Document généré le 19 avr. 2024 15:49

Historical Papers
Communications historiques

The Condition of the Working Class in Montreal, 1897-1920 [1]

J. T. Copp

Volume 7, numéro 1, 1972

Montréal 1972

URI : https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030747ar
DOI : https://doi.org/10.7202/030747ar

Aller au sommaire du numéro

Éditeur(s)

The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada

ISSN

0068-8878 (imprimé)
1712-9109 (numérique)

Découvrir la revue

Citer cet article

Copp, J. T. (1972). The Condition of the Working Class in Montreal, 1897-1920 [1]. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, *7*(1), 157–180. https://doi.org/10.7202/030747ar

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada,1972

Ce document est protégé par la loi sur le droit d'auteur. L'utilisation des services d'Érudit (y compris la reproduction) est assujettie à sa politique d'utilisation que vous pouvez consulter en ligne.

https://apropos.erudit.org/fr/usagers/politique-dutilisation/

Cet article est diffusé et préservé par Érudit.

Érudit est un consortium interuniversitaire sans but lucratif composé de l'Université de Montréal, l'Université Laval et l'Université du Québec à Montréal. Il a pour mission la promotion et la valorisation de la recherche.

https://www.erudit.org/fr/

THE CONDITION OF THE WORKING CLASS IN MONTREAL, 1897-1920[1]

J. T. COPP

Sir George Williams University

I

During the autumn of 1896 a young Montreal businessman, Herbert Brown Ames, employed a number of "enumerators" to undertake "A Sociological Study of a portion of the City of Montreal, Canada". Ames assembled the results of the questionnaires into a short book called "*The City Below the Hill*", which was published in 1897.[2] The district surveyed, portions of the St. Antoine and St. Anne's wards, contained 38,000 people, of whom only fifteen percent earned enough to be classified as "well to do". The residents were "evenly divided as to nationality: one third French Canadian, one third English, and one third Irish." So it was, wrote Ames, "an opportunity to study a class rather than a race".

The "City Below the Hill" was not a completely typical working class area. Its northwestern boundary was the main line of the C.P.R. leading into Windsor Station and just a block to the southeast, the Grand Trunk right-of-way to Bonaventure Station cut through the area. Two blocks further south the Lachine Canal, focal point of an earlier phase of industrialization, created a third axis of development. As a consequence the district contained more than its share of relatively high wage industries including iron and steel, machine shops and the railways.

There are other indications that much of the district was one of the better-off working class areas. With the exception of Griffintown, the "Poor Irish" ghetto, the density per acre figures and the mortality rate, particularly infant mortality, were much more favourable than in the central and eastern wards of the city. Using Ames statistics as the basis for a descriptive account of working class life in Montreal in the 1890's may lead to underestimating the extent of poverty in the city but no material of comparable value is available for the city as a whole.

The 1890's were a period of slow economic growth in Montreal as in all of Canada. The city's population grew by only 18 percent in the decade, the smallest decennial increase since the 1860's.[3] The total value of manufacturing production increased by a mere 5.09 percent,[4] prices were at their lowest point since Confederation and contemporary observors complained of difficult business conditions. The Montreal *Real Estate Guide* noted that there were an "abundance of dwellings for rent and that tenants were displaying a marked independance".[5]

Ames' study allows us to examine the working class areas of the city at a point in time when the first tremors of the great "boom" of the early years of the twentieth century were still a full year off in the future.

Rue Notre Dame bisected "The City Below the Hill" and the axis of all the old *quartiers* of the city. By 1897 it was paved for most of its length with a mixture of cobblestones and tamarack blocks.[6] Like the other main streets it was festooned with the overhead wires of the Montreal Street Railway Company. At night the glare of arc lamps and the glow of the remaining gas lights cast dark shadows over most of the street. Notre Dame was lined, except in the financial district, with one and two storey structures; the solid brick and stone buildings intermingled with flimsy wooden houses. The side streets were frequently unpaved (only 27 of the city's 178 miles of streets were paved in 1897)[7] and according to the City Surveyor "dust in the autumn is very bad and the mud wears out the streets quicker than the traffic does".[8] Elzéar Pelletier, the Secretary of the Quebec Board of Health, described the streets of Montreal as "intolerable though tolerated" and claimed the lanes resembled "refuse dumps".[9] The presence of 3000 horse stables and 500 cow sheds[10] within the narrow city limits added colour and aroma to the streets.

The lofty tenements of New York and Chicago were absent in Montreal. Instead, "the typical home was a *five room flat in the terrace of duplexes*." Ten percent of the total housing stock in the area surveyed by Ames consisted of "rear tenements", "either an ancient wooden cottage of the rural habitant type or a two-storey building encased in refuse bricks and reached by rickety wooden stairs or galleries".

Sewer and water lines reached most parts of the city but despite the municipal by-law of 1887 which had forbidden the further construction of houses served by the outdoor "pit privy", over 5000 privies remained in existence within city limits in 1898.[11] Over half the households in the "City Below the Hill" were "dependent entirely on such accomodation". Communal outdoor water taps were common.

Little attention had been paid to city planning in Montreal and the working class wards were densely populated, with narrow streets and few open spaces or parks. The 38,000 inhabitants of the western section of the lower city shared two formal public squares, Richmond and St. Patricks. The 26,000 residents of St. Louis ward could utilize Viger Square while in St. Laurent Ward there was the two acres of Dufferin Square.[12] Montreal did possess a "Great Park", Mount Royal, designed by Frederick Law Olmstead who considered it to be one of the best in North America.[13] But Mount Royal, like St. Helen's Island which could be reached by ferry, was remote from the everyday life of the city. Lafontaine Park, located just to the north of some of the more congested areas of the city, had more potential as a people's park. In the late 1890's it was undergoing extensive landscaping and the serpentine, the park's feature attraction, was under construction.[14] The playground movement which was spreading across North America from the "sand garden" and "outdoor gymnasium" created in Boston in the 1880's had not yet reached Montreal.

The local bar was the focal point of the neighborhood. Ames counted 105 licensed saloons and 87 liquor selling groceries in the area and concluded that even if one eliminated those outlets adjacent to the railway stations there was a licensed liquor outlet, "goodness knows how many unlicensed", for every forty-five families. Forty-three percent of the arrests made in the city during the year Ames undertook his survey were for drunkenness.[15]

Six mornings a week the narrow, damp, smoky streets filled with workers headed for shop or factory. A work week of 58-60 hours meant being on the job at seven or seven-thirty if a full ten hours was to be put in. Twenty percent of the labour force in the "City Below the Hill" was composed of women and approximately five percent of children.[16] Women and children were not permitted to work more than ten hours a day unless a special permit had been obtained for a period not exceeding six weeks.[17] This regulation, as well as the other rules laid down in the Industrial Establishments Act (1893) and the By-laws of the Quebec Board of Health Relating to Sanitary Conditions of Industrial Establishments (1895), did not apply to retail stores, home workshops or the many other forms of casual employment which absorbed the energies of working children.[18]

Something of the nature of working conditions in the factories of Montreal can be learned from the reports of the Factory Inspectors. The inspectors had the theoretical power to enforce rules concerning cubic feet of air space per worker, separate sanitary accommodation for men and women, cleanliness and appropriate fire escape mechanisms. Employers who offended against these regulations could be fined $200 for each contravention of the Act and $6 per day until the fault was remedied. In practice, since the inspector was required to institute court proceedings himself, a mixture of persuasion and threats were used to reform the more obvious abuses of the code. References to evasion of specific parts of the code, such as failure to provide fire escapes, were frequent and the inspectors returned each year to the theme of the "ugly, dirty, dingy buildings redolent with the odours of old age and decrepitude".[19] The inspectors tended to concentrate on the two most serious problems confronting them, the prevalence of child labour and the frequency of industrial accidents.

In his *Report* for 1897 Louis Guyon, who was to become Chief Factory Inspector in 1900, focused in on these issues;

> There have been very few infractions to note in regard to the employment of children under age; the limit of 12 years for boys being so low that there is hardly any desire among manufacturers to employ them younger . . .
>
> From the standpoint of the prevention of accidents . . . inspection is very important. It is impossible not to feel a profound sense of pity for these poor victims of labour. For the inspector, it is part of his duty which calls for the most effort and perseverance, to find in the first place the means of protection best suited to the circumstances and next to convince employers that such improvements form part of well understood progress, and that in protecting their employees against accidents they are protecting themselves from an economical point of view.[20]

With twelve as the minimum age for boys and fourteen for girls child labour was not only common but legal. Workers who were injured, or the family of those who were killed were required to institute legal proceedings against the employer and had to prove negligence, if compensation was to be obtained.

Guyon devoted much of his career to a campaign to abolish child labour and secure a Workmen's Compensation Act. One of his colleagues, James Mitchell, was more cautious about the child labour question:

> What of the ordinary labourer receiving $1.50 a day. Could he support a large family if deprived of the right of sending his children to work until they are fifteen?. . .[21]

The answer was clearly no, the ordinary labourer could not support his family on the basis of his own earnings. Ames found that the average family in 1897 had 1.4 wage earners and his statistics on family income suggest the importance of a second breadwinner.

Ames acquired information on 7671 families and found that their average income was $11.00 per week. He eliminated "the well to do" who earned more than $20.00 a week (15%) and the "submerged tenth" (11%) who received less than $5.00 a week. The remaining 74 percent which he called "the real industrial class" had an average income of $10.00 to $10.25 per week composed of some combination of wage earners earning an average of $8.25 per week, for a man, $4.50 for a woman and $3.00 for a boy. These figures cannot be translated into annual earnings by multiplying by 52. Ames himself noted that unemployment was the major cause of the poverty of the "submerged tenth" and that among families belonging to the "real industrial class" 23 percent had incomes "which could not be counted on as constant and regular throughout the year".

Ames sought to define the meaning of wages by establishing a "point below which comfort ends and poverty commences". He did this by deciding that since unskilled labourers earned a dollar a day but worked irregularly the sum of $260 per year could be used as the minimum necessary for "decent subsistence". Ames had never heard of the "working poor" and was unable to develop the concept. He avoided setting out the details of the style of life that might be enjoyed on $260 a year.

If the method of calculating a "theoretical weekly budget for a workingman's family of five" used by the Dominion Department of Labour after 1915[22] is applied as a "poverty line", then a family of five would have required a weekly income of $11.23 in 1902 to reach the level of a "typical family".[23] Very few working class families in Montreal could aspire to this level of expenditure unless there was more than one wage earner and work was available fifty-two weeks a year.

The Department of Labour's family budget is used as a "poverty line" throughout this study. It would be noted that the concept is not a new one. Robert Hunter, the author of one of the first estimates of the extent of poverty in the United States, argued in 1904 that only the most miserable of the needy were destitute and that the real poor in a community consisted of those who had "too little of the common necessities to keep themselves at their best . . . the large class in any industrial nation who are on the verge of distress".[24] The majority of the population of Montreal at the turn of the century fit this description and were, in the words of Jacob Hollender, "in constant danger, even with the exercise of care and foresight of falling or of slipping or of being crowded off the treacherous path encircling the morass of pauperism".[25]

There were other constant dangers confronting the residents of the working class wards. Montreal's death rate was generally recognized as among the highest in the civilized world. In 1898 Montreal's rate was 22.9 deaths per thousand, compared to 19.0 for New York city and 15.2 for Toronto.[26] The death rate in Ames' "City Below the

Hill" was 22.47, in St. Jean Baptiste Ward it reached 35.31 and in St. Marie 33.2[27] The upper section of St. Antoine Ward, "The City Above the Hill", to use Ames' phrase, had a death rate of 13 per thousand.

The key factor in Montreal's high death rate was infant mortality, which accounted for more than half of the total deaths. Montreal was the most dangerous city in the western world to be born in. Between 1899 and 1901 26.76 percent of all new born children died before they were one year old. This was more than double the figure for New York and was customarily cited as being lower than only one larger city — Calcutta.[28] These statistics were largely the result of unsafe water, impure milk and the limited use of vaccination against smallpox and diptheria. The Secretary of the Provincial Health Board commented that:

> . . . the thought of having little angels in heaven can only afford consolation when one is satisfied that everything possible was done . . . there should be no misconception on the subject, the use of antidiptheric serum has not yet become general in our province.[29]

In Montreal vaccination had indeed not become general. City health officials estimated that they had performed primary vaccinations on only one-fifth of the children born in the city during 1899.[30] The water supply was described by the Superintendent of the Water Works as "pure during ordinary times . . . (but) dangerous during spring and fall". He noted that the main reservoir leaked badly and that the boom which blocked floating refuse at the entrance was in a "state of decay".[31] Milk was of course unpasteurized and civic inspection and distributing facilities were completely inadequate.

Eighteen hundred and ninety-seven is frequently seen as the pivotal year in the history of education in the province of Quebec. The newly formed Liberal administration was determined to fulfill the *rouge* dream of a Ministry of Public Instruction and the rejection of the bill in the *bleu* dominated Legislative Council postponed the creation of an education ministry for sixty-five years. For the resident of working-class Montreal the great debates over the control of education must have seemed of little interest. Primary education was neither compulsory nor free and although the school inspectors and the Superintendent of Public Instruction insisted that the city's schools were generally excellent[32] there is little evidence that supports their view and much which contradicts it.

The Provincial Board of Health was a trenchant critic of the sanitary and safety conditions in the schools of the city. It noted that while ideal standards called for 250 cubic feet of space per pupil and

Quebec law required 150 cubic feet, the average in Montreal was only 75 cubic feet. The Board noted that little attention was paid to siting, orientation, ventilation or heating and that many schools lacked fire escapes.[33] Ninety percent of the teachers had less than eleven years of schooling and salaries in the Roman Catholic sector were among the lowest in North America. Over eight percent of the total enrollment was in grades one to three and less than three percent of the total was in grade six.[34] Public expenditure on education was at the lowest point in the province's history having declined in absolute terms from $155,000 (1883) to $153,000 (1901) and from 75 cents per student to 56 cents per student over the same period.[35] The frequent comments of the factory Inspectors on the illiteracy of children in the work forces add to the picture of an educational system which had little positive impact on working class children. Even the goals pursued by the Superintendent of Public Instruction, the teaching of " . . . great respect for paternal, civil and religious authority . . . warn against intemperance and extravagance that impoverish our country . . . avoid quarrels and law suits . . . show the benefits conferred by agriculture . . ."[36] could not have been very adequately fulfilled in such a system.

The years between 1897 and 1920 were, with the single serious exception of the recession of 1913-15, a time of rapid growth in the city's population and productivity. It is not possible in a paper of this length to analyze developments in all aspects of working class life and the problems discussed in this section can only provide an impressionistic picture. However, the general thesis put forward here, that the conditions of life for the city's working class deteriorated during this era of "national prosperity", can be argued on the basis of this evidence alone.

Housing Conditions

The accelerated growth of Montreal's population which began at the end of the 19th century placed a severe strain on the housing supply available to the working class. Contemporary observers were well aware of the shortages and the consequent necessity for subdividing flats, converting cellars into dwellings and the multiplication of what was called the "lodger evil". *Le Canada*, one of the most progressive voices on civic questions, reminded its readers in 1904 that the lack of housing in the city was an index of progress.[37] It is apparent that "progress" continued. The Federal Government's *Board of Inquiry into the Cost of Living* reported in 1915 that:

> Housing conditions (in Montreal) have degenerated and there is a decided

> lack of workingman's dwellings with proper conveniences at low rental. Rents have increased by fifty percent in the last seven years leading to a doubling up of families in the same apartment or house causing overcrowding and ill-health.[38]

The city's chief sanitary inspector felt that the situation had further deteriorated by 1920. "The inspection dwellings" he wrote,

> has become more difficult since a few years. The high cost of materials and labour are the main factors of this difficulty. The number of dwellings of low rent no longer meets the demand and attempts are being made to meet the scarcity by transforming existing houses built for one or two families into several small dwellings . . . much discernment and circumspection must be used in the revision of building plans and specifications in order to assure all possible protection to public health without hindering the progress of construction.[39]

Public health standards had certainly not been allowed to hinder the "progress of construction" in the years before 1920. Montreal's housing regulations, like those of most North American cities, had not been consolidated into a clear concise code which could be rigorously enforced. Instead vague bylaws empowering the sanitary inspectors "to prevent overcrowding" and require "proper sanitary conditions" were in force throughout the period.[40] The sanitary inspectors of the city's Health Department devoted their energies to "correcting nuisances" and attempting to persuade proprietors to improve dwellings classified as "damp", "dirty and overcrowded" or containing "dark rooms" (Rooms without any direct means of ventilation). In 1905 the inspectors reported 223 dwellings in the first category, and 261 in the second. In 1918, 1868 homes were included in this classification.[41] No valid statistical inference can be drawn from such figures but the observer cannot help but be struck by the size of the problem confronting the sanitary inspectors.

Elzéar Pelletier, the Secretary of the Provincial Health Board, was the leading crusader for housing reform. His attitudes and specific ideas were derived from careful study of the European and American experience. Like Lawrence Veiller, the American housing reformer, Pelletier believed that the enforcement of adequate regulatory legislation was the first priority. Pelletier was responsible in 1906 for drafting a set of by-laws to the Quebec Public Health Act which "if enforced by the municipalities, would prevent the construction of unhealthy dwellings".[42] He urged municipalities in the province to control building operations by giving "the Municipal Architect the power to reject plans that do not conform to (provincial) health laws" and to expropriate existing structures on the ground of unhealthiness" basing compensation on the "sanitary value and not on the revenue the owner receives".[53]

The following year Pelletier focused his attentions on Montreal.

> As the city spreads the streets and lots are arranged to suit the speculator . . . the city must plan with reserves for parks . . . . It must avoid the population density in the new wards such as exists in the old . . .[44]

The attempts to secure adequate housing legislation met with slight success. The city did eventually forbid the occupation of dark rooms but not their construction.[45] In 1916 the Montreal Board of Health reported that, "by-laws concerning construction regulate only the strength of buildings".[46] That was still the case in 1921.

No survey comparable to the one undertaken by Ames is available for the early 1920's but one study of post-war housing conditions suggests that the average number of persons to a room in Montreal had increased from 1 (Ames' figure) to 1.4 in 1921. The author of the 1921 study, Arthur St. Pierre, a professor at the University of Montreal, maintained that though his estimate of 100,000 persons living in overcrowded dwellings indicated a grave problem it was not the most serious aspect of the Montreal situation. For St. Pierre the distinguishing feature of Montreal was, "*la densite des logements sur une surface donnée*, et non pas la densite de la population dans les logements" (italics in the original). St. Pierre estimated that eighty percent of the city's population were tenants and suggested that only New York city had a comparable ratio.

> Chez nous, sauf dans deux ou trois petits districts privilégiés, auxquels la voracité des speculateurs en immeubles n'accorde qu'une existence précaire les maisons s'entassent et s'agglutinent, les logements s'écrasent et se superposent dévorant l'espace dans ses . . . trois, j'allais dire dans ses quatre dimensions.[48]

Montreal had not been a very pleasant place for the working class in 1897. By 1921, with a population growth to 750,000 conditions were considerably worse. There had been some "progress"; the paving of streets, and the construction of a new aqueduct were examples of limited municipal action, but the list of such achievements is a very short one.

The Working-Class Child

The campaign to end child labour in the factories of the province received occasional support from newspapers and voluntarist organizations, but the key figure was unquestionably Louis Guyon. Guyon and his associates led an indirect attack on the province's failure to impose compulsory education. In 1901 he described himself as a "convinced advocate of admitting children to factories on the basis of education and physical condition and reported that in a personal investigation of a large Montreal cotton mill . . . out of 65 girls 13 were illiterate and 18 wrote with difficulty. Out of 65 boys 21 were illiterate and 11 could hardly sign their names".[49]

The minimum age for boys in the factory work force was raised to 13 in 1903, then in 1907 the I.E.A. was amended to set 14 as the minimum age and require a test of literacy. Children between 14 and 16 who were unable to pass the test were required to attend night school. Guyon's reaction to the amendments is worth quoting at length:

> The obligation for children between 14 and 16 to be literate or attend night school is a very difficult one to fulfill . . . in the first place because in many cases there are no night schools, or at best for boys only . . .
>
> If I have fully seized the legislators' idea, the obligation for children to attend night school could only have been preparatory to a general law compelling children between 14 and 16 to fulfill the requirements regarding elementary education. Is it very practical to compel a child fatigued by ten hours of assiduous labour to spend even an hour and a half at school?[50]

A general law compelling children to fulfill the requirements of elementary education was not forthcoming. The inspectors' reports continued to advocate a literacy requirement or an elementary school certificate as a condition of entry into the factory labour force and urged that the provisions of the I.E.A. be extended to cover all working children. "There are" he wrote in 1912, "thousands of children over whom the factory inspectors have no control".[51] As the war continued the number of underage children in factories grew rapidly[52] and the problem of illiteracy among adolescent workers remained unresolved. By 1920 Guyon, who had become Deputy Minister of Labour, estimated that there were between eleven and twelve thousand children between 14 and 16 working in Montreal alone.[53] The Labour Department supervised a literacy exam for 6912 children in this age category and reported that 3081 were

> of the class of pupils at night school . . . some of them who could write in a fairly good hand their names, their address and the name of the company employing them, could read only hesitatingly while others who could read very well could write only with difficulty.[54]

In 1916 Louis Guyon had, in a moment of despair, complained that "child labour remains the same unsolvable problem we have encountered since 1888".[55] The problem remained "unsolvable" in 1921.

Working Class Women

The working class woman did not wait for the typewriter and the switchboard to "emancipate" her from domestic drudgery. Ames found that twenty percent of the labour force was composed of women in 1897, by 1921, one quarter of those gainfully employed were women.[56]

Women workers were viciously exploited receiving on the average just half of what men earned throughout the period under review.[57] Part of this discrepancy can be explained by the concentration of women workers in retail trade and the garment textile and food processing industries which paid unusually low wages to all employees, but simple discrimination between men and women doing the same job was a major factor.

Intellectuals who studied "social questions" believed that working women were earning supplementary income and the question of wage differentials was seldom raised. In 1918 the provincial government introduced a Minimum Wage Act for women in Industrial Establishments but four years passed before the regulatory commission required to enforce the Act was appointed. The minimum set out in the Act followed the pattern of most such legislation by setting a floor low enough to avoid interference with all but the smallest and most inefficient firms.

The Quebec Department of Labour did appoint several women to the provincial factory inspectorate and they were charged with special responsibility towards women workers. Louisa King and Louise Provencher, the first two appointees, campaigned vigourously for "seats for shop girls who stand from eight in the morning to six at night", separate sanitary facilities, factory cleanliness and cheerful lunch rooms. They paid particular attention to home workshops and garment lofts, Madame Provencher's report for 1899-1900 included the following description of the practices of the garment industry.

> . . . ready made clothing houses are actually offering to poor women compelled to earn their living with their needle, prices so low that they cannot earn their daily bread. To give 75 cents for a dozen morning gowns, 20 cents a dozen for undergarments and 5 to 15 cents (never more) for a dozen of neckties, is it not taking undue advantage of the ignorance and poverty and painful circumstances under which an unfortunate woman may labour?[58]

The factory inspectresses could do little to effect change in wage rates but they were convinced that their efforts won improvements for women workers with regard to the physical conditions under which work was undertaken. Miss Louisa King described her role in the following terms:

> Like bounteous dew falling noiselessly on thirsty plants and revivifying them, like the sun's rays that spread joy and life, whenever they shine, thus does the inspectress fulfill her mission.[59]

Workman's Compensation

Louis Guyon and his fellow inspectors won their greatest success in convincing the provincial government of the need for a Workman's Compensations Act. The Industrial Establishment's Act contained a clause which required employers to notify the factory inspectors of accidents and the inspectors were required to undertake an investigation and to appear in court to offer testimony should litigation follow. The Civil Code required the victim of an industrial accident to prove that the accident was due to the employer's negligence. Winning such court cases was not easy as Guyon testified in his 1897 report.

> There have been fewer suits this year on account of accidents, and a great many cases won in the lower courts were dismissed in the Supreme Court. In fact decisions favourable to workmen are becoming rarer and rarer.[60]

Accidents however, were becoming more and more common. Guyon quoted "the eminent Italian sociologist Mr. Lugattis" description of modern industry as "a real battlefield with its dead and wounded" and added that "each new invention, each increase in the rapidity of the means of production seems to carry in its wake a new train of dangers".[61]

During the year 1899-1900, in one textile mill in Montreal, 23 accidents were reported most of them involving the loss of a finger or hand. Between 1890 and 1907 the factory inspectors investigated 4,608 accidents of which 263 were fatal. This figure quoted by the Commission on Labour Accidents represented only those accidents reported to the inspectorate. Many employers simply did not make reports and among the recalcitrant employers were the Grand Trunk Railway and most of the firms employing longshoreman. Guyon believed that at least one in every three industrial accidents went unreported.[62]

Guyon views on industrial accidents were strongly influenced by his attendance at two conferences held in Paris in 1900. The sessions of fifth International Convention on Accident and Social Insurance and the First International Convention for the Legal Protection of Work People, provided Guyon with a detailed knowledge of European legislation.[63] His immediate preoccupation on returning from Paris was the development of a "Safety Museum" which included photographs, models and actual examples of safety devices. Guyon hoped that the museum would influence employers directly but in addition he was able to argue before the courts, with some success, that the absence of a safety device constituted negligence on the part of an employer.[64]

The factory inspectors continued to press for a Workman's

Compensation Act. Guyon attempted to obtain the active support of organized labour in this campaign but the unions showed slight interest. When a compensation law was finally adopted in 1909, Guyon remarked that the law was "entirely due to the initiative of the government".[65] Most of that initiative came from Guyon himself.

Public hearings on workmen's compensation were held in 1907 under the auspices of a specially appointed Commission on Labour Accidents. While some employers were flatly opposed to any legislation (one employer complained "legislators should promote instead of fetter industrial interests")[66] the important business groups supported the principle of compensation. The Montreal branch of the Canadian Manufacturer's Association and the Builder's Exchange went so far as to favour the adoption of the "professional risk" principle. They were opposed to the existing trial by jury system because of the lack of limits on possible compensation and the cost of legal proceedings. Most of the spokesman for organized labour supported the idea of compulsory insurance based on a concept of professional risk so well but the Commission accepted the argument of other business spokesman who insisted that insurance based on the idea of professional risk would "place Quebec manufacturers in an unfair footing with other provinces".[67]

The Workman's Compensation Act of 1909 was the first such act to become law in North America. Pioneering however, had its penalties. The Quebec law did not create an independent board or make insurance compulsory. It simply established a procedure for claims and a schedule of payments for partial and total disabilities as well as death benefits. If negligence or fault on the part of the employee could be proven, no compensation was payable. It was not until the mid 1930's that the law was amended to create a modern compensation system based on an independent board and compulsory insurance payments. In the interval seven Canadian provinces, beginning with Ontario in 1914, had passed Acts which were well in advance of the Quebec law.

The Real Income of Wage-Earners

The most important single measure of the consequences of a period of sustained growth is the effect of "national prosperity" on real income. The Department of Labour's index of wage rates in 13 Canadian cities, 1901-1920, indicates that wages moved steadily upwards for the 21 classes of labour examined. Average weekly wages increased by almost 33% — 1901 to 1911, a further 33% increase was obtained between 1911 and 1918 and in the following two years wage rates jumped by an unprecedented 38%.

The method of calculating changes in wages used by the Labour Department is open to a number of objections. The index is based on reported wage rates rather than actual income and the sample of occupations is heavily biased towards skilled and organized workers. The Census of 1921 notes that its figures on the percentage increase of income of heads of families in occupations comparable to those surveyed by the Department of Labour show a much smaller rate of increase (82.19 percent) 1911-1921 than the Labour Department's estimate (109.61 percent).[69]

Even if the Department of Labour's figures are used, a comparison of wage increases with the changes in the cost of living suggests that there was a slight decline in real income 1901-1920.

Index numbers of weekly wage rages for 21 classes of labour in 13 Canadian cities (1913=100)[70]		Index numbers of family budget 1913=100[71]	
1901	69.8	1900	69.7
1911	92.4	1911	92.7
1918	131.6	1918	147.2
1920	179.3	1920	184.7
1921	186.1[72]	1921	161.9

If figures on actual income rather than wage rates were generally available it would be possible to show that there was a significant decline in real income for most wage earners in Canada over the entire twenty year period. Certainly this was the case in Montreal.

The weekly income required by a family of five to reach the "typical expenditure" level in 1901 was $9.37 for the basic items of expenditure or $11.23 if these basic items are calculated at eighty percent of total family needs. How close to this figure could the average working man come in 1901? The primary income calculation used to establish this relationship was developed within the limitations of the material in the Census reports. For comparative purposes, it was necessary to eliminate those occupations which included significant numbers of women and child wage earners.

The average income for 6543 workers in those categories of "manufacturing" which did not have significant numbers of women and children workers was calculated.[73] This list excluded almost all of the classically low wage industries, yet the average income was only $405.00 per year or $7.78 per week. Average income for this group fell $3.45 below the sum required to meet the expenses of an ordinary family of five.

For 1911 the same method was used and the income of 9043 adult male workers averaged $549.00 a year or $10.55 a week.[74] The typical expenditure level in 1911 had risen to $15.68 a week. The figures for 1911 unlike the ones used in 1901 can be checked against the annual earnings of "Heads of Families in Specified Occupations" in Montreal.

Average income for the five categories of building trades craftsmen who were heads of families came to $711.00 per year or $13.70 a week. Labourers averaged $531.68 or slightly over $10.00 per week. Trainmen, traditionally one of the highest paid wage earners averaged $971.07 or $18.67 a week. They were the only category of wage earner in the Department of Labour sample who received an income high enough to place their families above the poverty line without the assistance of a second wage earner.[75]

The rapid rise in the cost of living during the years 1915-1920 is a well documented phenomena. For Montreal, it is possible to begin to use cost of living figures specific to the city thanks to the adjustments made by the Quebec Statistical Yearbook. By 1920, the "basic" items of expenditure required a weekly income of $22.38[76] and the total family budget called for an outlay of $27.96 ($1,456 per year).

The Census of 1921 provides much more detailed information on incomes than any previous census and it is possible to calculate the average income of all adult male wage earners in Montreal. The average $1,100 dollars falls $356 below the typical expenditure level.[77]

There is a good deal of contemporary descriptive evidence of the plight of the working poor in Montreal during these years. The Committee which organized the Montreal Child Welfare Exhibit of 1912 tried to draw up a family budget on the basis of earnings of $10.50 a week[78] (which it suggested an unskilled labourer could hope to earn if continuously employed). The Committee noted that the budget made no provision for "sickness, recreation, church, house furnishing, lectures and savings". A family of five would with careful planning be able to allot .75 cents a day to food, but the Committee quoted its domestic science experts who suggested that a minimum of .25 cents a day was required for food for a growing child. The rent allowance in this budget came to $9.00 a month which the Committee noted could only pay for "unsanitary quarters, sometimes below street level".[79]

It seems necessary to conclude that as far as real income is concerned the average wage earner in Montreal was less well off during the period of economic expansion than during the "depression" of the late 19th C. There has been a general awareness that increases in the cost of living outstripped wage gains during the war and immediate post-war years but the overall trend of the first two decades has not been widely recognized. Given the small percentage of the labour force that was organized and the weakness of most components of organized labour the decline in real income should occasion no surprise.

It should be noted that the situation in Montreal was not unique, but part of a national pattern. However the Montreal wage earner's income remained at a substantially lower level than wage earners in Toronto and generally worked much longer hours throughout the period. Some improvement did develop with regard to hours of work. The average in 1897 was 58 hours per week and this had declined to between 50-55 hours per week by 1921.[80]

The overall pattern of decline in real income and only marginal reductions in the length of the work week did not hold for all segments of the working class. Significant gains were made by a few groups of skilled or strategically placed workers who were able to organize and sustain locals of national and international unions. The data on the organization of unions in the *Labour Gazette* and the *Quebec Statistical Yearbook* indicates an incredibly high mortality rate for union locals in Montreal. It also points to a strong will to organize among the city's workers.[81]

The obstacles to union organization and meaningful collective bargaining were not peculiar to Montreal. Stuart Jamieson sums up the problem in the following terms:

> Labour in Canada and the United States has been especially difficult to organize for a number of reasons: high rates of immigration as well as mass migrations from rural areas to urban industrial centres; language and ethnic diversity of the labour force, the high mobility of the population, and the like. Employers, for the most part, presented an intense, and prolonged and at times violent opposition to unions. Up to the later 1930's generally less than 15% of the non-agricultural paid labour in either country was unionized.[82]

All of the factors noted by Jamieson applied in Montreal. The overwhelming majority of employers insisted on the "open shop", resisted use of the union label and opposed the principle of collective bargaining. Of the 287 strikes listed for the city by the Department of Labour between 1901 and 1921,[83] 115 resulted in the total rejection of employee demands, frequently accompanied by dismissal of the strikers and the employment of scab labour. Success in the sense of employer acceptance of the demands of the strikers, was obtained in only 49 strikes, most of them involving less than 100 workers in highly skilled craft unions. Some seventy strikes were identified as having ended in a compromise, but only detailed investigations of each one would reveal the meaning of that term to the employees.

It was not until 1916, when the demands of war production and army enlistments had created a labour shortage, that workers were able to bargain with some weight. Of the 21 strikes reported during the years 1916 and 1917, thirteen were described as "negotiations in favour of employees", two as "compromises" and two as under "arbitration". Close to 9000 workers were involved in strikes during this two year period. This pattern continued in 1918 though there were only six strikes unique to Montreal in that year reported in the Labour Gazette. The climate of labour relations during the three year period was determined by the demands of the war economy. Few employers could afford to allow their operations to be interrupted and they were ready to buy peace with substantial wage increases. The Department of Labour's index numbers for weekly wages illustrate this clearly. Averages for 21 classes of labour in 13 Canadian cities indicate unprecedented increases, ten points in 1916, 4 points in 1917 and 15 points in 1918. These figures are representative of changes in wage rates in Montreal. Iron moulders in the city secured 10 cents an hour increases in 1917 and again in 1918. They also won a reduction of the work week from 60 to 54 hours. Machinists averaged 10 cents an hour gains in 1916 and a further 5 cents an hour in both 1917 and 1918. "Common Labour in Factories" obtained an average increase of 20% between 1915 and 1918.

These gains were however wiped out by the rise in the cost of living. The "typical family" that could be fed, clothed and sheltered for $14.15 in 1915 required $21.24 to maintain the same standard of living in 1918 — a 50% increase in the cost of living. In 1916 the Quebec Government's chief labour arbitrator described this problem and pointed to a popular solution:

> . . . the cost of living continues to rise with a fearful rapidity . . . the average cost of mere necessities for a workman's family of five or six is $60.00 per month . . . the majority of workmen do not earn more than $15.00 per week. Consequently it is not so surprising to see children obliged to leave school and go to work at the age of fourteen or fifteen years. Their wages are very low but in many instances they are imperatively needed for the family's support.
>
> In the presence of such a state of affairs, the earnest and sincere patriots are quite right in appealing to the people to attach themselves more and

> more to the soil and to seek from it not only subsistence but also sound and real freedom.[84]

Such solutions were popular amongst intellectuals; workers turned to organization and direct action to secure a just return for their labour. Nineteen-nineteen witnessed a wave of agitation and confrontation such as the city has never before experienced. Sixty-two strikes involving more than 30,000 workers occured before the year was over. Felix Marois, the Commissioner of the Quebec Trade Disputes Act attempted to explain the mood of labour in his annual report.

> Neither revolution nor socialism is arousing the working classes today. No doubt there are ardent theorists and partisans of these dangerous doctrines in our province but the masses are ignorant of them. What the working class wants is improvement in their lot, fair remuneration for work and, above all, that living may not be unjustly made too dear for them. They admit that one who has a fortune may increase it but they will not admit that he should do so at the expense of the whole nation.
>
> Against this they rebel and protest; they find that food and clothing cost too dear . . . . They were told that the country's greatest interests were at stake and they were asked to consent to such a sacrifice, the better to ensure the Allies success. But the war has ended and there is no change. Far from dropping, the cost of living is soaring to heights more and more inaccessible to the masses.
>
> The people seek a remedy for the evil . . . but nothing is done. They become irritated, for they rightly or wrongly suspect the authorities of having allowed a band of profiteers to make large fortunes out of labour. The authorities have had enquiry after enquiry made but they only show more clearly the gravity of the evil. The masses understand nothing, they are driven mad for no remedy comes from anywhere . . .[85]

Perhaps "driven mad" is an exaggeration but the situation in Montreal in 1919 might well have given birth to madness. A strike at Dominion Textiles involving 3200 workers serves to illustrate the frustration of the working class. The demands were: recognition of the United Textile Workers of America as bargaining agent, a 50% wage increase, 44 hours a week, time and one half for overtime, abolition of fines for bad work, pay for time lost when it is not the fault of the worker (i.e., other departments slow), 20% over day rates for night work and an increase in piece work rates. Marois had tried to arbitrate the dispute but the Company had contented itself with the flat refusal of all demands and the statement that there was nothing to arbitrate. It regretted the "ill-advised strike" and declared "the mill doors are open". Two months after the strike began the workers returned without having obtained a single concession from the Company.[86]

The pattern of confrontation continued through 1920 with 10,000 Montreal workers on strike during the year but rising unemployment and the abrupt break in the inflationary trends during 1920 cut into union membership and labour militancy. Unemployment statistics for trade union members in Quebec illustrate the trend clearly. In July 1920 trade unions reported that only 2.54 percent of their membership was unemployed, by November the rate was 13.83 percent and by May of 1921 it had reached 26.54 percent.[87] The cost of living had peaked in October of 1920 at an average of $26.46 for the family of five budget.[88] By October of 1921 declines in food prices had led the way to a reduction of $4.45 in basic costs. Expressed as index numbers the cost of living declined from 184.7 in 1920 to 161.9 in 1921 and it continued to decline a further 12 points in 1922.[89]

The vast majority of the working class in Montreal had to face the "lean years" of the 1920's with little prospect of any fundamental changes in their way of life. Stable prices if coupled with full employment might provide greater security temporarily, but the failure to develop viable working class institutions meant the vulnerability of the wage-earning population in times of trouble would remain. Most of the population of Montreal would continue to tread the "treacherous path encircling the morass of pauperism".

III

It has been suggested that the exclusion of the majority of Montreal's working class population from the benefits of a period of great "national" prosperity was in no way unique but simply part of the general national pattern. Wage-earners in Montreal may have been less well off than their counterparts in Toronto but average annual earnings in many occupations were above the national average. What then may be said about the peculiar cultural characteristics of French Canadian society which are so often alleged to have a determining influence on the structure of Quebec society? The answer is that for the working class as a class the "cultural" or "national" question was largely irrelevant.

The evidence on trade union activity and the data on strikes in Montreal points to only one conclusion. The working class in Montreal responded to the oppression of the industrial system with the same mixture of sporadic militancy and passive resignation which characterized industrial workers throughout North America.

It may well be that anglophone workers or their children found it easier to become upwardly mobile in a society where business and industry was largely conducted in the English language but such mobility effected a small number of individuals and has little to do with the experience of the mass of the population. The crucial question for the working class was income distribution not upward mobility.

Income distribution refers not only to the proportion of national income placed directly in the hands of the working class through wage payments but also to expenditure in what is usually now called "the public sector". The evidence presented in this essay suggests that middle class Quebec society was little different than other North American societies in terms of ideological concern with "reforms" which would shift some percentage of national income from the private to the public sector.[90] In the early 20th century expenditure in the public sector meant increased funding of education and welfare services, the financing of public works designed to improve living conditions (parks, water systems, drainage etc.) and the creation or expansion of government regulatory agencies concerned with public health, factory conditions and other widely recognized social problems.

The Gouin government's attempt to raise teachers' salaries, establish technical schools and specialized institutions like the Ecole des Hautes Etudes Commercial may be judged as a modest response to a major problem but the same criticism may be leveled at all provincial governments. It was not ideology but tax resources which limited educational expenditure. The Loi d'assistance publique (1921) which channeled new tax revenues into hospitals and other welfare institutions met some opposition from social reactionaires like Henri Bourassa but the dominant Liberal party was not seriously threatened by such criticism.

The Quebec Trades Disputes Act (1901), the Workman's Compensation Act (1909), the Minimum Wage Act for Women in Industrial Establishments (1918), the numerous amendments to the Industrial Establishments Act and the Public Health Act, were typical examples of the kind of regulatory legislation passed in Canada. When the Gouin Government introduced legislation creating the Public Utilities Commission (1910) Gouin noted that the legislation was based on the system used in Wisconsin. This argument placed a very defective piece of legislation above criticism for everyone interested in public affairs believed that Wisconsin was the very model of a modern government.

The fact that these legislative initiatives appear to have had little real impact on the society is a comment on the history of regulatory legislation in North America not a critique of the peculiar characteristics of Quebec. Indeed it seems impossible to argue that the French Canadian middle class was in any way isolated from or hostile towards the ideas and techniques which were the common property of the nations of the western world. Louis Guyon and Elzéar Pelletier regularly attended international conferences and reported on developments in their fields. Since much of the pioneering work in social legislation originated in continental Europe, French Canadian reformers even enjoyed some advantages denied to their counterparts in English-speaking provinces.

To find evidence of the anti-statism so often attributed to the French Canadian elite the researcher must ignore the ideological center in French Canada and concentrate on the variable moods of a small number of not very influential *nationaliste* intellectuals. The press in French Canada consisted of more than *Le Devoir, Le Nationaliste* and *L'Action Sociale. Le Canada* and *La Presse*, for example, kept their readers informed of developments in social legislation in North America and Europe. Politicans could evoke graphic images by speaking of "les trusts" because their audiences knew about the Northern Securities affair and Standard Oil.

All of this is not to deny that there were problems which were different in detail because of the Quebec milieu. Education is the most obvious issue on which the case for "cultural determinism" might be made. Certainly resistance to compulsory education was much more powerful in Quebec than in other parts of Canada, though not more powerful than in other predominately Catholic societies. But compulsory education in Quebec was a political issue not a social issue. The idea of compulsion was so closely identified with the anti-clericism of the *rouge* element that otherwise reasonable men opposed or ignored the question while supporting other measures designed to accomplish the same purpose. Arthur St. Pierre for example, told the Canadian Conference on Child Welfare in 1923 that

> no law is harder to enforce than compulsory school attendance. It is the will of the parents, not the efforts of legislators, which will solve the problem. Underage workers seldom belong to well-to-do families, child labour is caused by low wages.[91]

Child labour was caused by low wages, and if the problem of child labour and indeed the problems of poverty and unemployment were more serious in Quebec than in some other parts of North America, the student will be well advised to ask questions about the special characteristics of the Quebec economy and the revenues available to provincial and city governments, rather than falling back on cliches about the weakness of Quebec's "social thought".

Arthur St. Pierre's 1923 address to the Canadian Conference on Child Welfare included a pssage which dealt with the crux of the problem confronting wage-earners everywhere.

> . . . . low wages are no more a necessary part of our social structure than the slavery of bygone days. They are, to a very large extent the product of ancient customs, of inherited habits, of ancestral fears that slowly but surely we are getting rid of. Wage rates are not fatally governed and kept

> down by any wage-fund law, but they are in a very large measure subjected to and limited by ways of thinking. . . .
>
> Today there are for a large minority of our workers, decent living conditions for themselves and family while there remains unfortunately a bare subsistence for millions of toilers. Tomorrow the minimum might be for all the salary of the well paid minority of today.[92]

Tomorrow has not yet arrived for Quebec or Canada.

NOTES

[1] This paper is based on sections of a work-in-progress of the same title. The author wishes to acknowledge the assistance provided by a research grant from the Centre de Recherche en Histoire Economique Du Canada Français (C.H.E.).

[2] H.B. Ames, *The City Below the Hill*, Bishop Printing, Montreal, 1897. All quotations in part one not otherwise footnoted are from *The City Below the Hill.* For a recent study of Ames' background and career in Montreal, see D. Russell, *H.B. Ames and Municipal Reform.* Unpublished M.A. thesis, McGill University 1971.

[3] *Quebec Statistical Yearbook*, Vol. 3, 1914, p. 59.

[4] Canada, Census of 1911, Vol. 2, p. XIX.

[5] *The Real Estate Guide*, Spring 1897.

[6] Montreal, Report of the City Surveyor, 1898, p. 4.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 4.

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 2.

[9] Quebec, "Report of the Provincial Board of Health" 1902 *Sessional Paper no. 6* 1903, p. 49. (afterwards RPBH)

[10] Montreal, *Board of Health Report*, 1899, p. 7 (afterwards B.H.R.)

[11] *B.H.R.* 1898, p. 13.

[12] Jessie Di Paolo, *The Development of Parks and Playgrounds in Montreal 1900-1910* Unpublished B.A. Honours Essay, Loyola College, 1969, Appendix B.

[13] F.L. Olmstead, *Mount Royal* (New York; 1881), p. 51.

[14] Di Paolo, *op. cit.*, p. 27.

[15] Montreal *Annual Report, Chief of Police*, 1896.

[16] The estimate of the number of women in the work force is from Ames' survey. He made a distinction between "lads" and "children" without defining the difference.

[17] The text of the I.E.A. is printed in Sessional Paper no. 7, 1896.

[18] Louis Guyon, Chief Factory Inspector for the province claimed, "It must not be forgotten that the employees in the majority of our shops are chiefly children", Sessional Page no. 7, 1902-03 p. 193, *Reports of the Factory Inspectors.* (Afterwards R.F.I.).

[19] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1897, p. 208.

[20] *Ibid.*, p. 41.

[21] R.F.I., Sessional Paper no. 7, 1902, p. 204.

[22] This hypothetical family budget was constructed by R.H. Coats, Dominion Statistician, and published in Vol. II of the *Report of the Board of Inquiry into the Cost of Living*, Ottawa, 1915. It was intended to represent weekly consumption of food, fuel, lighting and rent of an urban working class family of five. These expenses were thought to constitute from 60 to 80 percent of ordinary expenditures.

[23] Canada, *Labour Gazette*, March 1921, p. 432. The figures quoted for 1901, $9.37 for the four items analyzed by the Labour Department is eighty percent of $11.23.

[24] Robert Hunter, *Poverty*, New York 1904, cited in Robert Bremner, *From the Depths*, N.Y., 1956, p. 125.

[25] Jacob Hollender, *The Abolition of Poverty*, Boston, 1914, cited in Bremner, p. 125.

[26] *B.H.R.*, 1898, p. 6.

[27] *Ibid.*, p. 93.

[28] Joseph Gauvreau, *La Goutte de Lait*, l'Ecole Sociale Populaire No. 29, 1914, p. 5.

[29] R.P.B.H., Sessional Paper no. 7, 1897, p. 36.

[30] *B.H.R.*, 1899, p. 17.

[31] Montreal, *Report of the Superintendent of the Montreal Waterworks*, 1897, p. 3.

[32] By 1900 all Montreal Roman Catholic schools were graded "excellent" in all categories by the School Inspectors. See Sessional Paper no. 5 1901, *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction* "School Inspectors Reports".

[33] "Memoir on School Hygiene", p. 25. *RPBH* Sessional Paper no. 6, 1900.

[34] M.C. Urquhart and K. Buckley (eds.) *Historical Statistics of Canada*, p. 595.

[35] *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, Sessional Paper no. 5, 1901, p. XXII.

[36] *Report of the Superintendent of Public Instruction*, Sessional Paper no. 5, 1897, p. 323.

[37] *Le Canada*, Oct. 30, 1904, p. 4.

[38] Canada, *Board of Inquiry Into the Cost of Living*, Ottawa 1915, p. 483.

[39] *B.H.R.*, 1921, p. 60.

[40] *Charter of the City of Montreal, Corrected and Compiled with all Amendments Adopted up to date 1908* (Montreal, A. Pigeon, 1908). Bylaw 63. The extensive revisions of 1909 which introduced a Board of Control into civic government under pressure from middle class groups determined to end corruption and promote "good government" did not modify the housing bylaws, nor it may be added make any other changes which could have affected conditions among the working class. See Montreal, *Amendments to the Charter* 1909 (A. Pigeon, 1909) and *Amendments to the Charter* 1924 (Montreal, 1924).

[41] *B.H.R.*, 1906, 1919.

[42] *RPBH*; Sessional Paper no. 6, 1908-09, p.10.

[43] *Ibid.*, p. 79.

[44] *RPBH*; Sessional Paper no. 6, 1910, p. 49.

[45] *B.H.R.*, 1911, p. 4.

[46] *Ibid.*, 1916, p. 86.

[47] Arthur St. Pierre, *Le Probleme Social* (Montreal, 1925), p. 102.

[48] *Ibid.*, p. 103.

[49] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1901, p. 193.

[50] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1908-09, p. 88.

[51] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 4, 1912, p. 37.

[52] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 4, 1917-18, p. 69.

[53] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 4, 1921, p. 73.

[54] *Ibid.*, p. 72.

[55] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 4, 1916, p. 55.

[56] Canada, *Census of 1921*, Vol. 4, p. 438.

[57] Women earned an average of $185.00 per year in 1901, $286.60 in 1911 and $567.00 in 1921. (Figures are averages from information in respective Census Report).

[58] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1899-1900, p. 67.

[59] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1902-03, p. 186.

[60] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1897-98, p. 64.

[61] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1901-02, p. 64.

[62] Quebec, *Report of the Commission on Labour Accidents* (appointed 1907) N.D. p. 11.

[63] Guyon's Report on his experiences is included in *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1900-1901, p. 165.

[64] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1905-06, p. 183.

[65] *R.F.I.*, Sessional Paper no. 7, 1909-10, p. 76.

[66] *Report of the Commission on Labour Accidents*, p. 5.

[67] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

[68] *Labour Gazette*, March 1921, p. 3.

[69] Canada, *Sixth Census of Canada, 1921*, Vol. III p. XXI.

[70] *Labour Gazette*, March 1921, p. 3.

[71] Urquhart & Buckley, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

[72] Department of Labour, *Wages and Hours of Labour in Canada*, 1921-22 p. 2.

[73] Canada, *Census of 1901*, Vol. IV Manufacturing, p. 313.

[74] Canada, *Census of 1911*, Vol. III, p. 304-309, Vol. VI, p. 250-261.

[75] All figures in this paragraph are from Table XI, p. XIX, Census of 1921. Vol. III.

[76] Quebec, *Statistical Yearbook 1921*, p. 427.

[77] Canada, *Census of 1921*, Vol. III, p. XIX.

[78] Child Welfare Exhibition, Montreal, *Souvenir Handbook*, Montreal 1912, p. 31.

[79] *Ibid.*, p. 32.

[80] See Tables I-VI, *Wages and Hours of Labour in Canada, 1901-1920, op. cit.*

[81] See Quebec, *Statistical Yearbook*, 1920, p. 414.

[82] S. Jamieson, *Times of Trouble* (Ottawa, 1968), p. 39.

[83] Michael Piva, a graduate student at Sir George Williams University, compiled the information on strikes in Montreal reported in the *Labour Gazette* for this study. All of the information on labour unrest in Montreal not otherwise cited is taken from this compilation except statements on wages and hours which are from *Wages and Hours of Labour in Canada 1901-1920. op. cit.*

[84] *Report of the Commissioner of the Quebec Trades Disputes Act*. Sessional Paper no. 7, 1916, p. 109.

[85] *Ibid.*, 1919, p. 146.

[86] *Ibid.*, 1919, p. 149-151.

[87] *Labour Gazette*, July 1921, p. 934.

[88] *Ibid.*, Nov. 1921, p. 1329.

[89] Urquhart & Buckley, *op. cit.*, p. 303.

[90] See Micheal Gauvin, *The Municipal Reform Movement in Montreal, 1886-1914* Unpublished M.A. thesis. University of Ottawa 1972 for further evidence of "reform" efforts at the municipal level.

[91] *Report of the Canadian Conference on Child Welfare*, 1923, p. 123.

[92] *Ibid.*, p. 123-124.