Relations industrielles
Industrial Relations

The Impact of Labor Migration: The International Molders and Allied Workers Union in Canada, 1860-1885

C. Brian Williams

Volume 39, Number 2, 1984

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/050032ar
DOI: https://doi.org/10.7202/050032ar

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Département des relations industrielles de l'Université Laval

ISSN

0034-379X (print)
1703-8138 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Williams, C. B. (1984). The Impact of Labor Migration: The International Molders and Allied Workers Union in Canada, 1860-1885. *Relations industrielles / Industrial Relations*, *39*(2), 335–364. https://doi.org/10.7202/050032ar

Article abstract

This paper deals with some aspects in the relationships among Canadian molder locals, American molder locals and the binational organization.

The Impact of Labor Migration
The International Molders and Allied Workers Union in Canada, 1860-1885

C. Brian Williams

This paper deals with some aspects in the relationships among Canadian molder locals, American molder locals and the binational organization.

Beginning with the 1850's and the 1860's, the labor organizations of the United States entered into a phase of their development which has been variously described by labor historians as the period of «nationalization», or the development of «national» trade unions[1]. Up to this time, the vast majority of American labor had been organized into local bodies only. However, the weaknesses of local bodies in face of the changes which were rapidly appearing on the landscape of United States industrialism prompted some unionists to suggest that all local bodies in a trade or related trades throughout the country should come together to form a central organization[2]. As a result of these efforts, American labor entered upon the era of the national trade union[3].

However, it must be noted that the idea of a national trade union had to compete with the idea of regional central bodies as well as the idea of the One Big Union. Some of the richest episodes in American labor history deal with the vigorous contests among supporters of these alternate forms of organization. In addition, the national form of organization did not spring up full grown overnight. Questions such as the relationships between the local and the national, the authority of each to govern, and the trades and occupations included in the national took many years to answer. In many respects, the search for an answer to these questions (some of which still exist today) is the history of the rise of the national trade union. Lastly, not all trades moved to the national form of organization at the same time. The molders began their move in 1855, the miners in 1860, and the papermakers in 1890.

* WILLIAMS, C. Brian, Department of Industrial and Legal Relations, The University of Alberta.

In most, if not all of the literature recording the history of the rise of the national trade union, the events and personalities introduced and identified are American. However, in particularly the early years, the scope of this movement was not limited to the United States. Canadian unionists actively participated in this movement, in many cases assumed its leadership, and some of its strongest supporters were drawn from their ranks. In the case of the molders, and possibly others such as the printers, carpenters, and coopers, what is usually referred to as a rise of their national trade union was in fact the rise of the binational trade union.

It is regrettable that scholars failed to recognize the role and contribution of Canadian labor to this «nationalization» process. If they had, the chances are that the past and present knowledge of Canadian-American trade union relationships would be measurably greater than what it is and consequently the approach taken at times of Canadian-American labor conflict would have been probably quite different than the actual approaches used. Above all, it may have been suggested before now that, in light of the nature of Canadian-American economic relationships, there was a relationship between the reasoning behind «national trade unionism» and binational trade unionism. However, the labor historians' failure to recognize Canada's role and contribution is understandable. The number of Canadian union members and locals was small compared to the United States union members and locals. In terms of personalities and leadership, the nativity or citizenship of the individual is not readily observed in the sources and documents and can be determined only after detailed examination.

The remainder of this paper deals with some aspects in the relationships among Canadian molder locals, American molder locals, and the binational organization. It is designed to bring out the nature and extent of participation by Canadian molders and their locals in the «nationalization» movement, to emphasize the naturalness by which Canadian participation was absorbed into the process and to illustrate the consequences of labor migration across the International Boundary to both Canadian and American labor. Above all, the history of these relationships fails to support any possible argument that Canadian and American union molders sought different ends or otherwise considered themselves separate or apart from their brethren across the border. On the contrary, the cohesiveness shown between Canadian and American union molders, the similarities in their commitment to the binational, the absence of an American molder identification with the United States and Canadian molder identification with Canada, and the failure of nationalistic issues to divide Canadian and American labor are truly remarkable.

Formation of the Molders' Binational Union

The «National Union of Iron Molders» was founded in Philadelphia on July 8, 1859[4]. The Philadelphia meeting was the result of a circular call issued on June 15, 1859, suggesting that workers in the molding trade explore methods of attaining greater co-operation between locals[5]. The convention assembled thirty-two delegates from twelve local unions in the stove and hollowware branches of the trade[6].

After considerable discussion, it was resolved to form a National Union and to appoint a committee of five to prepare a constitution and bylaws for future government. It was argued that a national organization was essential to ensure the advancement of wages, hours, and working conditions in the trade. A local union standing alone was held to be too vulnerable in the face of the employers' power. Signs were already evident of collective action on the part of the foundry employers. Supporters of a central body argued that «In Union There is Strength, and in the formation of a National organization, embracing every Molder in the country; a Union founded upon a basis broad as the land in which we live, lies our only hope»[7].

However, these dual themes of labor solidarity and the establishment of a strong central rule-making body received little encouragement from the constitution itself. At this time the national organization was to be little more than a loose affiliation of autonomous local unions. The powers granted to the national body were extremely limited. It was to «possess original jurisdiction in all matters pertaining to the fellowship of the craft in the United States»[8] and was to be «the ultimate tribunal to which all matters of general importance to the welfare of the members of the different Unions shall be referred and its decisions thereupon shall be final and conclusive»[9]. Finally, it was given power «to determine the customs and usages in regard to all matters pertaining to the craft»[10].

The roving habits of the molders were recognized by the adoption of the travelling or visiting card system. This procedure permitted members holding authorized travelling cards to be received and admitted free of charge to all affiliated union locals. Affiliated locals were directed to submit semi-annual reports of membership, finances, and news of the trade. A rule was adopted which provided financial support to the central body from assessments paid by each local. Before the convention adjourned, to meet again in Albany on January 10, 1860, it was agreed that any local which refused to abide by the «laws and decisions» of the binational union should be expelled[11].

The Albany convention was made up of some forty-six delegates representing seventeen local unions[12]. On the motion of William H. Sylvis, the delegates affirmatively voted: «That this Convention do now resolve itself into a National Union, adopt the Constitution as adopted at the Philadelphia convention....»[13] Although July 5, 1859, is generally considered the date of the formation of the national union, it was not until the Albany convention that the amended constitution of 1859 was finally adopted.

The third convention was held in Cincinnati on January 18, 1861. It was a notable occasion for two reasons. First, the number of locals represented increased from seventeen, in January 1860, to forty-four. Second, this was the first convention attended by accredited Canadian delegates. The Canadian locals represented included Brantford, Montréal, Hamilton, and Toronto. Montréal was represented by John C. McAvoy, Hamilton by John M. Miller, and Toronto by George Sheed. There is also a possibility that an unofficial and unrecognized delegate was in attendance from a London, Ontario local union[14].

Participation of Canadian Locals. Information on the formation of molders' locals in Canada prior to 1861 is sketchy. At the Cincinnati convention of 1861, a committee was directed «to number the local unions according to seniority»[15]. Unfortunately, the term «seniority» was not clearly defined in the directive. Since the practice of issuing charters was not undertaken until May 1863, it is probable that seniority meant, roughly, the date at which the local organization attending the convention was established[16]. However, regardless of the meaning of seniority, we can be confident that the locals were numbered consecutively.

The Philadelphia local was assigned local No. 1[17]. A local union of molders in Philadelphia was sporadically in existence during 1833 and 1834[18] and was firmly established in 1855. It appears that it was this body that was assigned local No. 1[19]. Other locals included Troy (No. 2) established in April 28, 1858; Worcester, Massachusetts (No. 6) founded February 9, 1859; and Buffalo (No. 13) established March 10, 1859. The Montréal local was assigned No. 21. It is likely that the Montréal local was the first Canadian labor local to affiliate with an American organization[20]. The Hamilton local was assigned No. 26; Toronto No. 28; Brantford No. 29; and London No. 37. Although Canadian molders' locals may have existed before 1855, there is strong evidence to suggest that the locals attending the Cincinnati convention of 1861 were all established between 1855 and 1861. According to a report dated October 15, 1864, the Brantford local of the binational struck the firm of Butler and Jackson «some four years ago», which would

indicate that the local (No. 29) was operating in October 1860[21]. The Wilmington local (No. 36) was established by the time of the first convention held in Philadelphia in 1859[22].

The leadership of the Canadian locals took an active part in the government and activities of the binational organization. There is little evidence that the Canadian locals were considered to be «foreign» or their representatives to be from an «alien land»[23]. In 1863, the organization moved to officially recognize Canadian participation. It changed its name from the «National Union of Molders» to the «Iron Molder's International Union» and adopted a seal and logo showing crossed American (Stars and Stripes) and Canadian flags (Union Jack)[24]. The adjective «international» presented subsequent problems when, on July 10, 1872, the Troy convention resolved to petition Congress for legislation incorporating the binational organization[25].

The initial expectations of the leadership for the success of the binational organization were shattered by events following the convention of 1860. Many of the locals disappeared in the turbulent years of 1861 to 1864 as a result of the civil conflict and the fierce opposition offered by foundry employers against the unions demands for recognition and wage increases.

By 1862, the national body ceased to function. Although the subject of holding a convention in 1862 was discussed, no convention materialized. According to a union report:

> By the fall of 1862 not a single officer was performing his duties: President Van Alstyne had left Albany, probably for Canada; treasurer Francis Rosche had died in the service of his country, without paying back the $62 he owed the treasury -- the last resources of the national organization; secretary Robert Gilchrist, by his own description «a staunch friend of those who advocate the protection of labor», was too busy in Louisville politics to concern himself with molders' affairs. Reasons varied, but in the end there was no one to do the work of the central organizations.[26]

Sylvis Visits Canada, September-October 1863

In the closing months of 1862, William H. Sylvis, backed by the Philadelphia local, undertook to rebuild the binational organization[27]. An 1863 convention call was eagerly issued but was coolly received, with only twenty-one delegates from fifteen centers in attendance. At this convention, Sylvis was unanimously elected president. Sylvis' first task was the reorganization of the defunct organization. «Sylvis felt that a committee

should be appointed to visit and organize every foundry city in the United States and Canada, and he asked the delegates to appoint such a committee»[28]. Support for his plan was meager. However, after appointing a deputy to handle national affairs in Philadelphia, Sylvis left on a four-month tour of organization — a journey which was to take him to over one hundred molding centers in Canada and the United States.

Sylvis' initial reaction to the state of the organization in Canada was most enthusiastic. Up to the time of entering Canada, his trip had been fairly successful, and his observations and discussions lent encouragement to his task of rebuilding. However, he knew that the Canadian industry and Canadian locals were facing severe problems. Canadian molders were split because of racial conflicts among the French, English, and German. In addition, the Canadian molding industry was experiencing secondary effects from the development of the industry in the United States. «The foundries there did not share in the profits of the American munitions industry, and the labor market was crowded with Americans who, with one eye on the draft in the United States, were willing to work for any wages and under any conditions»[29].

So many crossed the Canadian border that the trade in Toronto, Montréal, Brantford, Hamilton, and other Canadian towns was «wrecked by molders from the states»[30]. Local unions which issued union cards under fictitious names to those who wished to escape military service, abetted the draft dodgers. A report in the *Iron Molders' Journal* in the fall of 1864 read: «Canada (trade) is again looking up, and only for the skedaddlers from the States would be all right». In the same issue a Troy molder described business as good, and reported a shortage of molders. He added: «I would inform our friends who have been travelling north for their health, that the weather here is considerably cooler now, and Troy is out of the draft, and they can return in perfect safety»[31].

Sylvis' first stop was at Chatham, Ontario, a small city only forty-five miles from Detroit. Although there was no local at Chatham, a number of workmen belonged to the London local. After a brief stay he departed for London where he found the union to be «in very good working order». His next stop was Woodstock, where the visited «a good set of unionists» attached to the Brantford local.

At Brantford, where a strike begun in 1860 at the Butler and Jackson shop was still in progress, Sylvis had a heart-to-heart talk with employers who were determined to starve the molders into submission. In his report, Sylvis offered the following observations on the Brantford situation.

> The Brantford union has had a very hard time in the past three years, having been forced to a contest with the greatest monopoly in the foundry business in all Canada. Owing to circumstances over which they had no control, they were partly defeated, but they are now all right... I introduced myself to Messrs. Butler and Jackson, and had quite a long and interesting conversation with them, during which they admitted that the stand they had taken was a failure; but still they expressed a determination to continue the contest and break up our union. This they say they will accomplish by forming a counter organization, and when the proper time comes all will close their shops and starve us out. I informed them that in that case, we would build our own shops, and do the business ourselves... The Brantford union is now in good condition and will give a good account of itself.[32]

By a mixture of threats and conciliatory proposals, Sylvis achieved a long step towards recognition of the Brantford local.

After visiting Hamilton, at the western end of Lake Ontario, where he found «a good set of men, and equal to the task before them», Sylvis moved on to Toronto. Of the cities and locals visited Sylvis was most pleased with Toronto. «Toronto», he declared, «is the finest city in Canada». As for the Toronto local, «they have altogether, I think, the best union in Canada». Just as Sylvis was immensely pleased with the condition of the Toronto local, the men were equally pleased with him. «The man was master of the work at hand», wrote a Toronto molder to *Fincher's Trades' Review*[33].

At Oshawa, where the unionists belonged to the Toronto local, he had some success in organizing two shops, but in a third he ran into a former Rochester union molder who had made himself «very obnoxious by a system of petty tyranny practiced upon the men». At Belleville there was but one good union man, «the rest ... not worth talking about».

His reaction to the city of Kingston and the city's unorganized molders received special note.

> It is decidedly the dullest place I have ever seen, not excepting Frog Town. Any man who can stay there two hours without getting the «blues», must have a better constitution than I have. there is [sic] three foundries working -- in all about sixteen men and boys without number. In the stove shop, most of the men, or perhaps all, work by the day; four of them working on long floors have a boy each; one of them is the foreman. Although working by the day, they run races to see who can get done first. After that they make over-work by the piece; altogether they probably manage to make a mere living. I heard of one man working in one of the other shops who was receiving only 60 cents or 70 cents a day. I talked to all of the men and found most of them favorable to the union. Made arrangements to have a meeting in the evening; three attended... I left them in disgust, on Monday, the 19th...[34]

On arriving at Montréal, Sylvis found the organization completely broken up. He later reported:

> The great enemy of the union here is religious, political, and national differences among the men. Many of them are so prejudiced, narrow contracted and ignorant, that they would sacrifice everything, self, family, honor and everything else, sooner than do anything for the elevation of themselves and their fellow men.
>
> There are, however, among them some first-class men, who came together and reorganized the union upon a basis that I am sure will secure them a sound and lasting organization[35]

Although Sylvis was discouraged after visiting some of the Canadian molding centers, by the time he crossed back to the United States he concluded that his Canadian trip had been well worthwhile. Just before leaving Montréal for Concord, he filed the following report.

> Having finished my journey through Canada, I will say that so far as the organization is concerned, I am much pleased. I found as good a set of men as I have ever had the pleasure of meeting anywhere, and I have found the unions, with the exception of number _____, in first rate condition; indeed, in some respects they are ahead of any in the States. I am under obligations to them wherever I have stopped, for the many acts of kindness, good-will, and hospitality extended to me during my short visit among them. I shall carry away with me the most pleasing recollections of my sojourn among them.[36]

The apparent success of some of the Canadian locals was short-lived. In 1864, Montréal local No. 21 had undergone a second «reorganization» and was reported to have «resumed operations»[37]. The Hamilton local No. 26 was reorganized during 1871, largely through the efforts of J.H. Dance of local No. 28, Toronto. By October 1871, only the Montréal, Toronto, and London locals were in operation[38].

Strikes Called by Canadian Locals, 1860-1875

The frequency and timing of strikes called by molders' locals in the immediate years following the formation of the binational were two of the main reasons for the failure of many early locals. Although strike aid (but not strike control) was an appropriate function of the national body, the frequency and cost of strikes were such that the binational union, often «embarrassed by difficulties on all sides», was unable to give assistance[39]. In 1861, the convention urged discretion on the calling of strikes and suggested that locals «discountenance all strikes in their respective localities until

other remedies have been tried and have failed»[40]. At first, binational sanction of a strike required approval by the executive board. Later a «circular system» of canvassing locals was adopted which, in effect, meant that strike approval was given by a majority of the membership. Difficulties in obtaining replies to the circular led, in 1870, to a rule that a strike would be sanctioned unless the request received a two-thirds negative vote of the membership.

The first strike called by a Canadian local which received binational support was the four-year strike of the Brantford local against the Butler and Jackson shop. Although the issues involved are not known, the strike was finally settled in favor of the union in October 1864, when the company agreed to operate the shop under union rules. The local called the strike «without any prospect of any assistance beyond their own resources»[41]. However, it later requested and received financial assistance from the binational[42]. The «strike created considerable excitement at the time, and was one of the most bitterly contested we have ever had»[43]. When the strike was finally settled, Sylvis cited this case as an example of what could be done with well disciplined and managed strike action. «This proves that what I have so often tried to show all the time is true, thus: that our ultimate success is only a question of time. We have only to keep pounding away. 'Stick to it', and all will be well»[44]. Sylvis' optimism from gains made after a four year strike bear testimony to both the degree of employer resistance and the union's acceptance and preparedness to make great efforts for seemingly small results.

The Great Lockout of 1866[45]. By 1866, American foundry owners had perfected one of the best employer associations in the United States. Stove molders were among the most skillful, most thoroughly organized, and highest paid craftsmen in the nation. In March of that year, the association and the stove branch of the binational engaged in a contest which became known as the «Great Lockout of 1866».

Earlier in the year the Troy molders demanded the elimination of the east-west wage differential and a general increase of 25 percent[46]. With the support of the Albany molders, the demand was placed before the employers. The proposals were curtly rejected. As a result of the blunt refusal, the Troy local modified its demands by eliminating the 25 percent general increase but retained the demand for wage equalization. Not only did the employers reject this demand, but they also posted the following notice in all Albany and Troy shops on behalf of the newly formed American National Stove Manufacturers and Iron Founders' Association.

> Resolved, that it is ... necessary to the protection of the interests of the iron founders of this country, to organize themselves ... for the ... promotion of a friendly feeling and mutual confidence among the members, and especially for the purpose of resisting any and all actions of the molders' union...
>
> Resolved, that we will proceed at once to introduce into our shops all the apprentices or helpers we deem advisable, and that we will not allow any union committee in our shops, and that we will in every way possible free our shops of all dictation or interference on the part of our employees.
>
> Believing that the interests of both the employers and the employees will thereby be promoted, the employees of this foundry are hereby notified that henceforth this foundry will be conducted in the spirit of the above resolutions.
>
> Troy, March 16, 1866.[47]

Following the posting of the notice, tension among the employees increased. The Troy and Albany employees swore they would not return to the shop until the «obnoxious notice» was withdrawn[48]. The union men considered themselves «locked-out» as long as they were unable to work on union terms.

Union strategy called for limited strike action. The Albany and Troy shops would remain closed while the locals elsewhere remained at work and supplied strike relief. Before long the employers were able to extend the lockout to shops in Covington, Cincinnati, Cleveland, California, Ironton, Indianapolis, Richmond, and London. However, the employers failed to maintain the cohesiveness needed to conclude successfully the lockout. With union approval, the eastern foundries in Buffalo, New York City, Philadelphia, Toronto, and Montréal were kept running. In the west, foundries in Pittsburgh were able to replace the production of the locked-out shops along the Ohio River. Although the number of locked-out unionists numbered 1800, some 5000 remained on the job and, through assessments, provided financial aid.

By the end of the first month, about half of the molders were back at work. At the end of the second month, Sylvis declared the lockout in the east over. In the west, the battle continued. In two more months the contest was over. In the end, the «obnoxious notice» was withdrawn, apprenticeship and helper rules were controlled by the union, and shop committees continued to enforce shop rules and customs. In referring to the strike, the *Working Man's Advocate* reported: «its moral results can scarcely be overestimated showing as it does what can be accomplished when labor is organized on a proper basis»[49]. However, Sylvis knew only too well that the

successes of the great lockout were costly. He continued to urge the locals to use discretion on the strike front, and to prepare for a coming conflict which «will place the one of last spring among the small things»[50].

In the following years, many strikes were called by locals in the Canadian section of the industry. In 1866, the Hamilton local struck against prevailing employment practices. The dispute was settled by Sylvis in May 1866, after he was «repeatedly and urgently requested to help and straighten out a difficulty existing there for a long time»[51].

The Toronto Strikes of the Winter, 1870-1871. The Toronto local called a four-month strike against the Gurney foundry in December 1870. The immediate issue was an employer demand that molders employ berkshires under yearly contracts[52]. However, the union charged that the dispute was in fact an attempt by the employers «to destroy Union No. 28, and through it all the unions in Canada»[53]. According to a union report, «all the powers of the law had been invoked in behalf of the employers»[54]. A number of men were arrested, fined, and thrown into prison. The local also encountered problems with out-of-town strike breakers. The binational gave unqualified support to the Toronto unions. In January 1870, the *Iron Molders' Journal* commented:

> The International Union is bound by every principle of honor and justice, to give those locked out no niggard support. They are fighting the fight that any Union may have forced on them at almost any time...
>
> What is our duty, under the circumstances? Is it to quietly see them driven from their homes to avoid the dungeon, for daring to assert their manhood; or is it to give them every aid, both moral and material? These questions can only be answered by your acts. Every member of the whole organization is interested. Do you know whether your Union has forwarded their tax to support these men? If you do not know, then why don't [sic] you know? Can you not find out? Go to your next meeting and inquire if the money has been forwarded, insist on its being sent at once -- not one week's tax, or one month's tax, but every cent you can spare. It may pinch you to-day, but your Union will be credited with every cent. If it pays more than its legal share the amount overpaid will be credited on the next tax that is levied. The fate of No. 28 and its members undoubtedly is in your hands. What shall it be?[55]

By February 1871, the *Iron Molders' Journal* was able to report that «money is being sent to them as fast as possible and we again urge upon the unions to send every dollar they can possibly spare...»[56].

After four months the strike was broken, largely because of Gurney's ability to obtain «scabs» from local No. 13 in Buffalo, and it was called off when most «men procured work in other foundries»[57].

After pointing out the behavior of the Buffalo molders, the *Iron Molders' Journal* offered the following comments.

> Now what is your duty under the circumstances? Allow us to tell you. It is to so perfect our organization that a molder leaving Buffalo will never know peace until he gets back again. It is to treat every man without a card as coming from Buffalo. It is to treat every man coming from Buffalo as you would a sneak thief who would steal your coat, or the burglar who would break in to your house. Treat him with contempt, or *something he would be more likely to feel*[58]

After the strike, in spite of losing the contest against Gurney, the union reported that:

> The union was placed in such a splendid condition that immediately after the close of the strike, a demand was made for a general advance of wages, and they received it; and since that date another firm, who for years had held out against the union, gave in their adhesion and No. 28 has increased just 50 percent in membership since the strike.[59]

John H. Dance, the corresponding secretary of the Toronto local, in thanking the locals for their support, commented:

> Gurney and his foremen both predicted to the men that the IMIU would not sustain them if they came out, and that a strike would destroy No. 28. The men had full confidence in the IMU, and the sequel has proven that their confidence was not misplaced. I can safely say that since the birth of the IU, no strike has been better supported, and that in the depth of winter, and many out of work.[60]

In January 1871, local No. 28 called a successful organization strike against the Toronto firm of Beard & Co. Since 1869, the firm had operated non-union, refused to employ union members, and attempted to operate using scab molders, boys, and berkshires. However, according to a union report:

> ... they found that reliable men were all Union men, they found that the sober men were all Union men, and they found what to them was a more important, that all the good molders were Union men and they were obliged to take the off scourings of creation, all the drunken scallawags and botch workmen, that found their way to Toronto, while the other shops could get Union men, and their choice of them at that. Their scab foreman was not equal to the emergency, and they found that their trade was fast leaving them, and to save themselves from utter ruin, the nauseous (to them) dose had to be swallowed. A request for a Committee from the Union was promptly complied with [. The shop,] after a long consultation [was] brought under Union rule. The Scabs «walked off on their ears», and Union men took their places; two-thirds

> of the boys were allowed to leave, as the balance were all that could be properly instructed and Beard & Co., now can, without continual dredge [,] make contracts with reasonable hope of filling them.[61]

The binational used this victory to illustrate the power of a well organized local and presented the solidarity shown during the Beard strike as an example for all unionists to follow. After describing the strike as «... one of the most significant victories for the union and its principles that has occurred for many years...,» the *Iron Molders' Journal* offered the following:

> Suppose, as has happened in many places, that when Beard & Co., declared their shop «independent», union No. 28 had thrown up the sponge, declared the Union no benefit, had returned their charter and all became independent, what to-day would have been the condition of the molders of Toronto? Would any of the employers have met them on an equality and discussed matters in which both are vitally interested? Would their wages have been raised 10% as were the wages in Toronto last spring? Let those of the classes mentioned, answer each for himself. We know that, instead of a fair discussion of their respective rights, as has happened, if the Union went down, the employers to-day would have but to command to be promptly obeyed without question; that instead of an advance of wages — reduction would have been the order — and instead of being the best paid mechanics in Canada, they would have been the worst paid. All honor to No. 28, and success to Beard & Co., who honestly acknowledge the failure of their pet scheme to break up the Union.[62]

In May 1872, the Hamilton local called a two-week strike in support of the nine-hour movement. This resulted in a general lockout of all members of local No. 26[63].

The question of financial aid to the Hamilton local was referred to the convention despite the fact that the Toronto local had received $1,276.17 in strike aid. The local claimed aid for the two weeks they were locked out. President Saffin explained: «... having no authority to draw the money from the treasury for a strike or lock-out, until one week after the strike or lock-out is recognized ... I could not recognize the claim. This is the first real lock-out since the law was amended, and I leave the matter to your consideration»[64].

The Hamilton local struck again in August 1874 to restore wage reductions. Again this dispute led to a general lockout of all union members. The lockout was reported «still on» in October 1874. Again the Hamilton local was concerned about the availability of strike breakers from the Buffalo and Troy locals[65].

Canadian Employers and the Lockout. In referring to the use of the lockout against the Toronto (Gurney) and Hamilton locals, President Saffin commented:

> Thus died the first effort in our trade to break our organization by lockouts. Our country is too large, its interests too varied, for them ever to be as successful as they have been in the more crowded nations of Europe. The prompt manner in which union Nos. 26 and 28 squelched the attempt, deserve special commendation at our hands.[66]

Up to 1872, the American molders had seldom encountered the aggressive use of an employer lockout. The lockout of 1866 is one of the few recorded instances of the use of this device. In Canada where the major molding centers were geographically proximate and where a large percentage of molders were employed in a few large shops, the lockout became a frequent employer tactic. It became a popular technique in many trades, particularly during the nine-hour movement of the early and mid-1870's[67].

As far as the molders were concerned, the lockout was a European development which had been borrowed by Canadian employers[68]. Needless to say, the binational viewed the adoption of this technique with considerable alarm, particularly since they fully expected the practice to spread to the United States. Beginning in May 1872 and continuing throughout 1872, hardly an issue of the *Iron Molders' Journal* failed to discuss some aspect of the lockout. The following excerpt, dealing with the definition of the lockout, is typical.

> What constitutes a lockout? This question will no doubt be asked by many who take notice that the convention legislated specifically for «lockouts». As a means of forcing compliance with demands of employers, or resisting the demands of employees they are seldom resorted to in this country, and in all our experience a lockout as it is understood in Europe has never been attempted except lately in Canada. *A lockout really occurs when an employer closes his shop and refuses to allow any person to work therein for a time under any conditions, the object being either to prevent them giving aid to others who may be on strike, or to starve them into a condition suitable for the employer to be able to force them to make terms such as may be dictated by revenge or avarice.* This class of conflicts between labor and capital are [sic] in Europe known as «lockouts».[69]

One of the immediate questions the lockout presented to the binational was: under what circumstances would locked out members receive the support of the binational? And, as a corollary, under what circumstances would members involved in a lockout be entitled to strike relief? These were no easy questions to answer, since in practice the distinction between a strike and a lockout is difficult to identify.

Under the union's strike legislation of 1870, the procedure for binational sanction of a strike included:

(a) the formation of an Arbitration Committee and an attempt to negotiate the dispute,

(b) failing successful negotiation, the submission of the grievances to the binational executive, and

(c) the submission of the grievances by the executive to a vote of the total membership.

Unless the circular received a two-third negative vote, the strike was sanctioned. Strike benefits commenced at the time the strike was formally sanctioned. In most cases, the date of strike sanction was some time after the men had physically left the shop. The time between the date of leaving the shop and the date of official sanction was actually an illegal strike, as far as the binational was concerned[70].

With the introduction of the lockout President Saffin ruled that, in the case of a bona fide lockout, binational support would be given from the date the bill of grievances was submitted to the binational executive[71]. As a result, several locals, who in fact had struck, submitted a bill of grievances claiming they were locked-out and hence immediately entitled to strike benefits.

Mobility in the Molding Trades

Canadian locals, like almost all locals of the binational, were faced with the problem of attempting to control the activities of the travelling member. Many molders, particularly in the early period, identified themselves not with a particular firm, but with the level of economic activity experienced in the various molding centers. Consequently, the unemployed molder often travelled from one center to another in search of work. These centers roughly fell into three geographical areas: eastern United States — New York, Massachusetts, and Connecticut; western United States — Ohio, Missouri, and Michigan; and Canada — Ontario and Québec. Knowledge of the level of economic activity and the firms which were «hiring» was obtained from three principal sources: other travelling members, reports on the conditions of trade as reported in the *Iron Molders' Journal,* and advertisements placed by employers in the public press[72]. The movement of molders to and from Canada and the United States was extensive and, by the early 1870's, had become a characteristic of the labor market structure in the trade[73].

At an early date, locals began loaning money to unemployed travelling members. This practice was based on the belief that, since the travelling member was an unemployed member of the trade, he should receive aid and assistance from fellow members. Before long this practice became abused.

In 1860, the binational ordered that amounts advanced by a local to a member from another local should be noted on the back of the bearer's beneficiary card. The local receiving the card was to collect any funds owing and forward them to the lending local. In the late 1860's, many locals complained that collections could not be made because holders would not submit cards, borrowers would simply not pay, or the bearer had tampered with the card. In addition, it was charged that unions receiving cards seldom made a real effort to collect. Eventually these abuses led to the labelling of travelling members as «bummers», rather than as honest mechanics out of work. Many locals declared that they would no longer be «taken in» by travelling «loafers» who desired «meal tickets». By the 1890's, the eagerness of the locals to assist travelling members had appreciably declined.

The travelling member was very much a part of the life of the Canadian local. Canadian locals participated in the debate on the union-wide benefit plans and the loan funds, and expressed concern over the abuses of the lending system. Like their American counterparts, Canadian locals had adherents of the «travelling» and «non-travelling» points of view. Supporters of the travelling and non-travelling points of view corresponded, roughly, to those who argued in favor of binational authority and those who argued in favor of local authority.

However, the major and somewhat unique problem faced by Canadian locals was the number of unemployed molders travelling to Canada from cities in the United States. What set Canadian locals apart from most American locals was the fact that Canadian molding centers and their locals were very small but within easy travelling distances from large centers and locals in both the eastern and western sections of the American industry. In addition, the Canadian centers were grouped closely together, whereas the American centers were further apart. Consequently, knowledge of a few job opportunities in the Canadian centers resulted in a large migration of molders from the United States[74]. As a result, there was often an oversupply of molders in Canadian centers. In the depression year of 1873, the number of American molders entering the Canadian labor market relative to the job opportunities available caused some Canadian locals to withdraw from the spirit of North American labor solidarity behind the protective shield of Canadian economic nationalism.

Statistics on the binational's membership in Canada are fragmentary. However, by 1870, it most likely did not exceed 350 molders. Membership figures, as reported by Canadian locals, and taken from «Report from Locals» in the *Iron Molders' Journal,* are given below in Table 1[75].

In early 1864, the locals of the binational began to publish the travelling cards received and issued as part of their monthly report in the *Iron Molders' Journal.* From 1864 to February 1867, only the travelling member's name was recorded. Consequently, the home local of the travelling member cannot be determined. However, in March 1867, the binational instituted a numbered travelling card system. Subsequently, locals reported to the *Journal* the number shown on cards received and issued, rather than the name of the card holder. With the aid of a directory showing the card numbers allocated to each local, an estimate can be made of the extent of migration of members between locals. Travelling cards received by selected Canadian locals from Canadian and American locals, during the period 1870 to 1875, are shown below in Table 2[76].

TABLE 1

Membership of Canadian Locals Established Between May 1859 and October 1867 as Reported in «Reports From Locals»: Selected Dates

	Date of Report				
Local	*4/11/1864*	*10/15/1864*	*3/1867*	*3/1867*	*10/1867*
Montréal — 21	10*	16	19	19	17
Hamilton — 26	50	63	59	60*	62
Toronto — 28	56	70	75	85	96
Brantford — 29	20	31	15	15	17
London — 37	26	28	5	5*	10
Oshawa — 136			20	13	16
St. John — 176				25	31
Halifax — 181					21*
Estimated Total	162	208	193	222	270

*Estimate

SOURCE: «Reports from Locals», *Iron Molders' Journal,* for dates shown.

As Table 2 indicates, the most popular Canadian cities for travelling members were Toronto, Hamilton, and Oshawa. In each year they received well over 50 percent of the cards received by all Canadian locals. In addition, the vast majority of cards received by Canadian locals belonged to members from the United States. The ratio of card holders received from Canadian and American locals averaged 1 : 5 throughout the period and ranged from 1 : 1 in 1870, to 1 : 9 in 1871.

Beginning in 1872, Canadian locals experienced a sharp increase in the number of cards from American locals. From a low of only six in 1870, the number of American cards received increased to fifty-four in 1872; twenty-five in 1873; seventy-six in 1874; and sixty-four in 1875[77]. Because of this increase and remembering that membership in Canadian locals likely did not exceed 350 members, the relations between Canadian and American locals took on an antagonistic mood. In the winter of 1873, under the title of «The Invasion of Canada», Canadian members charged that American molders were flooding the Canadian labor market, acting as strike breakers, and undermining the program of Canadian locals[78].

TABLE 2

Number of American and Canadian Travelling Cards Received by Selected Canadian Local, 1870 — 1875

	Year						
Local	*1870*	*1871*	*1872*	*1873*	*1874*	*1875*	*Total Received*
Montréal-Canadian	—	—	—	—	1	—	1
American	1	2	8	1	6	3	21
Hamilton-Canadian	4	—	9	3	3	2	21
American	4	5	25	6	20	14	74
Toronto-Canadian	—	1	3	—	2	1	7
American	—	6	15	1	15	10	47
Brantford-Canadian	—	—	2	—	1	—	3
American	—	—	3	1	15	8	27
London-Canadian	1	—	1	—	—	3	5
American	1	—	3	8	6	13	31
Oshawa-Canadian	—	—	—	2	1	4	7
American	—	—	—	8	14	16	38
Totals — Canadian	5	1	15	5	8	10	44
American	6	13	54	25	76	64	238

As would be expected, the large majority of American card holders were from locals near to Canadian locals and from cities located on major north-south transportation routes. Locals which supplied ten or more molders during the period included Cleveland, St. Louis, Cincinnati, Detroit, Troy, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, and Washington. Troy headed the list with thirty-seven, followed by Cincinnati and Detroit with twenty-four and twenty-three, respectively. Molders travelled to Canada from seventy-five American cities, ranging from as far west as San Francisco and as far south as Mobile, Alabama.

There is little doubt that the extent of this migration of molders from the United States to Canada was of very real concern to Canadian locals. One major consequence of the loose labor market was the possibility that union molders might intentionally or unintentionally, act as strike breakers or might accept employment on terms less favorable than those demanded by the Canadian local[79].

Reports stating, «trade middling, keep away»,[80] or «times are very dull at present, on account of Strike. Stay clear of this place for the present,[81] are common. At times the report advises of union conflict with an employer and urges the use of caution. One such report from Montréal is typical: «... if any union man should come this way, they must look out for the firm of Ives and Allan, for they are the greatest rascals on this continent. They have their boasts how they broke up the union when it was first formed. So steer clear of them as you would a pestilence»[82]. In September 1864, the Hamilton local reported that «there are more molders coming here than I ever saw before, and this makes employers feel very independent. No molders wanted»[83].

On the occasion of the Toronto strike in the months of December 1870 and January 1871, the local ran into a serious problem because of the practice of the members of local No. 13 at Buffalo travelling to Toronto for the purposes of strike breaking. According to a journalist of the time, when referring to the Toronto strike:

> Victory was merely a question of time. But the hordes of Buffalows have swooped down upon them, and now it is a war of extermination. They have not only to contend against the Buffalows, but the rigor of an old English statute, that was, perhaps, enacted, when all laborers were serfs. This statute has been brought to bear against them; and the statute, as interpreted by a subsidized judge, places them at the mercy of their oppressors.[84]

The travelling member presented problems for the binational as well as the local. Throughout the decades of the 1860's and 1870's, the binational

attempted to establish itself as a supreme authority, governing not only the rules and regulations under which union members were employed, but also the activities and interests of the union member in the trade. By and large, this process involved the replacement of local authority with binational authority. The molder had to become a citizen of the binational system of government rather than the local system of government.

This transfer of allegiance generated considerable debate between the travelling and non-travelling member groups. From 1864 to 1870, proposals for a union-wide death and disability plan in place of already established local plans received encouragement from the travelling members. They argued that it «was unfair to force them to pay beneficiary fees while they belonged to certain local unions and then to deny them any rights to benefits when they moved to other jurisdictions»[85]. On the other hand, the non-travelling members were adamantly opposed to the proposal. The travelling members offered a similar argument in support of a binational sick benefit plan. This plan was finally adopted on a binational basis in 1895.

Conflict Over American Presence in Canada

Dissonance and expressions of conflict were expressed by Canadian molders' locals on two occasions. The first was essentially a protest against the number of American molders travelling to Canadian cities and became known as The Invasion of Canada of 1873[86]. The second incident occurred in 1884 and was known as the Secession Movement of 1884[87].

In late 1883, unionists in the binationals' Toronto local organized a short-lived and unsuccessful campaign to bring Canadian molders under the banner of Canadian unionism. This movement proved to be the forerunner of many such movements within Canadian labor.

The year 1883 brought depression to the molding trades of Canada and the United States. Unemployment was widespread and most shops operated only part time. As business conditions worsened, the well organized Canadian Founders' Association demanded wage reductions. The binational executive board, realizing the widespread depression in the industry and the futility of resisting all wage reductions, urged locals to accept wage reductions provided they were just and reasonable. In December 1883, the Toronto local submitted a bill of grievances to the executive board and requested authority to strike against the CFA's wage reduction demands. The board (of which J.H. Dance of Toronto was chairman) rejected the grievance and

refused to authorize strike aid to the Toronto local[88]. As a result of the board's refusal to grant aid, the Toronto unionists began agitation to withdraw Canadian locals from the binational and to form a Canadian union of molders.

The seceders argued that the interests of Canadian molders would best be served if the authority to govern their affairs rested in their own hands. Since the binational executive board controlled the «purse» they were stripped of the resources needed to support a strike and consequently they had no alternative but to accede to the CFA's demands. In January of 1884, an Oshawa unionist commented on the secession proposal.

> The are times which tries [sic] the metal and patience of good Union men — these are the times for chronic growlers to get their work in and sow the seed of discord among their fellow-members and advocate secession. What we want in Canada is good, live Union men to go to work in earnest, and put their foot on all attempts to cause dissatisfaction among our members. They should realize the fact that in their Unions rest the only hope against persecution; and he who refuses to support them now, with all the means in his power, wrongs not only himself, but his fellow-craftsmen...
>
> To those who are so anxious to secede from our noble organization, I ask is the cause you profess to espouse likely to be benefited by the formation of a National Union? Can you afford to countenance, either by word or deed, the formation of an organization which can only widen the breach, or prove a stumbling block in the endeavor to secure that which we are all looking for through unification of our trade? Have the leaders of this new movement more brain power, more executive ability, more experience, more honesty and more determination of purpose? Are the principles they advocate more acceptable, more likely to achieve the redemption of the molders in Canada, or command their attention, than those which have heretofore been proclaimed by their representatives?... Would it have been good policy to resist under the present circumstances? It would have been suicidal.[89]

The Oshawa letter and the Canadian secession move led to a series of correspondence between Canadian and American molders which demonstrates that the secession proposal was not motivated simply by the desire for Canadian independence from American labor organizations or by other national issues. On the contrary, it was motivated by the desire to free themselves from the laws and authority of the union's central rule making body. In addition, the type of unrest exhibited by the Toronto unionist was not limited to Canadian locals, but developed among American locals as well. In February 1883, Detroit local No. 244 and two other machinery molder locals seceded and eventually formed the International Brotherhood

of Machinery Molders. Separate organizations were advocated on the grounds «that each branch of the trade would best legislate for its own wants and necessities, and further, that the burden of strikes ... had been borne by the machinery trade»[90]. In mid-1884, many American locals found the laws so faulty as to warrant the call for a special convention. However, the costs involved proved prohibitive.

In February 1884, correspondence from a member of the Toronto local commented on the Oshawa letter.

> In looking over the *Journal* I was pleased to find an article written by Sand Artist wherein he rams home some pertinent remarks to those members in this section who have lately been trying to sow the seeds of discord among the members in this city and elsewhere... One of the chief causes that impede the triumphant march of all trades unions is the want of confidence on the part of the members (the molders included).
>
> There is a proper time for all things, and if these brothers are sincere in this scheme of Canadian unions separating from the IMU of NA they can put their ideas into the shape of a series of resolutions and submit them at the coming convention when, if deemed advisable after mature deliberation — and it is the desire of the molders in Canada, which is far from the case just now — there will be no trouble in bringing it about in a constitutional and harmonious way.[91]

In the March issue, a unionist from Oshawa stated the position of the secessionists.

> ... I am of the opinion that, as far as our laws are concerned, we are making little or no progress towards perfection.
>
> Before the last convention there were numerous interesting letters in the *Journal* dealing with the various reforms and amendments deemed necessary in our laws, and I had hoped to see some radical changes; but very little alteration [sic] were made, and not all of those carried out, as for instance, the formation and continuance of a good sinking fund for strike purposes. Now when reductions are the order of the day with our employers (who intuitively seem to know how matters stand with us), we are totally defenceless, and compelled to take a reduction whenever it is demanded...
>
> A comparison between our own constitution and the English molders' constitution will convince any unprejudiced man of the necessity for reform, and while we can never hope to be perfect we may at least remove such causes for discontent as at present exist.[92]

In June, a Cleveland unionist called upon unionists who find fault with the laws to work for their improvement.

> ... the writer wishes to inquire what remedies have been suggested by those disaffected Unions who are airing their feelings through circulars and calling for a convention? It is the opinion of the writer that it would be well for those who see so many imperfections in our laws, and are so fearful that, as an organization, we are on the verge of ruin and bankruptcy, to reduce their magnifying powers, and suggest some practical remedies to prevent this dire calamity that is going to befall the IMU of NA. If a convention is an absolute necessity, and the only way out of present difficulties let us have some matured ideas upon these imperfections that are claimed to exist.[93]

Discussion. The foregoing brief account of the activities of the Molders' Binational Union in Canada during the first twenty years of its existence has attempted to highlight several features in the developing relations between Canadian locals and a binational craft organization. The molders are simply representative of the broader movement towards binational craft organizations[94]. The following are the major conclusions.

First, locals of the craft existed in Canada before the time of the formation of the binational.

Second, most of the Canadian affiliates of the binational can be divided into two classifications: (a) locals established previous to the formation of the binational and which voluntarily affiliated with it after its formation, and (b) locals organized directly by the binational.

Third, the activities of the binational in Canada and the activities of Canadian locals in the binational were part of a movement towards the formation of a centralized rule making trade union structure.

Fourth, to binational craft unionists, the limits on territorial jurisdiction were defined by economic and social constraints, not political constraints such as the International Boundary. As the events reported in this paper have attempted to convey, the attitude of the binational to Canadian locals did not differ substantially from its attitude to American locals, while the attitude of the Canadian locals to the binational union did not differ substantially from the attitude of American locals to the binational union. It is almost as if all three — the binational, the American locals, and the Canadian locals — believed that the territorial expansion of the centralized form of union organization to Canada was a natural and logical extension of the philosophy which brought Pennsylvania and New York locals together in 1859 to form the then national organization.

Fifth, in order to develop a strong centralized labor organization, Canadian locals had to be included. Canadian locals, in turn, needed a strong centralized organization to survive. The apparent agreement on the

need for an expansion of territorial jurisdiction was a most significant feature in the developing relations between the binational and Canadian locals.

The foregoing should not be interpreted as meaning that all Canadian locals accepted the idea of a strong centralized organization having territorial jurisdiction throughout North America. They did not. But neither did all American locals. However, dissonance on the part of Canadian locals over the structure and program of the binational was not cast in the context of American interference, or the need for an all-Canadian union of molders. On the contrary, the issues were part of a series of continuing disputes which started at the time of the formation of the binational and have continued to this day. The root source of these disputes was the need of the centralized model of the trade union organization to command the allegiance and commitment of a unionist to the central rule making authority. The immediate issues flowing from this basic conflict included: demands that the trade jurisdiction of the union be divided and a union formed for each jurisdiction, demands for local autonomy in organizing, collective bargaining, strike control, and the levying of taxes and assessments; and demands for an executive (or central structure) more responsive to the wishes of the local membership.

The Invasion of Canada and the Secession Movement were two early examples of Canadian labor's protest against what is often called «American participation in Canadian labor affairs». However, in the context of these two examples the phrase is meaningless inasmuch as it does not reveal the basic nature of the issue in dispute — the relations between Canadian local unionists and their central rule making body. It is probable, in the light of the preponderance of regional issues raised against the formation of national unions in the United States and the commitment of Canadian labor to a centralized union structure, that these issues would have arisen even if Canadian locals had formed their own Canadian molders' union[95]. In addition, the phrase suggests that this participation is unwholesome simply because Americans are citizens of the United States and Canadians are citizens of Canada. However, the record of the binational molders' union in Canada is barren of any evidence that nativity, citizenship, residence, or other characteristics that separate Americans from Canadians, influenced relations among Canadian molders, American molders, their locals, or the binational.

1 For example, COMMONS and Associates, *History of Labor in the United States,* Vol. II, Chapters I-V, and Lloyd ULMAN, *The Rise of the National Trade Union.*

2 For an interesting account of the relationship between industrial expansion and union expansion, see John R. COMMONS, «American Shoemakers, 1648-1895, A Sketch of Industrial Evolution», *Quarterly Journal of Economics,* Vol. XXIV, November 1909, pp. 39-83.

3 The word «national» in the literature on the national trade union is used in the context of territorial jurisdiction of the central body. Of course, as industry developed and became located in new areas, territorial jurisdiction increased. Ultimately, as industry spread throughout the country, the national trade union assumed jurisdiction throughout the territory of the United States.

4 In 1861, the name was changed to the Iron Molders' Union of North America in recognition of Canadian locals. In 1863, the name was again changed to Iron Molders' International Union. Because of the connotation «international» the name, in 1874, became Iron Molders' Union of North America. In 1907, the name was again changed to give «adequate expression to existing trade and territorial jurisdiction». The name, Iron Molders' and Allied Foundry Workers Union, was adopted in 1921.

5 A full account of the formation of the early locals and the founding of the national union is given in F.T. STOCKTON, *The International Molders' Union of North America,* Chapter 2, pp. 17-23. The first history of the Molders' Union was written by a Canadian unionist at Oshawa, Ontario. It was published in twenty-seven parts, commencing with the September 30, 1888 issue of *IMJ* and ending with the January 31, 1891 issue.

6 Representation was as follows: Philadelphia — 10; Troy — 5; Albany — 5; St. Louis, Jersey City and Providence — 2 each; Utica, Wilmington, Peekskill, Port Chester, Cincinnati, and Baltimore — 1 each. Canadian locals were not represented.

7 «To the Molders of the United States», IM&AWU *Proceedings,* 1859, p. 8.

8 IM&AWA *Constitution,* 1859, Article 1, IM&AWA *Proceedings, 1859, p. 9.*

9 *Ibid.*

10 *Ibid.*

11 IM&AWA *Constitution,* 1859, Article VII, IM&AWA *Proceedings,* 1859, p. 11.

12 IM&AWA *Proceedings,* 1860, p. 1.

13 *Ibid.,* p. 2. William H. Sylvis, one of the most prominent of early American trade union leaders, was president of the binational from January 6, 1863, until his sudden death on July 27, 1868. The best known biography on Sylvis is Jonathan CROSSMAN, *William Sylvis, Pioneer of American Labor.*

14 *IM&AWA Proceedings,* 1861, pp. 4 and 5.

15 *Ibid.,* p. 21.

16 «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1864, p. 6. «In May last, I had prepared a form of Charter, which has been issued all Unions now having an organization.»

17 «Report of Committee on Numbering of Locals», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1861, pp. 21-22.

18 As reported in John R. COMMONS and Helen L. SUMNER, *Documentary History of American Industrial Society,* Vol. 5, pp. 341 and 348.

19 STOCKTON, *op. cit.,* p. 14.

20 Actually the first binational organization in Canada was British. The Amalgamated Society of Engineers (ASE) established its first local in Canada in 1850, followed by three more in 1851. In 1860, the Amalgamated Society of Carpenters and Joiners (ASCJ) became the first permanent union in the buildings trades. The ASE was absorbed into the International Association of Machinists in 1920. The ASCJ was absorbed into the United Brotherhood of

Carpenters and Joiners in 1914, though some branches seceded in 1922 and resumed their status of locals of British organizations. In 1925 the ASCJ finally withdrew from Canada.

21 *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 9, October 15, 1864, p. 1.

22 STOCKTON, *op. cit.,* p. 14. The location and data of affiliation of Canadian locals and Canadian locals represented at conventions are given in Charts III and IV, Appendix I.

23 At the Cincinnati convention of 1861, William F. Beck of local No. 29, Brantford, was unanimously elected financial secretary for a one-year term. Through a resolution submitted by Mr. Beck, the support of the binational was given to a strike conducted by the Brantford local during January 1861. Beck also acted as recording secretary at the Toronto, was elected second vice president at the Chicago convention of 1865. At the Toronto convention of July 8, 1868, R.G. Breeze of local No. 136, Oshawa, was elected fourth vice president. The Philadelphia convention of July 6, 1870, and the Troy convention of July 10, 1872, elected J.H. Dance of local No. 28, Toronto, third vice president. On July 8, 1874, John Nolan of local No. 28 was elected third vice president. The Brooklyn convention of July 10, 1882, elected J.H. Dance second vice president. Two years later, on the death of the incumbent, Thomas E. White; Dance assumed the office of first vice president and chairman of the executive board. R.H. Metcalf of local No.28, was elected trustee at the London convention of July 7, 1886. «Report on Election of Officers», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* for dates shown.

24 IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1864, p. 6. «I took the responsibility of having a new seal made, the old one, in my opinion, not being international in design.»

25 The bill for incorporation was first presented to Congress by the Hon. Job Stevenson in 1873. However, Congress adjourned without taking action. In 1874, the bill was presented for a second time by the Hon. H.B. Banning, and was referred to the committee on education and labor. Shortly afterwards, President William Saffin was advised that certain members had entered serious objections to the bill and was requested to visit Washington to consider changes in the measure. The major objections to the charter centered on the use of the word «international» and on the location of the home office outside the District of Columbia. The latter difficulty was met by establishing a representative in Washington. The former difficulty required a change in title since the adjective «international» had overtones of the Internationale and the Commune of Europe, and suggested that the molders were sympathetic with European radical developments. The Richmond convention of 1874 abandoned the use of the work «international», and adopted the title «Iron Molders' Union of North America». However, further attempts had to be made to set aside suggestions raised in the Congress that the molders were sympathetic with the Internationale. A resolution had been passed at the Troy convention of 1872, which denounced the Internationale and forbade any local to participate in, associate with, or contribute to, any activities of the Internationale. This resolution was sent to the Congress and delivered in an address by the Hon. H.B. Banning. A further objection was raised to listing William Gibson of Toronto as a member of the corporation. According to one legislator, «it is an extraordinary idea to incorporate foreigners by an act of Congress». Mr. Gibson's name was subsequently stricken from the bill *IMJ,* June 30, 1874, pp. 388-403. «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* July 1, 1874, pp. 17-18. *IMJ,* March 31, 1873, pp. 1 and 2. *IMJ,* September 10, 1874, p. 1. *IMJ,* June 30, 1874, p. 402. *Congressional Record,* June 18, 1874, as reported in *IMJ,* June 30, 1874, p. 391.

26 Jonathan CROSSMAN, *op. cit.,* pp. 55-56. Norman Van Alstyne, third president of the Binational, assumed office in January 1861. At the time of the collapse of the Binational in the fall of 1862, Van Alstyne mysteriously disappeared. He later turned up as a foreman in the Ives and Allen shop in Montréal.

27 Based on «Report of William Sylvis on Canadian Trip», *Fincher's Trades' Review,* Vol. 1, No. 22, October 31,1863, p. 87, and IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1864, pp. 4-6.

28 CROSSMAN, *op. cit.,* p. 57.

29 *Ibid.*, p. 61.

30 *Ibid.*, p. 50.

31 *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 8, September 1864, pp. 63-64.

32 «Report of William Sylvis on Canadian Trip», *op. cit.*, p. 87. As noted earlier, the «counter organization» was formed in November 1865. See *Supra,* pp. 92-93.

33 *Ibid.*, p. 88.

34 *Ibid.*, p. 87.

35 *Ibid.*

36 *Ibid.*

37 IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1864, p. 5.

38 *IMJ,* October 31, 1871, pp. 4-5.

39 STOCKTON, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

40 IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1861, p. 39.

41 *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 9, October 15, 1864, p. 1.

42 IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* 1861, Tuesday, January 15th, p. 32. «Mr. William S. Beck offered a resolution sanctioning the Brantford strike. Agreed to.»

43 *IMJ, op. cit.*, p. 1.

44 *Ibid.*

45 The following account was drawn, in part, from CROSSMAN, *op. cit.*, pp. 166-170.

46 The wage differential was in favor of the west. The east-west dividing line was usually referred to as the «Mobile-Detroit line». This east-west line also defined the east and west stove marketing areas, i.e., eastern producers sold only in the eastern market, western producers only to the western market.

47 As reported by CROSSMAN, *op. cit.*, p. 167.

48 «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* January 2, 1867, p. 5.

49 *Working Man's Advocate,* Vol. 2, No. 39, April 21, 1866, p. 2.

50 As reported by *CROSSMAN, op. cit.*, p. 170.

51 IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* January 2, 1867, pp. 8-9. While in Canada, Sylvis also visited the Toronto and London locals.

52 *IMJ,* February 28, 1871, p. 13. See also pp. 96-97 Supra.

53 «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* July 10, 1872, p. 6. There is considerable evidence that Local No. 28 of Toronto was the leading Canadian local.

54 *IMJ, op. cit.*

55 *IMJ,* January 31, 1871, pp. 1-2.

56 «The Lockout of No. 28», *IMJ,* February 28, 1871, p. 13. Locals responding to the appeal included Albany — $10; St. Louis — $20; Cincinnati — $10; Indianapolis — $10; and Brooklyn — $10. See *IMJ,* August 31, 1871, p. 16.

57 IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* July 11, 1872, p. 6, also *IMJ,* January 31, 1871, pp. 1 and 16; April 30, 18)71, p. 11.

58 *IMJ,* November 30, 1870, p. 5, (italics in original).

59 «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* July 10, 1872, p. 6.

60 *IMJ,* April 30, 1871, p. 11.

61 *IMJ,* December 31, 1871, p. 3.

62 *Ibid.* Apparently the strikes of 1870 and 1871 had led to a general disorganization of Canadian locals. As a result and because of the «condition of affairs in Canada», and «urgent requests from there», President Saffin undertook a reorganization tour in December 1871. See *IMJ,* January 31, 1872, pp. 1-3.

63 The Canadian Foundry Employers developed quite a reputation for the use of the lockout. Referring to the Hamilton local, a writer in the *IMJ* commented: «The Canadian employers in our trade seem to be the only employers in America who ape the customs of the

British employer, by endeavoring to compel a compliance with their wishes by resorting to what is popularly known as a lock out.» *IMJ,* September 10, 1874, p. 54.

64 «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* July 10, 1872, p. 7.

65 *IMJ,* September 30, 1874, p. 89, and February 10, 1875, p. 209. Earlier in the year, the continued deterioration of Canadian locals and the Buffalo strike breaker problem, prompted President Saffin to make his second visit to Canadian locals. See *IMJ,* March 31, 1874, pp. 307-308.

66 «President's Report», IM&AWU, *Proceedings,* July 10, 1872, p. 7.

67 The lockout campaign in the molding trade was prompted by the influential Canadian Iron Founders' Association and its most prominent leader, Edward Gurney. The organized nature of this campaign is reflected in *IMJ,* December 10, 1874, pp. 151-153, and January 10, 1875, p. 187.

68 *IMJ,* May 31, 1872, pp. 14-15, and September 10, 1874, pp. 54-56.

69 *IMJ,* July 31, 1872, p. 5. (Emphasis added for clarity.)

70 *IMJ,* November 30, 1872, p. 1.

71 *IMJ,* September 30, 1872, p. 8.

72 For example of last two mentioned, see *IMJ,* January 31, 1884, p. 16, June 30, 1883, p. 14, and August 31, 1884, p. 4.

73 The issues concerning the travelling molder are introduced not only to illustrate the labor market structure in the trade but also to present an example of the common problems faced by Canadian and American locals and the binational. Other important issues which received the attention of these three groups included the beneficial feature and qualifications of officers and delegates to the binational's convention. Canadian molders frequently expressed their views in the *IMJ.* During 1870-1875, the letters of Canadian unionists writing under names such as Sand Artist (Oshawa), Unity (Toronto), and Fiedes et Justitia (Oshawa) became almost as common as the *Journal's* masthead. In some issues the correspondence columns, and often the editorial columns, were completely taken up by Canadian contributions.

74 For example, see comments of Oshawa unionist, *IMJ,* December 10, 1875, pp. 528 and 541.

75 Report of membership was discontinued in October 1867.

76 Table 2 includes only those cards numbered below 5000 where the location of the issuing local could be identified. Unfortunately, the records showing the locals which issued cards numbered above 5000 are not available. The number of cards received totalled 892. Only 282 could be identified. The number of cards issued and received both identifiable and unidentifiable are given in Table 12, Appendix I.

77 Assuming that the ratio between the total Canadian and American cards received was the same as the ratio between Canadian and American cards received and identified, the number of American cards received each year would be: '71-17; '72-131; '73-87; '74-218; '75-181.

78 The movement of workmen between Canadian and American molding centers had always been a characteristic of the labor supply in the molding trade. Correspondence from Canadian unionists expressing concern over the northern migration of American molders first appeared in *IMJ,* November 30, 1870, p. 4, and January 31, 1871, pp. 1 and 16. «The Invasion of Canada» refers to the unusually large numbers of American molders who travelled to Canada during the winter of the depression year, 1873. Correspondence referring to «The Invasion of Canada», was published in *IMJ,* November 30, 1873, pp. 181-182; December 31, 1873, pp. 202-202, 213; February 28, 1874, p. 267; and April 30, 1874, pp. 338 and 375.

79 For an example of the consequences of this migration on the Hamilton local, see *IMJ,* April 10, 1875, p. 277.

80 Hamilton Report, *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 1, February 10, 1864.

81 Toronto Report, *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 2, March 10, 1864.

82 Montréal Report, *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 4, May 10, 1864.

83 Hamilton Report, *IMJ,* Vol. 1, No. 8, September 15, 1864.

84 *IMJ,* January 31, 1871, p. 1.

85 STOCKTON, *op. cit.,* p. 25.

86 *Supra,* p. 131 ff.

87 Unfortunately, the details behind the Secession Movement of 1884 were not clearly discussed in available sources. As a result, some of the following record was gained from inference.

88 Shortly before the request for aid the binational's treasurer, Peter J. Meaney, absconded with the union's treasury of $20,000. This no doubt influenced the board's policy and decision.

89 *IMJ,* January 31, 1884, pp. 3-4.

90 *IMJ,* June 30, 1890, p. 4.

91 *IMJ,* February 29, 1884, pp. 4-5.

92 *IMJ,* March 31, 1884, p. 6.

93 *IMJ,* June 30, 1884, p. 1.

94 Other organizations which may have had a similar history in Canada include the International Typographical Union, the International Brotherhood of Carpenters, and the International Brotherhood of Bricklayers.

95 Examples of regional issues raised against the national union of the United States include: *Molder Demands for District Unions,* STOCKTON, *op. cit.,* pp. 35-38; «Knights of Labor Demands for Regional Autonomy», Norman J. WARE, *The Labor Movement in the United States, 1860-1895,* pp. 103-113; and the District 12 coal miner revolt of 1929, Edward Dean WICKERSHOM, *Opposition to the International Officers of the United Mine Workers of America: 1919-1933,* Ph.D. Dissertation, NYSSILR, Cornell University, 1951, pp. 131-194. Further examples as well as insights into the regional argument are given in Theodore W. GLOCKER,*The Government of American Trade Unions,* pp. 57-95 *passim* and 103-131 *passim.*

Le syndicalisme américain et les sections locales canadiennes au moment de son implantation

Les raisons du développement de la structure internationale des syndicats au Canada se prolonge en tant que thème central de l'étude de l'histoire du syndicalisme dans notre pays. On peut affirmer comme thème principal que l'implantation de cette structure fut le résultat des circonstances prévalant sur des marchés des biens, des capitaux et du travail qui se trouvaient pour ainsi dire inter-reliés. Cet article étudie l'émergence de l'un des premiers syndicats à structure internationale au Canada, soit l'*International Molders' and Allied Workers Union.* En utilisant la fondation et le développement de ce syndicat comme étude de cas, l'auteur traite de l'effet des circonstances des marchés du travail et des biens sur son organisation, sa croissance et son développement.

Dans ce cas typique, la poussée dans le sens du développement de la structure internationale fut favorisée par la forte pression des travailleurs et des employeurs vers la «nationalisation» du mouvement syndical au sein de l'industrie. Le cas à l'étude démontre encore clairement la cause et la nature des questions portant sur l'autonomie syndicale qui ne pouvaient manquer de se soulever dans les relations entre l'organisme central et ses sections locales. C'est aussi un cas qui montre le grand appui que les sections locales canadiennes et leurs dirigeants ont apporté à l'organisation centrale.

L'exemple de ce syndicat confirme le rôle important qu'ont joué les sections locales canadiennes au moment de l'implantation du syndicalisme en Amérique du nord. En premier lieu, dans cette industrie, les sections locales furent fondées longtemps avant l'implantation des structures internationales ou nationales. En second lieu, la centrale était fondamentale pour les premières sections locales en raison de leur inefficacité même. Il fallait nécessairement un organisme central. Troisièmement, l'activité de l'Internationale au Canada et des sections locales canadiennes au sein de l'Internationale faisait partie d'un même mouvement vers la formation d'une structure syndicale centralisée. Quatrièmement, cette tendance vers une centralisation accrue était limitée, non pas par un sentiment nationaliste canadien, mais par la réalité des marchés du travail et des biens dans l'industrie à l'époque. Enfin, à cause des caractéristiques du marché du travail dans ce métier, les sections locales canadiennes se devaient de faire partie d'une structure syndicale centralisée. En retour, pour se maintenir, les sections locales canadiennes avaient besoin de recevoir l'aide d'une organisation fortement centralisée. La reconnaissance de la nécessité d'une compétence territoriale canado-américaine était une caractéristique fort significative dans les relations qui s'instauraient entre les sections locales canadiennes et américaines.