the C.C.F. formed the official opposition to a Liberal government, and where it presented a strong challenge to the Liberal Party. The existence of the C.C.F. called in question the claims of King and the Liberals to be the "progressive" party in Canada. Ian Mackenzie, King’s chief lieutenant in B.C., was worried about Liberal chances in the province. Writing to his chief, he said:

The situation in British Columbia is not good. We have here the stronghold of the Socialist Party in Canada. My own constituency / Vancouver Centre/ is probably the reddest in Canada. We still think we can win, but it will be a bitter fight. 90

It was for MacInnis an easier election than his first federal campaign, for he now had solid organization above and below, a national
platform and policies, and strong local support. At the same time, it was more challenging, since he was opposing not only the Communists and Conservatives, but also the Liberals. This time, there was no question of co-operation with the Liberals against the Conservative Party organization. On the other hand, his reputation as a fearless spokesman for the unemployed, the unions, the relief camp workers, the aged and others hard hit by the Depression offset the loss of Liberal support and the effect of limited campaign funds.

Although he had done much to organize what there was of the C.C.F. in the Maritimes, and was a well known and popular speaker across the country, MacInnis did not do any campaigning outside Vancouver. He ran as the C.C.F. candidate in Vancouver East, and spoke occasionally in other Vancouver ridings, but never travelled as much as J. S. Woodsworth, William Irvine or even M. J. Coldwell. He ran not as a leader of the C.C.F. but simply as an M.P. seeking re-election. As the one C.C.F. incumbent in British Columbia, he would seem to have been a natural target for the Liberals and the Conservatives. Why this was not the case can only be answered by assuming that he was considered almost invincible in Vancouver East, that he was personally respected by the opposition, and that he did not pose as much a threat—or pose as inviting a target—as others in the C.C.F. Angus MacInnis was seen as a quietly competent, highly respected socialist, not a demagogue like Lyle Telford or a dogmatic Marxist like Wallis Lefeaux.

He did not take a larger part in the campaign probably because he was not asked to, and would not offer himself unless wanted. There were still Socialist Party leaders, particularly Lefeaux, Stephen and Telford, who opposed MacInnis' support of the merger between the two C.C.F.
affiliates, his support of Oriental enfranchisement, and his anti-communism. Although the C.C.F. party was united, there were still personal antipathies under the surface. One of them was the feeling of many former Socialist Party leaders towards Angus MacInnis. Other reasons for the nature of MacInnis' campaign would have been lack of money due to allocation of meagre financial resources to more difficult constituencies, and MacInnis' own disinclination to be "leader" of the C.C.F. in B. C. At any rate, his was a low key campaign, concentrated in Vancouver East. He told his first campaign meeting:

The issue in this election is Socialism vs. Capitalism. Capitalism comes to you with its arms—or its mouth—full of promises. We are not pedlars of paradise as we are accused of being, but we admit there is a paradise here and that the working class can only get into it by their own working. Nobody else will hand it to you on a platter.

If Gerry keeps on long enough, nobody will vote for Liberalism. I hope the C.C.F. let him go. He is like a famous Canadian river I once heard described: shallow, turbulent and wide at the mouth. 92

As in the 1933 provincial campaign, the Vancouver Sun and Gerry McGeer (running in Vancouver Burrard against C.C.F. President Arnold Webster) were the Liberals' main weapons. The Conservatives were more subdued as many of their votes were being siphoned off by Stevens' Reconstruction Party. The Social Credit League ran two candidates and the Communists ran one, Malcolm Bruce, in Vancouver East. MacInnis was also opposed by a Liberal, a Conservative, and a Reconstructionist. Of these, the only serious contender was Dr. J. C. MacDougall, the Liberal.

The contest in Vancouver East was little noticed beside some of the other battles raging. Mayor McGeer kept the spotlight focused on himself and the battle in Vancouver Burrard. While he turned his ire onto all other C.C.F. candidates, McGeer left the only incumbent alone.
In his voluminous correspondence with Mackenzie King, McGeer avoided mention of MacInnis and his Liberal opponent as thoroughly as did Ian Mackenzie. In a letter to the Prime Minister written immediately after the election, he commented on all the Vancouver constituencies except Vancouver East, where there had never been a real contest. In the same letter he assessed his own role in the election:

In my own campaign I made my chief drive against the C.C.F. and Communists, and while I did not achieve very much myself I think everyone gives me a good deal of credit for limiting the success of the C.C.F. in B.C. substantially. 93

The Province saw the contest in national terms, as Liberal vs. Conservative, virtually ignoring the C.C.F. In spite of this, however, it seemed to write off Thomas Todrick, the Conservative candidate in Vancouver East, who got even less coverage than other local Tories.

The Sun, MacInnis' ally in 1930, now had a Liberal to support against him. Beyond his standard insistence that it was "King or Chaos", Dr. MacDougall's main plank seemed to be that he was "the man who had the courage to make the Oriental question the issue." This stand was in keeping with the theme pushed by all Vancouver Liberals. Most of their advertisements were headed--"A vote for any C.C.F. candidate is a vote to give the Chinaman or Japanese the same voting rights that you have! A vote for a Liberal candidate is a vote against Oriental enfranchisement."

This bogey had played a part in most British Columbia elections for years, and would until the late 1940's. MacInnis did not mention this issue himself because the Liberals were doing it for him.94 Back in October, 1934, however, writing to the Province about some of the Hon. Ian Mackenzie's remarks at his nominating meeting, he had said:

The Oriental Question has done service as a political catchword in this province for a long time.
Covering incompetence by catering to racial prejudice will no longer work. The working class and the small business class can no longer be frightened by the old Asiatic bogey.... It seems to me that in face of our pressing social and economic problems, appeals to racial or any other kind of prejudice is not statesmanship of a very high order. 95

Only once did the Sun specifically mention MacInnis outside of strict reports of speeches. On that occasion C. Norman Senior gave his analysis of MacInnis' prospects in Vancouver East.

Out in Vancouver East, that contest is closer than most people expected.

It appears from street talk that Angus MacInnis is not as strong as he was a few years ago. The working people have a feeling he has become a little "high hat."

Some of them are coming over to Jack MacDougall, others of a more radical turn are giving Malcolm Bruce, Communist candidate, the support which would have gone to MacInnis.

In the same issue, the Sun spent an editorial analyzing the C.C.F. chances. It concluded:

The best they hope for and all they want is to establish a little nuisance group in Ottawa to preach and expound an obsolete doctrine that is as old as the hills and which had been revived in British Columbia under a fancy name to provide platform chewing gum for demagogues.

How do we propose to vote? .... For shallow, flippant, ululating Doc Telford and his little band of socialist missionaries? 96

The Sun was showing itself as strongly opposed to the C.C.F. as it was in the 1933 provincial campaign. Although MacInnis was grouped with the other C.C.F. "missionaries," he was not attacked with the vigour turned on Telford, Lefebaux, King Gordon, Webster and others.

The Commonwealth plunged eagerly into this, its first federal campaign. Editorials, articles, advertisements, and testimonials all
advanced the C.C.F. cause. However, MacInnis received little notice, possibly because his victory was a foregone conclusion. One of the few mentions made of him was in an advertisement for all C.C.F. candidates. After a brief outline of his life, the only part of his Parliamentary record that was noted was his defence of the Relief Camp Workers. 97

He did not attend the "Monster Rally" on October 7 at the Arena where 3,000 people heard Dr. Telford, W. W. Lefeaux, and A. M. Stephen hurl invective at Mayor McGeer, the Vancouver Sun, the federal government, and the Liberal Party. It is unlikely Angus MacInnis would have felt comfortable with Telford's hysterical style, or Lefeaux' attempts to dodge the issue of Oriental enfranchisement, or Stephen's pro-communist statements. 98 It would appear MacInnis' low key campaign in this, one of the most frenzied of Canadian elections was a result of his confidence of success at the polls, and a personal disinclination to take part in any of the campaigns of other candidates.

Just before the election, Barry Mather, in his column in the Commonwealth, "Idle Roomer, His Diary," gave an analysis that differed greatly from that of C. Norman Senior in the Sun, "Heard at the coffee house this noon how a straw vote taken in Vancouver East does give Angus MacInnis 69 percentum of the votes." 99

When the votes were tallied on the night of October 14, he did not have the sixty-nine percent "Idle Roomer" predicted. He did win though, with 50.9 percent in a field of five candidates, with 82 percent of the electorate voting. 100 Only MacDougall escaped losing his deposit. For Angus MacInnis it was a decisive personal vindication of his five years as an M.P. and of his efforts on behalf of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation in British Columbia.
The *Commonwealth* indicated the importance of the election in an editorial comment the week after.

Not the number of seats won but the fact that the C.C.F. has greater public support in this province than any other political group—-that, and the psychological victory—-was the important thing for us.

Despite the howl of derision from our opponents that we are negligible and are on the way out, it is indeed gratifying for us October 14 was not a final resting place; it constituted a new point of departure.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

The 1935 federal election has been selected as the termination point of this study because it divides Angus MacInnis' early from his later political career. It was his second federal election campaign and his victory confirmed him as an established member of Parliament and a leader of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. The result of this election also justified his efforts of the preceding three years in bringing the Socialist Party of Canada into the Federation.

In the twenty-three years prior to this election, Angus MacInnis gained the experience that he would use in his later life. From the time he first joined the Federated Labour Party in 1918, he was increasingly active in the socialist cause in British Columbia, both in its educational and its electoral activities. In 1930, when he had emerged as the leading socialist in British Columbia, he was elected a federal M.P. and his interests became correspondingly more national. As a member of the National Council of the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation from 1932 to 1935, he participated in the establishment of the Federation as a national "party." His influence was crucial in the acceptance of the C.C.F. by the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section) and the gradual consolidation of the Federation in B. C. into a true political party. As a realist, MacInnis knew that a Dominion-wide socialist party could only be based on the many small labour, socialist and farm groups scattered across the country. He also knew that this would have to be done slowly and carefully, gradually convincing the party members of their community of interest.
until a unified structure could be achieved. His efforts both in British Columbia, where such a union was achieved relatively peacefully, and in Ontario, where it came painfully, were essential in the development of the Federation.

The C.C.F. established itself as a definite feature of the Canadian political landscape in 1935. The results of the election did not justify the earlier optimism of its members, and it never achieved the power it sought federally. It did, however, show itself to be a national party which justified the efforts of its builders. Had it failed in 1935, the Canadian socialist movement would probably have returned to its original units and taken up the educational campaign again. The fact that it did not have to do so, proved its worth to its supporters, if not to its enemies. Its later internal dissensions, its failure in Quebec, its rapid increase followed by as rapid a decrease of influence in the 1940's, its effects on Canadian politics and society, and its eventual decline in the late 1950's were far in the future. In 1935, the future still held promise, particularly so in British Columbia. Much of the credit for this must go to Angus MacInnis.

Angus MacInnis was first and foremost a socialist. His own experience, his observations of the society in which he lived, and his reading led him to the conviction that capitalism, on which development in Canada had been based, was inefficient and immoral and that it had to be replaced by socialism so that "production for profit," with all its attendant evils, would be replaced by "production for use." It is unlikely that he came to this conviction quickly, but once he was convinced of its truth, he held to it with Scottish tenacity. Angus MacInnis was not a man to treat
his beliefs lightly, and so socialism became the religion to which he held firmly until the end of his life. Although flexible in the means to the socialist goal, he was inflexible about the end. He would work with others who shared this end as long as he was convinced of their sincerity.

MacInnis accepted the corollaries of socialism even when they were unpopular. He saw no place for racism in a socialist society, and condemned the discriminatory treatment of Orientals in B. C. long before the Second World War. He also saw no need for compensation of those who benefited from capitalism, and whose functions would be taken over by public servants in a socialist state, nor did he see any place in the "co-operative commonwealth" for individual land-owning farmers and he said so.

He considered himself a socialist and was considered one by others. In his articles in the Labour Statesman, the Commonwealth, and the Canadian Forum, in the daily press, and in Parliament, he always put forward what he believed to be the socialist viewpoint. The members of the Federated Labour Party, the Independent Labour Party and the Socialist Party of Canada accepted him as a socialist without question. To a significant degree, it was because they trusted his judgement that the members of the Socialist Party of Canada affiliated with the C.C.F. in 1932, merged with the Reconstruction Party in 1933, and that they did not bolt from the C.C.F. in 1934. Even Ernest Winch, one of the most doctrinaire of a very doctrinaire group, and a frequent opponent of MacInnis, did not question the latter's knowledge of socialism.

Where he and many members of the Socialist Party differed was on means. Angus MacInnis stood out in the B. C. socialist movement for his consistently pragmatic outlook. Once he had determined the desired end,
he set out to achieve it. MacInnis realized that socialists could not change society simply by preaching the "truth." They had to prove their message. They had to run for public office and implement changes in order to prove that what they advocated was reasonable. For this reason, MacInnis joined the moderate Social Democratic Party rather than the doctrinaire Socialist Party of Canada in 1912, and the Federated Labour Party rather than the more dramatic One Big Union in 1918. MacInnis realized that socialists would have to work within the system in order to change that system. He saw that, like the British Labour Party, Canadian socialists would have to be prepared for a long, discouraging struggle for political power. MacInnis had complete faith in democracy and in the good sense of the "public," and therefore believed that eventually the day would come when the socialists would be able to change the system. Education had its place in his plans, but it had to be followed by action. His record of election attempts and successes bears this out. It might be added that Augus MacInnis implicitly trusted the devotion of Liberal and Conservative supporters to democracy and did not think they contemplated fascism as an alternative.

After he went to Parliament, MacInnis realized that many of British Columbia's problems were Canadian problems. He believed that the solution to the Depression in B. C. could be effected by a Dominion-wide, legal socialist party, and that the British Columbia socialists with thirty years of educational work behind them would be essential members of the party. At first the B. C. socialists were eager for a Dominion socialist party and took an active part in the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties to this end. But the Calgary Conference showed them that socialism had different interpretations east of the Rockies. They began to doubt
the value of joining the C.C.F. Angus MacInnis convinced them that there were many in the East and on the Prairies who lacked the knowledge of classical socialist doctrine of the B. C. socialists, but who shared the same goals and were willing to learn. He urged the Socialist Party to accept them. It did so and affiliated with the C.C.F.

The next problem arose in British Columbia. Here, for the first time, thousands of people of all economic and social classes were beginning to respond to the socialist message. However, they were not flocking to the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section) but to the "C.C.F.," which did not have the same dogmatic, revolutionary implications. It was something new and promising, while the Socialist Party seemed sterile and sectarian. The middle class converts to socialism formed their own organization, the "Reconstruction Party," and applied for membership in the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. They were directed to apply through the Socialist Party. This they did, causing anguish in the S.P. of C. which was more hesitant to merge with this party than it had been to affiliate with the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation. True, if they merged with it in the Federation on their own terms, they would be part of a movement with broader electoral appeal than the Socialist Party could ever aspire to. But on the other hand, the middle class converts might not accept socialism as presented by the Socialist Party and could suffocate its revolutionary ardour in reformism. The party faced a dilemma it had never known before—whether to accept the Reconstruction Party into the Federation and thus risk loss of socialist principles for electoral gain, or to refuse it, to continue to preach to the converted and wait for the millenium, assured that it had not sacrificed the promise of the future for momentary gain. Was it to be a real party, with all its temptations, or was it to remain a movement with all its irrelevance? Hesitant,
the members again turned to MacInnis for advice. He told them to accept all support offered as long as it did not endanger socialist principles or goals. This argument was accepted, reluctantly at first, but later with greater willingness as the results of the 1933 provincial election proved MacInnis' advice sound.

In these two episodes with the Socialist Party Angus MacInnis showed his essential pragmatism. The goal for him was a united, democratic Canadian socialist party, pledged to replace capitalism by constitutional means. The name did not really matter—a "co-operative commonwealth" from which the profit motive had been banished was as good as a "socialist commonwealth." He would have preferred a unitary party but, realizing that differing interpretations of socialism and mutual suspicion among the affiliates made this impossible, he accepted a federation. He persuaded the Socialist Party to affiliate with the Federation, and it did so, becoming the nucleus of the C.C.F. in British Columbia. Angus MacInnis then saw that there were many in B. C. who lacked the knowledge of socialism of the Socialist Party members, but who were coming to accept a socialist solution to the Depression. He urged the Socialist Party to merge with these middle class newcomers, but to take care not to lose the party's principles in doing so. This was done and proven a success. Bickering and conflicts there were between the Socialist and Reconstruction Parties, but they both saw the Federation in B. C. as advantageous and so both supported it.

He again showed his pragmatism when he was called upon as a member of the National Council to deal with the C.C.F. in Ontario. At first he approved of the complicated federal structure there because the greatest need was for the C.C.F. to establish itself in the province. He was willing to accept the Labour Conference-Associated C.C.F. Clubs--United
Farmers of Ontario "troika" as long as it was of use to the cause of socialism in Canada. It quickly became a liability, so he supported the efforts of J. S. Woodsworth in dismantling the Labour Conference and the Associated Clubs and in instituting a unified organization for the Ontario C.C.F. This was the end MacInnis desired for the C.C.F. in B. C. but on the west coast it was brought about in a much different manner. What happened in Ontario was unfortunate (particularly because it lost so much support for the C.C.F.), but necessary for the Federation. There was no necessity for Dominion Council interference in British Columbia. When unity did come, it came peacefully and with the approval of the members of both the Socialist and Reconstruction Party members. Ernest Winch's threats and his rearguard action in defence of the federal nature of the C.C.F. in British Columbia probably ensured that the Socialist Party would remain influential in the C.C.F. party, but did not affect the course of events. He was swept along protestingly by the tide that MacInnis predicted as inevitable and beneficial. United, the B. C. party was able to build on its experience and its broad base of electoral appeal and at least in terms of the overall popular vote, to win the province in the 1935 federal election.

Angus MacInnis' refusal to countenance the use of force and of extra-constitutional methods made him a firm anti-communist. He believed that Canadian society could be changed by evolution, not by violent revolution, and that the most beneficial and enduring changes could be brought about by constitutional means. As a socialist, he believed it his duty to take an active part in the advancement of the cause, but as a pragmatic socialist, he believed this could only be done by using persuasion
and Parliament, not threats and violence. Angus MacInnis was as much a Fabian as James Shaver Woodsworth although he was as familiar with Marxist terminology as Wallis Lefeaux.

In the beginning, MacInnis felt that he could work towards the common goal with the communist "Workers' Party" in the Canadian Labour Party. However, he set limits beyond which the co-operation would not go. He stated that the Federated Labour Party would only use constitutional means. When it became apparent that the communists disagreed on these means and were trying to subvert the Canadian Labour Party, MacInnis united all the non-communist socialists into the Independent Labour Party. By 1928 he realized there could be no compromise with the communists because of their activities. He led the I.L.P. out of the C.L.P. and became an implacable foe of communism. The communists responded by running only one candidate in the 1930 federal election—against the one I.L.P. candidate who was running in Vancouver South. William Bennett, the communist candidate lost his deposit while the I.L.P. candidate, Angus MacInnis, went to Ottawa as the member for Vancouver South.

During the early 1930's the "party of direct action" was never far away and posed a constant threat to the C.C.F. Communist front organizations were particularly attractive to C.C.F. members and many C.C.F. supporters took part in the League Against War and Fascism, the Canadian Labour Defence League and the various protests against the deprivation of the civil rights of several communists. At Regina the National Convention voted overwhelmingly not to have any dealings with the communists or their front organizations. In spite of this, they managed to infiltrate several Clubs and Parties in the Ontario C.C.F. and precipitated the collapse of that organization in 1934. Angus MacInnis' activities in the reorganization of the Ontario Federation and his defence of his actions indicate
that he saw the communist movement as a threat to the C.C.F. and one that must be destroyed.

One of his main reasons for opposing Prime Minister Bennett's response to the plight of the relief camp workers was that it would play into the hands of the communists who would use the men as a threat to the rest of Canada. He was proven correct by the Regina Riot in 1935.

While others in the C.C.F. were willing to work with the communists towards limited objectives, such as the amelioration of the condition of the unemployed, MacInnis opposed this position. A brief alliance between the C.C.F. and the communists in B. C. ended rather badly for the C.C.F. in 1935. After this, he made it an official policy of the C.C.F. not to co-operate in any manner with the communists. Personal observation and bitter experience had convinced MacInnis that the communists were the most dangerous threat to the C.C.F.'s desire to be a constitutional socialist alternative to the government. If they infiltrated it, the C.C.F. would cease to be constitutional, and if they subverted it, it would cease to be an alternative.

Angus MacInnis was also very much a humanitarian. He first joined the socialist movement because of the Nanaimo Strike of 1912. The reaction of the government and the company turned him away from capitalism, convincing him that he must do something to replace it. Seeing the plight of the men thrown out of work, his joining the S.D.P. was essentially a humanitarian response to the situation. His first activities in the F.L.P. were in aid of the unemployed in Vancouver in the period immediately after the war. Although this produced little by way of results, it does reveal what he considered as practical socialism at the time.
Later on, as the one socialist member of the School Board and the City Council, he was not in a position to affect policy to any great extent. What he was able to do was to propose day rather than contract labour in public works, to spread employment opportunities around, and to defend the unemployed in 1930.

It was not as an alderman but rather as a member of Parliament that his humanitarian instincts can best be seen. His analyses of the effects of the Depression often emphasized the human damage done. He spoke for the coal miners of Nova Scotia, the seamen put out of work by cheap Oriental immigrant labour, the factory workers with excessively long hours and low pay, and particularly for the relief camp strikers in 1935. His best speeches in the House were his defences of the men in the camps and his attacks on the government's inaction. He tried unsuccessfully for several years to guarantee that Canadian citizens in the camps would not be disenfranchised, he brought before the House the conditions in the camps, and outlined for the House the men's increasing sense of alienation from the society that sent them away. He pointed out to an uninterested government that it was playing into the hands of the very communist agitators it professed to fear, and received no response to his efforts. During 1935 he was more interested in the relief camp workers than the "New Deal," but all his attempts to debate the government's policy failed. The Regina Riot resulted and Angus MacInnis had the grim satisfaction of knowing that he had been right, but the government had not listened. The camps were closed soon after the Liberals came to power.

During the period from 1930 to 1935 Angus MacInnis established himself as a Parliamentary personality. There was no question of MacInnis
being leader of the Ginger Group or of the C.C.F. and there is no evidence
to suggest that he wanted to be. He did not have the charisma, the ability
to utilize all types of people or the breadth of interest so necessary for
a leader. He must have realized this because, after his time as Chairman
of the I.L.P., he never sought a leading position. In appearance, he was
a tall, thin, dour man, with a rasping voice and a harsh Scottish
Maritimes accent. He was blunt and sure of his beliefs and, unlike J. S.
Woodsworth, did not suffer fools easily. Because of his narrow interests,
he did not represent a unifying force in the same way Woodsworth did.
His primary concerns were his desire to convince the House of the need to
respond to the Depression by establishing a "co-operative commonwealth"
in Canada, his defence of the casualties of the Depression, and the plight
of Vancouver. He had little interest in dominion-provincial relations
(except where it affected unemployment policy), Quebec, constitutional
issues, monetary policy, foreign relations, and agricultural problems.

Like Edmund Burke, Angus MacInnis was often the "dinner bell" of the
Commons. He was not a popular member of the House because of his blunt,
honest manner and his biting wit. He proved himself willing to work
within the Parliamentary system and was a conscientious member, but, al­
though he later came to be highly respected, he made few friends in the
Commons. His speeches were structurally sound, with every statement
explained and every assertion documented by statistics or quotations, but
they were not very interesting to the rest of the House. Two main themes
ran through most of them: the socialist solution to the Depression and
condemnation of the government's follies. They made excellent propaganda
outside the House but had little effect inside. Angus MacInnis soon
acquired a reputation as an unrepentant socialist and was singled out for
attack by government and Liberal members.
Not all his speeches sent the members to sleep. His pleas on behalf of the old, the lost and helpless, and the unemployed had much more spontaneity than his prepared orations. One cannot help but be struck by the passion and depth of feeling he showed in his spontaneous speeches particularly when they are contrasted with his prepared addresses. Of all the members, only J. S. Woodsworth and, occasionally A. A. Heaps, made as eloquent a defence of the defenceless.

MacInnis was an astute politician and realized the importance of keeping in close contact with his constituents. Lacking patronage and the opportunity to use public works to his own ends, he used personal contact and the press. He wrote articles for the labour and socialist press, his actions were followed by the Vancouver daily press, and he made a point of speaking as often as possible when in Vancouver. All of this served a dual purpose, it kept his image fresh and it educated his constituents on the importance of parliamentary government. His success in his efforts was proven in 1935 when his campaign was one of the most placid in this frenzied election. The Liberals, the Conservatives, the communists, and the press heaped abuse on the C.C.F. Angus MacInnis received little of it directly, but neither did he counter attack, thereby maintaining his low-key campaign. In the end, with two more opponents than he had faced in 1930, he managed to draw slightly over half the ballots and increase his percentage of the vote slightly.

Angus MacInnis' respect for Parliament increased during his first five years in the House of Commons. In the beginning he was amused at the ancient customs and rituals of Parliament and expressed this to his readers in the Labour Statesman. His first attempt at a motion ended in complete failure. But he learned quickly and grew to respect the customs of the House. Gradually his attitude changed, his early cynicism and
naivete slipped away and he became comfortable as a member of the House of Commons. His attacks on Bennett, King and their respective followers grew in intensity from 1930 to 1935, but very rarely did he speak ill of Parliament, its customs, or its potential as an agent for social betterment. Like many of his comrades in the C.C.F. and later the N.D.P., he changed from an uncomfortable radical to become one of the institution's staunchest and most knowledgeable defenders.

Although the terms "labour" and "socialist" were often used synonymously by members of the C.C.F. during the period 1930-1935, the C.C.F. did not attract the labour support it hoped to. This was because the trade unions were opposed to any relations at all with the socialist C.C.F.; the Federation's structure could not accommodate national or international unions; and labour's earlier support of the Canadian Labour Party had ended in failure. As a labour man in the C.C.F., one of MacInnis' roles would presumably be to enlist the support of organized labour. There is no evidence that he really tried to interest any unions in this period. Although he was still a union man, and considered himself representative of union men, he did not attempt to bring any unions into the C.C.F. until after 1935.

Dr. Walter Young, in his book The Anatomy of a Party: the National C.C.F. has indicated the internal stress within the Federation between those who saw the C.C.F. as something more than a party and those who saw it as an electoral vehicle.

This dichotomy within the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation between the concepts of the C.C.F. as a "movement" and as a "party" existed on two
planes. The one, organizational, saw the conflict in terms of the resistance of the small, scattered socialist parties to absorption into a national party, and to exchanging doctrinal purity for electoral efficiency. Here, Angus MacInnis was very much a "party" rather than a "movement" supporter. On the other, more ideological plane, his position was somewhat less easy to determine. If it is accepted that socialism was a viable political alternative during the lifetime of the C.C.F., then he was still a "party" rather than a "movement" man because he insisted on strict adherence to what he considered essential socialist principles, yet wanted an organization to translate these principles into political reality. If, on the other hand, it can be maintained that ideological purity became less important with each succeeding electoral rebuff, then MacInnis' adherence to his position becomes a sectarian hindrance to the development of a broadly based, North American type "party." However, during the period under study, it was possible to reconcile socialist principles and the notion of an efficient C.C.F. party, and therefore MacInnis' position was not difficult to maintain.

By 1935 Angus MacInnis had "won his spurs," and had helped set the C.C.F. on the path it was to follow for the rest of its career. His pragmatic socialism remained a feature of the party until it expired, although there were times when the pragmatism was more evident than the socialism. MacInnis never changed, however, and was as true to his socialist principles at the end as he had been in the beginning. His anti-communism, although sorely tested during the period from 1936 to 1939, also remained a tenet of the C.C.F. His greatest achievement was in convincing the Socialist Party of Canada (B. C. section) to cast in
its lot with the Federation, and to work with the Reconstruction Party and the C.C.F. Clubs until the final merger came. His influence was on the side of those in the party who saw the benefits of a closer union and a more centralized structure without loss of doctrinal purity, and it was this point of view that finally triumphed. His efforts from 1925 to 1930 to keep the I.L.P. a functioning, non-communist socialist party, and his work in bringing the Socialist Party of Canada into the mainstream of Canadian politics within a united party did much to advance the cause of the C.C.F. in Canada as well as in British Columbia. The task was not dramatic, but it was essential and Angus MacInnis did it well.
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Ibid., October 10, 1935. MacInnis did do some speaking outside Vancouver East, occasionally speaking in Vancouver South in aid of Robert Skinner.

Ibid.

The results: MacInnis (C.C.F.) 13629 Bruce (Comm.) 1555
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CHAPTER V

1M. J. Coldwell, in an interview with the author on May 2, 1968, confirmed that Angus MacInnis preferred a unified to a federal structure. Also, MacInnis¹ prediction to the C.C.F. provincial executive in B. C., July 11, 1933 shows beyond any doubt that he wanted a united party because it "was inevitable and necessary so as to function properly."

2This view was confirmed by Mrs. Grace MacInnis in an interview, April 2, 1968.


4See Walter Young, Anatomy of a Party, Chapter IV, pp. 68-101, which discusses the change from movement to party, and the effects of unions on this change.
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William Bennett. Born in Scotland in 1881. He came into contact with the socialist movement in Glasgow where he belonged to the Scottish Labour Party. He came to Vancouver in 1907 and worked as a barber and writer. He joined the Socialist Party of Canada when he arrived and was a frequent candidate in provincial and municipal elections. In 1921 he left the Socialist Party and joined the Workers' (or Communist) Party, of which he became an executive member. He wrote an early history of British Columbia from a communist viewpoint, Builders of British Columbia (Vancouver: Broadway Printers, 1937). Tom McEwan, another Vancouver communist wrote a biography of him, He Wrote For Us, (Vancouver: Tribune Publishing Co., 1951).
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W. L. Cottrell. President of the Streetrailwaymen from 1917 to 1919, and financial secretary from 1920 to 1923. He led the union during its most radical phase and worked closely with Ernest Winch and the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council in 1918, a departure from earlier, more conservative Streetrailwaymen Union policy. A charter member of the F.L.P., he opposed the One Big Union movement. He was later president of the Canadian Labour Party (1924) and a member of the I.L.P. He had drifted out of politics by the time of the C.C.F.

Herbert Gargrave. Born in England in 1905. He was a painter in England, but decided to try farming in Canada. He emigrated to Saskatchewan, but soon gave up and moved to Vancouver where he resumed his trade. In Vancouver he joined the I.L.P. and remained active in the S.P. of C. and the C.C.F. He was vice-president of the Socialist Party in 1934, and on the B. C. and national councils of the C.C.F. in the late 1930s and early 1940s. He was elected to the British Columbia legislature in 1937 and
remained an M.L.A. until 1945. During the 1950s and 1960s he worked in Ontario for the Steelworkers' Union.

Jack Kavanagh. He was a longshoreman in Vancouver and an official in the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council in 1918 and 1919. Along with Winch, Pritchard and Midgley, he moved over to the O.B.U. in 1919 and did much to set it up, becoming B. C. chairman of the organization. In 1922 he left the O.B.U., joined the Workers' Party and was soon elected to the National Executive of the Party.

E. T. Kingsley. Born in England. He was an active member of the Socialist Party of Canada and the Social Democratic Party before World War One. He also edited the Labour Statesman and was the author of many articles and pamphlets. Although he was considered a "scientific" socialist, he supported electoral activity and joined the Federated Labour Party when it was formed in 1918, becoming first president in Vancouver. He opposed the O.B.U. in 1919. According to Mrs. MacInnis (interview, January 9, 1968) he was a particular idol of Angus MacInnis' because of his incisive wit and his intellectual abilities.

Wallis W. Lefeaux. Born in England in 1881, he attended grammar schools there, and was raised in a comfortable, middle class atmosphere (a brother, with the same background as Wallis, went on to become a director of the Bank of New Zealand). He came to Canada in 1901, settling in the interior of B. C. where he worked at various jobs, such as fur trader, insurance agent, and storekeeper. He moved to Vancouver and became a lawyer in 1918. In 1919 he went to Winnipeg to defend the accused after the Winnipeg General Strike and travelled to London in an appeal. While in Europe he visited Russia (1920) which he lectured on in North America for a year under the auspices of the Soviet Government. He was in the socialist movement from soon after his arrival in Canada, belonging to the S.P. of C., the S.D.P., the F.L.P., I.L.P., Socialist Party and the C.C.F. As one of the few professional people in the C.C.F., he was in constant demand as a speaker and a candidate. He stood for many elections, coming within 130 votes of defeating Liberal Ian Mackenzie in the 1935 federal election. He was finally elected to the B. C. legislature in 1941, and became noted as a vigourous defender of the Japanese Canadians. He made a fortune in real estate in Vancouver during the 1920s, lived in a style befitting a successful lawyer, yet was a consistent defender of the poor and the helpless and was referred to by the Commonwealth, October 10, 1935, as "perhaps the most outstanding exponent of scientific Marxism in the West."

Victor Midgley. Born in England in 1889, and came to Winnipeg in 1904. He moved on to Vancouver in 1907, and worked as a lathe operator. He had been a socialist in Britain, and remained one in Canada. He took part in the Manitoba 1907 election, and belonged to the Socialist Party in Vancouver. He first ran as a Socialist Party candidate in 1912. From 1917 to 1919 he was on the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council (V.T. & L.C.) executive, and supported the establishment of the O.B.U.,
acting as Secretary-Treasurer for the organization until 1922. In that year, he left the O.B.U. and resumed his trade. He returned to the socialist movement about 1930, when he was living in Victoria. He was active in the Socialist Party and the C.C.F. In 1933, because he was living in Victoria, he was asked to act as secretary for the Rev. Connell. He did so, becoming so attached to him that he too left the C.C.F. in 1936. Midgley later moved to New Zealand where he died some years after.

**Joseph Naylor.** A Cumberland miner, he was president of the B. C. Federation of Labour in 1918. Along with other radicals in the Federation, he opposed the formation of the F.L.P. and supported the O.B.U. He remained on the Central Committee of the One Big Union movement until 1922 when he returned to his old job as a miner in Cumberland.

**Harry Neelands.** He was a member of the Typographers Union and a founding member of the Federated Labour Party. He was M..A. for Vancouver South from 1920 to 1928, then school trustee for Vancouver in 1930. He was vice-president of the C.L.P. in 1924, suggested the name "Independent Labour Party" when the new party was formed in 1925, and served as its secretary from 1925 until 1930. He was MacInnis' campaign manager in 1930 and remained in the S.P. of C. and the C.C.F. through the 1930s, though in a much smaller role than he had had in the 1920s. He was considered one of the more conservative members of the party.

**R. B. Pettipiece.** Born in Ontario. He first came to B. C. around the turn of the century and, through his newspaper the Ferguson (or Lardeau) Eagle, was one of the first active socialist propagandists in British Columbia. He was a member of the Socialist Party from its inception, and was first editor of the Western Clarion in 1903. An active member of the S.P. of C., the S.D.P. and the F.L.P., he was a frequent municipal candidate, serving as alderman in Vancouver in 1912 and again in the early 1920s. He remained in the I.L.P. and the S.P. of C., eventually became a columnist in the Commonwealth. A typographer, he was first secretary of the B. C. Federation of Labour in 1910.

**Jack Price.** Born in Wales in 1883, he emigrated to the U.S.A. in 1904, then moved to Vancouver where he became a Street railwayman in 1916. He was on the Central Strike Committee in Vancouver in 1919, but did not, like so many other labour leaders at the time, support the O.B.U. He joined the F.L.P. and remained in the socialist movement during the 1920s. He was elected M.L.A. from Vancouver East in 1933, and was treasurer of the C.C.F. in 1934. Besides his political activities, Price was also active in his union and a member of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council. He supported the Rev. Connell in 1936, left the C.C.F., and was defeated in 1937.

**William Pritchard.** He was born in Britain in 1889. He came to B. C. and joined the Socialist Party in 1912. He went over to the O.B.U. in 1918 and was one of its most important organizers until he was arrested
and convicted of seditious conspiracy and libel in Winnipeg in 1919. He was freed from Stony Mountain Prison in 1921 and returned to Vancouver to a hero's welcome. He left the disintegrating O.B.U. in 1922 and worked as a longshoreman with Ernest Winch whom he blamed for the collapse of the One Big Union. Pritchard was a municipal councillor in Burnaby, was elected Reeve in 1931 and was president of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities. His term as reeve ended when Burnaby defaulted on its debts and went into receivership. Pritchard had stayed out of socialist politics during the 1920s, but returned in 1932 through the Reconstruction Party. During the 1933, he started the Commonwealth, which he edited, was chosen one of the British Columbia representatives on the C.C.F. National Council and was elected first president of the Associated C.C.F. Clubs. Pritchard left the C.C.F. in support of Connell and took the Commonwealth out with him. It collapsed soon afterwards. Pritchard was a dynamic organizer, a popular speaker and writer, and interested in music, drama, and sports. He turned the Commonwealth into a formidable rival to the Vancouver city papers during its last year. After 1935, he suffered a number of personal tragedies, and left Vancouver for Los Angeles.

John Sidaway. Born in England about 1885. He came to Vancouver in 1904 and immediately joined the Socialist Party. He was a close associate of Angus MacInnis', both in the Streetrailwaymen (of which he was vice-president in 1920) and in the I.L.P. and S.P. of C. (both in the Mt. Pleasant branch). Sidaway was financial secretary of the I.L.P. in 1925 and 1926, B. C. vice-president of the Western Conference of Labour Political Parties in 1930, and editor of the Labour Statesman (1925) and I.L.P. News (1930). After his unsuccessful electoral bid in Vancouver Burrard in 1933, he faded out of active politics.

Robert Skinner. Born in Scotland in 1882. He first came to Vancouver in 1908, and worked at various odd jobs for several years. He returned to Scotland several times from 1910 to 1921 and served on the Glasgow Trades and Labour Council in 1918 and 1919. Upon his return to Canada, he joined the Federated Labour Party and was a member of the Mt. Pleasant branch with MacInnis and Sidaway. Robert Skinner took an active part in the activities of the F.L.P., the I.L.P., the S.P. of C. and the C.C.F. He was a delegate at the Regina Convention in 1933, and was first president of the C.C.F. in B. C., 1933-1934. He wrote for the various socialist and C.C.F. papers, and was a frequent, unsuccessful candidate in civic, provincial and federal elections during the 1920s and the 1930s. Skinner and Angus MacInnis were quite close, and so he and some of the doctrinaire element in the Socialist Party did not get along very well. During the 1920s, he organized the Vancouver Retail Employees Union while he was working for Woodwards, a Vancouver department store. He left Woodwards in 1928 and became a Vancouver sanitary inspector. He, like many others who had played a large part in establishing the C.C.F., drifted away in the late 1930s.

A. M. Stephen. Born in Ontario in 1882. He came to B. C. in 1901, articled as a law clerk in Victoria, but grew tired of this, and mined for gold in the Yukon and ranched, lumbered, and farmed in British
Columbia and Alberta. He was in Britain in 1915, was drafted, and spent three years with the British Expeditionary Force in France. After the war, he returned to Vancouver where he wrote poetry and novels and also taught. He drifted into the socialist movement in the early 1930s, was active in the S.P. of C. and the C.C.F. but was suspended in 1936 for pro-communist activities. He became disillusioned with the Communist Party in 1939 and died in 1942 a bitter anti-communist. Stephen considered himself a "scientific" socialist and gave lectures on Marxist economics and the economic interpretation of history, but his poetry showed him to be too romantic, sentimental and nationalistic to be truly "scientific." He wrote two novels and edited two school collections of poetry, and five of his own collections. His influence in the socialist movement was mainly negative; he opposed any compromise with the Clubs in 1934, and his communist activities helped to split the C.C.F. in 1935 and 1936.

Dr. Lyle Telford. Born in Ontario in 1889. A physician, he came to Vancouver in 1913. From the beginning of his time in Vancouver, he was interested in politics. He spent six months in the Liberal Party, but was converted to socialism at some point during the First World War and joined the Federated Labour Party in 1918. He was an active member of the F.L.P. and the I.L.P. during the 1920s, but did not come into his own until the 1930s. At this time, he began to edit a newspaper, The Challenge, to conduct regular radio broadcasts and to travel around B. C. lecturing on socialism. His paper, broadcasts and speaking tours around the province brought many people who disliked the Socialist Party into the C.C.F. He probably did more than anyone else in the B. C. movement to spread the gospel of socialism. Telford was a regular candidate in elections and invariably drew much of the opposition fire onto himself because of his uniquely bombastic speaking style and his wild pronouncements. His efforts at the polls finally produced results in 1937 when he was elected an M.L.A. and in 1939 when he was elected mayor of Vancouver. His holding two such positions was contrary to party policy and he left the C.C.F. He was defeated in both in subsequent elections. After these rebuffs, he lost all interest in politics, and returned to his medical practice.

A. J. Turner. Born in England in 1887. Around 1904 he came to Victoria where he worked as a machinist. In 1919 he proposed the motion that Canada adopt the Soviet system of government that was finally approved by the Calgary Conference that year. He moved to Vancouver after the First World War and operated an auto repair shop in the city. Turner was a member of the I.L.P., the S.P. of C., and vice-president of the C.C.F. in 1933. He was elected as an M.L.A. in 1941 and sat until 1966.

Ernest Winch. Born in England in 1879. He first came to Canada in 1898. After a year in Saskatchewan and British Columbia, he went to Australia, then home to Britain. He returned to Canada in 1910, this time with a family and a trade as a bricklayer and builder. After a number of business misfortunes, he became a longshoreman in 1917. During the period from 1910 to 1912 he became interested in politics and union activities. He joined the Social Democratic Party in 1912 and ran unsuccessfully for
Burnaby school trustee in 1914. Going the opposite direction from most of his comrades, he quit the S.D.P. in 1918 to join the more doctrinaire Socialist Party of Canada. The year before he had been elected president of the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council. He opposed the establishment of the F.L.P. and did much to advance the cause of the O.B.U. In 1919, when he was still president of the V.T.L.C., he was elected head of the Lumber Workers' Industrial Union. He led them 15,000 strong, into the One Big Union in 1919, and out in 1920. This did much to bring about the collapse of the Union in 1922. In the 1920s, he took very little part in politics but remained a member of the Socialist Party and the Independent Labour Party. For his life see D. G. Steeves, *The Compassionate Rebel*. (Vancouver: Evergreen Press, 1960.)