

Nativism in Alberta, 1925-1930

Howard Palmer

Volume 9, numéro 1, 1974

Toronto 1974

URI : <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/030782ar>

DOI : <https://doi.org/10.7202/030782ar>

[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

Palmer, H. (1974). Nativism in Alberta, 1925-1930. *Historical Papers / Communications historiques*, 9(1), 183-212. <https://doi.org/10.7202/030782ar>

All rights reserved © The Canadian Historical Association/La Société historique du Canada, 1974

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/>

Nativism in Alberta, 1925-1930

The contemporary Canadian preoccupation with national identity has given impetus to historical studies of western Canadian minority groups. Little has been written, however, about the attitudes of majority groups toward the various ethnic minorities who immigrated to the Canadian west.¹ This paper attempts to fill the gap to some extent by exploring the response of several major segments of Alberta society to immigration and ethnicity between 1925 and 1930.

During this period, which witnessed the second major influx into the province of central and eastern Europeans, there was a resurgence of nativist feeling. The traditional patriotic organizations – the Orange Order, the Canadian Legion, and the Native Sons of Canada – provided the most influential voice for nativist sentiment, but two new nativist organizations – the Ku Klux Klan and the National Association of Canada also emerged. Where did the Klan draw its sources of support, and what was its political impact? What caused this upsurge of nativism in a period of relative economic prosperity?² Were the various social changes, for which the twenties have become noted, related in any way to the upsurge of nativism or can it be explained purely as a response to the renewal of immigration?

The concept of nativism has proven to be a useful tool in analyzing the attitudes of Albertans. It describes the amalgam of ethnic prejudice and nationalism. John Higham, in his study of nativism in the United States, defined it as “intense opposition to an internal minority on the ground of its foreign . . . connection”,³ and delineated three main strands of American nativism: Anglo-Saxon nativism, anti-Catholic nativism, and anti-radical nativism. American nativists lashed out sometimes against a racial peril, sometimes against a religious peril, and sometimes against a revolutionary peril.⁴

Although Canadians have tended to look on nativism as an American malady, it has also been endemic in Canada. For a variety of demographic, economic, social and intellectual reasons, nativism was generally less virulent and less violent in Canada. But the three nativist strands that Higham discussed had considerable influence in English-speaking Canada prior to World War II. In Alberta between 1898 and 1906, 1919-20, and

1929-1933, the three, together or separately provided the basis of most anti-immigrant sentiment.

Each nativist tradition, however, had a slightly different origin within the Canadian context. Fears about the decline of Anglo-Saxon "stock" were given added impetus by the colonial desire to preserve Canada as "British". Anti-Catholicism was complicated by the fact that the largest single group of Catholics in Canada was French-speaking. The existence of French-Canada gave Catholics a greater sense of legitimacy in Canada; and yet at the same time, anti-French feelings could add additional fuel to Protestant anti-Catholicism. The American anti-radical nativist view that violent opposition to the status quo was "characteristically European and profoundly un-American"⁵ also had its Canadian counterpart. But Canadian hostility to radicalism did not stem from a "liberal" tradition as it did in the United States.⁶ Rather, it stemmed from the basic conservatism of Canadian values and politics which emphasized order rather than liberty.⁷

In order to understand Albertans' attitudes toward minority ethnic groups and immigration between 1925 and 1930, one has to examine the pre-1925 historical context.⁸ Immigrants from Britain, north-western Europe and the United States, who made up the vast majority of immigrants entering Alberta in the pre-1925 period, were welcomed by native-Canadians. These immigrants were culturally at home in western Canada and they helped to satisfy the main desire of Albertans during this time – continuous economic and population growth.⁹ Some opposition developed toward eastern Europeans (particularly the largest group – the Ukrainians) who came to Alberta in response to the immigration promotion campaign of Laurier's government. The Conservative party, many Protestant clergymen and even some Liberals like Frank Oliver, Minister of the Interior, 1905-1911, expressed fears that illiterate peasants from Europe and Asia would undermine "Anglo-Saxon" political institutions because of their lack of experience with self-government. There were occasional expressions of anti-radical and anti-Catholic nativism, but of the three strands of nativism which Higham has delineated, Anglo-Saxon nativism was by far the strongest in Alberta during the pre-World War I period.

Native-born Canadians saw several possible solutions to the "threat" which southern and eastern Europeans posed: assimilation to a British-Canadian norm, immigration restriction, or possibly both. The assimilationist programs sponsored by schools, Protestant denominations, patriotic and social welfare organizations combined nativist fears of what would happen if immigrants were not assimilated with humanitarian concern for the social and personal problems faced by immigrants.¹⁰

Nativist sentiment directed toward central, southern and eastern Europeans did not approach the intensity or pervasiveness of anti-Oriental sentiment in the pre-war period or of anti-German and anti-“enemy alien” sentiment during World War I.¹¹ At the end of the war, however, hostility toward all “foreigners” increased with the return of the veterans. Not only were veterans forced to compete with “foreigners” for jobs, but immigrants were associated in the public eye with labour radicalism especially in the aftermath of the Winnipeg general strike. Concern about “peculiar” religious sects was also aroused by the arrival of Hutterites in 1918. Official immigration policy reflected these changing attitudes toward non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants and during the first World War, Canadian immigration policy became increasingly restrictive.¹²

The basic trend in inter-ethnic relations during the early 1920’s was toward a lessening of the pre-1920 concern about the “undesirable” social consequences of non-Anglo-Saxon immigration. Nonetheless, there was still considerable debate in Alberta over immigration policy. The longstanding conflict in Alberta (as well as in the rest of English-speaking Canada) between business interests who advocated economic development through increased immigration, and organized labor, who feared that immigration would lead to unemployment and lower wages, was revived.

During the early 1920’s, the social and economic elite of the province, including Liberal politicians, the press, and business interests, particularly the Canadian Pacific Railway, were all vigorous promoters of immigration.¹³ Their major assumptions were still those of the national policy: farmers were needed to provide traffic and freight for the railways, to buy Canadian Pacific Railway land and to provide a market for eastern industrial goods. Promoters believed that a larger population could help provide a stable base for the economic and social infra-structure of the province. With a population of only 590,000 in 1921 and with much arable land lying untilled, it appeared obvious to these promoters that Alberta could and should sustain a much larger population. They regarded the need for large scale immigration as particularly pressing in the early 1920’s due to the over-extension of railways, the increase in the national debt during the war, and the out-migration of Canadians to the United States.¹⁴ There were, however, some differences of opinion between these “boosters” over the types of immigrants who should be encouraged. In particular there was considerable controversy over whether non-British immigrants should be encouraged to come to Canada.

The economic depression of the early 1920’s stirred businessmen to press for increased immigration, but it also caused organized labor and farmers to question the desirability of any further immigration. The major

force for immigration restriction in Alberta during the 1920's was the United Farmers of Alberta and organized labor. The opposition of these groups to immigration was based almost entirely on economic grounds. They questioned the boosters' belief in the connection between immigration and economic growth. The U.F.A. leadership did not however, have any fears about non-Anglo-Saxons undermining British institutions. While the federal wing of the U.F.A. opposed immigration in general, the provincial U.F.A. initiated an organized attempt to promote tolerance toward non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants already in the province and bring them into the mainstream of rural Alberta life.¹⁵

Many people in the U.F.A. and organized labor, even though immigrants themselves, believed that more immigrants would provide unneeded economic competition at a time when farmers were trying to cope with a drastic drop in wheat prices. The U.F.A. did not share labor's concern about job competition, but they believed that any increase in the number of farmers in Alberta would increase the province's economic problems by leading to an overproduction of grain.¹⁶

Opposition to federal immigration policies was not a primary factor in the farm revolt in western Canada, but disenchantment with these policies did form part of the overall rejection of the 'National Policies' of the two major parties. Opposition to immigration in western Canada was strongest among the U.F.A. federal M.P.'s. The U.F.A. easily fused anti-immigrant, anti-big business and anti-railway attitudes.¹⁷ They did not see the government's immigration policy as merely misguided. Rather they saw it as a graphic example of class favoritism toward the railways and land speculators.¹⁸

The U.F.A. expressed greater opposition to immigration than farm groups in the other two prairie provinces.¹⁹ This was due in part to the U.F.A.'s stronger distrust of eastern interests and to its co-operation with organized labor which was traditionally restrictionist on immigration.²⁰ The strong stand that the federal U.F.A. members took on immigration was both a cause and a consequence of co-operation with the two labour M.P.'s. J.S. Woodsworth and William Irvine, and of U.F.A. estrangement from other Progressives.²¹

Railways Agreement and the Influx of Immigrants

Despite criticism from the federal wing of the U.F.A. and labor organizations, the enthusiasm of the middle-class business interests for immigration as an economic panacea continued unabated throughout the mid-twenties. In March, 1925, civic boosters in Edmonton (where concern

about development was particularly strong since there had been virtually no growth since 1914)²² called an immigration rally to foster enthusiasm for the development of northern Alberta. The newspapers exuded confidence about the rally.²³ John Imrie, the editor of the *Edmonton Journal*, attempted to enlist support of prominent easterners for a national conference on immigration. He explained to C.A. Magrath:

I believe a vigorous immigration and colonization program backed by a large appropriation for loans to incoming settlers and under the direction of an independent commission composed of some of our biggest men, is the chief remedy for our present national problems.²⁴

The Calgary Herald also asserted that “there is unanimous agreement that immigration is needed”.²⁵

Contrary to the views of the federal wing of the U.F.A., the provincial wing of the United Farmers of Alberta came out openly in support of immigration in 1925. Their views on the subject were more booster oriented than the federal wing of the U.F.A. since being in power made the provincial party more subject to the pressures of business interests. Premier Greenfield attempted to steer a middle course between U.F.A. critics of immigration and the promoters. In 1925, he introduced a resolution in the provincial legislature urging the careful management of immigration.²⁶ The resolution stated that while the responsibility for agriculture and immigration policies rested with the federal government, the provincial government ought to have some say in the matter. The province recommended consolidation of colonization programs, careful selection of immigrants, and “reasonable” supervision of immigrants during and after settlement. These resolutions met with approval from the official opposition. A number of Liberal M.L.A.’s expressed admiration for the Premier’s courage in opposing the federal wing of his party.²⁷ Although Greenfield’s reluctance to oppose immigration helped undermine his position within the party and played a minor role in his decision to resign as Premier in 1925,²⁸ the fact that even one wing of the U.F.A. would come out openly in favor of immigration was indicative of a growing national consensus that more immigrants were needed.

In 1924 and 1925 several powerful sectors of Canadian society, including transportation companies, boards of trade, newspapers and politicians of various parties, as well as ethnic groups, applied pressure on the King government to open the immigration doors.²⁹ These groups believed that only a limited immigration could be expected from the “preferred” countries of northern Europe and that probably only central and eastern Europeans would do the rugged work of clearing unsettled farm land. With

improving economic conditions in the mid-twenties, the Federal government responded to this pressure and changed its policy with respect to immigrants from central and eastern Europe.

In September 1925, while continuing to emphasize its efforts to secure British immigrants, the King government entered into the "Railways Agreement" with the C.P.R. and C.N.R. which brought an increased number of central and eastern Europeans. The government authorized the railways to encourage potential immigrants of the "non-preferred"³⁰ central and eastern European countries to emigrate to Canada and to settle as "agriculturalists, agricultural workers and domestic servants".³¹ The agreement extended over a period of two years and was renewed in October, 1927 for another three years.³²

Through this agreement, the railways brought 165,000 central and eastern Europeans and 20,000 Mennonites to Canada. These people represented a variety of ethnic groups and a diversity of reasons for emigrating. Most of the Ukrainian immigrants were political refugees. Poles, Slovaks and Hungarians were escaping poor economic conditions. German-Russians and Mennonites were fleeing civil war, economic disaster, and the spectre of cultural annihilation in Russia.³³ Some of these immigrants were not in fact farm workers but were workmen, artisans, and merchants who viewed agricultural work as a temporary occupation until they could secure jobs in the city.³⁴ Often they chose Canada since they could no longer get into the United States because of its quota system.

With the introduction of the Railways Agreement, the total number of immigrants who gave Alberta as their intended destination increased from 10,728 in 1925 to 17,076 in 1926.³⁵ During the 1920's a total of 35,000 immigrants came to Alberta from central, eastern and southern Europe, composing 35 per cent of the total number of immigrants during this period.³⁶ They helped increase the total number of central, eastern and southern Europeans to 18 per cent of the total population and the total number of people of German origin to 10 per cent by 1931.³⁷ By 1931, 42 per cent of Alberta's population was of non-British, non-French origin.³⁸

With the renewed influx of immigrants under the Railways Agreement, opposition to immigration mounted and pro-immigration forces were placed on the defensive. Part of this opposition came from the same two sources which had previously opposed open immigration – organized farm and labor interests on the one hand and the Conservative Party on the other. These groups became increasingly strident in their opposition as the influx of

“continental” Europeans continued, and the Conservative Party eventually became just one voice in a chorus of patriotic groups demanding cancellation of the Railways Agreement.

Because of the diversity of the immigrants involved, no single group of immigrants was singled out for special nativist hostility. The opposition which developed was to the whole influx of immigrants under the Railways Agreement rather than to any specific group.

Reaction of the U.F.A. and Organized Labor to “Continental” Immigrants

The opposition of the federal wing of the U.F.A. and organized labor to the influx of immigrants under the Railways Agreement was initially based on the same economic considerations which had shaped their views in the early 1920's. U.F.A. members of parliament charged that the Railways Agreement was a classic example of the government catering to the interests of the railways.³⁹ During the 1928 immigration hearings of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture and Colonization, E.H. Garland and George Coote, both U.F.A. Members of Parliament, expressed concern that “continental” immigrants might aggravate the unemployment problem in the cities, and lower the standard of living on the prairies.⁴⁰ These economic arguments were sometimes combined with mild ethnic antagonisms in proposals made by U.F.A. locals, even though the leadership of the U.F.A. condemned ethnic prejudice. The overlapping of support during the late 1920's between the U.F.A. and the Ku Klux Klan in some parts of rural Alberta and the growing opposition within the U.F.A. to “bloc settlements”, or concentrations of particular ethnic groups in different rural areas, also indicates that non-economic considerations were coming to play a greater role in the opposition to immigration which existed in U.F.A. circles.⁴¹

Organized labor was not nearly as potent a force in Alberta as the U.F.A., but by the mid-twenties it wielded significant political influence in urban areas. Consequently, in the late twenties, when Alberta labour representatives and labour councils became outspokenly hostile to continued immigration, they were a force to be reckoned with.⁴² When unemployment in the cities increased during the late twenties and as “agricultural” immigrants began to drift into the cities, labour's opposition to immigration became more vocal.⁴³ There were three main reasons for the move to the cities. First, it was becoming increasingly difficult to establish oneself on a farm. Land, once free, now cost money and the cost of machinery needed to remain competitive was expensive for the new farmer.⁴⁴ Second, many so called agricultural immigrants came to Canada with the intention of moving

to the cities. Third, some eastern European immigrants were forced into the cities for work because established farmers preferred English-speaking labourers.⁴⁵ The fact that many immigrants left the farms and moved to the cities soon after they had arrived played an important part in the revival of restrictionist sentiment in the late 1920's.

Labour organizations devoted increasing attention to the question of immigration as the 1920's progressed. The organ of the Canadian Labour Party, the *Alberta Labor News*, argued that immigration was being promoted by employers to ensure themselves a cheap labour supply and charged that the railway companies were turning immigrants loose without jobs: "There is nothing for them to do except what some have already done -- offer to work for fifteen cents an hour for the railway companies which dumped them here".⁴⁶ The Calgary Trades and Labour Council urged the federal government to establish a quota that 75 per cent of immigrants coming into Canada should be English-speaking which would, theoretically, ensure that newcomers would not lower the working class standard by their willingness to work long hours at low pay.⁴⁷ Labor organizations also charged that immigration agencies were exploiting non-English speaking immigrants.⁴⁸ In 1929, with the help of J.S. Woodsworth, the Alberta section of the Canadian Labour Party formulated a policy on immigration which was virtually the same as that of the U.F.A. Basically it advocated more immigration control, more co-operation between the provinces and the federal government, repatriation of immigrants who had become public charges within two years of their arrival and the provision of more colonization and social services to immigrants.⁴⁹

Was there any truth to the labour and left-wing criticisms of the Railways Agreement? The immigration policy attempted to avoid bringing in non-farmers who would have provided the cheap labour supply. The C.P.R. co-operated with farmers who wanted farm labourers, but the ultimate goal was to bring in people who could eventually own their own land. Through their "colonization" efforts, the railways did make serious efforts to keep immigrants on the land. It could be argued that the railways were aware that many of the "agriculturalists" would drift into the city where they would provide a cheap labour supply for businesses and a labour pool that could be used on C.P.R. section gangs. According to this view, the C.P.R. and its corporate allies could get the cheap labour supply they wanted under the old legislation favoring farmers, but without being so obvious.⁵⁰ To doubt the conspiratorial view implied in this argument is not to deny that there was economic self-interest in the railways wanting to bring in farmers and farm labourers to purchase their land and provide traffic and freight.⁵¹

Reaction of Patriotic Organizations to "Continental" Immigrants

Paralleling this growing criticism of immigration policy by organized farmers and labour was an increase in nativist sentiment expressed by established patriotic organizations. Two new patriotic groups, the Ku Klux Klan, and the National Association of Canada also sprang up to meet the challenge of social change. While patriotic groups mouthed the economic arguments of the U.F.A. and organized labour, there was an obvious element of nativism running through their opposition to "continental" European immigration. For patriotic groups, and many Conservative politicians, the argument that non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants were necessary for economic growth was not only questionable, but crass. Canada needed more than good farmers and strong workers – it needed people who could easily be assimilated to the patriot's ideal of "British" or Canadian citizenship.

From 1926 to 1930, the predominant nativist theme was, as it had been prior to World War I, Anglo-Saxon nativism – the fear that non-Anglo-Saxon immigrants would subvert Anglo-Saxon institutions and racial purity. The Canadian version of Anglo-Saxon nativism was slightly different than its American counterpart. Whereas Anglo-Saxon nativism in the United States had been concerned primarily about a "racial" threat to the purity of the Anglo-Saxon "race",⁵² Anglo-Saxon nativism in Canada was given added impetus by the desire of some traditionalists in English-speaking Canada to preserve Canada as "British" in culture and tradition. Americans and Canadians could share Anglo-Saxonism as a racial concept, but "Britishness", though closely related, was a nationalistic sentiment which only Canadians could feel.

Nevertheless, not all opposition by Conservatives and patriotic groups to the new wave of immigrants was based on Anglo-Saxon nativism. The image of the immigrant as radical played a minor part in the nativist revival. More important, however, was the emergence of a nativist theme which was, for the most part, new to Alberta – anti-Catholic nativism. Nativist sentiment in western Canada was most pronounced in Saskatchewan where one of its leading spokesmen was George Exton Lloyd, who combined Anglo-Saxon with a touch of anti-Catholic and anti-radical nativism. Lloyd, an Anglican bishop and one of the founders of the Barr colony at Lloydminster, had hoped that the Barr colony would be the first step in the settlement of large numbers of Protestant Englishmen in western Canada who would preserve the area for those of British origin. The frustration of these hopes was undoubtedly one of the causes for his hostility to Catholic central and southern European immigrants. Lloyd saw a threat to the status of the British in Canada not only in the increasing numbers of "continental" immigrants,

but also in the declining status of things “British” as Canadians moved towards a North American based nationalism which did not include loyalty to the British Empire as its primary article of faith.

In a torrent of newspaper articles and speeches, reprinted both in Saskatchewan and in Alberta, Lloyd repeated the warning that Canada was in danger of becoming a “mongrel” nation: “The essential question before Canadians today is this: Shall Canada develop as a British nation within the empire, or will she drift apart by the introduction of so much alien blood that her British instincts will be paralyzed?”⁵³ Lloyd urged that “the immediate objective of all good loyal Canadians should be the abrogation of the Railway (sic) Agreement by which the country is being flooded with ‘unpreferred Continentals’”.⁵⁴

During the late 1920’s, Lloyd organized the National Association of Canada to bring together forces opposed to “continental” European immigration. He sought support in the existing patriotic organizations which were concerned with maintaining the British tie – the Orange Order, the Sons of England, and the Canadian Legion.⁵⁵ There is little evidence to show how much support Lloyd enlisted in Alberta for the National Association. But certainly there was some activity.⁵⁶

For Lloyd and most of his followers, anti-Catholicism was merely one aspect of their Anglo-Saxon nativism and by no means the major focus of their anti-immigrant campaign. However, for the Ku Klux Klan, which came into short-lived prominence in western Canada during the late twenties and early thirties, anti-Catholicism was the major organizational article of faith, and Anglo-Saxon nativism was secondary. The Klan opposed the Railways Agreement and advocated tighter immigration laws, but it did not arise entirely as a response to the influx of Catholic immigrants. Larger social forces were working to facilitate the growth of the Klan, and it opposed not only the new Catholic immigrants, but the whole Catholic church.

In the United States the Klan had been revived after World War I in a period of anxious American nationalism. Its goals related to vague defences of Americanism, Protestant Christianity and white supremacy. The organization accepted only native-born Protestant whites and combined an anti-Negro with an anti-foreign and anti-Catholic outlook. Anti-semitism, utilizing a stereotype of the Jew as the symbol of urban corruption, also became part of the group’s ideology. Klan membership, concentrated primarily in the southern and mid-western states, increased rapidly through 1923 and reached a total of nearly three million.⁵⁷

When Klan attempts to organize in the northern industrial states met with hostility, organizers extended their proselytizing efforts to Canada. Klansmen organized in Montreal and Toronto in 1921 and soon established locals in southern Ontario, British Columbia and Manitoba.⁵⁸ However, the Klan found its most fertile ground a little later in Saskatchewan, where it began organizing in 1927.⁵⁹ Although the first organizer absconded with the membership proceeds, Dr. J.H. Hawkins and J.J. Maloney, both long time anti-Catholic agitators, took over leadership of the organization in Saskatchewan.⁶⁰ Despite opposition from the Liberal press and from the Saskatchewan Premier, J.G. Gardiner, Klan membership reached 20,000 in 19 locals during the summer of 1928. This number was four times that of Klan membership in bordering northern states with comparable populations.⁶¹

In Alberta the Klan grew gradually throughout the late 1920's. Klan organizers first came to the province from British Columbia in 1925 and 1926 and began selling memberships in the cities and in a few towns in the south.⁶² By the end of 1927, the Klan reported that it had one thousand members in Alberta. Organizational momentum was curbed somewhat in 1927 when organizers once again disappeared with membership funds; however, in 1929, Klan organizers from Saskatchewan came to Alberta to revive enthusiasm.⁶³ These organizers were soon joined by J.J. Maloney who became the driving force behind the Klan in Alberta. Eleven locals of the Klan were established in central and northern Alberta by December of 1930 and a year later Maloney claimed to have already addressed 100,000 people.⁶⁴

In Alberta, as in the United States, Klans were able to attract as much support in the cities as in the rural areas and Klan leadership was centered in the cities. Under Maloney's leadership, Klan locals were eventually organized in approximately fifty towns and villages⁶⁵ as well as in the "cities" of Medicine Hat and Calgary.⁶⁶ Maloney chose Edmonton, which he called the "Rome of the West," as the center of Klan activity in Alberta and began the sporadic publication of a newspaper called *The Liberator* for which he claimed a circulation of 250,000.⁶⁷ Klan membership at its peak reached something between seven and eight thousand.⁶⁸ Although the Klan did not achieve its peak in Alberta until 1931, it must be regarded as a product of the late 1920's. Social and intellectual currents of the late 1920's gave rise to the Klan and by 1933, the depression had helped to kill it.

The Klan's activities in Alberta were similar to those it carried on in other parts of North America, but almost no violence was reported. There was one case of tarring and feathering in Lacombe which was attributed to the Klan and which brought adverse publicity, but the Klan denied any

involvement.⁶⁹ The organization attempted to instigate boycotts of Catholic businessmen, intimidate politicians who were “catering to Rome”, expose Liberals who were trying to “solidify the foreign vote”, and combat the use of French. In his autobiography *Rome in Canada* Maloney offered the following description of the organization’s activities in Alberta:

The Klan sprung up overnight and became the greatest order in Edmonton and won a municipal election six weeks after its inception. Convent inspection petitions were sponsored and signed by thousands; the public school board was warned; the matter of giving the city taxpayers’ money in the form of grants was challenged through the courts and over 700 boys and girls were saved from the dangers of mixed marriages.⁷⁰

The organization tried to influence the outcome of municipal elections and was credited with the defeat of Mayor Douglas of Edmonton who had strong connections with the Liberal party. By Klan reasoning, this was enough to brand Douglas a papist sympathizer.⁷¹

Following its North American themes, Klan literature and speakers in Alberta proclaimed the principles of “Protestantism, separation of church and state, pure patriotism, restrictive and selective immigration, one national public school, one flag and one language – English”.⁷² According to the charter which the Klan received from the provincial Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, Canadian membership applicants and their spouses had to be white Protestants “whose allegiance to the British Crown is unquestionable”.⁷³

Loyalty to the crown and anti-French sentiment were the only real departures from the main Klan themes in the United States. It is doubtful, however, that white supremacy or anti-semitism were very important to the Alberta Klan membership; both themes were imports and there is no evidence in existing Klan literature from Alberta that these themes were greatly utilized. This is not, of course, to imply that there was no anti-black or anti-semitic feeling in Alberta or that Klan members did not have these feelings. The image of the Jew as Shylock had previously existed and was reinforced by what were regarded as “sharp practices” of Jewish cattle buyers, and by the concentration of Jews in urban merchandizing. There was also some evidence of discrimination against blacks in the largest cities.⁷⁴ However, the small numbers of Jews and blacks and the concentration of the blacks in isolated rural areas kept anti-semitic and anti-black feeling at a minimum.⁷⁵ Anti-Oriental sentiment also continued to wane during the late 1920’s since the flow of Chinese and Japanese immigrants had been severely restricted and the Klan paid little attention to Orientals.⁷⁶

Anti-Catholicism formed the cornerstone of the Klan's ideology and most of its energies in the public sphere were directed toward combatting the power of the Catholic church. There had been undercurrents of anti-Catholicism in Alberta prior to the rise of the Klan in the late twenties.⁷⁷ These were partially based on the traditional Protestant fascination with alleged sexual indiscretions of the Catholic clergy. Heather Gilead in her autobiographical account of rural Alberta describes and analyzes attitudes towards Catholics in one part of rural Alberta:

When my mother and Mrs. Mildmay spoke of the Catholics it was with a furtive excitement utterly unlike their attitudes towards other churches. They spoke not a word of transubstantiation, nor of the nature of the Trinity, nor of Mariolatry, the communion of saints or the apostolic succession. They spoke of the goings-on in convents. I suppose that the Church's perpetual harping on celibacy and chastity and the sins of the flesh had, logically enough, provided a focus for the sexual anxieties and taboos of that Protestant Middle West wherein my mother and Mrs. Mildmay had been formed . . .⁷⁸

The Orange Order had also been alert to any indication of growing Catholic power. In 1926, the Orange Order launched a campaign against a proposed agreement between the federal and provincial governments regarding the transfer of natural resources control to the Alberta government when it was discovered that a condition had been attached to its terms for the purpose of protecting the separate schools of Alberta as established by the Alberta School Act of 1905.⁷⁹

The Orange Order and the Klan regarded Catholics not only as members of an idolatrous church, but as citizens who placed devotion to the Vatican above their devotion to the Crown. As in the United States, Klansmen believed that "the Pope was a political autocrat with a ravenous desire to extend his temporal as well as spiritual influence across the Atlantic".⁸⁰ The burgeoning of anti-Catholic sentiment was due in part to Protestant individualism, but was also a conservative reaction to the growing number of Catholics in Canada, particularly in Alberta, and to their gradually increasing economic and political power.⁸¹

Anti-foreign sentiment was closely allied with the Klan's anti-Catholicism since a large portion of the immigrants from central and eastern Europe who were coming to Alberta as farm laborers under the Railways Agreement were Catholics.⁸² But anti-foreign sentiment was also part of a more generalized distrust of minority groups and a concern about the homogeneity of Canada. According to the Klan, immigrants refused to be assimilated to British ideals. Instead they maintained their own ideals which

were allegedly incompatible with “the ideals of Canadianism”. The “plain people of Canada” asked, “Why not spend some money to keep our native boys instead to bring in these, which (sic) is the largest contribution to our crime list and by far the largest proportion of the inmates of our insane asylums”?⁸³ The Klan also charged, of course, that immigrants were forcing Canadians and Britishers out of work by underbidding them.

The Klan’s supporters in Alberta were attracted not only by the organization’s anti-Catholicism but by its patriotism, puritanical morality, and appeals to law and order. These precepts provided security against the rapid social change which characterized the post-war period. For many Albertans traditional assumptions were under attack. Modernism was making its impact on traditional Protestantism. Social, ethnic and religious heterogeneity were increasing. The apparent decline of public morality as evidenced, for example, in the repeal of prohibition heightened traditionalists’ anxiety. In the press of the late twenties, one can clearly see increased attention to signs of social change and threats to traditional family values. Mass media were definitely making an impact on traditional mores. Advertisements were beginning to appeal much more to sexuality than to long suffering virtuous womanhood, and Hollywood was assuming an increasingly substantial role in shaping social values. K.T. Jackson argues in *The Ku Klux Klan in the City* that fear of change was the basic motive of American Klansmen.⁸⁴ This also appears to have been the underlying reason for Klan support in Alberta. However, as important as these social and political conditions are in explaining the Klan’s appeal, it should also be noted that the appeal of social companionship, insurance benefits and the novelty of cross-burnings and white-sheeted parades gave ideology a social and fraternal base on which to build membership.

The social basis of Klan support was similar in both Saskatchewan and Alberta. The Klan gained support in areas where Catholics were under-represented and where conservative Protestants – either native Canadians, Britons, Scandinavians, Germans or Americans predominated.⁸⁵ Klans generally sprang up in areas where the Orange Order, with its long tradition of anti-Catholic sentiment and anti-French feeling, had been established. As in Saskatchewan, there was considerable cooperation between the Order and the Klan, and membership overlapped.⁸⁶ Maloney could claim that W. Walford, a Grand Master of the Loyal Orange Lodge in Alberta, co-operated with him in circulating a petition in Edmonton against the “promiscuous use of French on the radio”.⁸⁷

The political as well as the social basis of Klan support was similar in Alberta to that in Saskatchewan. However, since the Klan was not as

powerful in Alberta as it was in Saskatchewan, it did not become as deeply embroiled in provincial politics as in Saskatchewan where it played a part in the defeat of the Liberal government in 1929. As in Saskatchewan, the Alberta organization drew a disproportionate number of its members from the Conservative Party with which it shared a number of beliefs.⁸⁸ Although no longer overtly anti-Catholic, the Alberta Conservative Party and anti-Catholicism had historically some ties and the party relied heavily on Protestant support. Conservatives firmly believed in the virtues of the British connection which the Klan upheld, and Conservative politicians attacked the Railways Agreement almost as adamantly as the Klan.⁸⁹

Like Saskatchewan's Progressive Party, Alberta's U.F.A. ran second to the Conservatives in the number of members it contributed to the Klan. This was partly because the U.F.A., like the Klan, found its greatest strength where Americans, Britishers and native-Canadians predominated.⁹⁰ A majority of these groups were Protestants. There were also some ideological similarities between the Klan and the U.F.A. Both organizations emphasized a non-partisan approach to politics and were generally in agreement on immigration and anti-authoritarianism.⁹¹ In its initial stages the U.F.A. had been a strong spokesman for ethnic and religious tolerance. But the opposition to immigration which grew within U.F.A. circles during the twenties, coupled with the Klan's anti-Catholic reformist appeal and its strong support of prohibition meant that there were no great ideological problems for U.F.A. members who wanted to join the Klan. Indeed, in some places in Alberta, U.F.A. locals virtually disappeared as the Klan local attracted members.⁹² The Klan was embarking on a crusade against the powerful interests who were thwarting "the will of the people" precisely at the same time that reformist zeal was waning within the Progressive movement.⁹³ This is only to suggest psychological similarities between the U.F.A. and the Klan, since there were still great differences in ideology which separated the two groups.

Despite this overlapping of membership between the U.F.A. and the Klan, the U.F.A. leadership could never allow itself to become identified with the Klan. The former drew on support from Catholics as well as Protestants. Consequently, the U.F.A. cabinet tried to prevent the Klan from becoming a political issue.⁹⁴

In Alberta, the Klan attracted only about one quarter the membership of its Saskatchewan wing, even though Alberta had nearly as many people.⁹⁵ What are the reasons for this striking difference in support? The question is complex, and any explanation is tentative at best. However, one basic reason is that flammable issues were not as readily available in Alberta. The separate

school and French language questions had been continually debated in Saskatchewan throughout the 1920's.⁹⁶ Also, the Saskatchewan Liberal government was, by extension, vulnerable to attack on the immigration issue since the federal government, which controlled immigration policy, was also Liberal. The Alberta U.F.A. government, on the other hand, was not connected in the public's mind with the federal Liberals, and a number of U.F.A. Members of Parliament had spoken out against the federal immigration policy. The U.F.A. was also less vulnerable on the question of sectarian influence in public schools.⁹⁷ Social differences which existed between Alberta and Saskatchewan may also have played some part in the differing degree of support for the Klan in the two provinces, particularly the fact that the proportion of central and eastern Europeans was slightly larger in Saskatchewan than in Alberta.⁹⁸

It would be difficult to argue that the Klan's limited success in Alberta as compared to Saskatchewan was a result of a tradition of religious and ethnic tolerance in Alberta. British, democratic and Christian traditions promoted inter-ethnic tolerance, but it is doubtful that these traditions were stronger in Alberta than they were in Saskatchewan.⁹⁹ In Alberta, as in Saskatchewan, some urban newspapers denounced the Klan's activities as undemocratic and "un-British".¹⁰⁰ In some Alberta towns, Maloney was prevented from speaking, but most liberals responded to the Klan with a studied neglect rather than any active campaign.¹⁰¹ Indeed since the Klan was relatively small and made little political impact, many Albertans were scarcely aware that it even existed.¹⁰² Press accounts of the Klan's activities were often whimsical, and projected a middle-class disdain of lower middle-class activities. In March, 1930, for example, the Edmonton *Bulletin* headlined, "Kluck Klucks May Quack in Next Election", and noted that because of dissatisfaction with the Liberal's immigration policy, the "Invisible Empire" planned to become involved in the 1930 federal election.¹⁰³

Although Lloyd and his National Association and Maloney and the Klan received only minimal support in Alberta, their existence was indicative of a growing nativist and restrictionist mood. Most Albertans did not agree with the Klan's virulent anti-Catholicism or its sweeping demands for immigration restriction, but the public was definitely veering toward restrictionist ideas by 1929. This is evidenced in the increasing concern expressed by patriotic organizations and both federal and provincial wings of the U.F.A. over bloc settlement, unemployment and non-assimilation among immigrants.¹⁰⁴ Although women's organizations were generally not as active as men's organizations in demanding immigration restriction, in 1929, Alberta chapters of the Independent Order of Daughters of the Empire joined their

national organization in demanding immediate cancellation of the Railways Agreement.¹⁰⁵ The Alberta Grand Lodge of the Orange Order demanded that “unpreferred immigration” be restricted so that Canada could “remain British and Protestant.” Some Alberta Orangemen even tied the Catholic and Communist threats together, arguing that those who fell under the “hand of Rome” supplied the “propagandists” for communism.¹⁰⁶

The Canadian Legion also had its restrictionist outbursts. During the 1928 hearings of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture and Colonization, Hugh Farthing, a Calgary lawyer who represented the Legion, summarized why the organization wanted immigration from southern and eastern Europe restricted. According to the Legion, “continental” Europeans took jobs away from Britons and undercut labour’s position by accepting low wages. Farthing quoted a resolution from the Rocky Mountain Branch of the Legion which contended that since central Europeans were obtaining work to the detriment of ex-servicemen, “be it resolved that we greatly deplore the influx of central Europeans to Canada, and that we suggest that the number of immigrants from these countries be strictly limited.”¹⁰⁷

It is apparent that much of the restrictionist sentiment in the Legion was based on economic concerns. It cannot be denied, however, that hostility was also motivated by ethnic prejudice. In speaking for the Legion, Farthing explained that English speaking workers were being driven out of railway section gangs partly because they would not work for the wages that “continentals” accepted, but also because English speaking workers found that they could not live with “Pollacks”.¹⁰⁸

Opponents of Immigration Restriction

While patriotic organizations, local chapters of the U.F.A., labour organizations and Conservative politicians were exerting increased pressure in 1928 and 1929 for the cancellation of the Railways Agreement, there was still some resistance to immigration restriction. Promoters of immigration, long committed to it as an economic panacea, were not easily convinced of any error in their ways. In January of 1929 the Edmonton *Journal* condemned those who challenged the benefits of immigration, arguing that in fact more immigrants were needed.¹⁰⁹ The labor intensive sugar beet industry in southern Alberta was particularly dependent on the farm labourers who came under the Railways Agreement. When Premier Brownlee began to introduce measures to restrict the entry of immigrants in 1929, the Beet Grower’s Association, the Lethbridge Board of Trade and the Lethbridge Northern Colonization Association flooded the Premier with letters in which

they argued that the immigrants were needed because they would do work no one else would do.¹¹⁰ Some urban newspapers and the Beet Grower's Association continued to stress that continental Europeans could be assimilated and dismissed fears that immigrants were prone to radicalism.¹¹¹

A few Liberal and U.F.A. politicians, often immigrants themselves or representing immigrant areas, spoke out against nativist accusations. U.F.A. Member of Parliament, Michael Luchkovich denounced Bishop Lloyd's "neurotic and un-Christian" attacks on "Galicians" and emphasized their pioneering contributions and assimilability.¹¹² Similarly, Charles Stewart, Liberal Member of Parliament for Edmonton and Minister of Immigration and Colonization during the early 1920's, defended Ukrainian immigrants on several occasions and appealed to a cosmopolitan ideal in defence of immigrants.¹¹³

There were even a few people who voiced concern about the views immigrants gained from their experience in Canada. In assessing Canadian attitudes toward immigrants in 1929, C.W. Peterson, the Danish born editor of the Calgary based *Farm and Ranch Review* indicted them as "deplorable . . . the average Canadian is apparently unable or unwilling to penetrate to the soul of the stranger within his gates. The philosophy of life and the process of reasoning of the foreigner is to him a closed book".¹¹⁴

There were also nationally recognized authors who defended the central and eastern Europeans. Not all intellectuals retreated from the optimism which assumed that assimilation was possible; some, influenced by liberal and internationalist values (and in the case of John Murray Gibbon and Robert England, influenced as well by employment with the railway companies) went further to argue that immigrant groups could provide a cultural asset rather than a handicap to Canada.¹¹⁵ Those who defended "continental" European immigration most strongly emphasized that assimilation was not only possible, but that it was in fact occurring. Many of these people became involved in programs to facilitate the assimilation process.

Opposition to "Bloc Settlements"

Although there were some remaining pro-immigration forces, by the late 1920's they were relatively weak compared to the growing restrictionist forces. As has been pointed out, nativist sentiment focused on the influx of immigrants under the Railways Agreement. But there was another related issue which fed nativist anxieties. On the question of bloc settlements, the U.F.A. patriotic organizations, and even some defenders of the Liberal

immigration policy were basically in accord. These settlements were undesirable since they prevented “canadianization” which was still the goal of almost all sectors of the dominant society, whether they favored continuing immigration or not.¹¹⁶

During the early 1920's, concern about community solidarity had served mainly to promote inter-ethnic harmony. But by the late 1920's this same concern was increasingly becoming the basis of hostility to groups like the Ukrainians, German-Russians, Hutterites, Doukhobors and Mennonites. These groups, which were concentrated in rural areas, apparently would not become assimilated, despite the efforts of voluntary associations, Protestant churches and the schools.¹¹⁷ Indeed, some of these ethnic groups seemed staunchly opposed to assimilation.¹¹⁸

The tension which existed between the dominant society and these tight-knit groups was manifested in a general sense at the political level, and in a concrete sense at the local community level. There was some concern about the large settlement of Ukrainians and German-Russians¹¹⁹ which had been reinforced by new arrivals under the Railways Agreement, and the Independent Order of Daughters of the Empire, Womens' Christian Temperance Union and the United Church continued their “canadianization” efforts among the Ukrainians.¹²⁰ But the groups which aroused the most public discussion during the late 1920's were three rural pacifist sects — Hutterites, Doukhobors, and Mennonites. For these three groups, isolation from the “world” was a religious belief, and they were opposed to prevailing notions of “progress”.

The tension which existed between the larger community and the bloc settlements of Hutterites, Doukhobors, and Mennonites manifested itself in several specific conflicts during the late twenties. In 1927 patriotic groups in the Pincher Creek area rallied to oppose the attempt of a Hutterite colony near Pincher Creek to establish its own separate school.¹²¹ In 1928, local residents in the Arrowwood district became concerned over the refusal of the Doukhobors in the area to register under the Vital Statistics Act.¹²² The Doukhobors had long been reluctant to report births or deaths or to allow themselves to be enumerated since they were afraid this information would be used to force them eventually into military service.¹²³ Government officials sensed that neighboring communities were becoming “restless” as a result of rumours that the Doukhobors were receiving “special favors” from the government.¹²⁴

Although the conflicts in Alberta involving Hutterites and Doukhobors were relatively minor local affairs, they reflected and helped to create an

unfavorable social climate for “non-preferred” immigrants. The acid test of Alberta’s attitude was to come in the fall of 1929 when several thousand Mennonites who had been uprooted from their homes in Russia pleaded to enter Canada. They had gathered in Moscow, where they lived under harsh conditions awaiting approval of their entry into Canada. Meanwhile the Soviet government issued an ultimatum that if they were not accepted, they would be shipped to labour camps in Siberia.¹²⁵ The ensuing public debate in Alberta reflected the opposition which had crystallized towards “unassimilable” immigrants, including Ukrainians, Doukhobors and Hutterites. Although there were no specific complaints regarding the Mennonites already in Alberta, their isolationism had not made them particularly popular and the public did not distinguish between these groups. A resolution which the U.F.A. convention passed in 1929 stating that “Doukhobors and other Europeans of communal views are of no value to community life” was typical of the prevailing sentiment.¹²⁶

Given these attitudes, it is not surprising that a wide range of farm, patriotic and labour groups in Alberta protested against the possible entry in 1929 of the Mennonites from Russia. Their arguments that better settlers could be found reflected a mistrust of Mennonite separateness and pacifism. In the view of a community which almost unquestioningly accepted the ethic of progress and military virtues, immigrants like the Mennonites whose doctrines and behavior represented a rejection of these beliefs definitely were not desirable.¹²⁷ Another argument against Mennonite entry was based on the feeling that Mennonites in Russia were perhaps being punished by the Russian government for their failure to obey the laws of the land.¹²⁸

Local newspapers and the Premier’s office were flooded with letters opposing their entry. The Canadian Legion wrote to Brownlee that they had just completed a survey which showed the opposition of its membership to Hutterites, Mennonites and Doukhobors.¹²⁹ Local branches of the Canadian Legion, the Native Sons of Canada and the United Mine Workers of America joined in recommending more rigid selection of settlers.¹³⁰

Newspaper editorial reaction was also unfavorable.¹³¹ In a particularly insensitive editorial, the *Calgary Albertan* argued that despite the Mennonite claim to the contrary, these immigrants were not Germans and so were “non-preferred”.¹³² In a vitriolic editorial, the *Vegreville Observer*, situated in the heart of the Ukrainian district, noted that various immigration experiments had proven to be “disastrous. . . . [T]he business of bringing in certain classes of settlers and giving them land in solid bloc, forming

impermeable blocs of non-Canadian citizens is the finest method in the world of creating dissension in the long run. Keep them out! Let them hunt some other country where they can get away with their ridiculous ideas as to religion and as to their responsibility as citizens . . . Western Canada is already cursed with too many imported jackasses".¹³³

The Federal government left it to the provinces to decide whether to accept the Mennonites as immigrants. In Alberta, the decision rested with Premier Brownlee, who had stated in 1928 that he shared the reservations of the general public concerning non-British immigration.¹³⁴ Brownlee had also stated that he shared organized labour's concern about the "dumping" of unemployed immigrants on Alberta and the drift of immigrant farm laborers to the cities.¹³⁵ In January of 1929, Brownlee notified Ottawa that because of these problems, there was no longer any need for continental European immigrants until those already in the province were "absorbed".¹³⁶

Given Brownlee's public views on immigration, along with overwhelmingly negative public opinion and deteriorating economic conditions, when the officials of the Canadian Mennonite Board of Colonization met with the Premier to urge acceptance of the Mennonite immigrants, his answer was a foregone conclusion. The Mennonite representatives assured Brownlee that Mennonites respected school laws, that they were individual farmers and "do not believe in communistic settlements such as the Doukhobors and Hutterites".¹³⁷ Further, they promised that if the Mennonite immigrants were allowed to enter Alberta, the Mennonites already in the province would guarantee that the newcomers would not become public charges and would conform to school regulations.¹³⁸ Despite these assurances, after the meeting concluded, Brownlee told the press that while Mennonites had adopted Canadian ways more readily than Doukhobors, no more Mennonites could be allowed to come to the province since unemployment was already a serious problem.¹³⁹

Brownlee maintained his position against Mennonite immigration even though the federal Minister of Immigration, Robert Forke, urged provincial authorities to allow a number of the Mennonites to enter.¹⁴⁰ The Premier's firmness was undoubtedly based in large measure on political considerations. An election was pending in the spring and Brownlee knew that he could not afford to risk alienating support on this issue.¹⁴¹ Provincial authorities and various pressure groups in the province continued to press for the tightening of immigration regulations until the summer of 1930, when the newly elected Bennett government introduced regulations which drastically curtailed immigration.¹⁴²

Conclusion

Thus the 1920's which had begun in an expansive mood, with considerable support for large scale immigration, drew to a close with the introduction of a restrictionist immigration policy. Despite the apparent relative harmony of the early 1920's, the resurgence of nativism in the late 1920's in fact had its intellectual roots in the pre-1925 period. Anglo-Saxon, anti-Catholic, and anti-radical nativism had all been present prior to 1925. Changing economic and social conditions led not so much to changes in nativist ideas, but to strengthening of ideas which already existed. During the early 1920's, Albertans believed in the need for assimilation of immigrants in order to develop community solidarity and national unity. In the mid-twenties, a renewed influx of "continental" Europeans under the "Railways Agreement" together with a number of social and political changes led to a growing questioning of the society's ability to absorb immigrants. The consensus of the early 1920's about the need for community solidarity and the assimilation of immigrants had a nativist corollary; ethnic groups that could not be assimilated would have to be excluded.

The changing social origins of the immigrants also intensified restrictionist sentiment. Although there was less concern about illiteracy and poverty than there had been at the turn of the century since immigrants came from a wider social strata, many were not farmers and drifted into the cities where they began competing for jobs.

Anxieties about social change brought about a resurgence of Anglo-Saxon and anti-Catholic nativism in rural as well as urban areas. Not only did nativist sentiment come to dominate patriotic groups and the Conservative Party in Alberta, but with the waning of reform zeal, some elements of the U.F.A. and organized labor adopted nativist arguments in addition to their traditional economic arguments against immigration. While initially different sets of arguments were advanced by the two different groups to justify their opposition to immigration, the economic arguments of organized farm and labour interests, and the nativist arguments of patriotic organizations became increasingly intertwined as their concern about immigration intensified. This quite disparate variety of groups joined in opposing the Railways Agreement, and by 1930, these groups had helped to drastically curtail immigration.

With the coming of the Great Depression, concerns about Catholics virtually disappeared and the Ku Klux Klan collapsed¹⁴³ but the reaction of both Anglo-Saxons and eastern European groups to severe economic distress further sharpened ethnic cleavages, leading to the resurgence of anti-radical

nativism.¹⁴⁴ The focus of nativism would change even more during World War II as the heightened nationalism of wartime re-awakened hostility toward the Japanese and toward groups with German origins (particularly the pacifist Mennonites and Hutterites), and stimulated the growth of anti-semitism in one wing of the Social Credit movement.¹⁴⁵ Nevertheless, a number of developments during the war period worked to undermine nativism in the long run. Although none of the main nativist traditions has yet completely disappeared, large scale transformations since World War II in Alberta's social structure, in its intellectual climate, and in the socio-economic status of minority ethnic groups have radically changed the prevailing attitudes toward immigration and ethnicity.¹⁴⁶

NOTES

¹ There is however a growing amount of literature available. See Morris Mott, "The Foreign Peril: Nativism in Winnipeg, 1916-1923", (Unpublished Masters' thesis, University of Manitoba, 1970); W.E. Calderwood, "The Rise and Fall of the Ku Klux Klan in Saskatchewan", (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1968); Donald Avery, "Canadian Immigration Policy, 1896-1919: The Anglo-Canadian Perspective", (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1973).

² For discussion of the relative economic prosperity of the late 1920's and the causes of the renewed wheat boom see W.T. Easterbrook and H.G. Aitken, *Canadian Economic History*, (Toronto, 1956), pp. 490-491.

³ John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, (New York, 2nd edition, 1967), p.4.

⁴ Higham, *Strangers*, 2nd edition, preface.

⁵ Higham, *Strangers*, p. 8.

⁶ Louis Hartz, *The Liberal Tradition in America*, (New York, 1955).

⁷ Frank Underhill, *In Search of Canadian Liberalism*, (Toronto, 1960); S.M. Lipset, "Canada and the United States - A Comparative View", *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, Nov. 1964; Ramsay Cook, "Canadian Liberalism in Wartime", (Unpublished Master's thesis, Queen's University, 1955).

⁸ H. Palmer, "Responses to Foreign Immigration: Nativism and Ethnic Tolerance in Alberta: 1880-1920", (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1971).

⁹ J.B. Hedges, *Building the Canadian West*, (New York, 1939); Harold Troper, *Only Farmers Need Apply*, (Toronto, 1972).

¹⁰ H. Palmer, "Nativism and Ethnic Tolerance: 1880-1920", pp. 149-165.

¹¹ *IBID.*, Chapter 3

¹² However, the pre-1920 period was not characterized by unrestrained intolerance toward central and eastern Europeans; there were also forces working to keep hostility in check. Relative harmony was promoted by the predominantly isolated rural settlement of these immigrants and their slowly increasing political power, by the ascendance of the Liberal Party (which was traditionally committed to immigration encouragement as a spur to western development) and by the pervasiveness of Christian and British "fair play" values. Also, labor and farm organizations which grew rapidly after the turn of the century usually promoted ethnic tolerance (except for the Chinese) as a factor in class and occupational solidarity.

¹³ J.B. Hedges, *Building the Canadian West*, Chapter 12; H. Palmer, "Nativism

and Ethnic Tolerance in Alberta 1920-1972", (Unpublished Ph.D. thesis, York University, 1973), pp. 15-31

14 *Canadian Annual Review*, 1922, p. 269; J.B. Hedges, *Building*, p. 347.

15 H. Palmer, "Nativism and Ethnic Tolerance: 1920-1972", pp. 55-57.

16 George Coote, *Debates*, House of Commons, June 16, 1922, p. 3064.

17 See Robert H. Wiebe, *The Search for Order, 1877-1920*, (New York, 1967). Chapter 4, for discussion of a similar development among populists in the United States.

18 Edward Garland, *Debates*, House of Commons, June 23, 1924. It is significant that the U.F.A.'s ideas on immigration were similar to those of conservative eastern intellectuals, just as American populist's ideas on immigration had been similar to those of conservative American intellectuals. Both groups saw immigration serving the interests of big business which did not take into account its impact on the total society. See Richard Hofstadter, *The Age of Reform*, (New York, 1955), and Ramsay Cook, "Stephen Leacock and the Age of Plutocracy, 1903-1921", in J.S. Moir ed. *Character and Circumstance* (Toronto, 1970), p. 175.

19 M.F. Smeltzer, "Saskatchewan Opinions on Immigration From 1925-1939", (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1950).

20 H.A. Logan, *Trade Unions in Canada* (Toronto, 1948).

21 See Martin Robin, *Radical Politics and Canadian Labor 1880-1930*, (Kingston, 1968), p. 272; W.L. Morton, *The Progressive Party in Canada*, (Toronto, 1950), p. 196, p. 242.

22 O.D. Jones, "The Historical Geography of Edmonton, Alberta", (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Toronto, 1964), p. 67.

23 *Edmonton Journal* (hereafter cited as E.J.), March 20, 1925. See also Jan. 1926; Feb. 12, 1926.

24 Public Archives of Canada, (P.A.C.) Magrath Papers, John Imrie to C.A. Magrath, June 9, 1925.

25 *Calgary Herald* (hereafter cited as C.H.), April 27, 1925. See also May 7, 28, 1925.

26 *Alberta Labor News*, (hereafter cited as A.L.N.), Feb. 28, 1925.

27 *The U.F.A.*, March 18, 1925.

28 W.K. Rolph, *Henry Wise Wood of Alberta*, (Toronto, 1950), p. 179.

29 *Canadian Annual Review* 1923, pp. 264-265; 1924-25, pp. 190-192.

30 Immigration regulations introduced in February 1923 had classified Czechoslovakia, Poland, Yugoslavia, Austria, Hungary, Roumania, Russia, Latvia, Estonia, and Lithuania, as "non-preferred" and limited immigration from these countries to agricultural and domestic workers and sponsored immigrants. No immigration promotion was to be undertaken in these countries. J.B. Hedges, *Building*, p. 360.

31 See *Canada Year Book*, 1941, p. 733.

32 J.B. Hedges, *Building*, p. 362.

33 Olha Woycenko, *The Ukrainians in Canada*, (Winnipeg, 1967); Victor Turek, *Poles in Manitoba* (Toronto, 1967), p. 43; J.M. Kirschbaum, *Slovaks in Canada*, (Toronto, 1967), p. 101; Edmund Heier, "A Study of the German Lutheran and Catholic Immigrants in Canada formerly residing in Czarist and Soviet Russia", (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of British Columbia, 1955), Chapter 3.

34 *IBID.*

35 This number decreased slightly in the next three years to 15,424, 16,634 and 15,300 respectively. (Department of Manpower and Immigration, unpublished records, "Immigration to Canada by Province of Intended Destination", Alberta). The Census of 1931 revealed that 91% of the number who had given Alberta as their intended destination during the 1920's were still in Alberta in 1931. (*Census of Canada*, 1931, Volume 2, pp. 784-785).

36 80% of these immigrants arrived between 1926 and 1930. Census of Canada, 1931, Vol. 4, pp. 412-414. The 35% includes immigrants of German origin from Poland and Russia.

37 *Report of the Royal Commission on Bilingualism and Biculturalism*, Book IV (Ottawa, 1970), Table A-20.

38 *IBID.*

39 The *U.F.A.*, May 16, 1927; *Debates*, H. of C. May 24, 1929, p. 2876.

40 Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture and Colonization, *Minutes of Proceedings and Evidence and Report*, (Ottawa, 1928), *passim*.

41 Nevertheless, there was not a unanimous position on the question of immigration within the U.F.A. In the Commons, one U.F.A. member of Ukrainian origin, Michael Luchkovich, who represented Vegreville, clearly disagreed with his colleagues on the question of immigration. *Debates*, House of Commons, Dec. 14, 1926.

42 For evidence of a similar restrictionist attitude among organized labor in Saskatchewan, see Brian Smeltzer, "Saskatchewan Opinions on Immigration", (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1950), p. 79.

43 *Debates*, House of Commons, April 11, 1927, p. 2221.

44 C.A. Dawson and Eva R. Young, *Pioneering in the Prairie Provinces: the Social Side of the Settlement Process*, (Toronto, 1940), Chap. 3.

45 This does not mean, however, that the colonization schemes of the railway companies were complete failures. In 1931, 80% of the "continental" Europeans who had arrived during the 1920's were still in rural areas. Census of Canada, 1931, Vol. 1, p. 1248; Robert England, *The Colonization of Western Canada*, Chapter 6.

46 *A.L.N.*, March 27, 1926; *A.L.N.*, April 16, 1927.

47 *A.L.N.*, Aug. 18, 1928.

48 *A.L.N.*, March 2, 1929.

49 *A.L.N.*, Nov. 17, 1928. The tiny communist party in Alberta also opposed immigration. PAC, RG76, Immigration Department Files, Box 30 #274485, RCMP Report, Edmonton, Dec. 27, 1928.

50 This would not have been the first time that the railway companies had used their influence with government to obtain railway laborers, despite the immigration policy's preference for farmers. Donald Avery, "Canadian Immigration Policy and the Foreign Navy, 1896-1914, Paper delivered to the Canadian Historical Association, McGill University, June 1972, p. 23.

51 Resolution of this question will ultimately depend on research into the railways' records once these are made more readily available to scholars.

52 John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, *passim*.

53 G.E. Lloyd, "Nation Building", *Banff Crag and Canyon*, August 17, 1928. See also "The Building of the Nation: A paper read before the Grand Orange Lodge of British America", Edmonton, July 26, 1928, Anglican Church Archives, and *Banff Crag and Canyon*, August 17, 31, Sept. 21, Oct. 12, 19, 26, Nov. 2, 16, 1928.

54 *B.C.C.*, Sept. 21, 1928.

55 G.E. Lloyd, "The Building of the Nation".

56 Members of the National Association in Calgary demanded that the federal Immigration Department reveal whether or not the majority of immigrants coming to Canada were Roman Catholic and whether the proportion of Catholics in Canada was growing each year. The Grande Prairie Branch demanded that the Immigration Department ensure that the proportion of Britishers entering the Grande Prairie region be greater than it was at the time. The latter group combined Anglo-Saxon and anti-radical nativist fears in its warning of "the danger of the loyal British element in this Peace River country being submerged by the foreign immigrants that are arriving on

every train. Surely if any favors are to be granted they should be granted to loyal Britishers and not to the Bolshevik populations of central and southern Europe". PAC, RG 76, Immigration Department Papers, Box 32 #348818, "Reader", National Association of Canada to Minister of Immigration, May 18, June 16, 1928.

57 John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, Chapter 10.

58 For a brief overview of Klan activities in Canada see Robin Winks, *The Blacks in Canada*, (New Haven, 1971), pp. 320-325.

59 P. Kyba, "The Election of 1929", (unpublished Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1964). William Calderwood, "The Rise and Fall of the Ku Klux Klan in Saskatchewan", (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Saskatchewan, 1968).

60 For early reports of Maloney's anti-Catholic activities, see *Orange Sentinel*, April 3, 1923.

61 K.T. Jackson, *The Ku Klux Klan in the City 1915-1930*, (New York, 1967), Conclusion.

62 *Alberta Labor News*, Dec. 26, 1925.

63 *E.J.*, Oct. 19, 1929; *Lethbridge Herald* (hereafter cited as L.H.), Oct. 21, 1929. Calderwood, "The Klan", p. 24. For a later account of speaking tours by Saskatchewan Klansmen see *L.H.* June 30, 1930.

64 *E.J.*, Dec. 16, 1930; J.J. Maloney, *Rome in Canada*, (Vancouver, 1935), p. 158.

65 These included: Arrowwood, Bashaw, Blackie, Bow Island, Cadomin, Camrose, Carmangay, Carstairs, Chauvin, Clandonald, Claresholm, Coleman, Didsbury, Edson, Erskine, Forestburg, Fort Saskatchewan, Gibbons, Innisfail, Irma, Jarrow, Killam, Lacombe, Lomond, Marwayne, Milo, Nanton, Newbrook, Olds, Pincher Creek, Ponoka, Red Deer, Retlaw, Sterco, Stettler, Stony Plain, Taber, Tofield, Vermilion, Vulcan, Wainwright and Wetaskiwin. J.J. Maloney, *Rome in Canada*, p. 162, 164. APA, Klan File, *The Liberator*, May, 1932, p. 10. Interview, Fran Fraser, Calgary, 1970.

66 Based on census definition of city.

67 *Rome in Canada*, p. 79. This was, of course, an obvious exaggeration.

68 Interview, Fran Fraser, Calgary, 1970.

69 *E.J.*, May 23, 26, 27, Dec. 10, 1930.

70 *Rome in Canada*, pp. 158-159.

71 See PAC, King Papers, #158597, Hurley to MacKenzie King, Nov. 1931; and Maloney, *Rome in Canada*, p. 161.

72 Glenbow Foundation Archives. Principles enunciated in application for charter, Registrar of Joint Stock Companies.

73 *IBID.*

74 Winks, *Blacks in Canada*, p. 325.

75 At the time of the 1931 census there were 3,722 Jews and less than 1,000 Blacks in the province. (Census of Canada, 1931, pp. 464-465).

76 Charles Woodsworth, *Canada and the Orient* (Toronto, 1941), pp. 111-115.

77 H. Palmer, "Nativism in Alberta: 1880-1920" pp. 39-40.

78 H. Gilead, *The Maple Leaf For Quite a While*, (London, 1967), p. 17.

79 W.L. Morton, *The Progressive Party in Canada*, p. 224; *CAR* 1926-27, p. 494. Brownlee was disturbed that the clause had been inserted by the Federal Liberals since it threatened to open the whole question of separate schools and might undermine provincial rights in relation to education. PAC, King Papers, Brownlee to King, April 7, 1926, #109356, Vol. 128. Negotiations between King and Brownlee reached an impasse. Neither wanted the question of separate schools to become a public issue; consequently it was three more years before control of the natural resources was transferred.

80 K.T. Jackson, *The Ku Klux Klan in the City 1915-1930*, (New York, 1967).

81 The percentage of Catholics in Alberta increased from 16% in 1921 to 23% in 1931. (*Census of Canada*, 1921, pp. 736-737; 1931, pp. 670-671).

82 J.J. Maloney, *Rome in Canada*, p. 18.

83 Patrick Kyba, "The Election of 1929", p. 20, quoted from Klan literature.

84 K.T. Jackson, *Klan in the City*, p. 242.

85 In census divisions 3,5,6, and 8 where the Klans were concentrated, Catholics made up 14% of the population as opposed to 23% in the province as a whole. In these areas, people could indulge their frustrations about social change without seriously endangering community relations, or provoking a reaction from a large group of Catholics. *Census of Canada*, 1931, Vol. 2, p. 670; Richard Rofstadter points out that in the United States Klansmen "lived in areas where they had little real contact with the Catholics and Jews against whom their voices were raised". (*The Age of Reform*, New York, 1955, p. 293).

86 Dave Smith, "Organization of the Ku Klux Klan in Alberta, 1929-1933", (Unpublished seminar paper, University of Lethbridge, December, 1972). A former Klan organizer from Saskatchewan, R.C. Snelgrove, made a speaking tour of Alberta Orange Lodges in 1929, emphasizing exactly the same themes which the Klan emphasized. Orange Lodges "supplied the Klan with a list of reliable or sympathetic people in each new area, to which . . . invitations were sent, inviting their participation in the organization of a local Klan".

87 *Rome in Canada*, p. 164

88 Calderwood, "Klan", p. 213. There is of course no survey research to indicate that Klan supporters were predominantly Conservatives, but this was clearly the assumption of Klansmen and politicians of all parties. As one Klansman wrote to Premier Brownlee of Alberta, "As all true Klansman knows, [sic] Klanskraft, as practiced in this country, has been primarily a Conservative political organization". (Alberta Provincial Archives, Brownlee Papers, file on Klan, B.C. Klansman to Brownlee, Oct. 3, 1931). In the 1930 federal election, the Klan burned a fiery cross to celebrate the victory of A.U.G. Bury, the Conservative candidate in the East Edmonton constituency. (E.J. July 30, 1930). However, there is no evidence that the Klan and Alberta Conservatives consulted on the planks to be included in the party platform as they did in Saskatchewan, and R.B. Bennett does not appear to have considered the Klan a particularly desirable organization. (Calderwood, "Klan", p. 221). The Klan consistently attacked Liberal politicians—federal Immigration Minister, Charles Stewart of Edmonton was one of its principle targets, and in turn the Liberals tried to exploit the connection between the Conservatives and the Klan, (PAC, King Papers, #15897, Hurley to King: a Liberal from Alberta accuses the Conservatives of using the Klan to win a provincial by-election in Red Deer).

89 See *Debates*, House of Commons, June 7, 1928, pp. 3924-3927 for R.B. Bennett's views on the preferability of British immigrants and the dangers of non-British immigrants.

90 D. Flanagan, "Ethnic Voting in Alberta Provincial Elections, 1921-1971", *Canadian Ethnic Studies*, Dec. 1971, pp. 139-164.

91 See Calderwood, "Klan", p. 233, for an analysis of the similarities between Saskatchewan Progressives and the Klan.

92 Interview, Fran Fraser, Calgary, 1970.

93 L.W. Morton, *The Progressive Party*, Chapter 9; Carl Betke, "The United Farmers of Alberta, 1921-1935", (Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Alberta, 1971). John Higham, *Strangers in the Land*, p. 295, interprets the Klan as the frustrated remnant of moral idealism in rural America.

94 For example, when press reports first circulated that the Klan had entered Alberta, George Hoadley told the press that the Klan had no reason to be active in the province since the public schools were strictly non-sectarian. Premier Brownlee reassured the president of one U.F.A. local that his government was not protecting the Klan; nevertheless, Brownlee ignored the advice of Edmonton lawyers and permitted the Klan to be incorporated. Maloney claimed that Brownlee and some of his cabinet were Klan supporters, but Brownlee denied this. E.J., Oct. 22, 1929; Alberta Provincial Archives, Brownlee Papers, Brownlee to Mrs. Maud Trananhan, March 21, 1932; Charles Gran to Brownlee, Sept. 16, 1932; Calderwood, "The Klan", p. 87.

95 Alberta's population of 731,605 in 1931 was 80% of Saskatchewan's.

96 Raymond Huel, "French Language Education in Saskatchewan", in *The Twenties in Western Canada*, S.M. Trofimenkoff, ed., (Ottawa, 1972), pp. 230-243.

97 Although the school systems of the two provinces were virtually identical, the problem which arose in Saskatchewan over nuns teaching in public schools did not exist in Alberta. Patrick Kyba, "Ballots and Burning Crosses – the Election of 1929", in *Politics in Saskatchewan*, N. Ward and D. Spafford, eds., (Don Mills, Ontario, 1968), p. 14.

98 Excluding those of German origin, in 1931, 20% of Saskatchewan's population were central and eastern Europeans compared to 18% of Alberta's population. (*Census of Canada*, 1931).

99 It could, of course, be argued that British, democratic and Christian traditions formed the ideological basis of the Klan's anti-Catholic nativism. To suggest that these same values also promoted inter-ethnic tolerance is not to deny the role they played in generating intolerance, but rather to acknowledge that the same values, manifested differently, can lead to opposite results.

100 See E.J. Nov. 2, 1929; Alberta Farmer, June 5, 1930; *Gateway* quoted in *Alliance Times*, Dec. 19, 1931, and *Vegreville Observer*, Nov. 20, 1929.

101 *Wainwright Star*, March 23, 1932.

102 Interview, Senator Donald Cameron, (Ottawa, 1972).

103 E.B., March 14, 1930.

104 I.O.D.E. *Annual Report*, 1927, p. 103; 1929, p. 69.

105 *Echoes*, March, 1929, p. 7.

106 *Orange Sentinel*, Nov. 1, 1928.

107 Farthing pointed to one of the significant factors involved in the development of anti-immigrant attitudes in the late '20's – the railways brought out many non-farmers during the 1920's. As Farthing pointed out, while farmers did not compete with each other, workers did. He also pointed to resentment against the upward mobility of non-Anglo-Saxons in the mining areas. Legion members in the Crow's Nest Pass complained that more and more "foreigners" were becoming mine-foremen and that they gave preference in hiring to members of their own ethnic group. *Minutes and Proceedings of the Select Standing Committee of the House of Commons on Agriculture and Colonization*, p. 492.

108 *IBID.*, p. 491.

109 E.J., Jan. 2, 1929.

110 L.H., Feb. 1, 1929; APA, Brownlee Papers, Lethbridge Board of Trade to Brownlee, Feb. 9, 1929; Colonists' Service Assoc. to Brownlee, Feb. 22, 1929.

111 MHN, Jan. 5, 1929; C.A., Dec. 5, 1929; Jan. 23, 1929.

112 *Debates*, H. of C., May 28, 1929, pp. 2900-2905; Michael Luchkovich, *A Ukrainian Canadian in Parliament: Memoirs*, (Toronto, 1965).

113 *Debates*, H. of C., 1926, p. 1886; March 19, 1930, pp. 761-762.

114 *Farm and Ranch Review* (Calgary, 1929).

115 F.W. Baumgartner, "Central European Immigration", *Queen's Quarterly*, Winter, 1930, pp. 183-192; Walter Murray, "Continental Europeans in Western Canada", *Queen's Quarterly*, 1931; P.M. Bryce, *The Value of the Continental Immigrant to Canada* (Ottawa, 1928); E.L. Chicanot, "Homesteading the Citizen: Canadian Festivals Promote Cultural Exchange", *Commonwealth*, May, 1929, pp. 94-95; E.K. Chicanot, "Moulding a Nation," *Dalhousie Review*, July, 1929, pp. 232-237. Robert England, "Continental Europeans in Western Canada," *Queen's Quarterly*, 1931; Robert England, *The Central European Immigrant in Canada*, (Toronto, 1929). For further discussion of England's views, see H. Palmer, "Nativism and Ethnic Tolerance: 1920-1972", pp. 139-140.

116 *C.H.*, Jan. 23, 1926, Jan. 28, 1929; PAC RG 76 Vol. 84 #22878, p. 11.

117 For a discussion of the assimilation programs of these organizations see H. Palmer, "Nativism and Ethnic Tolerance: 1920-1972", pp. 50-70.

118 C.A. Dawson, *Group Settlement*, p. 379.

119 In Hanna, the group of German Russians who arrived during the twenties formed a distinctive group and were viewed as something of a threat by the rest of the community. See Jean Burnet, *Next Year Country*, (Toronto, 1951), pp. 35-36. On the whole, however, with the exception of the Mennonites, immigrants of German origin did not have major problems of acceptance, and were regarded as among the "preferred" immigrants. Although Germans formed the largest non-British group in Alberta, they were too diverse and too widely scattered to be viewed as a potential problem.

120 I.O.D.E. *Annual Reports* 1927, p. 103; *Echoes*, March 1929, p. 7. Michael Zuk, "The Ukrainian Protestant Missions in Canada", (unpublished Sacred Theology Master's thesis, McGill University, 1957), p. 69.

121 Glenbow Foundation Archives, Earl Cook Papers, Earl Cook to Perren Bakr, December 1927; *Pincher Creek Echo*, Dec. 7, 1928.

122 The Doukhobor colony at Arrowwood had been established in 1926 by Anastasia, a close companion of Peter Verigin, who had left British Columbia because of a dispute over the successor to Verigin. Anastasia claimed to carry on the teachings of Peter Verigin and rejected the leadership of his son, Peter Chistiakov. She had persuaded twenty-six families to purchase land in Alberta, which they farmed communally. See George Woodcock and Ivan Avakumovic, *The Doukhobors*, (Toronto, 1968), p. 289; Interview, Mike Verigin, Cowley, Alberta, 1971).

123 Woodcock and Avakumovic, *Doukhobors*, p. 210; A.P.A., Brownlee Papers, Doukhobor file, D. Mackie to George Hoadley, July 24, 1928. Unfortunately, there is no available evidence indicating how the controversy was resolved.

124 A.P.A., Premier's Papers, Doukhobor file.

125 Frank Epp, *Mennonite Exodus*, (Altona, Manitoba, 1962).

126 *CAR*, 1929, p. 172.

127 For evidence that attitudes toward progress played a part in hostility towards Mennonites, see C.A. Dawson, *Group Settlement*, Part II.

128 Many U.F.A. and labor people held favorable attitudes towards the Soviet Union, and it was difficult to convince them that the Soviet action was not justified.

129 A.P.A., Brownlee Papers, Mennonite file, Provincial Secretary, Canadian Legion, to Brownlee, Nov. 15, 1929.

130 *L.H.*, Nov. 28, 1929; *L.H.*, Nov. 28, 1929; January 11, 1930. A.P.A., Brownlee Papers, Mennonite file.

131 *C.H.*, Nov. 9, 1929; *E.J.*, Nov. 12, 1929; *C.A.*, Nov. 8, 1929.

132 *C.A.*, Nov. 8, 1929.

133 *Vegreville Observer*, Nov. 20, 1929.

134 Quoted in M.S. Hornby, "British Settlement in Canada", March 1932, circular letter.

HISTORICAL PAPERS 1974 COMMUNICATIONS HISTORIQUES

135 *Alberta Labor News*, April 16, 1927.

136 *E.J.*, Jan. 25, 1929. Brownlee had continued to allow the entry of British farm workers, however, until late in 1929. This was one of several issues on which the federal and provincial wings of the U.F.A. clashed, since the federal party made no distinction between British and non-British immigrants.

137 A.P.A., Brownlee Papers, B.B. Janz to Brownlee, Nov. 27, 1929.

138 *IBID.*

139 *E.J.*, Nov. 13, 1929; Nov. 29, 1929; Nov. 23, 1929. However, both Brownlee and Premier Anderson of Saskatchewan, who had also turned down the Mennonite request, made exceptions for close relatives of Mennonites already in their provinces. Frank Epp, *Mennonite Exodus*, Chap. 17.

140 A.P.A., Brownlee Papers, Mennonite file, Brownlee to Forke, Nov. 27, 1929.

141 Locals of the U.F.A., the National Order of Canada, and the Orange Lodge congratulated Brownlee on his stand. A.P.A., Mennonite file, Sedgewick U.F.A. to Brownlee, Nov. 13, 1929; Dec. 30, 1929; Belfast Orange Lodge to Brownlee, n.d. See also *E.B.*, Jan. 8, 1930, where an editorial again congratulates the government for not allowing "unprogressive" people like the Mennonites into the country.

142 *E.B.*, Jan. 7, 9, March 6, 1930; *Debates*, House of Commons, March 19, 1930, p. 766; *CAR*, 1929-1930, pp. 180-181; Simon Belkin, *Through Narrow Gates*, (Montreal: 1966), p. 73.

143 By 1933, the Klan had collapsed, partly because of the difficulties of maintaining the Klan organization in a period of economic distress, and partly because of the scandal surrounding Maloney's involvement in separate fraud, theft, vandalism and slander cases, and his resulting jail terms, *E.J.*, Jan. 25, 26, 27, Sept. 18, 1933; Sept. 16, 18, 1934. A movement like the Klan, essentially based on opposition to outside forces, with little positive content, was also susceptible to stagnation during economic crisis, since people were looking for positive solutions to their problems. There appears to have been some feeling that during a period of economic distress, religious bigotry was a luxury: one letter to the editor of the *Wainwright Star* (March 23, 1932) opposing the Klan emphasized that "in times of depression, we need our good neighbors".

144 H. Palmer, "Nativism in Alberta: 1920-1972", Chapter 3.

145 H. Palmer, "Nativism in Alberta: 1920-1972", Chapter 4.

146 *IBID.*, Chapters 5-7