

J. S. WOODSWORTH

A Study and Evaluation of
His Contribution to Modern Social Work
its Principles and Concepts

by

MYRTLE ELEANOR ROBERTSON

Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree of
MASTER OF SOCIAL WORK
in the School of Social Work

Accepted as conforming to the standard
required for the degree of
Master of Social Work

School of Social Work

1955

The University of British Columbia

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this thesis is two-fold: first, a biographical sketch of J. S. Woodsworth's life and career has been made in an attempt to see his work, its underlying philosophy, goals and methods in relation to modern social work.

And secondly, an attempt has been made to place some evaluation on the contribution made by J. S. Woodsworth to Canadian social work.

The material used has been drawn from published biographies of J. S. Woodsworth, some of his personal writings, magazine and newspaper articles, Reports of the Official Debates of the House of Commons, letters from relatives and contemporaries acquainted with his work. Modern social work principles, concepts and goals have been drawn together from current professional social work publications.

The Introduction describes the purpose, method and focus of the study. It also outlines the current social work principles and concepts against which J. S. Woodsworth's work is to be examined.

Chapter I gives a biographical sketch of Mr. Woodsworth's life, pointing up the influences and motivations leading to a career of social reform and statesmanship. It describes the social and economic conditions of Canada as the background against which this career developed.

Chapter II discusses J. S. Woodsworth's activities as a social worker, first under the auspices of the Methodist Church and later in organized social work under the Canadian Welfare League and the Bureau of Social Research. His rejection of wartime National Service Registration resulted in dismissal. The attitude of his contemporaries and subsequent reaction of the social work profession is discussed in relation to this.

Chapter III deals with Woodsworth's Parliamentary years, his goals, methods and legislative achievements. This is discussed under three main topics - Civil Rights reform, Amendment of Canada's Constitution, and Social Reform legislation. Mr. Woodsworth was the first consistent advocate of the social insurances which are now accepted as routine and of some which are still considered in advance of our time. His tangible achievements were less important than the influence which he exerted both inside Parliament and out, toward progressive social change. The method of study, research and public education was followed. The goal of bringing about conditions which would make possible a full and creative life for all, was unchanging.

Chapter IV attempts to draw together the principles underlying J. S. Woodsworth's activities, to show that these were in line with modern social welfare principles, and discusses his basic contribution to social work in Canada.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Introduction.	
Purpose, method, and focus of the study. Social work goals, principles and concepts.	1.
Chapter I. <u>J. S. Woodsworth, The Man and his Setting</u>	
Influences at work: family, church, Oxford and the East London slums, marriage, All People's Mission. From Social Worker to Longshoreman. From indictment to election. Social and Economic background 1896 - 1955.	8.
Chapter II. <u>J. S. Woodsworth, Social Worker 1907 - 1916</u>	
All People's Mission 1907 - 1913, work with Immigrants, People's Forum, Manitoba Compulsory School Law, publication of <u>Strangers Within our Gates</u> and <u>My Neighbor</u> - an effort at public education, to encourage citizen participation and to seek coordination of social work activities. Canadian Welfare League. Bureau of Social Research. Rejection of National Service Registration and dismissal. Attitude of contemporaries and subsequent reaction of social work profession. ...	39.
Chapter III. <u>Parliamentary Years 1922 - 1940</u>	
Winnipeg Strike, arrest, election to Parliament. Civil Rights Reform, Immigration Act, Section 98 of the Criminal Code, enfranchisement of minority groups, understanding the Doukhobors. Amendment to the British North America Act and complete autonomy for Canada. Social reform legislation, Old Age Pensions, divorce courts for Ontario, bridging the gap between Parliament and people, penitentiary reform; the case for the unemployed, labour legislation. Use of data from social work sources. Unchanging goals.....	62
Chapter IV. <u>J. S. Woodsworth - His Relation to Social Welfare, and an Evaluation of His Contribution</u>	
Modern social work concepts inextricably part of all J. S. Woodsworth's work, respect for personality, dignity and worth of all persons, respect for individual differences, right to self-determination, right to enjoy personal and civil liberties. Never doctrinaire. Faith in people. Individual, group and community participation. Defined the goals of social work. Demonstrated social work method. Achieved practical social reforms. Greatest contribution due to the influence of what he was rather than what he did. Achievement of a rare degree of maturity.	95

Appendices:

A. Statement of Refusal to Support National Service Registration.	107
B. Letter of Resignation from the Church.	108
C. The King vs. J. S. Woodsworth.	112
D. Speech in Parliament at the Outbreak of War.	126
E. Outline of Material on Social Welfare in J. S. Woodsworth Collection, National Archives, Ottawa. ..	130
F. Bibliography	132

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express her appreciation to all those who, through their help, encouragement and interest have made this study possible.

Special thanks is offered to Miss Mary Woodsworth for the stimulus of her kindly encouragement and helpfulness; to Mrs. Grace MacInnis, not only for her valuable biography without which the thesis would not have been written, but especially for her personal interest, support and source material made available. The writer is also grateful to Miss Nora Lea, Miss Ethel Johns, Miss Edna Bambridge and Judge F. A. E. Hamilton, for their generously informative responses to letters of enquiry.

In addition, mention should be made of the counsel, and encouragement offered by members of the Faculty of the University of British Columbia, in particular Dr. Leonard Marsh, Mrs. Joan Grant and Miss Elizabeth Thomas.

INTRODUCTION

In the course of a lecture on the development of social welfare, a comment was made that J. S. Woodsworth, as an Independent Labour member in the House of Commons at Ottawa was responsible for inducing the Liberal Government to enact Old Age Pension legislation in 1927. This led to an enquiry into the background of this incident which, in turn, revealed material of sufficient interest to social workers to lead to the present study.

The purpose of the study is two-fold - first, to examine the contribution made to Social Welfare in Canada by James Shaver Woodsworth, Methodist minister, social worker, dock labourer, and political leader, and, second, to examine the relation of his work - its methods, aims and achievements, to modern social work concepts and principles.

In examining and assessing the contribution made, some study of the social and political background of Canada was necessary and some limit had to be set for the period to be covered. The dates 1896 to the present were selected to include the entire period of J. S. Woodsworth's career beginning with his graduation from Wesley College, in Winnipeg in June 1896 and entrance into the home mission field and ending with his death in Vancouver, B. C. on March 21, 1942. Developments in social welfare in Canada between 1942 and 1955 have been looked at briefly in relation to the impetus given to social legislation by the work and influence of J. S. Woodsworth.

For the study, use has been made of biographical material, as well

as some of the personal writings of Mr. Woodsworth including books, pamphlets, magazines and newspaper articles. Already, only a little more than a decade after his death, this material is becoming scarce, with much of what he has written now out of print and with only a small percentage available in either the library of the University of British Columbia or the Vancouver Public Library.

Extensive use has been made of the recently published biography by Grace MacInnis. Material for Chapters I and III has been drawn heavily from this source. This has been due, not only to the relatively small amount of biographical material available but especially because of its comprehensiveness, its authority in terms of intimate knowledge of the man and the intricate details of the political scene which surrounded him.

Additional information has been given generously by relatives, friends, and associate workers who were his contemporaries. Hansard has been referred to for material covering the social legislation for which J. S. Woodsworth was responsible, directly or indirectly.

For the economic background of the period, use has been made of the Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion - Provincial Relations, published in 1940, under the chairmanship of J. O. S. Sirows.

In discussing the relationship of J. S. Woodsworth's work to modern social work, further research into the early history of such organizations as the Canadian Welfare League and the Bureau of Social Research, was necessary. Letters have been written to certain individuals,

to the Canadian Welfare Council at Ottawa, and to the National Conference of Social Work, Columbus, Ohio, for information dealing with the origins and influence of the Canadian Welfare League established in Winnipeg in 1913, and for which J. S. Woodsworth acted as secretary from its inception.

Letters have been written to the School of Social Work, University of Toronto and to certain individuals for information relating to the Training class for professional social workers established by Mr. Woodsworth just prior to the opening of the training program of the Toronto school in 1916.

In addition it has been necessary to draw together from current professional social work literature some of the basic concepts and the philosophy which underlies professional social work to-day.

For clarification, it would be helpful at this point, to state those definitions and concepts as expressed by leaders in the profession, which are central to this study and which will be referred to later as they relate to specific phases of the work being examined.

Social work was defined by Katherine Kendall in 1951 as follows:

Social work is a professional service, responsibly related to all community efforts to promote social well-being, democratically conceived and potentially available to every member of the community who may stand in need of help in removing obstacles to productive living.¹

¹ Kendall, Katherine A, "International Social Work: Plans and Prospects," Social Casework, July, 1951, vol. 32, p. 277.

The purpose of social work was stated by Charlotte Towle in 1946 in these words:

The profession of social work is concerned with the creation and development of a democratic society which will afford every individual opportunity for the maximum development of which he is capable. In achieving this purpose, the profession has worked toward two objectives:

- 1) The reshaping of social and economic institutions which are failing to fulfill their function.
- 2) The creating of special services for groups of individuals where needs are not being met.¹

The goals of modern social work were set forward in 1944 by Leonard W. Mayo as being:

To help create a world in which there can be peace, an economy in which there is full employment, and a society in which minority groups and those of every racial background may live as free people - these constitute our next and logical goals.²

Among the key concepts underlying modern social work are these, as outlined by Gordon Hamilton:

- 1) Any ability to help others effectively rests on respect for the human personality, on the person's right to make his own life, to enjoy personal and civil liberties, and to pursue happiness and spiritual goals in his own way.
- 2) Help is most effective if the recipient participates actively and responsibly in the process.
- 3) Respect for others includes respect for their differences.

1 Towle, Charlotte, "Social Casework in Modern Society," Social Service Review, June, 1946, p. 166.

2 Mayo, Leonard W., "The Future for Social Work," Proceedings of National Conference of Social Work, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, p. 28.

- 4) The individual has responsibility not only for himself but toward the society in which he lives.
- 5) In all social work the idea that the individual,¹ the group, the community must participate in the solution of their own problems has been the dynamic

Of civil liberties, in relation to social work, Benjamin

Youngdahl in 1951 stated:

The profession is alert to the necessity of maintaining our heritage of freedom and civil liberties and understands that social work can not be practised except in a democracy that safeguards the rights of people. Moreover, the profession recognizes that any diminution in these rights of self-determination and civil liberties means professional retrogression.²

The social work concept which gives recognition to the individual's spiritual needs is pointed up by Charlotte Towle:

Spiritual needs of the individual must also be recognized, understood and respected. They must be seen as distinct needs and they must be seen in relation to other human needs. . . . Through the influence of religion the purpose of human life is better understood and a sense of ethical values achieved. With that understanding comes keen appreciation of the individual's relationship to his fellow man, his community and his nation.³

1 Hamilton, Gordon, "Helping People - The Growth of a Profession," Social Work as Human Relations, New York, Columbia University Press, 1949, p. 8-14.

2 Youngdahl, Benjamin, "Social Work as a Profession," Social Work Year Book, 1951, p. 499.

3 Towle, Charlotte, Common Human Needs, American Association of Social Workers, New York, 1953, p. 8.

The place of social action and social reform in social work was discussed by Nathan E. Cohen in 1953 with reference to the work of the late Eduard Lindeman:

Social work must always remember its rich heritage of crusading and legislative action. A denial of the important role and place of social action in social work was to Lindeman a denial of social work's concern for democratic values. Thus he stated that, "social work may be said to be moving in the direction of democratic goals when it learns how to utilize its special insights and knowledge for the purpose of social action."¹

And at the same session of the National Conference, Charles I. Schottland stated:

. . . The social worker or lay leader who ignores the political turmoil around social work issues does a dis-service to a field which has made some of the most important social contributions of our times.²

The material discussed above is included under appropriate headings and the chapters are as set out below.

The first chapter is made up of an historical summary of J. S. Woodsworth's career, in its social and economic setting. Throughout the study, the main focus has been kept on those phases of his work which have particular significance for the social worker. These will be seen to fall rather naturally into a grouping of three main topics - organizational social work, social reform legislation and civil rights

1 Cohen, Nathan E., "Eduard C. Lindeman, - Social Welfare Statesman," Social Welfare Forum, New York, Columbia University Press, 1953, p. 13.

2 Schottland, Charles I., "Social Work Issues in the Political Arena," Social Welfare Forum, New York, Columbia University Press, 1953, p. 21.

reform. Chapters II and III will deal with these three topics in detail while Chapter IV will draw together these aspects of his work in their relation to social work concepts and will make some attempt to assess the contribution made in the light of present social work thinking.

CHAPTER I

J. S. WOODSWORTH: THE MAN, AND HIS SOCIAL SETTING

Amidst the great amount of philosophical and sociological material written during the last half-century dealing with the relation of the individual to society, one of the most widely known is Arnold Toynbee's Study of History. In making the point that society progresses only through the action of particular individuals, he quotes the following statement made by the French philosopher, Henri Bergson:

We do not believe in the "unconscious" [factor] in History: the "great subterranean currents of thought", of which there has been so much talk, only flow in consequence of the fact that masses of men have been carried away by one or more of their own number It is useless to maintain that [social progress] takes place of itself, bit by bit, in virtue of the spiritual condition of the society at a certain period of its history. It is really a leap forward which is only taken when the society has made up its mind to try an experiment; this means that the society must have allowed itself to be concerned, or at any rate allowed itself to be shaken, and the shake is always given by somebody. It is useless to allege that this leap forward does not imply any creative effort at the back of it This is to ignore the fact that the majority of great successful reforms have appeared at first unrealizable and have been so in fact. They could only be realized in a society whose spiritual condition was already that which these reforms were to induce through their realization; and there was a vicious circle here from which no issue would have been found if the circle had not been broken by one or more privileged souls which had dilated the social soul in themselves and which then drew the society after them [through the breach which they had made].¹

J. S. Woodsworth was one of the "privileged souls" who had dilated the

¹ Bergson, Henri, quoted in Toynbee, Arnold J., A Study of History, London, Oxford University Press, 1934, vol. 3, p. 231.

social soul in himself, broke the vicious circle and drew society after him. Some of the reforms for which he unceasingly struggled did not become reality until after his death and some have not yet been realized but his efforts were tireless and his aim constant. In this aim, of working towards "establishing on earth an era of justice and truth and love,"¹ he never wavered nor faltered, from the time when as a young minister he faced the social problems of the growing Winnipeg slum - problems of poverty, intolerance, ignorance, lack of sanitation and public health, - until as a newly elected member of Parliament, he startled the House of Commons in his first reply to the Budget. On that occasion he declared that "the government exists to provide for the needs of the people and when it comes to a choice between profits and property rights on one hand, and human welfare on the other, there should be no hesitation whatever in saying that we are going to place the welfare considerations first, and let property rights and financial interests fare as best they may."² He constantly thereafter sought throughout his twenty years in Parliament, the enactment of legislation which would "ensure to the community the resources by which each of its members could have opportunity for a full and creative life."³

What led up to these Parliamentary years? What were some of the influences, motivations and experiences which resulted in a career of

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., from a prayer written for the Winnipeg Labour Church, 1920.

² Dominion of Canada Official Report of the Debates of the House of Commons, 1922, vol. 3, p. 2249.

³ MacInnis, Grace, J. S. Woodsworth - A Man to Remember, Toronto, The MacMillan Company of Canada Ltd., 1953.

social reform?

Family and Church

The first influence that should be noted was that of the Church, received initially through his parents. "Following initial disappointment in having no living children, his parents had earnestly prayed for the gift of a son, dedicating him before his birth to the service of the Lord. Very early he became aware that his parents regarded him as evidence of God's blessing and he shared their sense of responsibility as to his future."¹ So that, following graduation from Wesley College in Winnipeg in 1896 it is not surprising to read that "James showed no uncertainty about his future course. His father and grandfather had been ministers in the Methodist Church. He had been brought up in that environment and knew no other. To the deep satisfaction of his parents, he felt impelled to carry on the same work, saying in later years, 'with me it was not a case of entering the Church; I was born and brought up in the Methodist Church and easily found my way into its ministry.'"²

That a pioneer spirit and a sense of responsibility for the wider community was an undertone in J. S. Woodsworth's home from his earliest years is evident in the feelings voiced by his father on accepting the challenge of the west to help the settlers in a new land, "that the Church had a part to play in shaping the life and institutions of the new country by the operation of educational, moral and religious forces."³

1 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 11-12.

2 Ibid., p. 19.

3 Ibid., p. 12.

Accepting this challenge meant moving from the relative ease of settled Ontario circuits to the wide sweep of the, then in 1882, unsettled prairies to a parish soon to extend from the head of the Lakes to the Pacific Ocean.

Those impressionable and formative years from eight to sixteen were spent in a home that was always open to travellers from far and near, and where, "the offer of a hot bath became as well known and as welcome as his Mother's good cooking."¹ These were years when his father, as First Superintendent of Methodist Missions for Western Canada, was away a great deal with the result that a naturally strong sense of responsibility in the boy was fostered. His helpfulness in the home was such that his mother came to depend on him a great deal. Thus we see evidences of a readiness to accept responsibility appearing early in the life of J. S. Woodsworth.

But the Church was to have an even more direct influence on his life. At the age of 22, James Shaver Woodsworth graduated in Arts from Wesley College in Winnipeg, with the highest honour that the student body could confer upon him, that of Senior Stick - a mark of merit indicating the best all-round student of the year. There is a record in the personal diary kept during these college years which shows that during vacations, the teen-age lad spent considerable time with his father, making the rounds of the widely scattered circuit. So that when he entered the Mission field immediately following his graduation, it was on probation

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 12.

but not as one uninitiated. The ensuing two year period only deepened the desire of the young minister to serve people through the church and at the end of this period he entered Victoria College in Toronto for his theological training. When this was completed, a year of post-graduate work at Oxford, England, rounded out his academic background and from this experience, which had a deep influence on the direction of his life, he returned to Carievale, Manitoba, the pulpit he had filled as a student minister.

Grace MacInnis states that "the steady routine of a country parish - regular Sunday morning service, Sunday School, evening Prayer Meeting, visits to church members - must have seemed a meagre contrast to the rich texture of living which he had just left [Oxford]."¹

It was during this period that the doubts and questions on matters of doctrine and dogma arose in J. S. Woodsworth's mind to give uneasiness and anxiety. This grew to the point where he felt compelled in 1902 to offer his resignation to the Church, rather than to be in the position of teaching something in which he did not believe. But in long discussions with several senior ministers he was convinced "that his ideas were not such as to take him out of the Church, that he should not offer his resignation but should try a year as junior pastor in Grace Church, Winnipeg. He felt, as he said himself, like a man condemned to death who had suddenly been reprieved."² But in spite of being caught up in the

1 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 45.

2 Ibid., p. 49.

great variety of activities and the volume of work involved in a large city church, the old doctrinal doubts and uncertainties continued to be a disturbing factor. In June 1907 he presented a statement of his resignation to the Church Conference. He did this for two reasons - one, his attitude to doctrine and dogma, and two, "he simply didn't want to be a preacher. He wanted to get out of the pulpit and among the people. He wanted to minister to them practically without having to bother with the screen of dogma between him and them."¹

Again the governing body of the Church refused his resignation. Instead, they offered him a post where he could be intellectually free and have an opportunity to come to grips with all the problems of a growing slum in the rapidly growing city of Winnipeg into which were pouring hundreds of immigrants. It was his experience here, as head of All People's Mission, from 1907 - 1913, that convinced him that greater welfare services, with greater community participation were essential, if the problems created by the growing industrialization and urbanization in Canada at this period were to be met.

Social Worker

And so it was that in 1913 J. S. Woodsworth moved completely out of the Church into the field of social work to become the first Executive Secretary of the Canadian Welfare League, established in Winnipeg and launched by the Canadian Conference of Charities and Corrections which met in September of that year, in Winnipeg.

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 57.

It was while still on the mission field that J. S. Woodsworth got his first glimpse into the reality of poverty and ignorance and its effect on human lives. It was as a minister in charge of All People's Mission in Winnipeg that he gained a deep understanding of the problems facing the immigrants in a new country and developed a burning conviction that the community as a whole must accept responsibility for preventing the suffering caused by such things as inadequate wages, lack of education, lack of opportunity to do a decent day's work. It was as a minister that he faced the fact that he could not repeat the words of the burial ceremony "The Lord hath given and the Lord hath taken away," knowing full well that the death of the child before him was not due to the Lord's will but the inadequate sanitation and public health in Winnipeg that resulted in the rapid spread of disease which eventually visited the well-to-do equally with the slum dweller.

It was through his work within the Church that J. S. Woodsworth came to see that if he was to follow the truth as he saw it, to remain true to the religion by which his life had been directed and to which it had been devoted - namely a belief in the love of God for all men, regardless of race, creed, color or status and the brotherhood of all men - he would have to leave the Church and work outside it. Leaving the Church then did not mean forsaking the principles or motivations which had directed him into it, but rather it meant that these had been steadily refined and developed in the light of his growing experiences to a point where he found that for him they could no longer be adhered to with integrity and remain within the Church as an institution.

But when J. S. Woodsworth left All People's Mission to become involved in the full-time social work program of the Canadian Welfare League, he still retained full ministerial status in the Methodist Church and was free to accept a church appointment at any future date should he so choose.

It was not until June, 1918, that this status changed and his divorcement from the Church was final and complete with the acceptance by the Church of his resignation offered for the third time.

"I Refuse to Participate in War . . ."

Already in 1916, because of his written and public refusal to support a National Service Registration Scheme proposed by the Dominion Government and which to him pointed in the direction of conscription, J. S. Woodsworth was relieved of his post as Secretary of the Bureau of Social Research. The latter, early in 1916, under the joint sponsorship of the three prairie provinces, had replaced the Canadian Welfare League which had to be closed due to the drain of the war effort on its sources of funds. Being relieved of his post, meant also the closing of the Bureau of Social Research which meant the end of the work on which he had placed great hopes; it meant the withdrawal of many of his friends and associates regardless of the quality of the work demonstrated during the preceding years.¹ Frank Underhill, in his pamphlet entitled James Shaver

¹ Is this one reason that existing social agencies, such as the Canadian Welfare Council, the Canadian Conference on Social Work, the School of Social Work, University of Toronto have no record information of these organizations? There are, however, in the archives at Ottawa three volumes of an estimated 5000 pages containing the actual record of J. S. Woodsworth's social work experience during these years.

Woodsworth, Untypical Canadian, states that "he found himself out of a job and was bitterly denounced by many who had been his social work associates."¹

Grace MacInnis describes this period in her father's life thus "Most of my father's associates and acquaintances shunned him, leaving him to find his way alone; many of them did not seek his society again until he had been a member of Parliament for years."²

With the closing of the Bureau of Social Research in January, 1917, J. S. Woodsworth moved still further westward with his family and after a brief period in Victoria, B. C., decided again to return to Church work and in June 1917 was put in charge of the Howe Sound Mission field, - which included a twenty-five mile stretch of B. C. coast-line from Port Mellon to Sechelt, with a total population of 140 families. Despite successful efforts at drawing together the scattered community and breaking down prejudices arising out of the mixed national groups within the area,³ Woodsworth felt that he could not continue in the Church. All his adult life he had been opposed to war, and he made no secret of his opposition when he took over this mission post. But to him, increasingly, it seemed completely dishonest to remain within an

1 Underhill, Frank H., James Shaver Woodsworth, Untypical Canadian, Ontario Woodsworth Memorial Foundation, Toronto, 1944, p. 15.

2 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 106.

3 A Finnish settlement here.

institution which fully supported war when his position was the opposite. "He had become convinced that he could no longer remain a minister of the Church and continue true to his ideals."¹ Thus in June, 1918, with a complete and full statement of his reasons, Rev. J. S. Woodsworth presented his resignation to the Methodist Conference. This time the reasons included "the belief that the teachings and spirit of Jesus are absolutely irreconcilable with the advocacy of war" and the statement that "Christianity may be an impossible idealism, but so long as I hold to it, even so unworthily, I must refuse as far as may be, to participate in war"² This time the Church accepted the resignation without hesitation.

This act of the Church closed the door on J. S. Woodsworth's career as a Methodist minister but it also opened the door on to the way that led him to become "the interpreter of the working classes to the more comfortable and successful groups of our Canadian Community."³ For it was with no alternative, if he was to support his family, that he sought work as a labourer and found a job as a longshoreman in Vancouver. It was this experience among workmen, "in meeting men as men, irrespective of nationality or creed or opinions - in being one of them"⁴

1 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 113.

2 J. S. Woodsworth, letter of resignation to Manitoba Conference of the Methodist Church, June 8, 1918.

3 Underhill, Untypical Canadian,

4 Woodsworth, J. S., "Come On In - The Water's Fine", On The Waterfront, Mutual Press Limited, Ottawa, 1918.

that convinced him that if the needs of the working people were to be met, Labour's voice must be heard. And to be convinced of anything, to Woodsworth meant to do something practical about it. It was from this time on that he identified himself closely with Labour.

Oxford and the London Slums

Together with his home background and the Church there were two other influences of primary importance in determining the direction of J. S. Woodsworth's life - his post-graduate year at Oxford and his marriage.

On reaching the end of his year as a divinity student at Victoria College, Toronto, in 1899, James Woodsworth had a clear plan of how he would spend the following year at Oxford and in making and carrying out these plans he adhered to two principles - first, to do what he could not do in Canada, and second, to study life rather than "do" places. In a letter to his father he stated his main aims in these words - "to gain as many points of view as possible - more especially to see what may be helpful later. To get a fair idea of the principles of the religious and educational and social problems and work, and to try to understand the spirit which characterizes the whole system."¹

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 29.

The impact of English culture - coming into contact for the first time with a world of music, art - painting, sculpture, architecture, - historic associations, all had a marked effect on J. S. Woodsworth and he wrote to his relatives expressing his joy and amazement. But while this aspect of England delighted him and enriched the aesthetic side of his nature there were other sides of the picture which exerted a more profound influence.

Like many other Oxford students at that time, Woodsworth went into residence for a period of time in one of the settlement houses in the slums of the East End of London. On December 11, 1899, he arrived at Mansfield House Settlement and the following two weeks spent there before returning for his second term of lectures at Oxford, were momentous ones in terms of the influence they exerted. He saw poverty, with its accompanying hunger, filth, discouragement and ignorance on a scale that far out-weighed anything he had seen in Manitoba. A letter to his family gives the following report of rounds made in one of the North-East London parishes:

It was really sickening to see the poverty and distress. We were in several homes where they had not had any dinner that day. One woman was working button-holes at a ha'penny a hole and a farthing for a small button-hole. She told me there were 70 stitches around. Another woman was making match-boxes at - I forget exactly how much - a few pence a gross. One child was lying very ill - hip disease. I think the poor little girl was dying. Her poor old grandmother showed me her own arm. It was only skin drawn over the bone. Some of the small back rooms upstairs were enough to kill anyone. Outside it was as bad. There was a heavy fog. The smoke would not rise. The streets were dirty and muddy. I do not wonder at people being driven to despair. Of course a good share of the poverty is due to improvi-

dence and drunkenness but that does not make it any the less real or pitiable.¹

He saw the contrast to all this in the homes of the well-to-do in West London where on occasion, he was entertained and this made a deep impression. Eleven years later he was to write, with reference to this experience:

Beautiful squares, historic palaces, old cathedrals, wonderful art galleries, the unaffected dignity, the inbred sense of honour, the ripe scholarship, the age-long culture - all have cast a potent spell, but even these could not blind to the monotony and wretchedness of the lives of great masses of people. The flowers of civilization were beautiful, but what of the millions of toilers submerged in the muck? They were struggling for an existence, at best degraded and miserable.²

From that time on he had a deep sense of personal responsibility to make the good things available to all.

The experience in the settlement house showed J. S. Woodsworth a possible method for coping, at least in part, with the living conditions in the slums and one which he later put into effect in his work in Winnipeg at All People's Mission.

During the year at Oxford it was not only the London slums that appalled him, but also those of Edinburgh and all the industrial area to the north. It was from these experiences that there grew a

1 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 36-37.

2 Woodsworth, James S., My Neighbor - A Study of City Conditions, Missionary Society of the Methodist Church, Toronto, July 1911, p. 69.

determination to prevent, in as much as lay within his power, the spread in Canada of the industrial slum with its submerged masses of people.

It was also during the year at Oxford that Woodsworth's attitude to war first began to crystallize. The Boer War was in full swing at this time. Witnessing the grief, alike, of some of his associates in the University and of the poor in the slum areas when touched with personal losses, he became intensely aware of the cruelty of it all. He also saw his classmates - studious, thinking people caught up in a wave of unthinking, unreasoning patriotism. He heard, too, reasoned opposition to war spoken by men in the Mansfield House common rooms. He began to question whether England had any justification for entrance into the war. He began to question the justification of war on any grounds.

This was the beginning of a hatred for war which grew deeper through the years, culminating in his public refusal to support the war effort in 1916, his resignation from the Church in 1918 and finally, in September 1939, his declaration before the House of Commons at Ottawa. Differing from the policy of the party which he led, as well as the rest of the House, he said:

While we are urged to fight for freedom and democracy, it should be remembered that war is the very negation of both. The victor may win, but if he does, it is by adopting the self-same tactics which he condemns in his enemy. As one who has tried for a good many years to take a stand for the common people, personally I cannot give my consent to anything that will drag us into another war.¹

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 101.

The experience at Oxford had also influenced his theological thinking - orthodoxy was never again to have a hold upon him. Seeing and listening to the theologians who were the leaders of his day, made it possible for him to see them as persons, to respect their views but also to see that they were not infallible nor to be idealized; that he must think through all questions in the light of his own knowledge and understanding.

Thus Woodsworth returned to the Canadian prairie in 1902 with a year behind him filled with experiences and a resulting degree of personal development which was in large measure to determine the course of the rest of his life and to make it impossible for him to remain for long a country preacher.

Marriage

Any historical summary of J. S. Woodsworth's career which failed to mention the importance of his marriage would be incomplete. In September 1902, the young minister and Lucy Staples, a Victoria College classmate, were married at Cavan, Ontario. One sentence written by Grace MacInnis highlights the keynote of their marriage: "Following a honeymoon at Muskoka, James and Lucy Woodsworth went west to their joint work." From then, until his death in 1942, it was indeed, joint work. They shared the same unfaltering love of truth and determination to follow it, no matter what personal sacrifice it might involve. For example, Mrs. MacInnis tells us that they discussed long and thoroughly all aspects of the decision to take a stand on the war issue and both agreed that no matter what the cost personally, it would be less than

the cost of silence on a matter which was of such deep conviction with them.

Mrs. MacInnis' biography of Woodsworth shows that there was a constant companionship - intellectual, spiritual and physical - that all his aims, ideals and plans were shared equally; that in his marriage Woodsworth found constant support, stimulation, relaxation and many times, especially during the later hyper-active parliamentary years, a refuge which provided periods of complete rest and refreshment such that would enable him to continue with the heavy responsibilities which he carried.

That Mrs. Woodsworth was undaunted by any crisis and unfailing in her understanding and support of her husband is shown rather vividly by a sentence from a letter written to him when he finally secured a job as a longshoreman in Vancouver, after all other avenues had been closed to him due to his pacifism. "I am proud to be your wife and the mother of the children of a docker when the docker is your own dear self but oh! I just ache when I think how your poor back must ache."¹

But it was not only encouragement that was given at this time by his wife. A longshoreman's pay did not provide too amply for a family of six children and to supplement this, Mrs. Woodsworth was able to get a teaching position which she carried while at the same time looking after the home and family.

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 120.

In spite of the difficulties which such a changed mode of living must have involved, the spirit and influence of the Woodsworth home continued to express itself. The following comment made by one who was a frequent visitor indicates the tone of this household:

On Sunday evenings one never knew whom one might meet at that hospitable fireside. University professors, teachers, social workers, union men, housewives and a rich assortment of political cranks all seemed to feel quite at home. We used to talk far into the night and, in his quiet way, James Woodsworth shared his philosophy with us.¹

Indictment and Election

J. S. Woodsworth's career as a longshoreman ended in May 1919 when he accepted the invitation of the Labour Church in Winnipeg to make a speaking trip across the three prairie provinces for the purpose of educating workers' organizations to the need for social change. It was at this point that he became caught up in the Winnipeg strike which began on May 15, 1919 involving some 30,000 workers. J. S. Woodsworth quickly identified himself with the worker's cause which included growing unemployment, sharply rising living costs, swollen profits by railroads, packing plants and other corporations, low wages and bad working conditions, coupled with the refusal of employers to permit collective bargaining or, in some cases, any labour organization whatsoever.

Woodsworth's identification with the cause of the workers and

¹ Johns, Ethel, formerly Superintendent of Children's Hospital, Winnipeg, Letter dated May 19, 1955.

the part he played in the situation led, first, to his indictment by the Crown and arrest on June 23, 1919 on charges of seditious libel, and confinement in the provincial jail in Winnipeg; secondly, to his nomination the following year as representative for Winnipeg Centre Constituency on behalf of the Independent Labour Party of Manitoba and subsequent election to the House of Commons on December 6, 1921.

For the rest of his life, a period of twenty-one years, J. S. Woodsworth remained the undefeated member for Winnipeg Centre. In 1932 he became the leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation which came into being that year as Canada's third political party. The formation of this was due, in no small part, to Woodsworth's leadership and initiative. It was a final step in his recognition that a force in Parliament, stronger than Independent members could exert, was necessary to combat the indifference displayed by the existing parties to the lot of the common people. It represented a coming together of the Progressive and Labour elements in the House of Commons and was seen by J. S. Woodsworth not as a political party but as a movement somewhat in the nature of a religious crusade, devoted to social and economic change in the interests of the great mass of the plain common people. Woodsworth felt that only if the movement maintained this religious aspect could the danger of being swayed by personal ambition or hope of immediate success be overcome.

December 16, 1921 marked the beginning of a Parliamentary career, towards the close of and about which W. L. MacKenzie King spoke in these terms:

There are few men in this Parliament for whom, in some particulars, I have greater respect than the

leader of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation. I admire him in my heart, because time and again he has had the courage to say what lay on his conscience, regardless of what the world might think of him. A man of that calibre is an ornament to any Parliament.¹

Blair Fraser, writing in McLean's Magazine, November 1, 1951 referred to J. S. Woodsworth as "the father of the Welfare State in Canada - of what we have now and of what we may have in store." The remainder of this study will be an attempt to examine in some detail the efforts and achievements which made it possible for such a statement to be made.

The foregoing summary of the main lines of development in the Woodsworth career has been made in an attempt to gain some understanding of the man himself, before attempting to examine his work. It is believed that the latter can only be understood in the light of the former.

Social and Economic Setting

One further aspect which should be considered briefly at this point is the social and economic background against which all the foregoing was taking place and which inevitably influenced the trends taken in this career - it might be said, in fact, to have set the stage for every phase and it will be seen that J. S. Woodsworth was quick to recognize and accept the vital role demanded by the setting.

When James Shaver Woodsworth was born in Ontario in 1874, Canada had had Dominion status for only seven years. In 1867 four-

¹ Quoted by MacInnis, Grace, p. 301.

fifths of the total population of Canada was rural. Montreal, Quebec and Toronto were the only cities with a population over 30,000 people. The principal occupations were farming, lumbering and fishing with only a small amount of manufacturing scattered throughout the relatively more settled areas. Self-sufficiency was the key-note of the economy. The family was the main economic and social unit in the community. In matters of public welfare, the family was regarded as the natural source of social security for the unfortunate, and what the family did not take responsibility for was left to municipal and private organization. At this stage there was no thought of government assuming any appreciable share of responsibility for public welfare.

At the time of Confederation - 1867 - the North-West was still a far frontier with its livelihood largely determined by the Hudson's Bay Company. The Red River Settlement had barely 10,000 people, most of these being half-breeds. Only fifteen years later, in 1882, the Woodsworth family moved westward at a time when the change in this area was barely beginning to take place. It was not until 1896 that the real expansion took place, brought about by the discovery of the wheat producing potentiality of the prairie. Settlers crowded into the west following the wheat boom and the result was the development of two new provinces. It brought about a new era of railway development and speeded up the industrialization of Central Canada.

It was in this setting then that J. S. Woodsworth was growing up and by the time the rapid expansion was in full swing, he was graduating from college and ready to enter the mission field.

By the time he had received his appointment to Grace Church in 1902, Winnipeg had become the urban centre and commercial hub of all this great western development and was the stopping-off place for hundreds of immigrants from Europe. The newcomers were being drawn, both by government and private enterprise, into the west as a cheap labour supply for the wheat fields, railway development and general industrial enterprise.

One of the inevitable accompaniments of such rapid urbanization is the development of slums. The influx of immigrants added to this problem, and the beginnings of this in Winnipeg coincided with the period at which J. S. Woodsworth was seeing in England, the effects on people of, not years, but generations of slum dwelling. It was with a strong determination to counteract this development in Canada in its beginning stages that he returned from Oxford in 1900.

By 1913 the Canadian economy had altered markedly and Canadians, through interdependence, had become conscious of themselves as a nation rather than separated units. Specialization had replaced the old self-sufficiency. The prairie provinces were growing wheat for the international market and Eastern Canada was providing specialized services for the domestic market. Thus an interdependence was developing and people were no longer so well able to meet economic reverses by their own resources. Private enterprise was being encouraged by the government. Intensive industrial development resulted in a change-over from predominantly rural living to urbanization and a consequent greater demand for collective services. In 1911 over 45 per cent of the

population had become urban in contrast to 20 per cent in 1867. Between 1901 and 1911 the urban population of the west grew from 193,000 to 673,000. Material conditions were thus developing which would make it necessary for government to look towards provision of social security measures in the near future.

It was at this period, during his work at All People's Mission and in the Canadian Welfare League that J. S. Woodsworth was seeing and voicing the need for over-all welfare services and the need for an awareness by the total community of the needs of all its members.¹ It was at this time that he began his social work activities in the Canadian Welfare League which had as its stated aim:

To make a practical study of Canada's emergent social problems caused by our large and heterogeneous immigration, by the rapid growth of our cities and the stagnation of some of our rural districts, and by the beginnings of industrialism and generally our emergence into a fuller national life.²

That Woodsworth was alert to and keenly aware of the developments taking place in the broad social framework of the nation is evident in this stated purpose.

The years between 1914 - 1921 brought major changes in economic, social and political spheres in Canada. The war brought vastly increased production, and consequent increase in the number of workers employed in

¹ Woodsworth, James S., publication of Stranger Within Our Gates or Coming Canadians, Methodist Young Peoples Movement, Toronto, 1909, and My Neighbor - A Study of City Conditions, Missionary Society of the Methodist Church, Toronto, July 1911.

² MacInnis, Grace, quoted from original statement of purpose of Canadian Welfare League, p. 87 f.

industry. This in turn resulted in major developments in the area of labour organization. In 1914 the number of Trade Union members was listed as 66,000. In 1919 the number had increased to 374,000.

The war brought inflation with profiteering and rapid increase in wealth by some. At the opposite end of the scale the common people bore the brunt of the sacrifice involved in the war and also the high cost of living. For the first time in Canada class conflict emerged.

During the early years of the war the country had been knit up in an all out effort which was marked by a greater spirit of unity than had ever been known in Canada. As the war dragged on, its demands on the people becoming steadily greater, the inequality of the burden became more evident and old discontents again came to the fore. The earlier sectional cleavages of east versus west again became apparent; the anti-conscription issue brought out strong differences of opinion between French and English, Labour and Capital. Agricultural interests seemed to be threatened by the large commercial enterprises of the central part of the Dominion.

Early in the war a union government had been formed, with a resulting weakening of both political parties. With the growing discontent of the farmers and the belief that the general interests of the entire country were being sacrificed to the interests of big business, came a movement resulting in the formation of a new political party representing agriculture. Labour lined up with the Farmers and for the first time in Canada's history a third political party became a factor

in government.

The United Farmers of Ontario were first organized in 1914, by 1919 they had a membership of 48,000 - on the prairies a total of 75,000. In 1916 the Canadian Council of Agriculture opened permanent offices in Winnipeg and in 1916 formulated the "Farmers' Platform". the 1918 convention demanded separate political action and in 1919 the first Farmers' Government was elected in Ontario. In 1919 the National Progressive Party became the counterpart of this at the Federal level and Manitoba elected 14 candidates to the National Progressive Party that year. In December 1921 the Union Government was defeated at the Dominion elections and 65 National Progressive candidates were elected to the House of Commons. Thus there had emerged in Canada a Progressive Movement led by agriculture and supported by Labour - a new phase in Canadian politics. This was a direct reflection of the effects of the war and an expression of discontent with the old two-party political system.

The sharply rising living costs without accompanying rise in wages caused much hardship among the working population. This was regarded by the people as being a direct outcome of the profiteering and rise of the industrial magnates. This resulted in a wave of strikes in industry during 1917 and 1918. As the government was attempting all-out effort at production due to the war situation, an order was passed in 1918 forbidding strikes. In 1919 the general sympathy strike in Winnipeg brought to a central focus the discontent of all the workers with the government's laissez-faire policy and industry's exploitation.

The government's immediate intervention with violence, and legislative action which was a direct infringement on individual rights, added great impetus to the political development of the Agriculture - Labour interests.

In the area of public welfare services also a changing philosophy was taking place. During the war years the government had made an all-out effort to coordinate the resources of the nation, and had used intervention at several points. People were now seeing that if an all-out governmental effort could be made to win a war, the same could be done in peacetime to make a better life for all its citizens. Intervention could be taken to prevent suffering caused by illness, unemployment, inadequate housing, neglect of children. Thus there was a beginning development of the philosophy that the government has a responsibility for meeting the basic welfare needs of people - this in contrast to the earlier concept that welfare services should be handled by private philanthropic organizations or family aid.

All this we see as the backdrop for J. S. Woodsworth's career. His experience as a worker coincided with the period when Labour was emerging as a new force. The General Strike at Winnipeg in 1919 coincided with his arrival in that city on a speaking tour in the interests of Labour education. It was inevitable with his interest in and knowledge of the people's needs, his convictions about the rights of all people that he would be drawn into the issues at stake. The indictment of the strike leaders, the amendments to the Immigration Act and Section 98 of the Criminal Code were issues which he had to speak out against. His voice was one of the most insistent in bringing the needs of the workers,

agricultural or industrial into the political arena - and his part in the Winnipeg strike directly resulted in his election to Parliament in 1921 - the year the Union Government was defeated in the Dominion Election.

It was an illustration of the propitious timing of events which sometimes occurs - the time was right and the man was ready.

During the "twenties" in Canada the Provinces became more aggressive about their rights and responsibilities. This was in part reaction to release from Federal domination of the war years and the immediate post-war period. After 1922 there was steadily expanding industrial development with the Federal Government encouraging private enterprise, hesitating to undertake any new services and letting the Provinces take the initiative in any new developments.

With increased industrialization went also increased specialization. A result of this was an increased demand for the greater role of government in providing welfare services. The prevailing philosophy in governmental circles in Canada was still that municipalities and local areas should carry the public responsibility for welfare services. In spite of this, the Provinces gradually were moving into acceptance of responsibility in this area; a responsibility which at that time, due to a high point in development of natural resources and general production, did not seem onerous. It did mean, however, that in practice they had accepted responsibility for something which, under changing conditions, might be more than they could handle. It also meant that welfare services were still being met on a local basis and therefore with great diversity from one part of the country to another.

The Dominion Government in the "twenties" accepted responsibility for providing one-half the cost of an Old Age Pension scheme enacted in 1927, but full administration of this was left to the provinces.

Mother's allowances were extended during this period and increased public health services were made available through the Federal Government - for example, enlarged support was given to hospitals and institutions and free curative and preventive services were made available for the treatment of tuberculosis.

The over-all cost of welfare services during these years increased 130 per cent with three-quarters of this being met by the provinces. Provincial prestige was gaining ascendancy. Thus, when the question of amending Canada's Constitution was raised during the "twenties" the provinces were in a frame of mind to be extremely reluctant to see anything done which might in any way restrict their provincial autonomy.

The period was one of general prosperity, but one in which the differences of interest between different regions of the country were becoming more evident. By the time the depression of the "thirties" struck, already marked differences became more sharply defined. There was no pattern of uniformity throughout the country as a departure point from which to deal with the severe dislocation caused by the crash of 1928 and 1929.

From 1930 to 1939 Canada, like the rest of the world, was in the grip of a depression of a nature and magnitude never before experienced.

She found herself completely unprepared to deal with it. Unemployment figures skyrocketed. There was no basis for a uniform or coordinated relief policy. Expediency became the keynote. The Federal Government did nothing to safeguard the financial position of the provincial governments and the policy of each, from town council to Dominion Government, seemed to be to get by as best they could with no thought for others.

The provinces were in no position to finance independently an economic program of the magnitude required. The Federal grant-in-aid policy was based on the premise that the province is constitutionally responsible and should bear as much of the burden of relief as possible. With the increased demands, the provinces were pushing the financial responsibility onto the municipalities. The end result was great and unjustifiable differences in standards of relief given; labour was not free to move from one locality to another in search of jobs without forfeiting relief rights, the homeless unemployed were the "lost men" and were pushed from one locality to another while municipalities argued about whose responsibility they were. By the middle "thirties" the provinces and many municipalities were on the edge of bankruptcy and countless people were not far from starvation. The main aim of government bodies seemed to be how much could be pushed off onto someone else rather than how, through coordinated effort, could this crisis be met to prevent starvation of thousands and to bring about some degree of economic stability throughout the country.

It was in this setting then that J. S. Woodsworth with his

vision of a government which would exist to provide conditions which would make possible a full life for all, faced the forces which were characterized by an attitude of expediency, self-preservation, and maintaining the status quo. His vision of a country, - strong, unified, cooperative and inter-related, was in sharp contrast to the provincialism, sectional cleavages and party interests which prevailed. It was to remedy these conditions through social and economic measures that he struggled incessantly. He constantly sought to bring others to see that only through changing the basic economic and social structure of the country could such depressions and their accompanying blight on the life of the nation be avoided. During the "twenties" and the "thirties" he fought for immediate remedial measures as well as far-reaching long term programs that would avoid such pitfalls in the future.

From 1939 until 1945 Canada was dominated by war instead of depression. The provision of full employment, which he urged as a governmental responsibility throughout his Parliamentary years, became a reality only through the cause which he deplored above all others. In 1939 in the House of Commons he spoke out against war as in any way solving the issues at stake, and that instead, war would but result in adding to the burdens of the world. His dissenting voice in the Dominion Legislature was a lone one and for the next six years the Canadian economy was geared to the all-out effort to win the war.

In 1945, three years after Woodsworth's death, the Liberal Government enacted legislation providing for universal Family Allowances. In 1929 Mr. Woodsworth had been the lone supporter of a motion made by a

Quebec member in favour of such a plan.

In 1952, the Federal Government brought in a plan providing for universal Old Age Security grants, free of any means test, to all Canadians 70 years of age or over.

In 1949 the much-debated right of Canada to amend her Constitution was granted by the British Parliament. Canada had become a nation in her own right.

Through her participation in the United Nations as a middle power Canada has been receiving increasing recognition as an influence in the affairs of the world. Such participation Mr. Woodsworth advocated even before war became a finality. In 1939 he made the following statement:

Even at this late hour some other way out must be found . . . I urge collective peace action among as many nations as can be induced to come in, including of course the United States. I think that, even at this late date, Canada, small nation as she is, ought to take some steps to throw her influence for the re-establishment of something in the nature of the League of Nations.¹

J. S. Woodsworth's hope that Canada would set her own house in order and in so doing become a good neighbour to the rest of the world is perhaps a little nearer to becoming a reality.

The Woodsworth career when seen against the background of national developments, represents the confluence of a stream of events

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 245.

in the growth of a nation with that of a life which was peculiarly fitted to meet and deal with those events.

CHAPTER II

J. S. WOODSWORTH - SOCIAL WORKER 1907 - 1916

In June 1907 when the Methodist Church Conference placed J. S. Woodsworth in charge of All Peoples Mission, the latter, almost immediately, under his efforts and inspiration, became a community centre. It was a place of friendship and of learning for the new Canadians who were herded into the shacks and ramshackle dwellings that surrounded the Mission and made up North Winnipeg.

Some idea of the living conditions in the neighborhood is given by a report in the Winnipeg "Telegram" on October 15, 1909. The newspaper told of landlords having been convicted in magistrate's court for maintaining dwellings unfit for human habitation. For example, one place of four rooms housed 32 men. The magistrate's comment on giving sentence, was "In your house there was not space for a dog, let alone a man. Besides being overcrowded the place was abominably filthy." Another case cited was that of one room 11 x 14 x 7 housing four men and two girls; another room 18-1/2 x 15 x 7 was occupied by twelve men, and one cellar room 15 x 14 x 6, declared unfit for use, was "home" to seven men.

That such an area would have use for a home supplement is evident.

The mission had a kindergarten -

A sunny happy place where the mothers brought their children There was a swimming-pool in the basement where the cement walls echoed the Tarzan-like

yells of boys and girls for whom bathing was an amazing luxury. There was the library Upstairs there were all sorts of classes, cooking classes, where the women made fragrant dishes of all kinds, sewing classes where they sometimes brought their embroidery from the Old Land, exquisite stitching in gorgeous reds and blues and purples. There were the classes in English where my father [J. S. Woodsworth] often taught. I remember watching him as he said slowly to some shy and awkward man who followed his encouraging expression: "I get out of bed . . . I put on my pants . . . I put on my shirt . . . I put on my socks . . . I put on my shoes . . ." He would accompany each sentence with appropriate gestures and wait for the learner to repeat it, often many times, until it became clear that he had grasped its meaning.¹

Among his efforts to help the immigrants become a part of the life of their adopted country perhaps none was more effective than the establishment of the "People's Forum". Mr. Woodsworth knew that the only real sense of belonging, anywhere, comes through participating in and contributing to the life around one. He saw that these people from other lands had a rich contribution to make culturally to life in Winnipeg. As a vehicle for expressing his belief, he instituted the People's Forum. This was a series of Sunday afternoon and evening programs held in the Grand Theatre. For seven years they were a popular feature in Winnipeg's cultural life. The afternoon program took the form of a lecture followed by discussion. The evening program consisted of a concert put on by one of the many national groups. The music, dances, colourful costumes were welcomed by Winnipeg audiences and the appreciation shown gave the newcomers a new sense of acceptance, dignity and worth. "Winnipeggers" gained from it a new awareness that persons from far away places also have much

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 4.

to offer.

The range of subjects for afternoon discussions was as wide as the following topics and speakers would indicate:

The Birds of Manitoba - Prof. V. W. Jackson
Canada and the Empire - Dr. S. G. Bland
Public Health in Winnipeg - Dr. A. J. Douglas, Health Officer
Is there a Moral Equivalent for War? - Miss Ethel Johns,
Supt. Children's Hospital
The Ukraine - J. S. Arsenych and Ivan Petrushewich
The Girl Wage Earner - Miss Cecilia Calder, C. A. S.
Architectural Masterpieces of the World - Prof. A. A. Stoughton
Next Steps in Social Progress
A Social Worker's Viewpoint - J. H. T. Falk, Secretary,
Social Welfare Association
Canada's Financial System from the
Farmer's Viewpoint - T. A. Crerar, President, Grain Growers
Grain Company

As an experiment in Community participation this venture also had much value. It was an opportunity, readily accepted, for exchange of ideas and experiences on the part of persons of widely differing backgrounds - socially, culturally and economically. It was a successful method of bringing about community understanding, joint participation and cooperation. It is significant of Mr. Woodsworth's way of working that nowhere in any of the programs for the activities of Forum's last year was his name in evidence. The object of the Forum was citizen participation and its popularity was a measure of the degree that this was achieved.

Social Conditions in Winnipeg

Woods' own daily experiences and those of the workers on the staff at the Mission revealed to him the complexity of the social

problems of the city, with a new intensity.

Wages were inadequate and many men were either irregularly employed or without any work. The income was usually supplemented by earnings of the wife and, often, of the children. Other children left uncared for at home also suffered physically, due to the mother's absence. The older ones "often become unmanageable and thus qualify for a life of crime - It should be a fixed rule with social workers that such arrangements should be made as would leave the mother free to care for her home and children."¹

J. S. Woodsworth saw, too, that the economic and social conditions of the poor were being perpetuated by the lack of opportunities for education. Manitoba was without a compulsory school law. The poverty of many families was such that it induced parents to take their children out of school to go to work. Many immigrant families from Central Europe were unaware of the values of formal education. Industrialists were willing to make use of child labour for their own gain. These combined factors provided a vicious circle which had to be broken by legislation. In 1909 Woodsworth wrote, "In Manitoba there is no compulsory education - a crying shame! Thousands of children are growing up without any education. In the city of Winnipeg itself hundreds of children run the streets and there is no law to deal with them."²

1 Woodsworth, My Neighbor, p. 104.

2 Woodsworth, Stranger Within Our Gates, p. 283.

And in 1911, on the same subject he said, "laws providing for compulsory education and forbidding child labour ought to be enacted in every province in Canada."¹

In an address to the Local Council of Women in Winnipeg in 1912, he stated that "one third of all the children in Manitoba do not attend school, only 25 per cent pass through the entrance, 5 per cent pass through the high school, and 1 per cent go through college."²

When the Compulsory School Law for Manitoba was finally enacted in March 1916, it was in no small measure due to the persistent efforts of Woodsworth, through writing and speaking and the consequent influence this had on others around him.

At this same time he was reiterating the need for putting public schools into wider use as social centres, a topic which was much to the fore in social work circles in the United States at that time. Woodsworth pointed out "the expensive school plant is used only for five or six hours, five days in the week and nine months in the year. Why not run it full time? In the basement could be a gymnasium and baths, in the class rooms all sorts of classes and clubs, in the assembly halls concerts and public meetings. Especially where there is a cosmopolitan population do we need a common meeting place."³

1 Woodsworth, My Neighbor, p. 107.

2 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 80.

3 Woodsworth, My Neighbor, p. 147.

Compulsory education and prevention of child labour were not the only means advocated for coping with adverse conditions relating directly to children. Woodsworth claimed that if conditions were such that children were getting into difficulty with the law, there should be a special court set up to deal with them. The result was a demand in Winnipeg for the establishment of a Juvenile Court. The Juvenile Delinquents Bill was under discussion at the time in Ottawa, and the Superintendent of All People's Mission urged that it be supported. In 1908 Winnipeg set up the first Juvenile Court in Canada.

The supervised playground was another measure in the prevention of delinquency urged by J. S. Woodsworth. In his book My Neighbor, published in 1911, he described what had been done in this regard in other cities and urged that Winnipeg undertake similar planning. In 1912 the municipality of Winnipeg assumed responsibility for planning, allocating and supervising city playgrounds.

The minister of the Mission tried to enlist the personal interest of South Winnipeggers towards participation in bringing about better conditions in the North End. In one instance a regular church goer and an excellent housekeeper was approached to come to the Mission to help the immigrant women learn Canadian ways of housekeeping. This woman refused, saying that she looked after her family, others could do the same. Not long after this incident, the "summer complaint" epidemic struck Winnipeg, spreading from the crowded, unsanitary North End to the more fastidious homes in the South. This woman's two children became infected and both died. J. S. Woodsworth, in telling this story ended

it by saying "and that was the hard way this woman learned the lesson that none of us can live unto ourselves."¹

This same philosophy was expressed many years later, in the House of Commons when he said: "If there is one thing that this war has taught the world, it is that no nation lives to itself, as no individual lives to himself, and Canada today can hardly hope for permanent prosperity short of the stability and prosperity of the whole of Europe."²

Sanitation measures in slum areas were conspicuously absent. Houses were crowded together - "yards were divided and subdivided until in some districts there is a perfect labyrinth of hovels, absolutely lacking in sanitary conveniences, and in various stages of dilapidation and decay The household refuse, slops, dishwater, etc., are thrown outside the door to sow the diseases that daily attack the inmates, sending adults to the hospital and babies to the graveyard."³

How to Deal with Conditions

In this contemporary description of Toronto slums, J. S. Woodsworth saw a parallel to the Winnipeg situation. He was aware that it was not only in Winnipeg that great masses of people, due to social and economic forces beyond their control, were living under conditions

1 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 64.

2 J. S. Woodsworth: Dominion of Canada Official Report of Debates - House of Commons, 1922, The King's Printer, Ottawa, vol. 1, p. 85.

3 Kelso, J. J., quoted by J. S. Woodsworth, My Neighbor, p. 214.

that could give no satisfaction to them and no opportunity for the development of sound, responsible citizens - the essential ingredient for producing a healthy and unified nation. He made it a point to become informed about the conditions of people and their problems elsewhere in Canada and the United States; also, to find out how the social problems created by living conditions were being dealt with - by governments, by social agencies, by private philanthropy and by churches. He urged the importance of this, writing in 1910, "surely we should study with the greatest care the economic and social forces that, having created our cities, are determining their destiny."¹

He recognized that such problems, to be dealt with effectively, required coordinated planning at the national level, involving joint efforts of town planning bodies, schools, municipal authorities, public health boards, social workers and an enlightened public.

In 1911, as a step in the direction of dealing with such problems, J. S. Woodsworth gathered together the information which he had been accumulating during his four years at All Peoples Mission. This was published in a book called My Neighbor and a quotation from the author's preface indicates its purpose and method.

It is not designed to be a dispassionate study of the social phenomena of urban life. It is written confessedly from the viewpoint of the Social Worker. Emphasis is placed on crying social needs, and on more recent and perhaps less familiar lines of social effort. For instance, normal home life, the interests of the

¹ Woodsworth, My Neighbor, p. 71.

well-to-do business and professional classes, and the well-established church activities are barely mentioned, not because they are of minor importance, but because the slums of the cities and the struggles of "the workers" and the social reforms are neglected, and on these attention should be concentrated. Free and extensive use has been made of the many excellent books and other publications dealing with city conditions in the United States. Canadians are urged to study these, as we in Canada are just now entering upon a stage of development through which the people of the United States have been passing during the last generation. We can and ought to learn much from their experience. . . .

Quotations are numerous. The author has not set out to "write a book" but rather to present a situation. Wherever possible he has tried to place the study-class "next to" authoritative sources of information. Conditions in Winnipeg are cited most frequently because they are most familiar to the author. But they illustrate social phenomena more or less common to all our cities . . . [the author] may help blaze a trail that will serve an immediate need, and the very inadequacy of which will call forth the best efforts of scientific experts whose far-reaching schemes will then be supported by an awakened and intelligent public interest. Dreams? - Yes, but dreams sometimes come true, and visions are prophetic."¹

My Neighbor is of historical interest as a document in the development of social work in Canada.

In order to make the public aware of conditions and the latest developments in social work to meet these conditions, J. S. Woodsworth drew material from a variety of sources, including such widely different ones as a report of the first convention of the City Improvement League of Montreal (1910), excerpts from History of Trade Unionism by Sidney and Beatrice Webb, and the 1909 report of the Winnipeg Health Department.

¹ Woodsworth, My Neighbor, p. 11-12.

He outlines the structure and function and interprets the work of the Charity Organization Societies. He illustrates this by quoting from the First Annual Report of the Associated Charities of Winnipeg, organized in 1910.

Mr. Woodsworth was associated with the group responsible for starting this organization. Many years later it was taken over by the City of Winnipeg Public Welfare Department and is an active department at this time.¹

Several statements in this report made by Mr. J. Howard T. Falk, General Secretary, point up the social work method of that period:

The Society acts in a three-fold capacity: Firstly to coordinate the work of all other Charities in the city, acting as their clearing house, secondly, as a bureau of investigation for relief cases, and lastly as a relief giving agency. In its relief work the sequence of efforts is to find means by which families may help themselves. . . . scientific charity involves the most careful investigation of the circumstances of the applicant for relief, a systematic recordance of the facts, and an intelligent consideration of the conditions which led to dependency [The social workers] must be fully trained persons having an intimate knowledge of all local institutions for the care of different classes of persons, of hospitals, free dispensaries, of employers of labour, of laws respecting health, child labour, employer's liability, non-support, desertion and other matters.

. . . These [workers] have only sufficient time to diagnose the cases as they occur, and to form a plan of treatment, which if followed will lead to the permanent improvement desired. This improvement will

¹ Information supplied by Judge F. A. E. Hamilton, Welfare Association, Winnipeg - letter dated June 6, 1955.

not be attained unless volunteer friendly visitors can be secured, who taking a personal interest in the families allotted to them, will superintend the treatment with regular friendly visits

. . . We do not want it to be "the fashion" to become a volunteer worker to the Associated Charities; the duty once undertaken must be as sacred as it would be, were the "helper" caring for his or her own family.¹

With reference to the training of social workers, Woodsworth, in 1911, stated that so far, notwithstanding its great importance, we have no institution in Canada which gives special training for social work. Several fine schools have been established in the United States,² in which practical instruction is given to those preparing for what has been termed: "The New Profession".³

My Neighbor also includes excerpts from a variety of reports given at the 1909 and 1910 meetings of the Canadian Confer-

1 Quoted by Woodsworth, J. S., My Neighbor, p. 283 - 286.

2 First Schools of Social Work in the United States:

1898 - Boston - School for Social Workers
Simmons College

1903 - Institute of Social Science
Extension Division, University of Chicago
in 1920 became Graduate School of Social
Service Administration

1904 - New York School of Philanthropy - 1 year course
(later New York School of Social Work)

3 Woodsworth, J. S., op. cit., p. 271.

ence of Charities and Corrections.¹ Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections have also been utilized. Included is a report by Miss Isabella Horton on the work at Hull House, Chicago. Many references are made to and quotations drawn from the work of authorities in the field of social work such as Professor Graham Taylor, President of the 1914 Conference of Charities and Corrections, Walter Rausenbusch of Chicago, Lincoln Steffens, Jane Addams, Richard C. Cabot, M. D., Edward T. Devine, and Mary Richmond, as well as from articles in periodicals such as "The Survey" and publications by the Russell Sage Foundation.

In outlining the types of existing agencies in Canada and the United States for dealing with social problems Woodsworth stated:

The number and variety of philanthropic agencies in our cities is almost bewildering. There are state and municipal institutions of all kinds; public societies for the relief of all sorts and conditions; church and private charities innumerable and with the most extensive ramifications. Immense sums, only a part of which are recorded in Annual Reports, are contributed toward the welfare and uplift of humanity. And yet the needs grow apace. How much of all this effort is wisely directed, and how far it is possible

1 The Canadian Conference of Charities and Corrections was first organized in 1900, in Toronto. Referring to this organization in 1911, Woodsworth said "In Canada we have a so-called Canadian Conference of Charities and Corrections which unfortunately is largely confined to the Province of Ontario." It met in Winnipeg for the first time in 1913.

The present Canadian Conference of Social Work first met from April 24 to April 27, 1928, in Montreal. Chief among those responsible for its organization were Dr. Dawson of McGill University, Mr. J. Howard Falk of Winnipeg and appointed as its first secretary was Miss C. Jean Walker of Toronto.

to relate these various activities, so as to secure the greatest efficiency are matters of the utmost importance to the entire community.¹

This book stressed the essential inter-relatedness of people not only within one city but of all people throughout the country. It was an attempt to call forth efforts at coordinating the work of all groups concerned with human welfare.

As another step in this direction, in 1910, Woodsworth had been responsible for a meeting at All People's Mission which resulted in the formation of the League of Social Service Workers, the aim of which was greater coordination of effort. J. S. Woodsworth was moving gradually in the direction of organized social work as a method of meeting the practical needs of the community.

In relation to this question of coordination in social work, and Woodsworth's attitude and activities in it, a statement made by Stuart Queen twelve years later is of interest:

Of tremendous significance for its [social work's] future are the various movements which aim at bringing together the host of individuals and organizations engaged in social work. Much is being said and done today concerning federation, unification, standardization and other phases of correlation.²

The years spent at All People's Mission were a transition period for Woodsworth. His going there had marked a point of departure in his

1 Woodsworth, J. S., My Neighbor, p. 245.

2 Queen, Stuart Alfred, Social Work in the Light of History, J. B. Lippencott Company, Philadelphia, 1922, p. 31.

thinking. When he had entered the Ministry it was with the aim of bringing about the fellowship of mankind through personal salvation - changing moral and personal habits. His year at Oxford and subsequent years in the Ministry revealed to him that the individual's practical needs had to be met. He went to the Mission to work among the immigrants - to put into practice his belief that all men were equal before God, with a right to a decent living, that friendship and aid must be offered to these New Canadians to help them become a part of the nation. It was at a time when the newcomers from Europe were looked down on generally by their Anglo-Saxon neighbors - "dirty", "ignorant", "lazy" were the common terms of opprobrium used. J. S. Woodsworth saw that if this great increase of population was to be woven into the fabric of Canadian life, practical and immediate steps had to be taken. The step he took was the work of All People's Mission.

The years of experience there revealed a wider vista of need. The complexity of the problems facing him made it clear that attention had to be focused, not just on the individual by individual agency effort, but that it was something which had to be dealt with at the community level, by the community. He wrote, "At least in this world, souls are always incorporated in bodies, and to save a man, you must save his body, soul and spirit. To really save one man, you must transform the community in which he lives."¹

¹ Quoted by MacInnis, Grace, A Man to Remember, p. 91.

Woodsworth still, while at the Mission, looked for leadership in this to come from the Church and he concluded his book, Strangers Within Our Gates, with an urgent appeal to the Church to take up the challenge of saving men, through saving their bodies and their minds as well as their souls.

Later, when My Neighbor was published Woodsworth still had not given up hope that the Church might come forth. But at the same time he was looking for leadership elsewhere and it was during his time at the Mission that he saw the possibility of this coming through organized social work.

In 1911 he had been appointed as Ministerial representative to the Trades and Labour Congress of Winnipeg. Shortly after this he was appointed Chairman of a sub-committee formed to look into the need for technical education for the young men and women in industry. In connection with this he made a tour of some of the main cities of the United States to enquire into the educational methods used there. He made use of this opportunity to visit leading social agencies in Chicago, New York and Boston, in order to obtain as much first-hand information as possible on how social needs were being met.

In 1912, in connection with the work of All People's Mission, Mr. Woodsworth attended the meetings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections in Cleveland and again in 1913 was present at the meetings of the Conference held that year in Seattle. He was one of thirty-four representatives from Canada included in the 1913 member-

ship list of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections.¹

In 1912 Mr. Woodsworth also attended the Canadian Conference of Charities and Corrections and addressed the Conference on the topic "How Can Schools be Put to Wider Uses?"

By this time it was clear to Woodsworth that if the needs of people were to be met, coordination of all existing efforts was necessary, constant study must be carried on to learn how to improve existing services and how to add new ones where a need for this was indicated.

In 1913 a group of Winnipeg citizens met, formed a committee, many of them social workers, and laid out the constitution for an organization to be called the Canadian Welfare League. Dr. J. Halpenny was named as President and J. S. Woodsworth was appointed Executive Secretary.

The purpose of the League was stated as follows:

To make a practical study of Canada's emergent social problems caused by our large and heterogeneous immigration, by the rapid growth of our cities and the stagnation of some of our rural districts and by the beginnings of industrialism and generally our entrance into a fuller national life.²

The plan was to gain citizen participation everywhere. It would

¹ Proceedings of National Conference of Charities and Corrections, Fort Wayne Printing Company, Fort Wayne, 1913.

² MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 88

give counsel and assistance to every community towards federating existing agencies or otherwise planning to make organizations more nearly meet the needs of the people. It aimed at providing trained leaders for social work. The central Bureau would send out bulletins across the country, providing social workers everywhere with up-to-date information on conditions, developments in other areas, and common problems. It would see that lecturers would be available across the country. It would cooperate with service clubs, industrial bureaus, government departments, universities and other educational services.

This was the work that seemed the culmination of all the years of preparation beginning with Woodsworth's first experience on the mission field, followed by the year at Oxford, including the contact with East London Settlement work, then the move beyond the limits of a pulpit ministry to minister to the practical everyday needs of people as well as their spiritual needs. Out of these years of experience grew an awareness that poverty, - both spiritual and physical, illness and ignorance were not in the main, the result of individual weaknesses but rather, that the whole structure of society was at fault; that not one city or one group of people required attention, but that basic needs had to be met everywhere and that costly effort was being wasted without a coordinated plan. He believed that piece-meal attempts would solve nothing. When he saw his way clearly there was nothing for him to do but act. This he did by moving into full time social work. He gave himself completely to the demands of the job, believing that this at last was where his efforts were most needed and where he could give the most; that through this

channel an over-all effort could be made to meet the common problems throughout the country.

In September 1913, the Canadian Conference of Charities and Corrections met outside Ontario for the first time. At the meeting held that year in Winnipeg, the new coordinating agency, the Canadian Welfare League, was given the official blessing of the Conference.

In the fall of 1913 the Secretary was invited to Edmonton to help establish a civic welfare organization there. Lecture tours took him to all the major cities across Canada and the prairie towns and villages were never overlooked. His discussions with the farmers and housewives in the little rural schoolhouses brought him close to this section of the people. He came to know and to understand their readiness for ideas and idealism. In their interest he prepared a handbook on Studies in Rural Citizenship designed to be used for study groups among the farm people. This booklet was authorized by the Canadian Council of Agriculture.

His lectures were well received by every audience whether it was farmers in the country school house or business men at a civic luncheon or students in the university. The reason for this has been given as the fact that he always felt that his listeners were an indispensable part of the cause for which he was speaking. His unwavering faith in his listeners conveyed to them a faith in themselves and in their ability to participate in solving their own and their country's problems. This faith in people and their ability to work out their own

destiny remained with him all his years and was as much a part of his influence during his parliamentary career as it was when as a beginning preacher he went about his parish duties.

His tours in connection with the League, included consultation with social workers and social agency administrators across the country. This first year of extensive travel and contact with social agencies, showed Woodsworth the great need for trained social workers and the lack of the same.

In the summer of 1914, he set up a "Short Training Class in Social Work" and secured specialists in the field to help in conducting it. The same was repeated the following summer. This was evidently the first attempt at professional training for social workers in Canada. In 1915, the University of Toronto opened its Department of Social Science and J. S. Woodsworth was one of its first lecturers, his topics being, "Rural Life in Canada" and "Immigration".¹

In 1915 Woodsworth gave, among numerous other talks to varied audiences in Montreal, a series of Extension lectures at McGill University, on Canadian Immigration Problems.

The second Annual Report of the Canadian Welfare League made by the Secretary in the fall of 1915 indicates the volume and the kind of work undertaken. The year's work had included 260 public addresses

¹ Miss Agnes MacGregor, formerly of the School of Social Work, University of Toronto, recalls that Mr. Woodsworth also lectured at the School on occasion after his experience as a longshoreman, letter dated January, 1955.

given before organizations of students, business men, farmers, women, social workers, church groups and miscellaneous groups such as the Canadian Club, labour groups and service organizations.

The aim of awakening the interest of the people of the nation in their own problems and of stimulating them to become sufficiently well informed to deal intelligently with these problems was the keynote throughout the lecture tours and addresses.

In 1916, due to the drain of the war effort on all private funds, the Canadian Welfare League had to close for lack of financial support. The value of the work being done, however, had been sufficiently demonstrated to result in the combined governments of the three prairie provinces assuming responsibility for sponsoring a successor to the Canadian Welfare League. Thus the Bureau of Social Research came into being with J. S. Woodsworth as its Secretary. The work which had been begun under private auspices had now been undertaken as a governmental responsibility and there seemed even broader scope for bringing to reality the dreams which J. S. Woodsworth had referred to in My Neighbor. In the words of one of his associates of that period:

When in 1916, Mr. Woodsworth organized and became the Secretary of the Bureau of Social Research, established by the Manitoba Government, it seemed as though his capacity for dynamic leadership was at last to be given full scope.¹

¹ Miss Ethel Johns, letter dated May 19, 1955.

After nine months' work, the Secretary presented, on December 18, 1916, a report of his work.

It included three prairie-wide surveys. One, a survey of rural communities had been made with the help of rural teachers, clergymen and Womens' Institutes. Another was a preliminary report on a survey of mental defectives in the three provinces. The third was a careful study of Ukrainians in Western Canada, made by a house to house canvass of over five hundred Ukrainian homes and great numbers of questionnaires to persons with information. . . . the secretary had given 124 public addresses and scores of interviews. Then it outlined plans for the coming year's work, including an inquiry into child welfare, a study of social conditions among the Germans in Western Canada, and a study of the effect of anti-crime legislation.¹

The plans were never put into effect. Only a few days after the report was made J. S. Woodsworth received a circular from the Federal Government seeking help in putting forward the new scheme of National Service Registration. National Service Registration was just one step away from conscription for military service, in J. S. Woodsworth's mind. His convictions about war, his belief in the inalienable rights of self-determination for all people, regardless of economic status, or cultural background, made it impossible for him to do other than refuse to condone any move in the direction of conscription. Accordingly he made public reply to the circular. He was summoned to appear before the Cabinet Minister to whom he was responsible. When he maintained his position of refusal to support the National Service scheme he was advised of his dismissal and the Bureau of Social Research

¹ MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 96.

was closed on January 31, 1916.

Despite the fact that this seemed the end of the dreams which had shown such promise of fulfillment, in spite of the sacrifices, and the disappointments involved, J. S. Woodsworth's convictions compelled him to follow the truth as he saw it, to take a stand against war, and remain true to the ideals which were part and parcel of his being.

While many of his associates shunned him because of his pacifism, some felt indignation at his dismissal and the cancelling out of the social work undertaken. Some indication of this is given in the following statement made by one of his contemporaries:

I shared the indignation of his friends. After all, it was he who had organized the first course for social workers in Canada, it was he who had written such books as The Stranger Within our Gates, and My Neighbor which had meant so much to all of us. Like him, I admired and respected the hardy men and women, contemptuously labelled the "Polacks", the "Hunkies", the "Wops" and the "Yids" and who, like ourselves, lived and worked in "the North End". It was he who taught us to know them for what they really were - the many-coloured threads in the rich fabric of our national life.¹

Just how great the influence of J. S. Woodsworth was during these years of close contact with social workers across the country, cannot be estimated. Social work appears to have kept silence in regard to his contribution. This investigation has failed to find any reference to his activities or to the Canadian Welfare League or the

¹ Miss Ethel Johns, letter dated May 19, 1955.

Bureau of Social Research in the available professional literature relating to developments of social work in Canada. Letters written to the professional organizations have failed to draw out any information. And, during the last decade of active association in the profession, the writer has heard no mention made of his work.

In view of his wide-spread and comprehensive activities, his scientific approach to social problems which is in line with the most progressive attitudes in the profession today, this is noteworthy. This silence may be rooted in two factors: first that shortly after leaving social work he became a controversial political figure and Canadian social work of the period has tended to stand "afar off" from political action; secondly, his unpopular position on the question of war.

In spite of the lack of concrete evidence, one can be certain that one of J. S. Woodsworth's calibre, of his vision, of his devotion to the cause of a better life for all people, and his faith in people to achieve this, together with a painstaking, thorough factual approach, left its mark on his associates and the field of social work.

This conclusion is given weight by the following statement offered by one of his contemporaries in an allied profession, and who was well acquainted with his work:

The specific pioneer contributions made to social welfare by James Woodsworth, while valuable in themselves, were not nearly as important as the intangible influence that he exercised over young men and women who were looking for leadership in the various branches of what was then a relatively new field.¹

¹ Miss Ethel Johns, one-time Superintendent of Children's Hospital, Winnipeg, and later Director of School of Nursing, University of British Columbia - letter dated May 19, 1955.

CHAPTER III

PARLIAMENTARY YEARS - 1922 - 1941

J. S. Woodsworth's exit from social work was unplanned, unexpected and unwanted. His entry into the ranks of the working man on Vancouver's waterfront was out of necessity, with no other employment available. His arrival in Winnipeg on the eve of the General Strike in June 1919 was coincidental - a scheduled stop in the itinerary of a speaking tour across the prairies arranged by the Labour Church in Winnipeg. He was on the scene when Labour and vested interests clashed, openly, with physical violence. The rights of not only the workers but all future citizens of the country were at stake when the Federal Government took precipitate police and legislative action to deal with the strikers. All his previous association with working people - with immigrants, farmers, longshoremen - together with his firm convictions about the rights of all persons, made Woodsworth their natural and logical spokesman in a time of crisis. His fearless action in the strike situation, his readiness to stand firmly on his conviction, to the point of incurring arrest and detainment in jail, and throughout the entire episode, his consistent attempts at peaceful, reasonable settlement of the issues at stake, showed him to be one whom the people of Winnipeg could trust and look to for leadership. In the next Dominion elections held in December, 1921, James S. Woodsworth was returned as Independent Labour Member for Winnipeg Centre.

Legislative career planned? Foreseen? No, not by J. S.

Woodsworth; but prepared for? Yes, by years of diligent, faithful and consistent effort to become knowledgeable about, to understand and to serve, in the most intelligent way possible, the country and the people in whom he believed so completely. As he had been ready to move out of the church and into social work when it seemed clear that this was the way to make his contribution, so now he was ready to move into a political career. But still the same motivations directed him and he still held to the same ultimate goal.

Since election to Parliament was the direct outcome of Woodsworth's involvement in the General Strike, some attention should be given to the issues which were involved.

Winnipeg Strike

The strike, stemming from exploitation of workers by large industry, represented the antagonism which existed following the war, between, on the one hand, rapidly expanding commercial and industrial enterprise, and on the other, labour. The latter, as a result of its important war contribution was no longer willing to be pushed aside.

When two particular unions went on strike, others joined them in sympathy. Large numbers of veterans, many unemployed also sided with Labour. J. S. Woodsworth, from the time of his arrival in Winnipeg, attempted to bring about conciliation of the disputes. He made it clear that his sympathies were with Labour but he nevertheless tried to negotiate on amicable, reasonable terms with the captains of industry.

In a public letter he pointed out the importance of seeing the issues from both sides and emphasized the fact that, among both the employers and the strikers there were reasonable, thinking men. In spite of having expressed a sound reasonable point of view in this letter, it was one of the articles which later drew a charge of seditious libel.

All attempts at mediation failed. The Minister of Justice and the Minister of Labour visited the scene of the strike on May 24, and the former issued a statement to the effect that the strike was unjustified. Immediately following this, the Federal Government enacted legislation permitting deportation of aliens without trial by jury, and arrest of persons on suspicion of belonging to an organization deemed illegal. The strike leaders, on the authority of this legislation, were jailed. The editor of the strike bulletin was also arrested. Woodsworth filled in immediately as editor and kept the Western Labour News reaching the public. The strikers continued to hold out and the Western Labour News consistently advised the strikers to refrain from any acts of violence but to hold to their wage demands. In one newspaper article he urged the public to stop trying to place blame and instead to turn their attention to attempts towards discovery and removal of the causes that had produced the strike and which would produce more serious ones if not dealt with now.

On June 21, a parade was organized by a committee of war veterans and it quickly became a mass gathering of strikers and onlookers. Mounted police attempted to break up the gathering. They charged into the crowd, swinging clubs and creating terror on all sides. Soldiers

with rifles and machine guns appeared before the City Hall where the crowd finally dispersed. Two deaths resulted and a hundred other persons suffered injuries.

The next issue of the Western Labour News carried an editorial protesting the police action. It also urged the Government to take immediate action to investigate the strikers' grievances. On June 23, J. S. Woodsworth was arrested on charges of seditious libel and was confined to the provincial jail in Winnipeg. The counts on which the charges were laid are set out in a booklet, now out of print, entitled The King vs J. S. Woodsworth.¹ Two of these were direct quotations from the Book of Isaiah, another was a speech outlining the platform of the British Labour Party, and two others were editorials which were written by someone else.

The trials began at the end of 1919, at the Fall Assizes. Before J. S. Woodsworth had to stand trial the charges against him were dropped.

Woodsworth had witnessed the ease with which civil rights could be threatened. He realized that the legislation which had been passed to combat the strike situation was, and would continue to be, a threat to civil liberties of all Canadians as long as the law remained on the statute books. On election to Parliament he immediately began working to have this legislation cancelled.

1. See Appendix C

CIVIL RIGHTS REFORM

The legislation in question involved Amendments to the Immigration Act and to the Criminal Code, in the latter instance being referred to as Section 98. Both these pieces of legislation passed the House of Commons and the Senate in less than an hour in 1919. Such was the hysteria in Government circles, aroused by the General Strike.

Immigration Act

The Amendment to the Immigration Act permitted the deportation of any immigrant, British-born or otherwise, regardless of the length of time he or she had lived in Canada and without a trial. The basis for deportation needed to consist only of the decision of appointed Immigration Department officials that the person was undesirable. This was calculated to be a way of getting rid of the strike leaders. Public opinion held the view that the strike was inspired by Russia and some foreigners were arrested on the supposition that they had contact with Russian authorities. J. S. Woodsworth stated that there was not one foreigner in a position of leadership in the strike and that arrests of this kind were falsely contributing to the wave of hysteria.

That the abuses to which such legislation could be put were endless, was clearly seen by Woodsworth as soon as the law was passed. In his first Session in the House of Commons, in January 1922, he moved an amendment to deal with this and Section 98 of the Criminal Code. The issue was sidetracked by the appointment of a special committee to study

the matter. Toward the end of the Session, Mr. Woodsworth enquired about the outcome of the study. The answer given by the Committee was that the entire Immigration Act needed revision and therefore that it was useless to make further amendments at this time.

Woodsworth did not let the matter rest. It was 1926 however, when the Labour members held the balance of power in the House, before he was finally successful in urging the Government to take action. A letter written by the Prime Minister to the Independent Labour member for Winnipeg Centre gave assurance that legislation on this issue would be introduced later in the Session. This did happen and the proposed legislation to amend the Act passed the House of Commons but was blocked by the Senate. This was repeated several times but steadily and insistently Woodsworth kept the matter before the House. In 1928 the Amendment was finally repealed.

This did not end the efforts of the member for Winnipeg Centre in the cause of the rights of immigrant peoples. During the depression years, with great numbers of persons unable to get work, the Government availed itself of the opportunity to deport many persons who were unable to support themselves and therefore were a public charge. Mr. Woodsworth found by going after facts and figures to substantiate his case, as was his usual procedure, that in two and a half years nearly 10,000 persons had been deported because of being unable to maintain themselves. Some of these, he proved had been in Canada as long as 18 years, with no remaining ties in the Old Country. The consequent disruption of families was a severe hardship. In 1933, J. S. Woodsworth introduced an amendment

which would guarantee that persons forced to accept unemployment relief would not automatically become liable to deportation. The amendment was not followed up by the House.

Evidence came to light that men were being arrested, without a warrant and literally spirited away from their own cities to some point of embarkation where a routine enquiry would be made into the charges held against them, without any opportunity for the person so charged to produce witnesses or defend himself in any way. Legally the machinery was there to allow him to plead his case, but the practical difficulty involved in bringing witnesses as much as 3000 miles was insurmountable. This meant that persons were being deported on the basis of decisions reached by, at times, only a one-man enquiry. J. S. Woodsworth brought such evidence before the House of Commons with all details and facts provided. He protested the practice thus:

. . . if he has committed any offense against the Criminal Code, by all means let him be tried, convicted and deported if we can deport him. I am not arguing against deportation for cause, but let him have a trial,¹

In 1935, the arrest and deportation of persons suspected of Communist affiliations came to the attention of Mr. Woodsworth. Newspaper accounts cited an instance where an editor of a Finnish paper in Sudbury had been arrested in a raid on the newspaper office and police headquarters refused to give information as to his whereabouts.

1 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1932, vol. 3, p. 2686.

Attorney General Price of Ontario admitted to the newspaper that this person had been removed on suspicion of subversive activities and that as a protective measure for Canadians all such would be deported. J. S. Woodsworth warned the House against such methods:

You condemn the Communists . . . but let me warn you that actions of this kind are doing more than all the Communists in the country can do to undermine faith in British institutions.¹

Later when the question was still under debate he expressed the conviction that:

. . . . the place to defeat Communism in a democratic country is at the ballot box . . . and not by arresting people who do not agree with our political opinions.²

The Criminal Code

Section 98 of the Criminal Code permitted the arrest of any person on suspicion and required him to prove his innocence, a reversal of traditional British law which maintains that a man is innocent until proven guilty. Under this Amendment, a person could be sentenced up to twenty years if he could not prove that he did not belong to an unlawful organization. This was the second piece of legislation attacked by Woodsworth on his entrance to Parliament. It met with the same response as the proposed repeal of the Amendment to the Immigration Act. In 1926

1 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1932, vol. 3, p. 2690-1.

2 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1935, vol. 4, p. 4128

Mackenzie King had given his assurance to Woodsworth, in a letter, that this too would be dealt with in the current session of the legislature. It was brought before the House but was defeated and even two years later, when the Immigration Amendment was repealed, Section 98 remained on the statute books.

Until 1931, Section 98 had not been used. In the autumn of 1931, under its authority, five members of the Communist Party were tried and sentenced to five years in Kingston Penitentiary. Woodsworth saw that what could be used against the Communists at one time could be used against someone else at another. Section 98 meant, in effect, curtailment of freedom of speech and freedom of thought. In a time of crisis under it no one would be assured of liberty.

Therefore early in the next Parliamentary session Woodsworth again proposed his amendments. His motion was defeated as was a second one put forward a few days later. As a result of his stand, he came under fire from many members of the House as being a supporter of the Communists. On the other hand, because of his avowed refusal to accept or support any social change brought about through violence, he drew the fire of the Communist sympathizers. None of this altered in even the slightest degree his continued efforts to have freedom of thought guaranteed for all, enemy or friend. This attitude is clearly indicated in his words spoken at the conclusion of the debate on his motion:

A number of the ideas of the Communist party are not my ideas, but that does not mean to say that I should try to have them suppressed by force. If one set of opinions is suppressed by force, it will be only a

matter of time until other ideas are similarly suppressed. So that even though the Communists are bitterly opposed to us, we will stand for freedom of speech, and I trust that in this position we shall be joined by a great many other citizens.¹

Ernest Lapointe, Minister of Justice, was one of those who shared this point of view. As a result, he presented a bill to repeal the Amendment. This time the House of Commons accepted it but it was defeated in the Senate. In the 1931 elections, the Liberal Government was turned out of office and during the following five years the Conservative Government gave no support to such a view. In 1936, with the return of the Liberals to power, Ernest Lapointe was again appointed Minister of Justice. In the first Session, he put forward another bill to repeal Section 98. This time it passed both Houses. From 1922 to 1936 J. S. Woodsworth had battled continuously to make the Government and the people aware of the dangers of such legislation and to have it removed from the Statute book. While the final bill was introduced by the Liberal Government, there is no doubt that the constant pressure which Woodsworth brought to bear through the years had much to do with finally getting rid of the amendment which constituted such a threat to civil liberty.

Woodsworth was constantly alert to the dangers of the loss of civil rights in any area. In the first session of the House he also protested against the secret activities of the Royal Canadian Mounted Police; against their methods of gaining information about labour

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., quoted by MacInnis, Grace, A Man to Remember p. 203.

organizations, their part in the trouble at the time of the Winnipeg strike. He protested their action in entering homes without a warrant on suspicion of subversive activities. Always he backed up such cases with provable factual material. He protested the seizure and confiscation of property of persons belonging to so called unlawful organizations. In one debate early in 1932 he said:

. . . that there should be a search without any warrant, and a seizure without any conviction does not seem to be in keeping with the best British traditions.¹

He fought the infamous Padlock Bill of Quebec during the late "thirties" and scorned the Federal Government's refusal to take notice of the seriousness of the nature of this bill. He urged, in 1937 and 1938, that there be recourse to the Supreme Court to find out whether this Provincial bill could be disallowed by the Dominion Legislature.

Rights of Minorities

The enfranchisement of minority groups was another battle which J. S. Woodsworth waged. In 1923 the Independent Labour Member for Winnipeg Centre had asked why Orientals of British Columbia should not have the vote the same as everyone else. His question was disregarded. In 1934 the Conservative Government, under R. B. Bennett had passed legislation which disfranchised all Doukhobors in British Columbia and their descendants in perpetuity. The reason given for this was the

1 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1932, vol. 1, p. 843.

refusal on the part of the Doukhobors to give information in connection with the national census. J. S. Woodsworth spoke against this legislation immediately and introduced an amendment to eliminate the discrimination from the Franchise Act. The amendment was defeated by a large majority. During the debate, Woodsworth indicated his position with regard to equal rights for all people, in these words:

I protest very decidedly against Dominion legislating following the lines of some one particular province. It seems to me that if we are acting here on behalf of the Dominion at large, our legislation should be uniform, and there should be no exception of any kind for the prejudices of some one particular province. I have felt that way for a long time with regard to the practical disfranchisement of Orientals on the Coast. If an Oriental in Alberta or Saskatchewan may vote, I think the Oriental ought to be able to vote in British Columbia¹

When the question was put to him by a member of the Government as to whether or not he was in favour of enfranchising Orientals in British Columbia, his reply was "I am in favour of enfranchising Orientals in B. C."²

In the election campaign of the following year this statement was picked up by one of the other political parties and the whole issue of racial discrimination in British Columbia became central in the campaign in that province. Thus at the beginning of the 1936 session of the House it was a lively issue for debate. Summing up his own position and that of his party, Mr. Woodsworth said:

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1934, vol. 4, p. 4206.

² Loc. cit.

Surely it is not a good thing to have in our midst a subject race, as well educated as we are, many of them better educated, because the Japanese are not an inferior people - it is not, I say, a good thing for us to have such people here trying to earn a precarious living while excluded from a great many occupations, and with a rankling sense of injustice because they are not granted full rights of British citizenship.¹

It was 1948 before the franchise was granted to the Orientals in British Columbia and J. S. Woodsworth did not live to see it become a reality.

Respect for Differences

In 1931 the Doukhobors were creating a new problem for the Dominion Government. As a method of expressing resistance to civil regulations they were staging a series of nude parades. The Government attempted to enact legislation by which such action could be controlled. Many years before Mr. Woodsworth had moved into a Parliamentary career, he had gained considerable understanding of and sympathy for the Doukhobors. With the Sons of Freedom branch of the sect he did not sympathize and could not condone their methods of violence and destruction but he realized that this group did not represent the majority of the people. Peter Veregin, the first leader of the Doukhobor group in Canada, had visited in the Woodsworth home and Mr. Woodsworth had lived for two weeks in the community of this religious sect. Mr. Woodsworth held a deep respect for the courage and the adherence of these people to their religious convictions and faith.

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., quoted by MacInnis, Grace, A Man to Remember p. 212.

When the Government proposed legislation to deal with the current problem much levity was evident in the remarks that were bandied about the House. J. S. Woodsworth was not willing that this group of people should be treated with so little respect, understanding and recognition of the fundamental reasons behind their behaviour. In a lengthy speech, he put clearly to the House the historic background, the cultural patterns and the religious convictions which had made them willing to withstand persecution through the centuries and across the world. He pointed out the difference between the Sons of Freedom, and the main body of the Doukhobors; stating that only one in twenty belonged to this sub-group. He pointed out that he was not condoning the behaviour in the present situation but he firmly believed that legislating against them would never bring about any solution to the problem nor a reconciliation of their differences. He urged another approach:

What we have to do is in some way learn to understand these people, understand their point of view, do a good deal of educational work among them, and not consider that merely by repressive measures we will overcome these deep-seated religious instincts and social practices which have been prevalent among this particular group for at least several centuries.¹

2 AMENDING CANADA'S CONSTITUTION

Economic and social changes which had taken place in Canada during the preceding two decades had produced conditions, by 1922, which

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1931, vol. 4, p. 4145.

Woodsworth saw could be coped with only by means of social legislation. He found too, that under the British North America Act, the Canadian Parliament apparently had no power to implement such. His suggestions for social welfare measures were continually being blocked by claims that any such move by the Federal Government would be unconstitutional. In the 1924 Session, with reference to the need for amendment to the British North America Act, he stated:

. . . during my short experience in this House, on a number of occasions we have been faced with very practical difficulties which, it would seem, make necessary some such resolution as this. Again and again we have been told that we were not capable of passing certain legislation because this came within the jurisdiction of one of the various provinces. It is for these practical reasons that I have been wondering how it would be possible to introduce measures which would enable us to make our administration more efficient.¹

This struggle for constitutional reform was one which Woodsworth carried on from the beginning to the end of his twenty years in political activity.

The suggestion that Canada should have completely responsible government to the extent of having power to amend her own constitution brought opposition from Liberals and Conservatives alike. On March 20, 1924, Woodsworth proposed a motion which read:

That, in the opinion of this House, the governing powers of Canada as constituted by the British North America Act as amended and altered from time to time hereafter, ought to possess under the British Crown the same powers with regard to Canada, its affairs and its people as the Parliament of Great Britain possesses in

1 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1924, vol 1, p. 508.

regard to Great Britain, its affairs and its people.¹

In the lengthy and heated debate which followed, it seemed evident that neither Government nor opposition were willing to trust themselves or their fellow-Canadians with the ultimate power of altering their own Constitution. There was fear, on the part of many that loss of provincial rights would follow, fear by Quebec members of loss of religious and educational safeguards for French-speaking minorities, fear on the part of others merely of altering the status quo. The motion received no support and Mr. Woodsworth withdrew it.

Safeguarding Minority and Provincial Rights

In 1925 another attempt was made. This time an Ontario Conservative proposed a motion to empower the Federal Government to change the British North America Act but "not to pass any amendment affecting the rights guaranteed in the said Act to minorities."² Woodsworth followed this up with an amendment to the motion, calculated to forestall objections from those who were standing firm on the question of provincial rights. His Amendment included a rider that the unanimous consent of all the provinces be obtained before making any change in the Act governing Canada's Constitution. The House was advised that even the request for such could not be made without the consent of all the provinces. Again

1 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1924, vol. 1, p. 508.

2 MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 180.

the motion was withdrawn.

In 1927 Mr. Woodsworth raised the issue once more. He asked that a Committee be formed to consider amendments which would conserve the principles of Confederation, but would make possible the enactment of legislation to more adequately cope with the complicated problems existing in Canada at that time. After a debate which lasted a half day the matter was dropped.

In 1931, with the depression having already hit Canada hard and with every indication that conditions would become worse, Mr. Woodsworth tried again to have removed the barrier which stood in the way of dealing effectively with Canada's social problems. The new situation confronting Canada, he insisted, demanded a new approach; maintaining the status quo could do nothing but lead to greater difficulties. Therefore he proposed another motion:

That, in the opinion of this House it is desirable that Canada should have the right to amend her own Constitution, but that in proceeding to make any amendment, scrupulous care should be taken to safeguard the rights of minorities.¹

He proposed that the statute empowering Canada to amend the British North America Act should set forth clearly in a preamble certain things that would remain inviolate, the minority religious, educational and language rights to be included. He urged the calling of a Constitutional Conference with representatives of the Provincial and Federal Governments

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., quoted by MacInnis, Grace, A Man to Remember, p. 181.

where the questions could be discussed in detail to the satisfaction of all. Once again opposition and lack of support resulted in withdrawal of the motion.

By 1935 the world depression had created still greater havoc in the economic and social life of Canada. The complexity of the situation was furthered by the lack of clarity between Federal and Provincial responsibilities. Uniformity in social and labour legislation was essential in a country which had become so inter-dependent. A Constitution which had suited a collection of self-sufficient units such as Canada was in 1867, was far from meeting the requirements of a country which had developed a great industrial network. What happened to the miners in Nova Scotia affected the miners in Alberta and Ontario, what happened to the wheat farmers in Saskatchewan had repercussions throughout the entire country. Again J. S. Woodsworth sought support for the right of Canada to amend her Constitution in order to make possible the enactment of unified social legislation. This time he urged the setting up of a committee which would study the Act and bring in recommendations for amendments which would protect minority rights and legitimate provincial claims to autonomy and, at the same time, allow the Federal Government to deal with economic problems which were national in scope.¹ The House agreed to the motion but the Committee was not set up.

In 1937, M. J. Coldwell, C. C. F. Member, put forward a motion asking for a special committee to recommend specific amendments.

¹ Hansard, 1935, vol. 1, p. 217.

Woodsworth supported it but the motion was lost. It was only a short time later, however, that the Rowell - Sirois Commission was appointed by the Liberal Government to study the whole area of Dominion - Provincial relations. This report, when presented in 1940, indicated the pressing need for constitutional changes along the lines which had been advocated by Woodsworth for years.

Canada Comes of Age

It was not until after his death that the motion which Mr. Woodsworth had first made in 1924, and repeatedly thereafter, bore fruit. In 1949, the British Parliament granted Canada the right to amend the British North America Act.

J. S. Woodsworth was the one who most consistently had fostered the growth of the nation to a point of maturity from which it could finally accept responsibility for complete self-government and autonomy. And when the petition was made to the King for this right, the final form embodied those aspects which Mr. Woodsworth's motions had set forward many years earlier.

3 SOCIAL REFORM LEGISLATION

That Canada had made some provision for Old Age Security as early as 1927 is directly attributable to J. S. Woodsworth. In 1919 the desirability of state insurance against unemployment, sickness, invalidity, and old age had been indicated by a National Industrial Committee. The Liberal Party Convention at the same time endorsed a resolution calling

for the Federal Government to institute a system of social insurance in conjunction with the provincial government. In 1921 a motion was proposed by a Liberal member that the Government should consider ways and means of establishing Old Age pensions in Canada. The House passed this motion but nothing was done about it.

In the 1922 session Woodsworth questioned the Government about what had happened to this motion and was told that the Committee had not come to a favourable decision on the matter. In 1924 a special committee was appointed by the Prime Minister to consider an Old Age Pension scheme for Canada, in consultation with each of the provinces. A year later, in response to questioning, the Minister of Labour advised that as Quebec province had been unwilling to consider the plan nothing further could be done.

The 1925 elections resulted in Conservatives and Liberals holding approximately equal power in the House. Thus the two Labour members and the Progressives held the balance of power. The Labour members were quick to recognize their favourable position and to put it to use. Early in the 1926 session of Parliament, J. S. Woodsworth spoke as follows:

We have been pressing during the past four years for a number of measures that would to some extent meet the needs of Labour. Among all these there were two very urgent measures that we kept dinning into the ears of this Parliament in season and out of season. One was old age pensions and the other was relief for unemployed. Some of the papers have characterized us as Labour Communists. Well, if it is anything very bad to desire to look after the old people and to care for the unemployed, we are quite willing to be placed in that class. When we came to this parliament, even before the Speech from the Throne was read, my colleague

and I decided to find out what the attitude of the various parties was with regard to these measures. We wrote the following letter to the Right Honourable W. L. Mackenzie King, the Prime Minister, on the 7th of January:

Dear Mr. King,

As representatives of Labour in the House of Commons, may we ask whether it is your intention to introduce at this session a) provision for the unemployed, b) Old Age Pensions.

We are venturing to send a similar enquiry to the leader of the opposition.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) J. S. Woodsworth
A. A. Heaps

. . . Mr. Mackenzie King was good enough to give us the opportunity to present our case in detail, and to-day I received from him the . . . letter which I should like to place on Hansard.¹

This reply from Mr. King included a statement declaring the Government's intention to introduce Old Age Pension legislation during the following session and to carry out unemployment relief measures similar to those in effect immediately following the war. The letter also referred to a previous personal interview between Mr. King, Mr. Woodsworth and Mr. Heaps when these matters were discussed in some detail.

The Throne Speech made on January 8 had made no intimation of any such legislation being considered. The Prime Minister recognized that his Government could be either forced to resign or to call a general election if outvoted in the House. That the Labour members were in a

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1926, vol. 1, p. 560-1.

position to bring this about was clear.

The proposed legislation was presented and passed by the House of Commons but was defeated in the Senate. The following year the Senate also passed the bill. Thus on March 31, 1927, Canada announced its first social security legislation which provided Old Age Assistance of twenty dollars monthly for all persons seventy years of age or over, who complied with the means test required.

It was during the negotiations in 1926, over Old Age Pension legislation that, in private, Mr. King offered J. S. Woodsworth a Cabinet post as Minister of Labour. He refused the offer, stating that he believed that he could serve the people better as an Independent Labour Member. This story was not made public until many years later and even the Woodsworth family had been unaware of the incident. The Labour Member had indeed held power over the Liberal Government. But this power had been used to the advantage of the people - the aged - those whom he referred to during the debate as "my friends" - and in no degree was the position used for self-advancement.

Divorce Courts for Ontario

Another piece of social legislation directly resulting from Mr. Woodsworth's efforts was that which established divorce courts for Ontario. The latter province and Quebec were the only two in the Dominion which still obtained divorces by means of private bills passed by the Federal Government. In 1928 J. S. Woodsworth became acutely aware of the impracticalities and the injustices involved in this procedure.

During the 1928 Session of Parliament a particularly large number of divorce bills were being presented. The Prime Minister suggested by-passing the usual legislative procedure and passing these "en masse". J. S. Woodsworth objected. He believed that every divorce petition should be passed on its individual merits. He believed that each case merited attention to details, such as provision for dependents. He also was fully aware that, if this procedure was followed, no other business would be handled during the Session. Clearly, then, it was a function which Parliament should not be serving. But as long as it was Parliament's duty he planned to see that the obligation was properly discharged. Another factor which caused him concern was that persons involved in the divorces were under considerable additional expense through having to bring witnesses to Ottawa. For those on low incomes this was an unfair burden.

The procedure which Woodsworth followed to ensure action being taken to have Courts established in Ontario was to insist upon discussion of the details and merits of each divorce case presented. He advised the House that he would continue this procedure as long as it remained Parliament's responsibility to handle divorce cases. In the Session the following year, 1929, J. S. Woodsworth proposed a bill to provide in the province of Ontario for the dissolution and annulment of marriage. The bill did not carry. Woodsworth continued his tactics of questioning every case as it was presented. Eventually the Prime Minister promised that some means would be undertaken, during the next session, to provide for divorce courts in Ontario. The 1930 Session came but the Government made

no indication of following through with the promised action. Mr. Woodsworth again put forward the bill as proposed in 1929. Despite considerable opposition, the bill received a second hearing and was passed by a vote of one hundred to eighty-five.

The volumes of Hansard from 1922 to 1940 are richly coloured with the words, often seeming to stand out as though in bold print, with which J. S. Woodsworth consistently voiced a concern for bringing about a fuller life for the common people everywhere. He pointed up the needs and conditions of labourers across the country, whether from the mines of Cape Breton, the fishing fleets of Nova Scotia, the wheat farms of Saskatchewan or the logging camps of Ontario and British Columbia. He spoke for the small business man, the civil servant, the white-collar worker. He spoke for minority groups everywhere - whether French or Semitic, Ukrainian or Doukhobor, Oriental or East Indian. The words were always backed up by hard cold facts, the product of intensive, thorough and detailed study into every situation with which he dealt.

Bridging the Gap Between Parliament and People

As he had been close to the people when at All People's Mission and the Canadian Welfare League, so he continued throughout his Parliamentary years. He felt that it was impossible to legislate wisely without knowing how the people lived, and this meant all Canadians everywhere. He urged this as a method to be followed by other members of the House also:

I would seriously suggest that the Prime Minister and the other Ministers be forced to spend some six months of each year going in and out among the people until they find out what the condition of the people really is and what the people are thinking. They seem to be so isolated from the life of the common people that they have no conception whatsoever of actual conditions.¹

In this, Woodsworth was not suggesting something which he did not follow himself. When the House was not in session he was travelling from coast to coast, addressing large gatherings, talking with small groups in rural schoolhouses and discussing social and economic problems with small groups of intellectuals. His aim was always to awaken the people to the possibilities of their own participation in determining the affairs and social progress of their own community.

An example of these trips is given by an incident occurring in 1922. When the House adjourned for the Easter recess Mr. Woodsworth went at once to talk with the Nova Scotia miners who had been involved in a prolonged strike against British Empire Steel Corporation. Before the recess, through the persistence and determination of the two Labour Members the Government had agreed to make provision for an on-the-spot investigation into the circumstances causing the strike. The Dominion Conciliation Board would carry this out. This did not make Woodsworth feel it any the less necessary for him to find out conditions at first hand. He visited the families, saw for himself the plight they were in and talked with them individually and in groups. He pointed up the part they could play in determining conditions by appointing their own

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., quoted by MacInnis, Grace, A Man to Remember p. 253.

candidates for election.

On return to Ottawa, Mr. Woodsworth's concern for the immediate needs of these families was great enough that he was able to enlist the interest of a group of Ottawa women to send clothing and food to these families as an emergency measure. These women were from a well-to-do, socially prominent section of the community and politically they were opposed to Mr. Woodsworth. In spite of this, his sincerity and genuine concern for the suffering of people in a concrete life situation, bridged the differences between them. The potentialities of this group of women as helpers were called forth by his concern for others and by his readiness to seek help wherever it could be made available.

Just as he urged the miners' families to use their democratic privileges to participate in the affairs of the nation, so he urged this group of Ottawa socialites to participate in meeting the needs of a group widely removed from them, geographically, socially, economically and culturally. It was all part of his ability to see the totality of the country, the inter-relatedness of all people and the basic fact that any social change requires the participation of every group and every individual.

Woodsworth was never blind to the suffering of people anywhere. He made every effort to meet immediate needs wherever possible, at the same time seeing far into the future and taking every possible step to ensure conditions which would guarantee at least a minimum of security for all. He was a visionary, he did see farther into the future than

many of his contemporaries but at the same time he never overlooked the practical need of the moment and the realities of life as experienced by the common people everywhere.

Prison Reform

Another illustration of Woodsworth's readiness to deal with immediate and practical situations as the need presented itself, was the part he played in bringing about changes in prison conditions which were being disclosed to the light of day.

For some years the condition of Canada's penal institutions had been under question by various groups and individuals. During the "twenties" there was a series of riots in several penitentiaries. In 1932, shortly after several Communist leaders had been sentenced to Kingston penitentiary, a new outbreak of riots occurred. The trials resulting from this brought to light evidence that the prisoners had just cause for grievance but nothing remedial was done. During the Kingston riots, one of the guards had fired a shot into the cell of one of the Communist prisoners. The warden and guard involved in his action had been discharged but no further investigation into the matter was reported. At the end of the 1934 Parliamentary session, when the matter of allocation of money for prison administration came before the House, one member requested a report into the conditions leading up to the dismissal of the warden. A second member requested a statement regarding the rumor that this warden was being given a civil service post. The reply from the Minister of Justice was that he had no information on the matter and that

since Parliament was about to be prorogued the situation could not be discussed further.

J. S. Woodsworth refused to permit the issue to be sidetracked. He insisted that the questions raised be answered according to Parliamentary procedure and that the House continue in session until satisfaction had been given. The result was that the House continued to sit for several days, a full report concerning the Kingston riots was presented and an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the action of the guard tabled.

In the light of these reports, Woodsworth urged a full investigation into prison conditions throughout the country. As a result of the debate which followed, a Royal Commission was appointed and two years later the Archambault Commission on Penitentiaries was set up. The report made by the Commission disclosed conditions which indicated that Canadian penal reform had been too long neglected. It resulted in considerable effort on the part of the responsible authorities to institute changes. Also as a result of this report the general public became more conscious of and concerned with prison conditions than ever before.

On Behalf of the Unemployed

The case for the unemployed was pleaded by Woodsworth from 1922, his first session in the House, until his last. When he came to Ottawa, Canada was suffering her first major depression. Unemployment figures were soaring and extreme hardship was being faced by thousands

across the country. In 1922 he urged not only a program of production which would result in full employment, provision of immediate relief for those suffering but also the enactment of unemployment insurance measures.

He made the three main points that 1) unemployment is involuntary, 2) the state is under obligation to provide work for men and 3) until suitable work is provided there ought to be adequate maintenance.

If it is necessary to have men in this country employed during rush seasons, we ought at least to see that they are kept over during the slack season. . . . I would say that the financing of any such scheme is a first charge on the natural resources and credit of the country. Surely there is no reason why we should insist that railway dividends should come up to a certain mark in order that railway investors should be able to go forward with their work, or why banks should be permitted to retain their interest and dividends, and yet that we should refuse to labour even the minimum, a decent living.¹

By 1935 Canada was again in the depths of a depression, this time one of much greater magnitude. Unemployment had reached a new high, with the Conservative Government taking no action to provide for the unemployed single men. Great numbers of young men rode the rails from east to west and back again, seeking any possible job in cities along the way, sleeping in parks and "flop houses", being given occasional assistance by private sources such as certain missions, churches and individuals across the country.

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1922, vol 1, p. 88.

Woodsworth repeatedly urged the Conservative Government, then in power, to make some provision for these men, pointing out not only the suffering and demoralization involved, but also the danger to the country of disregarding them. When large numbers of single unemployed banded together and began a trek eastward to lay their problems before an apparently indifferent Government, Woodsworth strongly recommended that attention be given them. The Government's answer was in another tone. In Regina, on Dominion Day, 1935, an open-air meeting of the marchers was broken up by the Royal Canadian Mounted Police and local police, as an unlawful assembly, and acting on instructions from Ottawa, Woodsworth protested this action having been taken, especially while Parliament was in Session, and without the knowledge of the House. He vigorously pointed out that these single men were compelled, through force of hunger if nothing else, to demand action, and commented that it seemed difficult for well-fed persons to understand that degree of hunger. A retort from one member in the House that Woodsworth was not suffering brought forth this reply:

No, I am not suffering, and I am glad that there are some of us who are not suffering at present who are prepared to stand up for these people. I hope the time will never come when I shall be so well fed and comfortably placed that I shall refuse to fight for the under dog. Some people say that this is poor politics. I do not care very much whether it is poor politics. I know there are gentlemen opposite who will go out on the hustings and say that we are allied to the Communists. I know that we have to run the risk of that, but that does not matter. I intend to stand here and plead for the rights of these boys who are not given a fair chance in life.¹

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1935, vol. 4, p. 4129.

And later in the same debate he proclaimed:

. . . the people of Canada have a right not merely to freedom of movement, freedom of action and freedom of association, but they have the right to live - and to live decently. That right is not being accorded to these 20,000 young men¹

He continued to plead for their rights as long as he remained in the House and the issues of unemployment relief, provision of opportunity for gainful employment, and unemployment insurance were issues which he kept before the House at some point during every Session.

The need for Labour legislation was not overlooked by Woodsworth. He brought to the attention of the House, in glaring details, the exploitation of workers by industry. Discrimination against employees for the sole reason of membership in a trade union he scored and in 1937 he introduced a bill to make it a criminal offense for any employer to so discriminate. The bill was refused a hearing, and the following year he again presented it. It was given a first hearing but did not get a second. By 1939 the labour unions had become sufficiently aroused to demand this legislation and the Liberal Government introduced the bill and it passed both Commons and Senate.

In the Parliamentary Debates Mr. Woodsworth frequently referred to factual information provided by social workers and those in allied professions, regarding the living conditions of the people. For example

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1935, vol. 4, p. 4129.

in 1922 he cited starvation conditions of families living in Vancouver as shown in reports of visits made by the Victorian Order of Nurses. In the 1939 debates he illustrated a case with figures from studies made by the Canadian Welfare Council. He consistently followed the method of study, research and public education toward spreading the results of the research and taking the action as indicated necessary by the research.

Mr. Woodsworth stressed constantly the preventive aspects of social welfare and his legislative efforts were consistently in this direction. He expressed the conviction that if social and economic conditions of the country were faced and brought into adjustment, many of the problems of social maladjustment would not occur. For example, in 1922 he said:

I am quite free to admit that there are among the unemployed a certain percentage who are lazy, drunken and inefficient - anyone who has studied the subject knows that, to a very large extent, their laziness, drunkenness and inefficiency are the results of our haphazard system¹

Parliamentary Goals

That James S. Woodsworth's ultimate parliamentary goals remained unchanged throughout the twenty-one years of his career is illustrated clearly by two statements, one made at the beginning of his career and one near the end. On March 24, 1922, in his first session in the House of Commons he said:

¹ Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1922, vol. 1, p. 87.

We must first of all see to it that there are certain minimum standards involving proper conditions of livelihood for every man and woman and child in the country. And until every man, woman and child is so provided for we ought not to talk further about profits and dividends. Before we can get our labour and social problems solved the great mass of the people must have, what they have not to-day, a real voice in the control of their own affairs and of the affairs of the country There is a group of men here, new members of the House if you will, who have clearly made up their minds that in so far as they can decide it, human welfare is to be given the precedence.¹

At the beginning of the 1939 session of the House of Commons there was evidence of somewhat feverish activity of social events and pageantry in connection with the forthcoming visit of Their Majesties the late King George VI and Queen Elizabeth. Woodsworth noted the elaborate social functions described in an Ottawa newspaper and contrasted this with excerpts from the Toronto Globe and Mail and the Winnipeg Free Press. These two newspapers carried vivid stories of extreme poverty of certain families in Manitoba and of the fishermen's families on the Nova Scotia and New Brunswick coasts. Mr. Woodsworth read aloud these articles in the House and concluded his remarks with the following:

. . . In view of such an appalling contrast as I have given in these different stories, some of the ministers of the gospel may well be asking whether the church has failed, and we may well be asking the other question, whether democracy has failed I suggest that either democracy must solve these problems or democratic institutions as we know them must pass Will anyone claim that we should have these social functions and elaborate displays for any purpose whatever, while we allow these conditions to prevail, year after year.²

1 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1922, vol. 1, p. 87.

2 Woodsworth, J. S., Hansard, 1939, vol. 1, p. 76.

CHAPTER IV

J. S. WOODSWORTH - HIS RELATION TO SOCIAL WELFARE AND AN EVALUATION OF HIS CONTRIBUTION

From the foregoing material it is clear that the concepts underlying modern social work as outlined at the beginning of this study were inextricably a part of all J. S. Woodsworth's work.

Respect for personality, belief in the individual worth and dignity of man, respect for individual differences, belief in the right of all to self-determination, the right to enjoy personal and civil liberties, were all reflected in his work. He not only believed that these were rights for all, and expressed them through his own actions, but he set in motion the machinery which would help to guarantee such rights in the future. He understood that "the individual, the group and the community must participate in the solution of their own problems."¹ He encouraged this process wherever he could. The establishment of the People's Forum in Winnipeg is an illustration of the principles involved in this. In his book My Neighbor and in his work in the Canadian Welfare League he emphasized the necessity of this principle if any social progress was to be made. During his Parliamentary years, when he made countless speaking tours across the country, talking to small groups and large, whether at the mines, on the prairies or in the cities, it was to urge the people to become acquainted with the forces at work in their own community and their own country and so be able to participate in the

¹ Hamilton, Gordon, "Helping People, the Growth of a Profession," Social Work as Human Relations, New York, Columbia University Press, 1949, p. 14.

solution of their own problems.

He believed that the people were capable of this, he had complete faith in the potentialities of every human being and his belief in his listeners made them believe in themselves - a first step in being able to do anything. He made them feel that they were a part of the whole and so enabled them to become participating members in their community.

That he believed "the individual has responsibility not only for himself but toward the society in which he lives"¹ was self-evident in all his efforts to enlist active participation of all members of the community - from the effort made to interest the South Winnipeg homemaker in the problems of the North End immigrants, to the enlistment of the aid of Ottawa socialites in meeting the needs of miners' families of Nova Scotia, and his impassioned addresses in the House of Commons to awaken in the members a sense of individual responsibility to the people whom they represented. His own career from beginning to end was a reflection of this belief.

He saw social work in terms congenial with those used recently by Katherine Kendall, namely, "a professional service related to all other community efforts to promote social well-being, democratically conceived and potentially available to every member of the community who may stand in need of help in removing obstacles to productive living."² This is

1 Loc. cit.

2 Kendall, Katherine, "International Social Work: Plans and Prospects." Social Casework, July 1951, vol. 32, p. 277.

evident in the ideas expressed in My Neighbor, in the stated purpose of the Canadian Welfare League and in the work which he carried out under the League and the Bureau of Social Research.

The aim of his entire Parliamentary career was in line with social work's concern "with the creation and development of a democratic society which will afford every individual opportunity for the maximum development of which he is capable."¹

He worked towards the "re-shaping of social and economic institutions which were failing to fulfill their function."² He urged such changes all through his Parliamentary years and even before, as a minister at the Mission and as a social worker at the Canadian Welfare League.³

1 Towle, Charlotte, "Social Casework in Modern Society," Social Service Review, June 1946, p. 166.

2 Loc. cit.

3 In 1910 J. S. Woodsworth wrote the following, "To deal with these specific problems I have elsewhere mentioned some reforms which seem to me preventive in their nature. They contemplate such legislative action as may enforce upon the entire country minimum standards of working and living conditions. They would make all tenements and factories sanitary; they would regulate the hours of work . . . they would regulate and supervise dangerous trades; they would institute all necessary measures to stamp out unnecessary disease and to prevent unnecessary death; they would prohibit entirely child labour; they would institute all necessary educational and recreational institutions to replace the social and educative losses of the home and the domestic workshop", My Neighbor, p. 91.

The goals which Leonard Mayo outlined in 1944 as the next and logical ones for social work were those for which J. S. Woodsworth was striving as early as 1922. Full employment, equal rights for all minority groups, complete freedom from discrimination of every kind, were aims for which he battled from his first session in the house of Commons until his last. And before this, his work with and for immigrant peoples from the time he went to All People's Mission in 1908, is practical evidence of his early efforts and aims in this area.

"To help create a world in which there can be peace,"¹ was a goal to which he was consistently devoted. Charlotte Towle, in 1946, urged upon social work the acceptance of its responsibility for:

. . . promoting social and economic measures that will remove the causes of war and thus check the threat of aggression, a program that will establish a system in which business management, labour, agriculture, and government together provide full employment, and fair employment practices . . . social services and social welfare measures would be brought up to date to assure, when adversity strikes, adequate financial and medical assistance, vocational and educational opportunity to every citizen, regardless of race, colour and creed."²

Woodsworth saw clearly, and repeatedly expressed the view in debates in the House of Commons, that measures such as these were essential if the occasion for wars was to be removed. Programs such as the ones

1 Mayo, Leonard W., "The Future for Social Work," Proceedings of National Conference of Social Work, New York, Columbia University Press, 1944, p. 28.

2 Towle, Charlotte, Social Service Review, June, 1946, p. 165.

advocated above were worked for earnestly as seen in the foregoing chapter. And on a personal level, his relationships with people, individually and in groups was of a nature that would reconcile differences and dispel hostility.

When he had taken all the positive, constructive steps possible to help remove the causes of war, he followed the path consistent with his beliefs and took the final step towards outlawing war, that of refusing to condone or participate in it in any way. That each war, regardless of its causes or the issues involved, breeds more wars, that ends never justify means, were deep convictions with him and therefore war could never under any circumstances be a way of bringing about a better life. It was therefore a denial of the ultimate purpose of life. The end could only be final disaster. Charlotte Towle concludes somewhat similarly when she states that unless these reforms take place "there will be no profession of social work and social casework in modern society will be engrossed in sitting with its ten thumbs and fingers helplessly pressed against the weak spots in a crumbling dike."¹

Woodsworth used all his capacities, not just to keep the dike from crumbling but to make it invulnerable. Each piece of legislation for which he was responsible, directly or indirectly added strength to the foundation of the dike.

The profession of social work "understands that social work can

¹ Loc. cit.

not be practiced except in a democracy that safeguards the rights of people" and that "any diminution in these rights of self-determination and civil liberties means professional retrogression."¹ If this is so, Canadian social work is indebted to J. S. Woodsworth for his ceaseless efforts at guarding against curtailment of liberty which would have resulted in "professional retrogression". His successful efforts to remove from Canadian legislation the Amendment to the Immigration Act and Section 98 of the Criminal Code, as well as other struggles to safeguard civil rights, merit recognition by the profession of social work if it accedes to Benjamin Youngdahl's statement as noted above.

Eduard Lindeman cautioned social work to remember "its rich heritage of crusading and legislative action"² and that a denial of the importance of social action in social work was a failure to express concern for democratic values. No one in the history of Canada has contributed so largely to this heritage as did J. S. Woodsworth. No one person has done more to safeguard in Canada the democratic values on which social work's foundations rest.

It can be said that James S. Woodsworth defined the ultimate goals of social work. He defined them both in words and in action, and he was able to set in motion the machinery which would move toward the

1 Youngdahl, Benjamin, "Social Work as a Profession," Social Work Year Book, 1951, p. 499.

2 Cohen, Nathan, "Eduard C. Lindeman - Social Welfare Statesman," Social Welfare Forum, Columbia University Press, New York, 1953, p. xiii.

attainment of these goals. Many who preceded him, some who were his contemporaries and others who have followed him have dedicated themselves to achieving some one or other of the specific goals - for example, the development of child welfare services, or education of the deaf, or prison reform. But he was one of the few to whom was given the opportunity and the capacity to tie all these together, into a unified dynamic conception of life's purpose.

Much of his work was a demonstration of the methods and principles advocated by modern social work. With him, the methods did not imply the use of a certain set of rules to be applied in a given situation, nor some process drawn on from somewhere outside himself. He was not only a social tactician. His method of dealing with people was the expression of a consistent and integrated, positive approach to the whole of life.

This integrated, positive approach to life is the mark of one who has achieved a rare degree of maturity - emotional, intellectual and spiritual. Leon Saul describes the mature person as one who is creative and not destructive to himself or others; one who is more interested in giving than in receiving; one whose standards, ideals and conscience are so integrated within the person that they operate unconsciously and automatically; one in whom conscience is not just a negative force that restrains but one which furthers the innate tendencies of growth toward independence, responsibility, productivity and cooperation. Saul claims that this is the psychologic contribution of Christianity, expressed as "love thy neighbor as thyself." Saul also states that in the development

of such maturity, alone, can we hope for removal of the causes of war, neurosis and crime.¹

It has been noted earlier that Woodsworth's career was religiously motivated, that "love thy neighbor as thyself" was a practical working guide for him. His maturity, his integrated personality, his determination to seek for others what he would want for himself, were not unrelated to this religious principle, rather, it was the factor which undergirded his entire career. His methods arose out of close contact with people, it is true, but more, they resulted from a genuine concern for and love of all people, stemming from a deep personal awareness of a God to whom every being is of infinite worth.

It was this same religious motivation and degree of maturity which made it possible for him, while holding in his hands considerable power, never to use this to the disadvantage or harm of others; nor did he use it for self-advancement. For example, the power which he held in Parliament at the time Old Age Pensions were enacted, was used to gain legislation which would benefit thousands of aged persons then and in the future. At the same time, behind the scenes, he was offered a Cabinet position. Self-advancement was not his interest and he refused the office. He preferred to continue to exert the power which he then held, in the interests of the people whom he felt he could better serve as an Independent Labour Member.

¹ Saul, Leon J., Emotional Maturity, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1947, p. 7. - 22.

Woodsworth's zeal for social reform was peculiarly devoid of the hostility and bitterness which has sometimes been evident in the work of social reformers. His opposition to war was out of love for people and not out of buried hostility, it was the consistent following out and expression of the desire for the creative progression of mankind, - a mature desire to create, rather than the immature desire to destroy. His desire for social change grew out of the positive factor of love for people rather than a destructive and negative hate for any particular evil or class or group. No matter how much he opposed what certain individuals stood for, there was never hostility towards the person as an individual. A warm friendliness characterized his relationships with his most bitter opponents.¹ Even for those who vigorously denounced him and with whom he differed widely in his views, he sought complete personal and political freedom.

He was never doctrinaire in his ideas, or in his likes and dislikes. His political aims and ideas, as his social work aims and ideas, grew out of practical experience and were based on the hard, cold facts of observable phenomena around him.

The plan for the C. C. F. party evolved with him only when he had seen conclusive evidence, through the years in Parliament, that Independent Members could not bring about the far-reaching legislative

¹ This characteristic at first puzzled his opponents in the House of Commons, as illustrated by a comment made by a French-Canadian member: "Mr. Woodsworth, you are such a friendly man outside, yet in the House you shake the fist at me!", Grace MacInnis, A Man to Remember, p. 173.

changes which he saw as being essential to meet the serious and complex situations developing in Canada as a result of industrial expansion and the great depression. And until his death, he continued to see the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation as something more than a political party. He saw it as a movement which would alter the existing social and economic structure in such a way that freedom to grow, to develop, to live to his or her fullest capacity would be guaranteed to every person throughout the nation.

That Woodsworth was a visionary, that he saw far ahead of his fellows is true. In 1922, the ideas of full employment and unemployment insurance seemed like those of a visionary crank. Today, Annette Garrett says "full employment seems to us not the pipe-dream of a starry-eyed idealist, but so practical an aim that we are impatient that it has not been achieved sooner."¹

It is also true that Woodsworth sought for reform legislation before those around him were ready to accept his ideas. But he knew that the people who would benefit most from the reforms were more than ready and would support such if they could be educated to the point of realizing their potentialities as participating citizens. This he ceaselessly attempted to do. His object was always to enlighten and never confuse. He sought to educate those sections of the community which enjoyed in large measure, comfort and security under the present system -

¹ Garrett, Annette, "The Professional Base of Social Casework," Principles and Techniques of Social Casework, ed. Cora Kasius, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1950, p. 44.

those who were unaware of actual conditions under which many others lived; he tried to get other Members in the House of Commons to see the need for change, the reasons behind existing conditions and the hopelessness of expecting improvement through maintaining the status quo. But whether the ideas were accepted or not, he could see sufficiently far into the future, into the relation between social cause and social effect, to work determinedly for the legislation which would help to bring about a fuller life for all. Finally, we would refer again to Bergson's statement, quoted earlier in this study, that all social reforms seem unrealizable at first and that society can only reach a point of readiness to accept reforms after some one individual has led the way. Woodsworth did lead the way. Social policies which are now accepted as commonplace were considered radical, if not dangerous, when first advocated by Mr. Woodsworth.

If we were to add up all the tangible acts of the Woodsworth career - the studies made, the organizations brought into being, the legislation secured, the individual lives enriched, we would still have failed to arrive at the sum or the core of his contribution. The greatest contribution of a career such as J. S. Woodsworth's lies in the influence of what he was, as a total human being, rather than what he did. This was recognized by those who knew him as a Parliamentarian. Bruce Hutchison, well known Canadian writer - and always politically opposed to the leader of the C. C. F. party - said at the time of Woodsworth's death that he was the most Christ-like man ever to have entered the Canadian Parliament and that "our politics and all men who knew him gained

a certain purity from his presence"¹ He was commonly referred to in the legislative circles as the Conscience of the House of Commons. Some who knew him during his social work activities also recognized that it was his influence and example which made the greatest and most lasting impression on those around him. A contemporary offered this comment:

. . . to me, and to others of my generation he was, above all else, a catalytic agent - an intellectual stimulus, that changed our thinking without himself being changed. We knew that he had vision that we did not possess and that while we were concerned with treating the symptoms of social maladjustment he was determined to seek and root out its causes . . . the specific pioneer contributions made to social welfare . . . were not nearly as important as the intangible influence that he exercised over young men and women who were looking for leadership . . . in what was then a relatively new field.²

Woodsworth's life and career point up, for modern social work the fact that, in the field of human welfare, ultimate values can not be disregarded, that spiritual needs and material needs are inextricably a part of human life and that one can never be achieved at the expense of or by the exclusion of the other.

This career is an illustration for modern social work that scientific method based in study, research and painstaking attention to detailed laborious work, can be successfully combined with a crusading spirit, religiously motivated and devoted to a cause; that

1 Hutchison, Bruce, quoted by MacInnis, Grace, p. 320.

2 Letter from Miss Ethel Johns, dated May 19, 1955.

vision and ideals can be combined with hard work and tiresome routine.

J. S. Woodsworth's life was a demonstration of what can be accomplished, against all odds, by an individual of great maturity. This way of maturity, points the direction that leaders, whether political or social, must travel if there is to be any real progress towards universal growth and development. The rarity of such maturity and the need of the world for persons having it, is expressed in a statement made by the psychiatrist, Henry Stack Sullivan:

It is the inadequacies of the people in politically significant states, and in their leaders, which now imperil world peace and universal social progress. I do not believe that there are enough mature people anywhere in the world, today, to hold out great hope of dissipating inter-national tensions by mere virtue of information about the common humanity of man."¹

J. S. Woodsworth achieved practical reforms which have aided and advanced social work in Canada to a marked degree. But, for social work, as for all other areas of Canadian life, the greatness of his contribution lies in the quality of what he was; a quality which throughout history has been recognized by only the few contemporaries but which, from the background of time, emerges in its magnitude. This he shares with the great religious leaders, prophets and statesmen of the ages.

¹ Sullivan, Henry Stack, quoted by Schleicher, Charles P. Introduction to International Relations, Prentice-Hall, Incorporated, New York, 1954, p. 240.

APPENDIX A

APPENDIX A

Refusal to Support National Service Registration

In the Manitoba Free Press, on December 28, 1916, the following letter appeared:

Sir:

Yesterday morning there came to me a circular letter asking my help in making the National Service registration scheme a success. As I am opposed to that scheme, it would seem my duty as a citizen to state that opposition and the grounds on which it is based. For this end I would ask the courtesy of your columns in presenting the following considerations

(1) The citizens of Canada have been given no opportunity of expressing themselves with regard to the far-reaching principle involved in this matter.

(2) Since 'life is more than meat and the body more than raiment,' conscription of material possessions should in all justice precede an attempt to force men to risk their lives and the welfare of their families.

(3) It is not at all clear who is to decide whether or not a man's present work is of national importance. It is stated that the brewery workers in England are exempt. What guarantee have we that Canadian decisions will be any more sound, and who are the members of the board that decides the question of such importance to the individual?

(4) How is registration or subsequent conscription, physical or moral, to be enforced? Is intimidation to be used? Is blacklisting to be employed? What other method?

Is this measure to be equally enforced across the country? For example, in Quebec, or among the Mennonites in the West?

This registration is no mere census. It seems to look in the direction of a measure of conscription. As some of us cannot consciously engage in military service, we are bound to resist what - if the war continues - will inevitably lead to forced service.

(signed) J. S. Woodsworth

APPENDIX B

APPENDIX B

Resignation from the Methodist Church

The following letter, dated June 8, 1918, ended J. S. Woodsworth's official connection with the Methodist church:

Dear Mr. Smith:

After serious consideration I have decided that I should resign from the ministry of the Methodist Church. It is perhaps due both to the conference and to myself that I state, at least in outline, the considerations that have led me to take this action.

Within a short time after my ordination I was much troubled because my beliefs were not those that were commonly held and preached. The implications of the newer theological teaching that I had received during my B. D. course and in post-graduate work at Oxford revealed themselves with growing clearness and carried me far from the old orthodox position.

In 1902 I came to conference with my resignation in my pocket, but the urgent advice of the president and others of the senior ministers persuaded me to defer action. I accepted an invitation to become junior minister at Grace Church and for four years devoted myself largely to the practical activities of a large down-town church.

Ill-health made necessary a year without a station. This gave me an opportunity of getting out of the routine and seeing things in a somewhat truer perspective. While in Palestine I decided that, come what might, I must be true to my convictions of truth. It seemed to me that, in the Church, I was in a false position. As a minister I was supposed to believe and to teach doctrines which either I had ceased to believe or which expressed very inadequately my real beliefs. I carefully prepared a statement of my position and sent it with my resignation to the conference of 1907. A special committee appointed to confer with me reported that in their judgment my beliefs were sufficiently in harmony with Methodist standards to make my resignation unnecessary, and

recommended that it be not accepted. The conference, without dissent, accepted the recommendation.

What could I do? Left intellectually free, I gratefully accepted the renewed opportunity for service. For six years, as superintendent of All People's Mission, I threw myself heartily into all kinds of social service work. Encouraged by my own experience, I thought that the church was awakening to modern needs and was preparing, if slowly, for her new tasks.

But, as years went by, certain disquieting conclusions gradually took form. I began to see that the organized Church had become a great institution with institutional aims and ambitions. With the existence of a number of denominations this meant keen rivalry. In many cases the interests of the community were made subservient to the interests of the Church. Further, the Church, as many other institutions, was becoming increasingly commercialized. This meant the control of the policies of the Church by men of wealth, and, in many cases, the temptation for the minister to become a financial agent rather than a moral and spiritual leader. It meant, also, that anything like a radical program of social reform became in practice almost impossible. In my own particular work among the immigrant peoples, I felt that I, at least, could give more effective service outside denominational lines. Intellectual freedom was not sufficient - I must be free to work.

For three years I acted as secretary of the Canadian Welfare League and for one year as Director of the Bureau of Social Research of the Governments of Manitoba, Saskatchewan, and Alberta. Last year, owing to the closing of the bureau, and another breakdown in health, I came to British Columbia. At the suggestion of one of the ministers and by courtesy of the B. C. Conference, I was appointed "supply" on a little coast mission field. Here I have again had the opportunity of trying out church work and learning in still another field how difficult it is to help the people through the church.

In the meantime, another factor makes my position increasingly difficult. The war has gone on now for four years. As far back as 1906 I had been led to realize something of the horror and futility and wickedness of war. When the proposals were being made

for Canada to assist in the naval defence of the Empire, I spoke and wrote against such a policy. Since the sudden outbreak of the war, there has been little opportunity to protest against our nation and empire participating in the war. However, as the war progressed, I have protested against the curtailment of our liberties which is going on under the pressure of military necessity and the passions of war.

According to my understanding of economics and sociology, the war is the inevitable outcome of the existing social organization with its undemocratic forms of government and competitive system of industry. For me, it is ignorance, or a closed mind, or camouflage, or hypocrisy, to solemnly assert that a murder in Serbia or the invasion of Belgium or the glaring injustices and horrible outrages are the cause of the war.

Nor, through the war, do I see any way out of our difficulties. The devil of militarism cannot be driven out by the power of militarism without the successful nations themselves becoming militarized . . .

This brings me to the Christian point of view. For me, the teachings and the spirit of Jesus are absolutely irreconcilable with the advocacy of war. Christianity may be an impossible idealism, but so long as I hold it, ever so unworthily, I must refuse, as far as may be, to participate in or to influence others to participate in war. When the policy of the State - whether that State be nominally Christian or not - conflicts with my conception of right and wrong, then I must obey God rather than man. As a minister, I must proclaim the truth as it is revealed to me. I am not a pro-German. I am not lacking, I think, in patriotism; I trust that I am not a "slacker" or a coward. I had thought that as a Christian minister I was a messenger of the Prince of Peace.

The vast majority of the ministers and other church leaders seem to see things in an altogether different way. The churches have been turned into very effective recruiting agencies. A minister's success appears to be judged by the number of recruits in his church rather than by the number of converts. The position of the church seems to be summed up in the words of a General Conference Officer - "We must win the war, nothing else matters." There is little dependence on spiritual forces. The so-called Prussian morality that might

makes right, and that the end justifies the means, is preached in its application if not in theory. "Military necessity" is considered to cover a multitude of sins. Retaliation, specifically repudiated by Jesus, is advocated

Apparently the church feels that I do not belong and reluctantly I have been forced to the same conclusion. This decision means a crisis in my life. My associations, my education, my friends, my work, my ambitions have all been connected with the church. After twenty-two years it is hard to go out, not knowing whither I go. In taking this step, I have no sense of disloyalty to the memory of my honored father or the upbringing of my widowed mother. On the other hand, I have a growing sense of fellowship with the "Master" and the goodly company of those who, throughout the ages, have endeavored to "follow the gleam". I still feel the call to service, and trust that I may have some share in the work of bringing in the Kingdom.

Yours sincerely,

(signed) J. S. Woodsworth.

APPENDIX C

APPENDIX C

The King vs. J. S. Woodsworth

LET THE UNDERWRITTEN BILL OF INDICTMENT

be preferred on behalf of the Crown before the Grand Jury for the Eastern Judicial District at the sittings of His Majesty's Court of King's Bench for Manitoba for the trial of criminal matters and proceedings to be held at the City of Winnipeg, commencing on the Fourth day of November, A. D. 1919.

(Sgd.) GEO. A. GRIERSON,
Acting Attorney-General.

COURT OF KING'S BENCH.

(Crown Side)

FALL ASSIZES, 1919

CANADA,
PROVINCE OM MANITOBA,
EASTERN JUDICIAL DISTRICT,

The Jurors for our Lord the King present:

1. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

BLOODY SATURDAY

R. N. W. P. Make Gory Debut - Peaceful Citizens Shot
Without Warning - City Under Military Control - Returned
Men Incensed - Strike More Determined.

One is dead and a number injured, probably thirty or more, as a result of the forcible prevention of the 'silent

parade' which had been planned by returned men to start at 2.30 o'clock last Saturday afternoon. Apparently the bloody business was carefully planned, for Mayor Gray issued a proclamation in the morning stating that 'any women taking part in a parade do so at their own risk.' Nevertheless, a vast crowd of men, women and children assembled to witness the 'silent parade.' The Soldiers' Committee which had been interviewing Senator Robertson had not returned to their comrades when the latter commenced to line up on Main Street near the City Hall. No attempt was made to use the special city police to prevent the parade. On a previous occasion a dozen of the old regular city police had persuaded the returned men to abandon a parade which had commenced to move. On Saturday, about 2.30 p.m., just the time when the parade was scheduled to start, some fifty mounted men, swinging baseball bats, rode down Main Street, half were red-coated R. N. W. P., the others wore khaki. They quickened pace as they passed the Union Bank. The crowd opened, let them through and closed in behind them. They turned and charged through the crowd again, greeted by hisses, boos, and some stones. There were two riderless horses with the squad when it emerged and galloped up Main Street. The men in khaki disappeared at this juncture, but the red-coats reined their horses and reformed opposite the old post office.

Shooting to Kill

Then, with revolvers drawn, they galloped down Main Street, turned, and charged right into the crowd on William Avenue, firing as they charged. One man, standing on the sidewalk, thought the mounties were firing blank cartridges, until a spectator standing beside him dropped with a bullet through his heart. We have no exact information about the total number of casualties, but there were not less than thirty casualties. The crowd dispersed as quickly as possible when the shooting began.

Some Citizens Applaud Man-Killers

When the mounties rode back to the corner of Portage Avenue and Main Street, after the fray, at least two of them were twirling their reeking tubes high in the air in orthodox Deadwood Dick style. Some individuals, apparently opposed to the strike, applauded the man-killers as they rode by.

Special Police Appear

Lines of special police, swinging their big clubs, were thrown across Main Street and the intersecting thoroughfares. Dismounted red-coats lined up across Portage Avenue and Main Street, an officer rode up and down Main Street declaring the city under military control. Khaki-clad men with rifles were stationed on the street corners.

Public Meetings Abandoned

There were no open-air meetings on Saturday night, but the Central Strike Committee met as usual and resolved to 'carry on' with redoubled vigor. If the city remains under military control meetings will likely be held outside the city limits.

Soldier Strikers Incensed

Indignation at the action of the authorities was forcibly expressed by returned men. They feel that the prevention of the parade was an infringement of the human rights they have fought to defend, and they are especially incensed by the murderous assault of the mounties upon an unarmed crowd. One man, recently returned, said: 'They treated us worse than we ever treated Fritz.' The returned men assumed full responsibility for the 'silent parade' proposition, making a special request that the strikers should not join them: 'This is our affair,' they declared. Had they intended violence they would hardly have invited their wives to join in the parade.

The Jurors aforesaid do further present:

2. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

KAISERISM IN CANADA

What shall the sacrifice profit Canada if she who has helped to destroy Kaiserism in Germany shall allow Kaiserism to be established at home? Whoever ordered the shooting last Saturday is a Kaiser of the deepest dye. The responsibility must be placed and the criminal brought before the Bar of Justice. There may be those who think that the blood of innocent men upon our streets is preferable to a 'silent parade.' There may be those who think their dignity must be upheld at any cost. But we fail to see the slightest justification for the murderous assault which was committed. Whoever ordered it acted in the spirit of Kaiser Wilhelm when he said: 'Recruits, before the altar and the servant of God you have given me the oath of allegiance. You are too young to know the full meaning of what you have said, but your first care must be to obey implicitly all orders and directions. You have sworn fidelity to me, you are the children of my guard, you are my soldiers, you have surrendered yourself to me, body and soul. Only one enemy can exist for you - my enemy. With the present Socialist machinations it may happen that I shall order you to shoot your own relations, your brothers or even your parents, which God forbid - and then you are bound in duty implicitly to obey my orders.'

The events of last week show to what lengths the opponents of labor will go in their efforts to fasten despotism on this city and this country. The midnight arrest of men whose crime seems to be that of 'lese majeste' against the profiteers, and the shooting of innocent and defenceless citizens mark the depths of desperation to which the Kaiser-like crowd at the Industrial Bureau are prepared to go in order to turn their defeat into a temporary victory.

But they must not be allowed even temporary satisfaction. Organized labor must continue the magnificent fight of the last five weeks, until its just and moderate demands are granted. It were better that the whole 35,000 strikers languished in jail; better even, that we all rested beside the men who were slain on Saturday than that the forces of Kaiserism should prevail.

There have always been those who imagine that 'A whiff of grape shot' would stop the cry of the people for justice. There are those in Winnipeg who think the shooting on Saturday taught labor a lesson. But labor did not need the lesson. The parade was attempted and the blood of innocent men spilled 'without permission of the Strike

Committee.' Labor already knew that two dozen men on horseback, shooting to kill, could disperse a crowd of several thousand unarmed men and women.

The Committee of One Thousand has, however, many lessons to learn - among other things the members of that Committee must be taught that ideas are more powerful than bullets. The blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church. We shall 'carry on' in spite of hell, till victory is won."

The Jurors aforesaid do further present:

3. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

IS THERE A WAY OUT?

What is the present situation? The sixth week of the strike leaves neither side in control. Both the Strike Committee and the 'Citizens' Committee are determined to hold out. Neither is by any means at the end of its resources. In the ranks there is little sign of weakening. The strike may be prolonged for weeks. In the meantime the business men claim that the city is being ruined - is ruined and the workers undoubtedly will face the winter with reserves sadly depleted.

The City Council, the Provincial Government or the Federal Government have adopted no constructive policy. They stood prepared only for repressive measures.

When finally it did seem that the Provincial Government might effect a settlement, the Dominion Government upset everything by its outrageous arrest of the strike leaders.

In the meantime, the returned soldiers are becoming restless and threatening to take things into their own hands. They are tired of the policy of 'do nothing' - 'keep order,' so consistently followed by the strike leaders.

[In Law, the whole article of which this is an excerpt must be quoted. The article continues: - J. S. W.

Mediation, by a body as well equipped as any that is likely to be found, has apparently failed. There is a dead-lock.

What will happen? How will it end? Is there any possible way out?

Members, both of the Strikers' Committee and the Citizens' Committee say: 'We must fight to a finish. We cannot afford to yield. If it takes three months, we will see it through,' and both camps raise the roof - or the sky - with applause. But all thoughtful men must think of the terrific cost. Then when one side is brought to its knees what will be done? Someway or another things must be pulled together. After-the-war problems are as serious as war problems.

Mediators have failed. Possibly something might be done if the principals could only be brought face to face. In spite of the war of words in the newspapers there are very reasonable men in both camps. They are not weak men. They intend to stand by their principles, but they are open to more light and they recognize that there is perhaps another side to the question than that which has bulked so largely in their eyes and consequently determined their action. Unfortunately personal attacks and the military necessity of showing no spirit of compromise makes it difficult for the leaders in either camp to make a move.

The real difficulty behind the schemes for getting together lies in the fundamentally different and apparently irreconcilable claims of the contending parties. Arguments proceed from different premises. The fact is that the war has thrust upon us an entirely new world situation, thoughtful students and statesmen have warned us that there must be radical measures of re-construction after the war. But we, so far, are trying to carry on business much along old lines.

Can we not shift the basis of discussion? If two unkind goats meet on a narrow bridge and each insists on fighting it out, one or both will fall into the water. In the case of this strike, whichever side falls in the public may find itself 'in the soup.' In this strike, too, neither goat seems a bit inclined to do the 'kind' act and let the other fellow walk over him.

But, leaving the old fable, is it not possible to find another bridge further down the stream? As an illustration, take a matter which has arisen during the strike. The strikers insist that they will not return to

work unless all the strikers are given back their old jobs. They cannot recede from this position. Workers who have no immediate trouble with their employers have given up their position and have been replaced. Those for whom they came out in sympathy cannot go back on them. On the other hand, the Governments have given ultimatums and Governments, like individuals, don't like to swallow themselves.

Further, men, risking the opprobrium attached to the strike breaker, have been induced to accept positions. The Governments or other employers can hardly go back on these men.

A deadlock on a narrow bridge. Behind this question of jobs is the bigger question of unemployment. So long as there are more men than there are jobs, and the finding of jobs is left to the individual, there will be industrial unrest. Why could not our Government boldly face the question as the British Government has done? Let the State take the responsibility of finding a suitable job for every man at a living wage. If this were done, the question as to whether or not a man should be reinstated in his particular job would not be a vital one. It would become a matter of readjustment. So, with other matters in dispute. Behind the whole question of collective bargaining and the sympathetic strike lies the question of the democratic control of industry. The British Government is attempting to solve this most important problem by creating new machinery in the form of industrial councils. These are not the solutions proposed by the workers, but apparently they have been successful in forming a sort of 'modus vivendi.' That, after all, is the British way. Adopt some temporary expedient by which we can keep things going and then some way a policy gradually shapes itself. In Canada, so far, we have done nothing. In this strike we have thought only of one or the other winning and then going on in the same old way. It can't be done. We must face the larger issues sooner or later. Why not now?

It may be claimed that when the battle is at its hottest it is no time to talk of constructive measures. But the loss goes on and permanent peace cannot come until the constructive measures are put into operation.

Why not the appointment of a strong commission with wide powers? When, during the war, there was trouble with the miners in the Crow's Nest, the Government appointed a Commission to operate the mines. The academic right of the operators to run their own mines was a secondary consideration.

The right of the miners to a raise in wages proportionate to the increased cost of living was a matter to be worked out. In the meantime the people needed coal. Run the mines!

So we need a Commission with extraordinary powers; powers to make full investigations; powers to suggest and to enforce radical and far-reaching policies; powers, if found necessary, to actually keep the business of the country going.

There is, of course, one 'sine qua non.' Such a Commission must be acceptable to all parties concerned. That, undoubtedly is the 'stickler.' But there are men big enough and fair enough to be trusted by even the majority of the members of the Strikers' Committee and the 'Citizens' Committee.

The task of such a Commission would not be an easy one. The strike has revealed how widely divergent are the views of the employers and 'the workers.' Then, what is the alternative? A wide bridge must be found or 'It's a fight to a finish,' and then what?

Let us reiterate there are very reasonable men in both camps.]

The Jurors aforesaid do further present:

4. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

Woe unto them that decree unrighteous decrees, and that write grievousness which they have prescribed; to turn aside the need from judgment, and to take away the right from the poor of my people, that widows may be their prey and that they may rob the fatherless.

ISAIAH [10: 1-2]

And they shall build houses and inhabit them; and they shall plant vineyards, and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat; for as the days of a tree are the days of my people and mine elect shall long enjoy the work of their hands.

ISAIAH II. [65: 21-22]

The Jurors aforesaid do further present:

5. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

ALAS! THE POOR ALIEN

When is an alien not an alien? Answer, when he is a rich man, a scab-herder, or a scab. At first our opponents tried to divide the returned men from the labor forces by attacking the alien in the ranks of organized labor. There are comparatively few men of alien birth in the organized labor movement. The returned men know this. They know that so long as the alien is in this country it is better that he should be in the union and thus assisted to keep from scabbing on other workers. Returned men know that aliens have taken a very insignificant and strictly incidental part in this strike? They know that the Strike Committee has passed a resolution in favor of deporting all undesirable aliens.

Knowing all this the returned men have not been divided from labor by the alien cry, which has been raised by the Committee of One Thousand, from ulterior motives.

Now, the opponents of labor are trying to intimidate the aliens and separate them from the forces of labor.

If any alien will become a scab-herder, or a scab he will be protected. If he stands loyal to his fellow-workers he is threatened with arrest and deportation. There is little doubt that the wholesale arrest of aliens is an attempt to insinuate that the strike is depending largely on alien support. Coupled with this is the idea that the British and Canadian-born workers who constitute the great majority of the strikers would leave these arrested aliens in the merciless hands of the authorities without protest.

If labor did this it is highly probable that the exploiters would be able to persuade many aliens to scab on the strikers. The bosses would have succeeded in dividing the forces of labor and by dividing they hope to conquer. As Alderman Fowler said: 'We must get sane labor to defeat insane labor.' According to the profiteers,

all such labor is sane labor, no matter what its nationality. Once again they will fail. The returned men know, for instance, that some of their comrades of foreign birth have been arrested, held without bail, and threatened with deportation without the formality of a civil trial, and they say: 'If an alien is brave enough to fight in Flanders for British Law and British Justice, he is entitled to all the privileges of British citizenship.' Therefore, neither labor nor the returned men will desert comrades who may be called aliens. This last ruse of the exploiters will also fail. Let us have British Fair Play and British Justice for all.

If after a fair trial undesirable aliens are found, let them be deported.

Meanwhile, how about deporting the profiteers? Everyone knows they are undesirables.

The Jurors, aforesaid, do further present:

6. That J. S. Woodsworth, in or about the month of June, in the year of Our Lord One Thousand Nine Hundred and Nineteen, at the City of Winnipeg, in the Province of Manitoba, unlawfully and seditiously published seditious libels in the words and figures following:

THE BRITISH WAY

Apparently a good many of our local business men have the idea that after the strike things will go on again much as usual. The war was to them merely an interruption in the smooth current of events - an opportunity, perhaps, for piling up greater profits. It is true that a few months ago, we heard considerable talk about 're-construction,' but the matter was not taken very seriously. In fact re-construction for the Canadian business man was conceived as construction on a larger scale along the old lines.

The general strike came somewhat as a shock, just as the business man thought things were beginning to get back to 'normal,' the blanketly blank people upset everything - housing schemes and all. To say that the business man was angry is putting it mildly. He didn't see that the strike was an inevitable outcome of the industrial and financial conditions brought on by the war. Then someone whispered the dread word 'Bolsheviki' and he became positively hysterical. 'The strike was simply a part of

a carefully concocted conspiracy to overthrow constitutional Government in Canada. Five dangerous Reds were responsible for the whole miserable business - off with their heads, and we will have peace and prosperity again!'

Now, if instead of thinking so much about the dreadful things that are happening in Russia, suppose we consider the remarkable changes that are likely to take place in Great Britain. Within the last few days, several men prominent in civic affairs and in the Citizens' Committee, have confessed that they know nothing of the platform of the British Labor Party. Yet, this party is now in opposition in the British House of Commons and, it is generally conceded, will before long become the Government of Great Britain. Their policy is then already a matter of practical politics and may in the not distant future be carried into operation. Either this, say students of social movements, or the deluge!

The draft report on re-construction has already appeared in full in the "Western Labor News" so we touch only on the outstanding points.

'The view of the Labor Party is that what has to be re-constructed after the war is not this or that Government department, or this or that piece of social machinery, but, so far as Britain is concerned, society itself.'

'Revolutionary!' certainly. But the exponents of this view are not persecuted as British and Scotch Anarchists. A goodly number of them have been elected to Parliament.

'The individualist system of capitalist production based on the private ownership and competitive administration of land and capital, with its reckless 'profiteering' and wage slavery; with its glorification of the unhampered struggle for the means of life, and its hypocritical pretense of the 'survival of the fittest'; with the monstrous inequality of circumstances which it produces and the degradation and brutalization, both moral and spiritual, resulting therefrom may, we hope, indeed have received a death-blow.'

'Sounds like a Socialist soap-box orator, eh? And does that really mean the doing away with private ownership of land and capital?' - Precisely! 'Why that's Bolshevism' - Oh, no, its only the policy of the party

in opposition in the British House of Commons.

'We must insure that what is presently to be built up is a new social order, based not on fighting, but on fraternity - not on the competitive struggle for the means of bare life, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in production and distribution for the benefit of all who participate by hand or by brain - not on the utmost possible inequality of riches, but on a systematic approach toward a healthy equality of material circumstances for every person born into the world - not on an enforced dominion over subject nations, subject races, subject colonies, subject classes or a subject sex, but, in industry, as well as in Government, on that equal freedom, that general consciousness of consent, and that widest possible participation in power both economic and political, which is characteristic of democracy.'

'Anarchist, Internationalist, Pacifist, Pro-German, off with him to the penitentiary. He would subvert constituted authority!' In England he is called into the counsels of Government.

In the pamphlet which explains the draft programme, a solemn warning is given: 'Whether we like it or fear it, we have to recognize that in the course of the last three and a half years people have become habituated to thoughts of violence. They have seen force employed on an unprecedented scale as an instrument of policy. . . We may be warned by a perception of these facts that if barricades are indeed likely to be erected in our streets they will be manned by men who have learned how to fight and not by ill-disciplined mobs unversed in the use of modern weapons, likely to be easily overcome by trained troops.'

This is not incendiary writing. It comes from Rt. Hon. Arthur Henderson, who sees some of the dangers ahead of the legitimate aims of labor are baulked.

But what is this new social order and how is it to be brought in? The Labor Party insists first of all on a minimum standard of living. Each family must have sufficient to provide for decent living - good food, clothing, and shelter, opportunities for education, recreation and culture, insurance against accident, sickness, unemployment, old age. The State assumes responsibility for finding men work and providing for all their needs.

This is not continental Socialism. It is not a utopian dream. Today England is paying millions of pounds in unemployment benefits.

In the second place, the Labor Party stands for the democratic control of industry. This means 'the progressive elimination from the control of industry of the private capitalist, individual or joint stock.' It means a genuinely scientific reorganization of the nation's industry no longer deflected by individual profiteering, on the basis of the common ownership of the means of production. ('Rank Socialism!') It means the immediate nationalization of railways, mines and electric power. It means that the worker has a voice and a share in the industry in which he is engaged.

But how is all this to be financed? How provide for the needs of all? How buy out railways and factories? The Britisher doesn't like the word 'confiscation,' so he has worked out a little scheme to accomplish his end in another way. He is not hot-headed like the Russian. He goes more slowly, but he is just as thorough.

He proposes that all revenues should be raised from two sources: (a) an income tax, (b) an inheritance tax.

The capitalist says he will not engage in industry without the incentive of profit. 'Very well,' says the Britisher, 'go to it.' Make all the money you like, but remember the State will take most of it back in taxes.' The Labor Party proposes to exempt from taxation all income not above that necessary to maintain a good standard of living. After that there will be a steeply graded tax 'arising from a penny in the pound on the smallest assessable income up to sixteen or even nineteen shillings in the pound on the highest income of the millionaire!'

With regard to inheritance there will need to be a complete reversal in the point of view. Today we go on the assumption that a man has a right to say who will inherit his property, the State claiming merely certain inheritance taxes. The Labor Party goes on the idea that naked a man came into the world and naked he will go out again. At a man's death all over what is necessary for the needs of his immediate family will revert to the State. Thus, in the course of a generation all the great estates will revert to the common people of England from whom they were filched by the 'enclosing' of the 'common land.'

This is the British way and, remember! It is absolutely 'constitutional'.

The surplus which will accrue from these national enterprises and large revenues will be used for the common good. Such is the programme of the British Labor Party, regarded by Radicals as rather temporizing and altogether too slow.

Do our Canadian business men suppose that with revolutions going on all over Europe and with this programme offered in England as a substitute for sudden and perhaps violent revolution, that we in Canada are going to be permitted to go with undisturbed step along the accustomed ways?

No! We, too, must face the new situation. Whether the radical changes that are inevitable may be brought about peaceably, largely depends on the good sense of the Canadian business man who now largely controls both the industry and Government of this country.

We confess the prospects are not overly bright.

(Sgd.) G. H. WALKER,

Clerk of the Peace.

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX D

On the Outbreak of War.

The following speech was the last major one given in the House of Commons by Mr. Woodsworth.

Tonight I find myself in rather an anomalous position. My own attitude towards war is fairly well known to the members of the house and, I think, throughout the country. My views on war become crystallized during the last war, long before the Co-operative Commonwealth Federation came into existence, but our C. C. F. is a democratic organization that decides matters of policy. My colleagues in the House and in the National Council of the C. C. F., which has been in session with us almost continuously for the last two days, have very generously urged that I take this opportunity of expressing my own opinions with regard to this matter.

First of all, I should like to know Canada's responsibility for the result of British policies. On other occasions in this House I have tried to take my stand with those who have said that we were no longer colonials If I understood the Prime Minister aright, the policy in the past has been for Canada to refuse to have anything to do with any imperial council. Yet he would have us support Great Britain in the results of policies in the formulation of which we have had no part. I do not think that can go on. I think I speak as anyone living in Great Britain would speak. Living under British institutions we claim the right to decide our own policies and not have them decided in any degree outside

Let us be clear on these matters. In my judgment the immediate situation has been due almost entirely to the bungling of Mr. Chamberlain I know something of the way in which Mr. Hitler has been built up by some big interests in Great Britain. I think that anyone who has studied the policies of the British Government for the last year or two - their policy, for example, in Spain - knows that by this means Hitler has been actually built up, as it were, and now that matters have gone too

far a great appeal is sent out, not only through Great Britain but all over the world, to rescue Great Britain from the situation in which she finds herself through the bungling of her own government. I submit that we in Canada should not accept responsibilities for the results of such bungling, since we have no voice in it

After the last war many of us dreamed a great dream of an ordered world, a world to be founded on justice. But unfortunately the covenant of the League of Nations was tied up with the Versailles treaty, which I regard as an absolutely iniquitous treaty. Under that treaty we tried to crush Germany. We imposed indemnities which have been acknowledged by all to be impossible We took away colonies, sank ships, and all the rest of it. We know that long, sordid story. To no small extent it was this kind of treatment which created Hitler. I am not seeking to vindicate the things that Hitler has done - not at all But you cannot indict a great nation and a great people such as the German people. The fact is we got rid of the Kaiser only to create conditions favorable to the development of a Hitler. Of course Canada had her responsibility. But the great nations did not take the League of Nations very seriously. I sat in as a temporary collaborator during one entire session of the League at Geneva, and I am afraid it was a disillusioning experience

Further than that, there was a steady refusal of the nations to go to the help of the countries whose nationality was violated. It is all very well to talk about the sacredness of our treaty obligations. It is all very well to say that Hitler has broken treaties. Well, what about France and Great Britain? It is a sad story. Think of Manchuria and Ethiopia and Spain and Czechoslovakia. And now it is Poland. Modern Poland undoubtedly was one of the nations set up as a result of the treaty.

We remember that Danzig formerly belonged to Germany; its population is something like 90 per cent German. We know that there is a Corridor there which is undoubtedly very valuable to Poland but which is a bar to communications and the unity of Germany. All this is the result of the Versailles treaty I am not sure how far the question could have been settled peaceably; certainly it could not have been so settled at the very last. But efforts should have been made at an earlier stage to do justice.

I will not go into the question of colonies We belong to one of the "have" empires. Germany was late in the game; so was Japan, and today they are naturally seeking to have some of those things which are necessary if they are to compete successfully with the other great empires of the world. So we have a situation developing in which you cannot face a concrete problem and say that all the right is one one side and all the wrong on the other. That cannot be done. It seems to me that above all things we in Canada must avoid hysteria - and we are in a better position to do so than are the people in other places. We must devote our efforts to something constructive

I would ask, did the last war settle anything? I venture to say that it settled nothing; and the next war into which we are asked to enter, however big and bloody it may be, is not going to settle anything either. That is not the way in which settlements are brought about. While we are urged to fight for freedom and democracy, it should be remembered that war is the very negation of both. The victor may win; but if he does, it is by adopting the self-same tactics which he condemns in his enemy. Canada must accept her share of responsibility for the existing state of affairs. It is true that we belong to the League, but anyone who has sat in the House knows how difficult it has been to secure any interest in the discussion of foreign affairs. More than that, we have been willing to allow Canadians to profit out of the situation. The Prime Minister may talk about preventing profiteering now, but Canada has shipped enormous quantities of nickel and scrap-iron, copper and chromium to both Japan and Germany, who were potential enemies. We have done it right along. It may be possible now to prevent it, but I submit that if any shooting is to be done the first people who should face the firing squad are those who have made money out of a potential enemy.

I am among a considerable number in this country who believe that war is the inevitable outcome of the present economic and international system with its injustices, exploitations, and class interests. I suggest that the common people of the country gain nothing by slaughtering the common people of any other country. As one who has tried for a good many years to take a stand for the common people, personally I cannot give my consent to anything that will drag us into another war. It may be said that the boys who stay out are

cowards. I have every respect for the man who, with a sincere conviction, goes out to give his life if necessary in a cause which he believes to be right; but I have just as much respect for the man who refuses to enlist to kill his fellowmen and, as under modern conditions, to kill women and children as well, as must be done on every front. These facts ought to be faced.

The nationalism that we have known in the past has become impossible. It was all very well in the old days for us to erect barriers round ourselves and to say that we would keep everyone off, but the old narrow boundaries are gone forever I am sorry that the League went by the board, but some new and better league is the only salvation of humanity. We had better recognize that fact before we sacrifice many millions more of our people

Now I want to mention one other aspect I left the ministry of the church during the last war because of my ideas on war. Today I do not belong to any church organization. I am afraid that my creed is pretty vague. But even in this assembly I venture to say that I still believe in some of the principles underlying the teachings of Jesus and the other great world teachers throughout the centuries. For me at least, and for a growing number of men and women in the churches - and we should remember there have been people all down through the years in both the Catholic and Protestant churches who held this view - war is an absolute negation of anything Christian.

The Prime Minister, as a great many do, trotted out the "mad-dog" idea; said that in the last analysis there must be a resort to force. It requires a great deal of courage to trust in moral force. But there was a time when people thought that there were other and higher types of force than brute force. Yes, if I may use the very quotation the Prime Minister used today, in spite of tyrants, tyrants as bad as ever Hitler is today, in spite of war makers - and every nation has them - as Lowell reminds us:

"Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne -

Yet that scaffold sways the future, and behind the dim unknown,

Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own."

APPENDIX E

APPENDIX E

The following information was supplied by Mrs. Grace MacInnis in a letter dated February 3, 1955.

Material on Social Welfare

In J. S. Woodsworth Collection in National Archives, Ottawa.

1. Scrap Book No. 1 (1907 - 1910)

Contains a great deal of material about Social Service work at All People's Mission, Winnipeg - including work among immigrants.

2. Scrap Book No. 2 (November 1910 - June 1913)

More detail about All People's Mission

The People's Forum

Report of J. S. Woodsworth's address to the Canadian Conference of Charities and Correction - 1912. (Topic: How Schools can be Put to Wider Uses.)

3. Scrap Book No. 3

Detailed setup of Canadian Welfare League

Articles on aspects of community living, in the Grain Growers' Guide - 1915.

A number of articles on immigrants and their problems.

4. Outline of Bureau of Social Research

(Provisional plan of organization)

Given by J. S. Woodsworth, Director, December 6, 1916.

Includes:

Purpose

Organization

General policy and Budget

The Director

Lines of Research

First Year's Budget.

5. Theological Students' Course in Community Problems
(Prior to 1915?)

- (1) A survey of the social field and the church's relation thereto.
- (2) What is social work?
- (3) Recent advances in social work.
- (4) Changing conditions in Canada.
- (5) Method - inductive and practical, that of the laboratory and the clinic.
- (6) Programme - Conferences, visits of inspection, investigation.

APPENDIX F

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Bisno, Herbert, The Philosophy of Social Work, Public Affairs Press, Washington, D. C., 1952.
- De Schweinitz, Karl, England's Road to Social Security, University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia, 1947.
- Lee, Porter, H., Social Work as Cause and Function, New York School of Social Work Publications, New York, 1937.
- MacInnis, Grace, J. S. Woodsworth A Man to Remember, The MacMillan Company of Canada, Toronto, 1953.
- Queen, Stuart Alfred, Social Work in the Light of History, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1922.
- Reynolds, Bertha Capen, Social Work and Social Living, Citadel Press, New York, 1951.
- Saul, Leon J., Emotional Maturity, J. B. Lippincott Company, Philadelphia, 1947.
- Towle, Charlotte, Common Human Needs, American Association of Social Workers, New York, 1953.
- Toynbee, Arnold J., A Study of History, Vol. III, Oxford University Press, London, 1934.
- Woodsworth, James S., My Neighbor, A Study of City Conditions, Missionary Society of the Methodist Church, Toronto, July, 1911.
- Woodsworth, James S., Strangers Within Our Gates or Coming Canadians, Methodist Young People's Movement, Toronto, 1909.

Articles

- Bowers, Swithun, "Social Work and the Social Worker in the Next Half-Century," Social Work Journal, October 1952, American Association of Social Workers, New York.
- Brote, Stephen, "A Canadian Who Disagreed," Canadian Unionist, vol. 24, 1950, Canadian Congress of Labour, Ottawa.

- Cohen, Nathan E., "Eduard C. Lindeman, Social Welfare Statesman", Social Welfare Forum, Columbia University Press, New York, 1953.
- Davidson, George F. and Edgar Hare, Jr., "The Relationship Between Income Maintenance and Service Programs in Public Welfare", Social Work Journal, July 1953, American Association of Social Workers, New York.
- Fraser, Blair, "Saintly Failure Who Changed Canada", McLean's Magazine, vol. 64, November, 1951, McLean Publishing Company Limited, Toronto.
- Garrett, Annette, "The Professional Base of Social Casework", Principles and Techniques of Social Casework, ed. Cora Kasius, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1950.
- Hamilton, Gordon, "Helping People - The Growth of a Profession", Social Work as Human Relations, Columbia University Press, New York, 1949.
- Hamilton, Gordon, "The Underlying Philosophy of Social Casework", Principles and Techniques of Social Casework, ed. Cora Kasius, Family Service Association of America, New York, 1950.
- Hoey, Jane M., "Social Work Concepts and Methods in the Post-War World", Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, Columbia University Press, 1944.
- Howard, Donald S., "Civil Liberties and Social Work", Social Welfare Forum, Columbia University Press, New York, 1953.
- Kendall, Katherine, "International Social Work - Plans and Prospects", Social Casework, July 1951, Family Service Association of America, New York.
- Mayo, Leonard W., "The Future for Social Work", Proceedings of the National Conference of Social Work, Columbia University Press, New York, 1944.
- McMillan, Wayne, "A Base Line for Community Welfare Services", Social Service Review, vol. XXIV, September 1950, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- McNaught, K. W., "J. S. Woodsworth and a Political Party for Labour - 1896 - 1921", Canadian Historical Review, vol. 30, 1949, University of Toronto Press, Toronto.
- Towle, Charlotte, "Social Casework in Modern Society", Social Service Review, June, 1946, University of Chicago Press, Chicago.
- Youngdahl, Benjamin E., "Social Work at the Crossroads", Social Work Journal, July 1953, American Association of Social Workers, New York.

Youngdahl, Benjamin E., "Social Work as a Profession", Social Work Year Book, 1951, Russell Sage Foundation, New York.

Pamphlets, Minutes, Proceedings, Official Reports

Canadian Child Welfare News - February 15, 1928, Canadian Council on Child Welfare, Ottawa, Canada.

The King vs J. S. Woodsworth, Court of Kings Bench, Fall Assizes, 1919, The Defense Committee, Winnipeg.

Official Reports of the Debates of the House of Commons [Hansard], King's Printer, Ottawa, 1922 - 1941.

Proceedings of the National Conference of Charities and Corrections - 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, Fort Wayne Printing Company, Fort Wayne, Indiana.

Report of the Royal Commission on Dominion - Provincial Relations, Book I Canada 1867 - 1939, King's Printer, Ottawa.

Toward Socialism - Selections from the Writings of J. S. Woodsworth, ed. Edith Fowke, Ontario Woodsworth Memorial Foundation, Toronto, 1948.

Underhill, Frank H., James Shaver Woodsworth - Untypical Canadian, Ontario Woodsworth Memorial Foundation, Toronto, 1944.

Woodsworth, J. S., On the Waterfront, Mutual Press Limited, Ottawa, 1918.

Woodsworth, J. S., Reconstruction from the Viewpoint of Labour, Hecla Press, Limited, Winnipeg, (undated circa 1919).

Woodsworth, J. S., War, - Clippings from a War-time Scrapbook, The Labour Church, Winnipeg, 1918.