Document generated on 08/10/2024 6:32 p.m.

Labour/Le Travailleur

"Knowledge is Essential for Universal Progress but Fatal to Class Privilege": Working People and The Schools in Vancouver During The 1920s

Jean Barman

Volume 22, 1988

URI: https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/llt22art01

See table of contents

Publisher(s)

Canadian Committee on Labour History

ISSN

0700-3862 (print)
1911-4842 (digital)

Explore this journal

Cite this article

Barman, J. (1988). "Knowledge is Essential for Universal Progress but Fatal to Class Privilege": Working People and The Schools in Vancouver During The 1920s. *Labour/Le Travailleur*, *22*, 9–66.

Article abstract

Labour historians have characterized the 1920s as a time of working-class quiescence. The reality, at least in the case of Vancouver, was more complex. The work place may have become quieter, but working people were not inert. Organized activity focussed on the city's schools, not to overturn the system but rather to obtain fairer consideration for the children of working people. By opting for reform over class confrontation, working people allied themselves with like-minded, largely middle-class individuals equally concerned with educational reform. Considerable improvement of facilities resulted, despite active opposition by business interests concerned with immediate economic advantage. The consequence was that more children of working people, and more children generally, stayed in school a little longer.

All rights reserved © Canadian Committee on Labour History, 1988

This document is protected by copyright law. Use of the services of Érudit (including reproduction) is subject to its terms and conditions, which can be viewed online.

https://apropos.erudit.org/en/users/policy-on-use/

érudit

This article is disseminated and preserved by Érudit.

Érudit is a non-profit inter-university consortium of the Université de Montréal, Université Laval, and the Université du Québec à Montréal. Its mission is to promote and disseminate research.

https://www.erudit.org/en/

ARTICLES

"Knowledge is Essential for Universal Progress but Fatal to Class Privilege":

Working People and The Schools in Vancouver During The 1920s

Jean Barman

BY THE LATE NINETEENTH century the school was a fact of life across Canada. While a small minority attended an elite private institution or undertook home study on the frontier, the vast majority of children went to their neighbourhood school. Perhaps more than any other institution of Canadian life, even the church, the school brought together different social classes on a systematic and sustained basis.[1] On the other hand, as John Bullen reminds us in a recent issue of *Labour/Le*

[1]The theoretical difficulties in any use of the term, "class," are emphasized in Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A vocabulary of culture and society* (London 1983), 60-9; and in Peter Calvert, *The Concept of Class: An historical introduction* (London 1982), esp. 65, 94-5, 170, 185, 202-03, 209, 211 and 214. Calvert points to "the frailty of the criteria by which many human beings choose to rank themselves and others" (211) and concludes that "the value of the term lies in the fact that the task [of establishing a meaning that will command universal acceptance] is impossible" (214). A recent Marxist interpretation of class in Canada (Henry Veltmeyer, *Canadian Class Structure* [Toronto 1986]) relegates to the working class "all those individuals who do not own or control the means of production and thus are compelled to sell their labour-power to those who do," with further specification of membership between the middle and working classes depending on degree of autonomy over conditions of work and degree of direct exploitation at the point of production (25 and 71).

Jean Barman, "'Knowledge is Essential for Universal Progress but Fatal to Class Privilege': Working People and The Schools in Vancouver During The 1920s," *Labour/Le Travail*, 22 (Fall 1988), 9-66.

Travail, the reality of class made participation unequal. Many parents in urban as well as rural Canada long continued to rely on their children's labour to maintain the family economy.[2] To paraphrase Ian Davey, the rhythm of school was punctuated by the rhythm of work.[3]

Over time, as census data makes clear, more children remained in school longer: by the first decades of the new century, as noted in Table 1, virtually the entire cohort aged 10-14 attended school. More importantly, as detailed in Tables 2 and 3, the proportion of 15-year-olds rose to half by 1921 and over the decade to two thirds. The proportion of 16 and 17-year-olds moved up to over a third.[4] Conversely, numbers of 10-14-year-old males at paid labour fell to a mere 3 per cent, of 15-year-old males to one in four and of 16-17-year-old males to just over half.[5] Although far fewer females were gainfully employed, most not in school were undoubtedly at work, some within marriage.[6]

Explanations for the growth of schooling in Canada have been limited. Historians of education writing in the mid and late-1970s focussed on its early promoters in mid-nineteenth-century Ontario, virtually all of whom were middle class. Looking for the most part at statements of intent, they concluded that such individuals and, more generally, the state encouraged common schooling for their own purposes — to avert social and political disruption by socializing the next generation into the priorities of the existing order.[7] Although such a simplistic explanation has been generally dis-

[2]John Bullen, "Hidden Workers: Child Labour and the Family Economy in Late Nineteenth-Century Urban Ontario," *Labour/Le Travail*, 18 (Fall 1986), 163-87.

[3]Ian E. Davey, "The Rhythm of Work and the Rhythm of School," 221-53 in Neil McDonald and Alf Chaiton, eds., *Egerton Ryerson and His Times* (Toronto 1978).

[4]No comparable data is available for 1901. Census officials themselves became conscious of the shift by 1931. See *Census of Canada*, 1931, v. 13, esp. 385-94.

[5]About one in ten were, so to speak, caught between school and work, a condition similar to that described for the nineteenth century by Michael B. Katz and Ian E. Davey in their "Youth and Early Industrialization in a Canadian City," 81-119 in John Demos and Sarane Spence Boocock, eds. *Turning Points: Historical and Sociological Essays on the Family* (Chicago 1978). Much of this essay was integrated into Michael B. Katz, Michael Doucet and Mark Stern, *The Social Organization of Early Industrial Capitalism* (Cambridge MA 1982).

[6]Census data only includes marital status of the ages 15-19 as a single age group, of which 7.1 per cent of young women were married in 1911, 6.7 in 1921 and 5.1 a decade later. *Census of Canada*, 1931, v. 1, 432-3 and 444-5.

[7]This argument was put forth in Canada most fervently by Michael Katz and his students. The most persuasive study was undoubtedly Alison Prentice, *The School Promoters: Education and Social Class in Mid-Nineteenth Century Upper Canada* (Toronto 1977). Useful historiographical overviews are found in J. Donald Wilson, "Some Observations on Recent Trends in Canadian Educational History," 7-29 in his *An Imperfect Past: Education and Society in Canadian History* (Vancouver 1984), and Chad Gaffield, "Back to School: Towards a New Agenda for the History of Education," *Acadiensis*, 15 (1986), 169-90.

counted, it lingers on in the tendency to view schooling from the perspective of administrators, teachers, and curriculum — thereby by inference interpreting education as imposition.[8] Scholars of labour and the left, while shifting the discussion to the mass of schooling's recipients, the working class, have reinforced this perspective through their general assumption of class struggle against the existing order of things.[9]

On the other hand, a number of historians in other countries have examined the relationship between the working class and schools without comparable preconceptions as to who must inevitably be exploiting whom. An Australian scholar styling himself a "traditional" Marxist has directly challenged the assumption that a working class conscious of itself as a class must necessarily act in a confrontational fashion toward public schooling, pointing out that Marx himself recognized the value of educational reforms achieved within capitalism.[10] A European oral-history project on four working-class communities in France and Italy has concluded that during the interwar years individuals turned away from direct conflict inward to the family and to the improvement of local lay schools "by means of subsidies, support organizations, and so on."[11] Similarly, several historians of American schooling have documented the active participation of the working class, including the labour movement, in educational reform in such major

[8]See Wilson, *Ibid*., and Gaffield, *Ibid*. The principal Canadian exception which focuses on schooling's recipients, apart from studies of specific ethnic groups, is the research of Robert Gidney and Douglas Lawr or, more recently, of Gidney and W.P.J. Millar; for example Gidney and Millar, "From Voluntarism to State Schooling: the Creation of the Public School System in Ontario," *Canadian Historical Review*, 66 (1985), 443-73.

[9]Little attention has been accorded schooling even within the recent expansion of interest from organized labour to the totality of working-class culture. On the historiography, see Gregory S. Kealey, "Labour and Working-Class History in Canada: Prospects in the 1980s," *Labour/Le Travail*, 7 (1981), 67-94; his "The Structure of Canadian Working-Class History," 23-6 in W.J.C. Cherwinski and Gregory S. Kealey, eds., *Lectures in Canadian Labour and Working-Class History* (St. John's 1985); and Carl Berger, *The Writing of Canadian History: Aspects of English-Canadian Historical Writing Since 1900*, 2nd ed. (Toronto 1986), 264-5 and 303-07. A notable exception is Bill Maciejko, "Public Schools and the Workers' Struggle; Winnipeg, 1914-1921," 213-37 in Nancy M. Sheehan, J. Donald Wilson and David C. Jones, eds., *Schools in the West: Essays in Canadian Educational History* (Calgary 1986).

[10]Geoffrey Partington, "Two Marxisms and the history of education," *History of Education*, 13 (1984), 251-70. His critique of "reproduction theory" as represented by Katz centres on its elimination of any role for the working class and its argument that any "support given to compulsory schooling by the labour movement was a form of class betrayal" (264). It is interesting to note that Partington writes from within the South Australian context and that one of his principal targets is Ian Davey, who did his doctoral work in Canada under Katz.

[11]Yves Lequin, "Social Structures and Shared Beliefs: Four Worker Communities in the 'Second Industrialization'," *International Labor and Working Class History*, 22 (1982), 11.

cities as Chicago, Milwaukee, and San Francisco.[12]

A case study approach to explore the role played by working people in the growth of schooling is equally valid for Canada.[13] The selection of the west coast city of Vancouver during the 1920s has certain advantages. As is clear from Tables 1-3, larger proportions — by 1931 four out of five 15-year-olds and almost half the 16-17-year-olds — remained in school longer in British Columbia than in any other province. The partial data which exists for urban British Columbia and its major city of Vancouver, summarized in Table 4, suggests strongly that within the province the lives of young people altered first in urban areas, as it probably did across Canada.[14] Not only were proportions at school on average four to five percentage points higher, but numbers of young males at work comparably lower. The exception were high numbers of young women at paid labour, due undoubtedly to its greater availability and acceptability, forcing fewer to spend part of their lives between school, visible employment, and marriage.[15] As a Vancouver school official noted in 1925, they no longer "recede from competition with men in industry in their desire for economic independence."[16]

[12]One of the most carefully crafted studies is Julia Wrigley, *Class Politics and Public Schools: Chicago 1900-1950* (New Brunswick 1982), whose introduction, 1-17, nicely distances her findings from the notion that "schooling was imposed on a reluctant and hostile working class" (2). Although focussing only on the years to 1920, William J. Reese's recent analysis based on Rochester, Toledo, Milwaukee, and Kansas City (*Power and the promise* of school reform: Grassroots movements during the progressive era [Boston 1986]) argues equally effectively for the role played by coalitions of working people and others, ranging from socialists to female reformers, in effecting change. Also see his prize-winning article: "'Partisans of the Proletariat': The Socialist Working Class and the Milwaukee Schools, 1890-1920," *History of Education Quarterly*, 21 (1981), 3-50. Among the studies to emerge out of a National Institute of Education project on the relationship between schools and the working class in the United States, 1870-1940, are Paul E. Peterson, *The Politics of School Reform 1870-1940* (Chicago 1985), which compares Atlanta, San Francisco, and Chicago; and Ira Katznelson and Margaret Weir, *Schooling for All: Class, Race, and the Decline of the Democratic Ideal* (New York 1985), limited to Chicago and San Francisco. For an overview of recent American writing, see Harold Silver, "Zeal as a historical process: The American view from the 1980s," *History of Education*, 15 (1986), 291-309.

[13]The term, "working people," here used as a synonym for wage earners or the working class, was a self-definition at least from 1930 (for instance, statement by long-time Vancouver labour organizer R.H. Neelands in *Labor Statesman*, 5 December 1930).

[14]In 1931 47.0 per cent of young people aged 15-19 were in school in Vancouver compared with 29.4 to 46.6 per cent in the other half dozen largest Canadian cities. However, proportions ranged between 49.2 and 56.5 per cent in the smaller prairie cities of Edmonton, Calgary, Regina, and Saskatoon. See *Census of Canada*, 1931, v. 3. 906-07. Unfortunately, no data is available only for ages 15-17.

[15]In 1911 12.5 per cent of British Columbia young women aged 15-19 were married. The proportion dropped to 6.7 per cent in 1921 and 5.2 per cent in 1931. *Ibid.*, 1931, v. 1, 440-1 and 452-3.

[16]Vancouver, Board of School Trustees [hereafter VBST], *Annual Report*, 1925, 13.

The decade of the 1920s, in which the balance between school and work shifted so dramatically, has been largely dismissed by historians of working people.[17] Following the collapse of the Winnipeg General Strike and the One Big Union, organized labour retreated before the onslaught of international capitalism. This meant, conversely, that individuals had more time to reflect on their everyday conditions of life and on their longterm priorities for family and children.[18] In Vancouver a buoyant economy from early decade not only gave many wage earners the confidence to look beyond the exigencies of the workplace but provided the dominant society, should it so choose, with the financial resources to effect change.[19] Moreover, much more than was the case elsewhere in British Columbia, working people in Vancouver identified their priorities with organized labour and were thereby conscious of themselves as a class: at mid-decade the Vancouver area contained almost 80 per cent of the province's union-affiliated workers.[20]

[17]See, for instance, Gregory S. Kealey, "Labour and Working-Class History," 73, and his "Structure," which passes over the decade, as do all the essays in the collection from which it comes. Bryan Palmer has characterized the 1920s as a time when working-class culture broke down before the growth of monopoly capitalism and mass culture, epitomized by the radio and the automobile; see *Working-Class Experience: The Rise and Reconstitution of Canadian Labour, 1800-1980* (Toronto 1983), 190-5.

[18]Much as Lequin, "Social Structures," concluded concerning European working-class communities, a recent study of early twentieth-century Pittsburgh determined that, following the defeat of their unions, activist industrial workers "lavished attention on the schooling of their sons and daughters." Ileen A. DeVault, "Sons and Daughters of Labor: Class and Clerical Work in Pittsburgh, 1870s-1910s," doctoral dissertation, Yale University, 1985, discussed in David Montgomery, "Trends in Working-Class History," *Labour/Le Travail*, 19 (1987), 19. An alternative perspective is presented in Leo Panitch's review of Palmer's *Working-Class Experience in Labour/Le Travail*, 14 (1984), 221-5, which questions "why so little attention is paid to working-class politics at the municipal level in the inter-war years." "Indeed, it might be said that Palmer's claims with regard to the weakness of labour reformism during the 1920s ... collapses entirely once this municipal dimension is introduced" (225).

[19]According to Eleanor Bartlett ("Real Wages and the Standard of Living in Vancouver, 1901-1929," *BC Studies*, 51 [1981], 3-62), real wages climbed by about 12 per cent in Vancouver between 1922 and 1928, twice that in Canada as a whole. The Royal-Sirois Royal Commission of 1937-39 concluded that British Columbia's economic growth in the years 1920-29 exceeded that of any other Canadian region, with its benefits concentrated on Vancouver (v. 1, 122). Vancouver's well being was due in part to the Panama Canal, whose completion in 1914 made the west coast port a logical successor to Winnipeg for the shipment of prairie grain: the quantity dispatched via Vancouver grew from just over a million bushels in 1921 to almost a hundred million in the bumper crop year of 1928. See Patricia E. Roy, *Vancouver: An Illustrated History* (Toronto 1980), 171.

[20]Paul A. Phillips, *No Power Greater: A Century of Labor in British Columbia* (Vancouver 1967), 91 and 96. The causes had, of course, as much to do with the course of the labour movement, in particular the collapse of the One Big Union and the systematic effort by

In Vancouver during the 1920s, this essay will argue, working people turned their attention to the city's schools, not to overturn the system but rather to obtain for their children fairer consideration within it. By opting for social reform over class confrontation, working people became allied with like-minded individuals most generally characterized as middle class. The consequence was considerable change in public schooling despite active opposition by middle-class business interests more concerned with their own immediate economic advantage than with the creation of optimum social infrastructure for the entire community.[21] To the extent that class struggle informed the debate over the direction of schooling, it was a struggle within the middle class rather than one between classes.[22] Vancouver's position at the fore in Canada in the growth of school attendance related directly to the initiatives taken by working people.

The geography of working people

As HAS BEEN DETAILED ELSEWHERE, by the 1920s Vancouver was divided between east and west largely by socio-economic orientation.[23] A survey conducted by the YMCA in 1928 put the division at Cambie Street. As indicated by the map, Cambie also served, south of the city's limits, as the boundary between its two residential suburbs of largely middle-class Point Grey to the southwest and working-class South Vancouver to the southeast, municipalities which would amalgamate with Vancouver in 1929. Looking to the future, the survey asserted:

---

international capitalism to break local unions in isolated resource communities, as with conditions in Vancouver. All the same, the number of union members was on the rise in the Vancouver area while in decline across the province, totalling 12,000 of 27,000 in 1918 but 20,000 of perhaps 22-24,000 by the end of 1925 (76, 96 and 169).

[21] Wrigley, *Class Politics*, makes this point in her evaluation of business attitudes in Chicago (11, 14 and 261).

[22] Apart from R.A.J. McDonald's work on the years prior to 1914 (esp. "The Business Elite and Municipal Politics in Vancouver," *Urban History Review*, 11 [1983], 1-14) almost nothing is known about the structure of Vancouver's middle class and, more specifically, its business community. The most public statement attributed to the latter, at least to its more conservative elements, remains the Kidd Report of 1932 (*Report of the Committee Appointed by the Government to Investigate the Finances of British Columbia* [Victoria 1932]), a list of suggested government economies put together by a group of Vancouver businessmen. Prominent among its recommendations were the restriction of free public schooling to age fourteen and closure of the province's sole university, the University of British Columbia [UBC].

[23] See Jean Barman, "Neighbourhood and Community in Interwar Vancouver: Residential Differentiation and Civic Voting Behaviour," *BC Studies*, 69/70 (1986), 97-141, a special issue also published as R.A.J. McDonald and Jean Barman, eds., *Vancouver Past: Essays in Social History* (Vancouver 1986). See also Roy's map, "Vancouver Neighbourhoods, c. 1925," which differentiates the city by "income levels" (*Vancouver*, 120).

The physical settings in which middle and upper-class children spent their leisure time in Vancouver during the 1920s differed considerably from those where the children of working people played. (City Archives, Vancouver, B.C.)

> Increasingly the district west of Cambie will be occupied by those engaged in commercial pursuits with growing incomes and cultures. The district east of Cambie, speaking generally, will be occupied by artisans and skilled workers. The Oriental section [of the population] and unskilled laborers are apt to be on the fringe of the Oriental section [northeast of Cambie across False Creek] and on the fringe of industrial areas [principally around False Creek at the north end of Cambie].[24]

The distinctive racial character of the East End is evident from an elementary-school soccer team of 1920. (City Archives, Vancouver, B.C.)

The city's middle class tended to reside either in Fairview or Kitsilano in what was known as the West Side or in the West End, their original area of settlement in the late nineteenth century.

Working people were similarly clustered in distinctive neighbourhoods. "Artisans and skilled laborers" preferred such long-established residential areas of the East Side as — moving eastward from Cambie Street — Mount Pleasant, Grandview, and Hastings Townsite, the latter adjacent to neighbouring Burnaby. The YMCA survey noted that "the Trades and Labor Council consider Main and Broadway [in Mount Pleasant] as the logical

[24]Vancouver Young Men's Christian Association, "Vancouver Survey October 1928," 3, Town Planning Commission (A-1-21, file 9), City Archives of Vancouver.

social centre for industrial men."[25] A city planner writing the same year emphasized Hasting Townsite's special appeal to "those who have to gain their livelihood by manual labour."[26] The East Side's inhabitants were, to quote the YMCA survey, "natives of English speaking countries and northern Europeans."

In sharp contrast, the area known as the East End housed a very different population of working people, what the YMCA survey termed "the Oriental section and unskilled laborers." During the years of mass immigration prior to World War I, the East End had become, in part due to its location next to the city's Business District, a refuge to the poor, the transient and the newly arrived.[27] A house-to-house canvas of the East End conducted in 1913, which did "not include either the Japanese or the Chinese district" due to their being "solid in their nationality," determined that this "working class" area of "wage-workers" comprised "forty-two different peoples," over half of them "foreigners."[28] In 1931 the federal census for the first time enumerated the East End separately and found virtually a third of its population to be Chinese by origin, 15 per cent Japanese, almost a quarter continental European.[29]

Thus, although the Vancouver population was not, it must be emphasized, residentially segregated, socio-economic status and residence had become intertwined. The city possessed eight distinct geographical areas of settlement, each reinforced by the ward boundaries used for municipal elections. The West End and the two West Side neighbourhoods of Fairview and Kitsilano were particularly favoured by middle-class residents.[30] Working people tended to congregate either in one of the three East Side areas of Hastings Townsite, Grandview and Mount Pleasant, or in the East End.[31]

[25] *Ibid.*, 2.

[26] Harland Bartholomew, *A Plan for the City of Vancouver* (Vancouver 1928), 26.

[27] See esp. *VBST, Annual Report*, 1911, 59. For another description, see the "Picturesque Vancouver" series in *British Columbia Magazine*: "Little China," 7,1 (Jan. 1911), 89-90, "The Beachcombers," 7,3 (March 1911), 206-07, and "The Japanese Quarter," 7,4 (April 1911), 311-2. The ethos of the area is perhaps best evoked in the recollections making up Daphne Marlatt and Carole Itter, eds., *Opening Doors: Vancouver's East End*, vol. 8, nos. 1-2 (1979) of *Sound Heritage*.

[28] See report in *B.C. Federationist*, 3 October 1913, of tally taken on behalf of a number of Protestant churches. "Foreigners" referred in census data to individuals from outside the British Empire, all of whom, except Americans, were non-English-speaking.

[29] *Census of Canada*, 1931, Bulletin XL, as summarized in Barman, "Neighborhood," 113, Table 5.

[30] In *Ibid.*, Kitsilano was divided between Kitsilano and West Point Grey, but such a distinction is not useful for analysis only of the pre-amalgamation years, since the two areas formed a single ward through 1920 and 1924-28.

[31] In *Ibid.*, which discusses civic electoral behaviour through 1939, Grandview was called Cedar Cottage, better to describe its residential ethos over the longer time period.

The overcrowding which typified Vancouver Schools by the early 1920s was emphasized in a 1924 pupil photo. (City Archives, Vancouver, B.C.)

Between the West and East Ends lay the city's semi-residential Business District.[32] While the East Side was identified primarily by the wage earning character of its residents, the East End had become even more distinguished by its inhabitants' race, ethnicity and poverty.

Working-class priorities for Vancouver schools

ALTHOUGH THE ASPIRATIONS of all Vancouver working people for the city's schools

[32]Through 1920, The West End comprised ward 1, Fairview and Kitsilano ward 6, Hastings Townsite ward 7, Grandview and Mount Pleasant wards 5 and 8, East End wards 3 and 4, and Business District ward 2. Under proportional representation, 1921-22, the city was divided into twelve districts, with the West End comprising district 1, Fairview 9 and 10, Kitsilano 11 and 12, Hastings Townsite 5 and 7, Grandview 7, Mount Pleasant 8, East End 3 and 4, and Business District 2. On redivision into wards in 1923, the West End became ward 1, Fairview ward 5, Kitsilano ward 6, Hastings Townsite ward 7, Grandview ward 4, Mount Pleasant ward 8, East End ward 3 and Business District ward 2.

remain impossible of definition, those of residents who identified through the polls or through the workplace with organized labour or with a left-oriented political grouping can be determined with some specificity from published statements.[33] Families also spoke through their actions, by deciding whether or not to maintain offspring in school a year or two longer than was necessary to meet attendance requirements. A critical question that had to be faced by Vancouver working people in the 1920s — just as it must be by all individuals everywhere anytime concerned with schooling — is precisely what is its role within a society. A belief that it functions only as a dependent variable, reflecting and transmitting the ethos of the dominant society, leads inevitably to the conclusion that little can be accomplished through specific reforms within the system. Schooling is to be endured because it cannot by definition be improved. So long as formal education is viewed solely in terms of its reproductive function, as a bulwark of the status quo, all efforts to effect change must be directed toward overthrow of the larger political and economic order. It is this premise which underlies scholarship in the history of education interpreting schooling as class imposition.[34]

On the other hand, a belief that schooling also acts as an independent variable presumes its ability to change society through enlarging individual horizons. In supporting this position, traditional Marxists point not only to Marx's own enthusiasm over the educational clauses of the Ten Hours' Bill in England, which imposed compulsory schooling on working children, but to Lenin's assertion that it would be "a great mistake ... to draw the conclusion that one can become a communist without acquiring what human knowledge has accumulated."[35] Such a perspective gives immediate hope to those dissatisfied with existing structures. Improved access to schooling, as well as more specific reforms, become of themselves worthwhile goals to pursue, whether or not the longterm goal remains a fundamental restructuring of the larger order.

The latter, more reformist or "labourist" orientation — determined by Craig Heron and Robert A.J. McDonald to have existed among working people in central Canada and in Vancouver prior to World War I[36] — appears

[33]For the changing alliances and political groupings that characterized these years, see Phillips, *No Power Greater*, esp. 83-100; and Martin Robin, *Radical Politics and Canadian Labour, 1880-1930* (Kingston 1968), esp. 200-85.

[34]This perspective also underlies much of the literature in sociology of education, as succinctly summarized in Jeannie Oakes, *Keeping Track: How Schools Structure Inequality* (New Haven 1985), 191-211.

[35]Karl Marx, *Capital* (London 1933), 521-5, and V.I. Lenin, *Selected Works* (Moscow 1943), vol. 9, 467-8, quoted in Partington, "Two Marxisms," 257-8.

[36]Craig Heron, "Labourism and the Canadian Working Class," *Labour/Le Travail*, 13 (1984), 45-75; and Robert A.J. McDonald, "Working Class Vancouver, 1886-1914: Urbanism and Class in British Columbia," *BC Studies*, 69/70 (1986), 33-69. Heron asserts that labourism had largely disappeared, at least in eastern Canada, by the 1920s; McDonald's

to have been dominant among Vancouver's working class during the 1920s.[37] This view was perhaps most eloquently expressed by the young labour activist Angus MacInnis, who perceived education as a liberating experience:

> The laborer or artisan when he has finished his day's work should find pleasure in taking down from his shelf his Keats, Byron, or Shakespeare, his Macaulay, Scott, Dickens and spending an evening with them as that the banker, lawyer, doctor or professor should have access to and be able to appreciate them.

Schooling expanded the horizons of the children of working people, as it did of all children: "Education, even present-day education, with all its defects, tends to stimulate the imagination and sharpen the perceptions of those who receive it; and under adverse circumstances they begin to question the fitness of things." As summed up by MacInnis, "knowledge is essential for universal progress but fatal to class privilege." Education's function was no more and no less than "the emancipation of the working class, let us do our task."[38]

Certainly, not all working people agreed with MacInnis, and many must have continued to believe that schooling's inherent bias toward the existing order overrode any positive role it might play in individual lives. But to a considerable extent Vancouver working people were themselves aware of the

study is limited to the earlier time period. James Conley's recent doctoral dissertation focussing on the Vancouver area ("Class Conflict and Collective Action in the Working Class of Vancouver, British Columbia, 1900-1919," Carleton University, 1986) argues, on the basis of contentious actions and strikes brought to the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council [VTLC], that in the two decades culminating with the events of 1918-19 "factory operatives and settled urban workers were nearly always poorly mobilized and non radical" (695). Labour protest was led by "crafts in crisis," including metal tradesmen, and "frontier labourers," essentially migratory resource workers such as loggers. In comparable fashion, referring to British Columbia as a whole, Phillips contrasts a more moderate, urban reformist tradition with a radical, non-urban orientation (*No Power Greater*, 43).

[37]However reformist Vancouver's working class may or may not have been during the first two decades of the century, no question exists but that the ferment of 1918-19 had a radicalizing effect: the emphasis in schooling became the provision of alternative educational facilities explicitly promoting a left-wing, even revolutionary, perspective, including a labour Sunday school and adult economics classes. See *B.C. Federationist*, 10 and 17 October, and 21 November 1919, and 30 January and 8 October 1920. The former was intended to counter "a capitalist controlled educational department." Some interest in alternative schooling continued; see, for instance, *Labor Statesman*, 24 July 1925, concerning a "summer school of social science" being offered in Summerland. However, as early as 4 February 1921, J.S. Woodsworth was urging "my fellow workers" to "regain control over the education of the children" as carried out in the public schools; see *B.C. Federationist*.

[38]Angus MacInnis, "As We See It—Concerning Education," *Ibid.*, 15 and 29 August 1924. The presence of at least one of these clippings among MacInnis' surviving papers, located in Special Collections, UBC Library (153A), suggests the topic was of more than passing interest.

Working people's opposition to military training in the schools was very likely heightened by the longstanding tendency for high school cadets to parade publicly. (No Source)

conundrum and by early decade appear to have confronted and made their peace with its implications.[39] As an editorial in the labour press supporting the school bylaws placed before voters in 1923 put the case:

> It might be said that the workers have no interest in the erection of schools to spread ruling class education, but the fact remains that as conditions are, the children of the workers are compelled by law to attend the schools, and to receive such education as is given in those institutions. Overcrowding and the consequent unsanitary conditions, including foul air, and all that these things mean, affect the children of the workers, and unless the organized workers get out and work for the carrying of the bylaws, ... the conditions in the city schools become worse.[40]

Improvement of Vancouver schools to maximize access became critical to working people.[41] An editorial in the labour press in 1921 which viewed "overcrowding and bad ventilation" as "two of the worst features of the situation" expressed the reality.[42] No money bylaws for schools had been approved since the beginning of the war, which meant that by the 1920s the

[39]Thus, one of the few discussions on schooling to be recorded in the VTLC minutes during the early 1920s comprised a spirited discussion over whether to endorse or oppose a VBST motion to construct a high school in the West End; meeting of 20 December 1921, in VTLC minute books, Special Collections, UBC Library. At the very same meeting the question of the labour movement securing representation on the VBST was raised for the first time.
[40]*B.C. Federationist*, 18 May 1923.
[41]McDonald, "Working Class Vancouver," 63, notes that a similar priority existed prior to the war.
[42]*B.C. Federationist*, 28 January 1921.

city was making do with almost 200 temporary structures.[43] When in 1921 the provincial school-leaving age was raised to 15 years, Vancouver's inspector of education did little more than shrug his shoulders in despair: "We have to admit frankly that this new compulsory clause has been almost a dead letter, owing to the fact that there are not classrooms enough in Vancouver to accommodate the fourteen-year-old pupils who left school last mid-summer."[44]

The attrition rate among older pupils was horrendous, despite attempts to diversify the secondary level beyond the traditional academic program aimed at the small minority going into teaching or the professions. Even such half measures as the 1902 introduction of a commercial department and of the first technical courses in 1908 had required defense against the province's more conservative Department of Education.[45] As the Vancouver School Board queried, "Not one out of ten pupils goes to the University; and why should the interests of the remaining nine be sacrificed for the one?" Rather than being "merely a preparatory school, for the University," the high school should become "the People's School (with a very big capital P)."[46] By 1920, as indicated in Table 5, about a quarter of the city's secondary pupils were pursuing a technical or commercial rather than a purely academic course.

Overcrowding became the rule with high school class sizes at the beginning of the 1920s ranging between 35 and 40. Virtually a quarter dropped out in each of the three years. Another quarter failed end-of-year examinations. As a consequence, less than one in five completed the program. One official commented wryly concerning the attrition rates that "undoubtedly a greater effort might be made to decrease them were it not that to do so would only be to increase the congestion that now obtains." Equally importantly, of pupils over the school-leaving age, many were only attempting to complete their primary education: in 1920 almost a fifth of the 800 over age 16 had yet to pass grade seven.[47]

As many working people must have been aware, it was their offspring who were suffering most. According to the labour press in 1925, the 60 per cent increase in pupils occurring over the past decade had been "the greatest in the east and south-east portion of the city, where the workers live."[48] That

[43] J.H. Putman and G.M. Weir, *Survey of the School System* (Victoria 1925), 364, 376 and 382.
[44] VBST, *Annual Report*, 1921, 24.
[45] On friction over Vancouver's unwillingness to "turn the educational clock back to the hour set in Victoria," see unidentified clipping, 14 June 1912, in Department of Education clippings scrapbook (GR467-2), Provincial Archives of British Columbia.
[46] VBST, *Annual Report*, 1908, 14; 1909, 16; 1911, 11; and 1917, 12.
[47] *Ibid.*, 1920, 23-4.
[48] *Labor Statesman*, 4 December 1925. Numbers grew from 13,183 in 1915 to 20,845 in 1925.

year the proportion of temporary classrooms was over twice as great in Hastings Townsite as in the next worst areas of Grandview and Mount Pleasant, which were followed fairly closely by the East End.[49] Nowhere on the West Side or in the West End were conditions comparable. As noted in Table 6, which presents a rough approximation of proportions of pupils completing grade eight, virtually all were so doing by the early 1920s in the dominantly middle-class areas of the city, whereas upwards to half in the East End had already dropped out. The problem also existed in Hastings Townsite and in the Business District, bordering on the East Side, although in those two areas proportions were on the decline, falling from one in three to about one in ten.

Labour rhetoric makes clear the great extent to which consciousness existed of schools' limitations. The long popular working-class slogan, "education for the masses not for the classes," became refined as "absolutely free and equal educational opportunities, from the primary school to the university."[50] Rising out of the overriding priority to maximize accessibility

[49]For the location of temporary structures, see table in Putman and Weir, *Survey*, 379. The comparison is between the number of temporary rooms in each principal geographical area of the city according to the map in Putman and Weir, *Survey*, 431-2, and total number of pupils in each area's schools, as detailed in BC, Department of Education, *Annual Reports*.
[50]For examples of the first, see *B.C. Federationist*, 2 January 1920; of the second, *Labor*

Spokesmen for working people differed on the extent to which schools should emphasize vocational training as opposed to academics. Angus McInnis argued that children should spend their time in the classroom, whereas an alternative perspective urged that boys be taught to "work with their hands," girls prepared for their proper "place in the home." (Photo at left: No Source. Photo above: British Columbia Department of of Education, *Annual Report,* 1927/28.)

were demands that "all schools be maintained on a non-sectarian basis."[51] High-school fees for pupils over the school-leaving age were vigorously opposed as placing children "on the labor market at an age of fifteen years or so with only a partial education, when a full education is so very neces-

Statesman, 5 December 1924, 8 December 1925, and 9 December 1927. The latter phrase was also part of the 1922 election platform of the socialist Federated Labor Party; see scrapbook in MacInnis papers; on the Federated Labor Party, Phillips, *No Power Greater*, 71 and 90.

[51]*B.C. Federationist*, 30 November 1923. The argument was highly pragmatic: "Historically, whenever the church of whatever denomination had control of the education system, theology was a major part of the school curriculum with the result that the children of the poor received an abundance of instruction in the hell, fire and brimstone doctrines of the church but little real education beyond the proverbial three R's. Wherever the working class movement has advanced it has been compelled to demand the unconditional separation of the church from the educational system." *Labor Statesman*, 15 August 1924.

sary."[52] Textbooks needed to be provided free or, at the least, at cost.[53] A sense of Canadian nationalism was evident in the complementary demand that "a whole mass of useless stereotyped books containing American History" be eliminated.[54]

Many of the specific changes demanded by working people in Vancouver in the 1920s paralleled labour priorities elsewhere in Canada, as with opposition to compulsory school vaccination and to "military training."[55] On the first, concern over the state's usurpation of parental responsibility combined with vague suspicions of the medical profession; on the second, opposition reflected more widespread anti-militaristic attitudes held by the left in Canada during these years. As the resolution forwarded by the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council to its national convention in 1925 asserted, "military training as practised in the public schools is a pernicious and deceitful method of imbuing the youth with militarist and jingoistic aspirations, aiming not so much at the development and training of the muscles as at shaping the mind during the most impressionable period of a boy's life."[56]

Practical policy alternatives were offered. Vaccination was not denounced carte blanche; it was simply that parents opposed on principle should be given a process permitting them to opt out.[57] To replace military training, daily physical exercises were advocated as being healthier both

[52]*Ibid.*, 3 December 1926; also 26 November 1926, and 6 December 1929, and *B.C. Federationist*, 15 August 1924. See also VTLC meeting of 21 December 1926.

[53]VTLC meetings of 5 and 19 September and 7 November 1922; *B.C. Federationist*, 23 November 1923; *Labor Statesman*, 5 December 1924, 4 December 1925, 3 December 1926, and 9 December 1927. The issue received front-page headlines in the *Labor Statesman* on 5 September 1924 — "Text Books Should Be Printed in B.C. and Sold at Lower Price" — following on strong support given at a meeting of the Vancouver, New Westminster and District Trades and Labor Council. See also VTLC meetings of 2 September 1924 and 21 September 1926.

[54]*B.C. Federationist*, 3 December 1926, also 4 December 1925, and 9 December 1927. A more extreme view also existed that all "history books could be beneficially eliminated, inasmuch as they were nothing more but stories of kings and queens and other 'tripe'." *Labor Statesman*, 5 September 1924.

[55]For evidence from elsewhere in Canada, see Maciejko, "Public Schools." The recent American literature cited above reveals very real parallels to labour priorities in United States cities. See, for instance, Reese, "'Partisans'," 9-10, 12 and 35. On Britain, see Clive Griggs, *The Trades Union Congress & the Struggle for Education 1868-1925* (London 1983).

[56]VTLC meeting of 4 August 1925.

[57]See *B.C. Federationist*, 30 November 1923 and 5 December 1924; and *Labor Statesman*, 5 December 1924, 4 December 1925, 3 December 1926 and 9 December 1927. The labour press was not unwilling to present both viewpoints on the issue; for a favourable perspective, see *B.C. Federationist*, 5 September 1924. See also VTLC meetings of 20 January and 3 February 1925, reporting on unvaccinated children being sent home from school, and meetings of 5 January 1926, 15 February, 1 March and 3 May 1927, and 7 February 1928.

physically and psychologically.[58] Children's health was of very considerable general concern to working people.[59] "Healthy school accommodation" became virtually a catchphrase.[60] Thus, "the question of homework" was considered especially "acute amongst the High School students, taking up as it does, practically the whole of their time at home, and giving them no time for musical study and recreation," both deemed requisite to pupils' well being.[61]

The concern over physical health reflected growing interest in the whole child. A feature article in the labour press in 1924 related labour's priorities to what was becoming known in Canada as the "new" education, in the United States as "progressive" education:

> Thus far education has chiefly concerned itself with the things we adults think the children ought to know. It is time we considered education from the children's point of view and let them learn the things they want to know and are fitted to learn .... The New Education considers the children's happiness, and self-development first and foremost.[62]

Earlier in the decade, when the labour movement was still on the offensive, an entirely "new system" of schooling had been advocated which, while much more radical in orientation than the new education, similarly had its focus in the well being of the individual child through such practices as their being "gathered together into much smaller groups and a generous allowance of pure air (at least 600 cubic feet) allotted to each child."[63] Working people's growing moderation then very likely prompted their tendency to link what were originally separate movements leading in the same direction.

The corollary was general opposition to child and even youth employment. By the 1920s the former existed in Vancouver principally as isolated incidents, unlike the years prior to World War I, when the city's school attendance officer reported "a great many young-looking children," some no more than nine years of age, working in department stores, laundries, and offices, others "street trading" in merchandise, newspapers or magazines.[64] In 1919 the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council came out firmly against

[58]See *B.C. Federationist*, 30 November and 7 December 1923, and 11 January 1924; *Labor Statesman*, 5 December 1924, 4 December 1925, 3 December 1926, and 9 December 1927; and VTLC meetings of 4 August 1925, 21 December 1926, and 7 June 1927.

[59]For a good general statement, see Nemesis, "Education of Today and Tomorrow," *B.C. Federationist*, 16 January 1920.

[60]*Labor Statesman*, 5 December 1924, 4 December 1925, and 3 December 1926.

[61]*B.C. Federationist*, 30 November 1923; VTLC meeting of 21 December 1926; and *Labor Statesman*, 12 October 1928.

[62]*B.C. Federationist*, 5 September 1924.

[63]*Ibid.*, 16 January 1920.

[64]VBST, *Annual Report*, 1909, 14 and 35; 1910, 34; 1911, 11 and 27; 1917, 77; and 1918, 76.

child labour, petitioning the provincial government to keep children out of the labour market until age 16 rather than 14, which it clearly considered to be the rule. The practical demands of many family economies was tacitly acknowledged in the comment that "it was a hard matter to deal with as parents frequently lied about children's age, in order to get them working."[65] Shortly thereafter, in the early 1920s, the province prohibited factory employment under age 15 and Vancouver City Council street trading by children.[66] The Trades and Labor Council's opposition continued, expressed in 1923, for instance, against "attempts being made to have the schools closed down an extra two weeks [in the summer] with the object of enabling the Berry Growers to employ child labor on Berry picking."[67] Even the longstanding practice of newsboys hawking papers on Vancouver streets came under attack, a 1926 resolution urging provincial legislation to raise their lower age limit from 10 to 16 years.[68]

Working people's attitudes to youth employment varied. For some, schooling remained an unaffordable luxury once the leaving age was reached. As recollected by an East Side resident of these years, "If you went to high school, your parents had money and anybody who didn't have money, the kids left school at 13, 14 or 15 .... I didn't go to school after 13 because I had to go to work. People were poor. I earned about $3.00 a week."[69] The school board of working-class South Vancouver was repeatedly faced during the 1920s with requests that older children be allowed to leave school before the age limit, even though its stated policy was not "to consent to the practice of the education of the child being sacrificed for the purpose of contributing to

[65]VTLC meeting of 4 December 1919.

[66]The history of child labour legislation in British Columbia is detailed in Harold Fabian Underhill, "Labor Legislation in British Columbia," unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of California, 1936, 169-82. Also see *Annual Reports* of BC's Department of Labour, created in 1918, esp. 1923, G19; and VBST, *Annual Report*, 1923, 94. The only prohibitions up to 1920 related to coal mining and night work. Factory employment by girls under 15 and boys under 14 was prohibited in 1921, by boys under 15 two years later, the same year that street trading was curtailed in Vancouver.

[67]VTLC meeting of 20 March 1923. Also see 18 July 1924 meeting, condemning several boys of 14 being employed 10 hours a day in a box factory.

[68]VTLC meetings of 2 and 16 March 1926. Also see meetings of 3 April 1923 and 15 May and 21 August 1928.

[69]Quoted in Seymour Levitan and Carol Miller, eds., *Lucky to Live in Cedar Cottage: Memories of Lord Selkirk Elementary School and Cedar Cottage Neighbourhood, 1911-1963* (Vancouver 1986), 23. For useful comparisons on youth employment, see Rebecca Coulter, "The Working Young of Edmonton, 1921-31," 143-59 in Joy Parr, ed., *Childhood and Family in Canadian History* (Toronto 1982), and Jane Synge, "The Transition from School to Work: Growing Up Working Class in Early 20th Century Hamilton, Ontario," 249-69 in K. Ishwaren, ed., *Childhood and Adolescence in Canada* (Toronto 1979).

the maintenance of the home."[70] School officials' opposition was heightened by their conviction that pupils going to work at an early age would likely remain at the bottom of the socio-economic scale. As the chairman of the Vancouver School Board observed in 1923, "work is *available* for boys and girls under sixteen; but most of it is not *desirable*, being of the 'blind alley' type, which leads nowhere except into the ranks of unskilled labour."[71]

Realization that the average 15-year-old leaving school tended, as indicated by Tables 7 and 8, to secure fairly menial employment led some working people seriously to consider whether or not the schools should more directly prepare pupils for the labour market. Spokesmen were divided. The more limited perspective viewed commercial and technical courses as schools' principal function. As one writer in the labour press asserted, "every child has a right to education suitable to his special case to fit him for the life work that he will do,"

> The vast majority of the children in our schools belong to what is termed the "laboring class." That means that they will have to earn their living by doing work with their hands (plus considerable help from their head, of course) for wages .... We say to a boy, "What do you want to be when you grow up, son?" and he answers "an engineer," or "a framer," or "a cow-puncher." So we train him along the identical lines (until he quits schools at 14 or 15) that we lay down for educating doctors, lawyers, tailors and civil service employees, and let it go at that.

Girls were a different matter: "the writer believes that first and foremost a woman's place is in the home." "Believe me, the average man appreciates well-cooked meals, clean mended socks and intelligent help in locating lost collar buttons far more than he does his wife's ability to write essays on 'Browning's obscurities'." To deal with "the boys and girls who are now 'quitting school' at will or because their parents and communities don't care whether they go to school or not," "a well-balanced practical system of education" was needed, combining "the three r's and other useful subjects" with "vocational training" for boys and a "a thorough and compulsory course

[70]See South Vancouver, Minutes of Board of School Trustees, for instance, meeting of 16 May 1923 in Minutes (C-1-18), City of Vancouver Archives.

[71]VBST, *Annual Report*, 1923, 10-1, emphases in original. On the general concern during these years with "blind-alley" or "dead-end" jobs, see Harvey Kantor, "Vocationalism in American Education: The Economic and Social Context, 1880-1930," esp. 31-32 and 40-1, and Joseph F. Kett, "The Adolescence of Vocational Education," esp. 97-100, both in Harvey Kantor and David B. Tyack, eds., *Work, Youth and Schooling: Historical Perspectives on Vocationalism in American Education* (Stanford 1982). Blind-alley jobs were by definition those which were unskilled and poorly paid without opportunity for advancement, such as messenger, domestic and factory worker. A minority viewed these jobs rather as temporary positions probably always to be filled by the youngest employees in the labour force.

in 'domestic science'" for girls.[72]

MacInnis probably best represented the alternative view which, much like the new education, viewed the school's principal function as to "develop personality, create a desire for investigation and creative work."

> The subjects most necessary to the laying of the foundation during the school term are: literature, history (political, industrial and geographical) and mathematics. When manual training and domestic science are taught the object should be the stimulating of the mental faculties and for the purpose of explaining theoretical instruction by actual practice and not for the purpose of imparting knowledge or training in practical trades and crafts.

To counter "those who are crying for more practical education in the schools," MacInnis pointed to a recent statement by the principal of the Vancouver technical school that even "twenty per cent of the students graduating from that school had to enter 'blind alley' occupations, that is, odd jobs around town ... which offer no scope for putting into use the training acquired."

Thus, despite differences among working people on the degree to which the content of schooling should have immediate occupational utility, agreement existed concerning the necessity to encourage more children to remain in school longer. School life must be made as conducive as possible to that goal. A series of specific reforms was put forward, none of which could be termed openly confrontational. The question became how best to achieve change.

Working people and the electoral process

MUNICIPAL POLITICS BECAME VIEWED as a vehicle for change. From the early 1920s, the labour movement regularly endorsed candidates for city council, elected by ward, and for the schools and parks boards, chosen citywide. A January 1922 editorial in the official publication of the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council and the British Columbia Federation of Labor justified so doing in much the same terms as it editorially promoted school bylaws:

> While recognizing that the emancipation of the workers will never come through taking part in municipal or any other elections, the fact remains that we are still living under capitalism, and municipal bodies are playing their part in the obstruction of the workers in their every day struggles, and also in the efforts made to educate the working class.[73]

[72]Clement Manthano, "Our Education System: What Should Be Its Aim?" *B.C. Federationist*, 21 December 1923.
[73]*Ibid.*, 6 January 1922; also see 8 and 15 December 1922. Shortly thereafter the newly founded *Labor Statesman* became the official VTLC publication (Phillips, *No Power Greater*, 93). The policy on electoral participation changed several times, as detailed in Phillips, *passim*. "The question of the Council [VTLC] taking steps to secure representation

The intent was not, at least publicly, to wrest control of civic bodies or even necessarily to be set apart on them if in fact general agreement could be achieved. The aims of organized labour were decidedly moderate:

> Organized labor should at all times have a fair representation on elective public bodies .... In this regard labor does not want demagogues nor yet idealists to serve it, but it needs men of intelligence holding reasonable and common-sense views to deal with questions affecting— not corporations alone—but the whole population as a body politic.[74]

The electoral response across Vancouver to individuals who ran for civic office as "labour" candidates or with the public endorsement of organized labour or of a left-oriented political grouping provides a valuable clue to the level of class consciousness existing among Vancouver working people, at the least among that minority who could and did vote.[75] The civic franchise was limited to British subjects over age 21, both property owners and tenants whose property under tenancy had an assessed value of at least $300 per prospective voter in the household, this at a time when the average Vancouver male wage earner grossed just over $1,000 annually.[76] Chinese, Japanese, East Indians, and native Indians were all excluded. What this meant in the early 1920s was that, of some 78,000 adults resident in the city, about 10,000 were barred by race, another 24,000 for other reasons including modesty of

---

on the Board of School Trustees in the forthcoming Civic Elections" was first raised at their meeting of 20 December 1921, although no action appears to have been taken until early 1923; see meeting of 7 April.

[74] *B.C. Federationist*, 23 November 1923.

[75] The counter-argument to be considered is that this minority who voted and who spoke for labour was unrepresentative of Vancouver's working class, comprising a kind of more recent parallel to the traditional craft-based "labour aristocracy" introduced by Eric Hobsbawm some three decades ago to explain reformist tendencies in the nineteenth-century English labour movement (see his *Worlds of Labour: Further Studies in the History of labour* [London 1984], 214-51). The available evidence in the Vancouver case, including the occupations of labour-endorsed school board candidates (Table 9) and of VTLC leadership (as revealed in minutes of meetings), does not point to their being a distinctive elite group or, more generally, to divisions within the labour movement or among individuals identifying themselves as working class. It is, however, necessary to keep in mind the fundamental division based on race, ethnicity and poverty which separated the East End from the rest of the city, including the East Side.

[76] This aspect of the civic franchise was only changed in 1949. In addition, corporations on the assessment role could vote through an authorized agent. See "An Act to revise and consolidate the 'Vancouver Incorporation Act'," 1921, section 8, in British Columbia, *Statutes*, 1921, 310-11; and "An Act to amend the 'Vancouver Incorporation Act, 1921'," section 4, in *Ibid.*, 1949, 269-70. On mean wages, see Bartlett, "Real Wages," 38 and 39. For a comparison with numbers of civic voters in the early 1930s, see Barman, "Neighbourhood," 122, including footnote 49.

income and transiency.[77] Of this 44,000 about 10-14,000 actually cast their ballot.[78]

Despite major limitations on the civic franchise, several candidates identified in the press with "labour" secured election as alderman or school trustee during the 1920s, their base of support firmly in the East Side.[79] Angus MacInnis's statement to the press following his initial aldermanic victory in 1925 makes clear the extent to which success at the polls depended not only on rhetoric but on practical commitment by working people. Noting that, "comparatively speaking, political activity on the part of the working class is something new," he considered "the chief factor in winning the election was the good work done by voluntary workers in the ward." Then MacInnis revealed what may have been a major factor contributing to the success of labour candidates in his observation that "most of this work was done by women."[80]

As detailed in Table 9, the nine labour candidacies to the Vancouver School Board between 1920 and amalgamation in 1929 received on average 63 per cent of votes cast in Hastings, 60 per cent in Mount Pleasant, half elsewhere on the East Side and in the East End but just a third to a quarter elsewhere.[81] Three of these individuals secured election citywide: "street railway conductor" Angus MacInnis in 1922 followed four years later by "motorman" A.V. Lofting and the next year by "mail carrier" Fred Knowles.[82] The reason these particular men did so had less to do with greater

[77]According to the 1921 census (v. 2, 105-07), 77,798 of Vancouver's 97,416 residents were aged 21 and over. Of total population, 6,484 were Chinese, 4,316 Japanese, and 59 native Indians with the number of East Indians impossible to determine (v.1, 542). Eligible voters were estimated in January 1922 as about 44,000 (*Province*, 13 January 1922).

[78]Total votes cast for mayor, which biennial race usually brought the highest turnout, were 9,853 in Janaury 1920, 11,428 two years later, and 13,746 in December 1923. *Ibid.*, 9 January 1920, 13 January 1922 and 13 December 1923.

[79]In January 1920, James Reid, "representing labour," secured election as alderman in ward 7, Hastings Townsite. During a brief civic experiment with proportional representation, longtime labour activist R.P. Pettipiece, together with W.J. Scribbins, won citywide. The former's support came principally from Mount Pleasant and Hastings, the latter's from Hastings, followed by Mount Pleasant and Grandview. MacInnis was elected alderman in 1925 in ward 8, Mount Pleasant. *Province*, 9 January 1920, 16 December 1922 and 10 December 1925; *B.C. Federationist*, 4 February 1921 and 15 December 1922; *Sun*, 14 January 1921 and 11 December 1924; and *Vancouver Daily World*, 13 January 1922. Also see Barman, "Neighbourhood," 131, fn 70.

[80]*Labor Statesman*, 18 December 1925.

[81]For the vote garnered by left-endorsed candidates, see Barman, "Neighbourhood," 130, Table 10.

[82]Details on civic elections, including actual ballots with occupational and other data and official results by ward or district, are found in "Nominations and Elections," v. 1, 1886-1924, and v. 2, 1924-49 (MCR4), City of Vancouver Archives.

(Vancouver Board of School Trustees, *Annual Report,* 1923)

general appeal across the city than with very high proportions of the vote garnered in Hastings Townsite and Mount Pleasant — in the case of MacInnis virtually 90 per cent in each area compared to a quarter to two-thirds anywhere else.[83]

Such consistency in electoral behavior at both the aldermanic and trustee levels argues that working people on the East Side, and especially those in Hastings Townsite and Mount Pleasant, perceived themselves as a separate, working class. The labour press, in supporting a left-endorsed candidate for the school board in 1926, made precisely this point to the electorate of

[83] *Vancouver Daily World,* 13 January 1922.

While Vancouver School Boards during the 1920s continued to be dominated by men and women identified with the middle class, their influence was tempered by the presence of labour-endorsed trustees. The 1923 board included Angus Mcinnis, the 1928 board both A.V. Lofting and Fred Knowles. Also trustee throughout the decade and beyond was pro-labour James Blackwood. (Vancouver Board of School Trustees, *Annual Report*, 1928)

Hastings Townsite: "This is a working-class district, that is one reason why the working class should have direct representation on the school board."[84] Voting behaviour in the East End was less consistent than on the East Side, part of the immediate explanation lying certainly in racial and monetary

[84] *Labor Statesman*, 3 December 1926.

restrictions on the franchise. To the extent consciousness of class may have existed, it was muted at the polls.[85]

Working-class priorities on the Vancouver School Board

THE EXTENT TO WHICH REPRESENTATIVES of the working class made a difference to the Vancouver School Board during their two-year terms is difficult to ascertain. Board minutes are often oblique in indicating the initiators or significance of specific policy proposals, although they do suggest what were the dominant patterns of behaviour.[86] Most importantly perhaps, the three labour trustees, while a minority of one or two on the seven-person board, did not always stand alone. From 1920, and indeed up to 1945, a fellow board member was James Blackwood, a painter-decorator who, while a union member, was labour endorsed only sporadically.[87] As the labour press itself asserted, while believing that "organized labor should at all times have a fair representation on elective public bodies, this does not mean that wage-earners outside the pale of the unions should not also be represented by them."[88] The board usually also contained, together with a plurality or even majority of business and professional men, one or two women members

[85]The existence of class consciousness is itself problematic, given the harsh reality of anti-Asian agitation within the Vancouver labour movement, well detailed by Gillian Creese in her recent doctoral dissertation: "Working Class Politics, Racism and Sexism: The Making of a Politically Divided Working Class in Vancouver, 1900-1939," Carleton University, 1986, 103-42. Also see her survey of earlier literature on the topic (3-10). In complementary fashion, Conley, "Class Conflict," 167-9 and 683-5 argues that ethnic and racial minorities in the Vancouver area were uninvolved in contentious actions and strikes, 1900-19, except alongside other workers.

[86]See VBST, Minutes (8-A2), City of Vancouver Archives.

[87]VTLC meeting of 20 January 1920, and *Labor Statesman*, 3 and 11 December 1931. In 1920 the VTLC endorsed Blackwood's endorsation by the United Services Council. So far as can be ascertained, the VTLC did not then make its action public in the mainstream or labour press or otherwise try to further Blackwood's election. He was not again endorsed by labour until 1931. The case of Blackwood points up the limitations in seeing labour endorsation as the significant measure of class identity. On the other hand, he was the sole working-class candidate to run prior to amalgamation in 1929 without visible labour support. Blackwood joined the board in the first postwar school board election actually to be contested, thereafter securing re-election on the basis of his outstanding record as trustee. Differentials in Blackwood's level of support between the eight geographical areas was never as great as that for labour-endorsed candidates, ranging in 1920 from 60 per cent in the West End, where he lived, to 87 per cent in Hastings Townsite. In the decade after amalgamation, several candidates comparable to Blackwood did run without labour endorsement, as discussed in Barman, "Neighborhood," 125-32. However, as also noted there (see esp. 132, Table 11), they were generally unsuccessful in securing election, suggesting that occupation was of itself insufficient basis to be supported electorally by working people.

[88]*B.C. Federationist*, 23 November 1923.

who, while middle class as determined by husband's occupation, shared many of the goals of the board's working-class representatives.[89]

As board minutes make clear, the consequence was shifting alliances which not infrequently resulted in the passage of measures of common interest. Blackwood and MacInnis led the opposition to corporal punishment, and they stood together against a staff recommendation that, in the case of "a small percentage of the children ... unable to attend school owing to the fact that their parents are out of work and the children have no shoes to wear and in some cases, clothes," fathers be required to work off such items rather than their being provided free by the schools as had formerly been the practice. The two successfully argued that not only should the former practice be retained but that, for any work proffered, "the men be paid at the regular rate of wages."[90] A comparable correspondence of interests characterized Lofting's two years on the board, extending to his successful proposal of Blackwood as board chairman for 1928.[91] Issues of special concern to labour often found MacInnis and later Lofting standing alone.[92] A 1922 motion cutting back the number of sick days to teachers saw only MacInnis opposed.[93] MacInnis and Lofting were especially vocal in speaking out against school cadet programs, expressed by the former as opposition to the purchase of new uniforms, by the latter against a rifle range in a city school.[94] But each was joined once again by Blackwood in protesting various actions "unfair to organized labor."[95]

Public statements such as that made by the school board chairman when MacInnis left the board after a single term suggest both that working-class members spoke their mind and that their priorities received due consideration:

> I regret very much that Trustee MacInnis has decided not to offer himself for reelection. During his two years of service, we have highly appreciated his ability and unfailing devotion to duty. His sound judgment on all matters dealt with by the board made him a valuable and

[89]For VBST composition, see Barman, "Neighborhood," 120-40.

[90]Architect's letter of 6 January 1922, and VBST meeting of 20 February 1922. During 1922-23 MacInnis and Blackwood very often seconded each other's motions; see meetings of 20 July and 16 and 23 October 1922. In other cases, MacInnis and Blackwood were joined by Mrs. Dora Macaulay, as on 24 September 1923.

[91]VBST meeting of 4 January 1928.

[92]The third labour trustee, Fred Knowles, who served during 1928, appears to have been relatively inactive, not even appearing from mid-January to mid-March and from mid-September to the end of the year.

[93]VBST meeting of 16 October 1922.

[94]VBST meetings of 1 January, 9 and 16 April, and 2 May 1923, 6 December 1927 and 21 June 1928.

[95]For instance, VBST meeting of 2 May 1923.

agreeable member. We shall all miss him.[96]

The chairman added, "he was a useful member of the board and stood by his convictions fearlessly. None were more conscientious or gave better service than he." Conversely, MacInnis commented that the chairman "had been manifestly fair in all his rulings."[97] It was perhaps precisely because of this moderation that changes were effected and, just as importantly, that attitudes toward the working class altered: for instance, when in late 1923 the board discussed which Vancouver organizations should make presentations to the Putman-Weir survey of provincial education, the Trades and Labor Council was encouraged to do so along with the Parent-Teacher Federation, Teachers' Federation and Board of Trade.[98]

Money bylaws and working people

THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE REFORMIST rhetoric of spokesmen for the working class reflected priorities within individual families is suggested not only by electoral preferences for trustees but by voting patterns on school money bylaws. In this case the civic franchise was even more limited. The stipulation that voters be themselves rate payers, in effect, property owners, cut their number to some 32,000 in the early 1920s, a reality bemoaned in the labour press as giving "about half of the adult population ... a status little better than that of an Oriental."[99] Of the number eligible, about 10-15 per cent usually cast their ballot.[100]

In the decade between the end of the war and amalgamation in 1929 fully three dozen money bylaws on schools were, as indicated in Table 10, put to Vancouver voters.[101] General improvement in economic conditions is confirmed by steadily increasing levels of support from half or less to the 60 per cent necessary for passage by late 1924. By looking at differentials between residential areas, as is done in Table 10, it is possible to determine with some precision who was most concerned with the quality of public education. At first glance patterns of support, if consistent, appear unclear from a class perspective. Money bylaws were most strongly supported in Hastings and Kitsilano, the first dominantly working class, the second just as firmly middle class. Conversely, greatest opposition came from the East End, the poorest

[96]Chairman's address, 11 December 1923, and VBST meeting of 8 December 1923.
[97]*Province*, 13 December 1923.
[98]VBST meeting of 30 October 1923.
[99]*Province*, 21 June 1920, and *Labor Statesman*, 12 September 1924.
[100]Of the 32,000 eligible in mid-1920, 3,354 actually voted; over the next three years the highest number to cast their ballot was about 5,200 in December 1923. *Province*, 21 June 1920 and 13 December 1923.
[101]Bylaws continued to be successfully submitted through 1930, albeit to a much larger voting public following amalgamation in 1929.

area of Vancouver and the one where, it might be argued, residents had most to gain from better facilities. Also negative were the Business District and West End, whereas Mount Pleasant, Grandview and Fairview generally paralleled city- wide means.

The addition of other considerations to that of class alone begins to explain electoral behaviour, especially when examined together with the areas' reactions to money bylaws on other issues, as is done in Table 11. A significant factor was family status, the presence of a direct, personal interest in the quality of schooling, and here the coalition in favour of educational expenditure extended far beyond working people. Indeed, from the time of submission of the first postwar bylaws, the two groups spearheading approval were the Vancouver School Board, dominated by middle-class humanitarians, professionals and businessmen, and the Vancouver Parent-Teacher Federation. As early as 1919 they claimed support from organizations as diverse as the Local Council of Women and the Federated Labor Party.[102] A year later the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council "offered its whole-hearted support to the Parent Teachers' Association in its effort to have these money bylaws passed," and thereafter the labour press repeatedly urged "workers to get out on election day and vote in favor of the school by-laws."[103] So did the Vancouver Board of Trade, concluding "after careful consideration" that the expenditure was "absolutely necessary."[104] Wide-ranging support, even at the beginning of the decade when the city had not yet recovered economically after the war, is indicated by large ads appearing in the establishment-oriented *Province* newspaper in spaces separately donated by the Hudson's Bay Company, Fraser Valley Dairies, a piano store, and other companies "for the sake of the kiddies of the community and of humanity." In words which virtually replicated the labour rhetoric, the focus was placed squarely on giving "every child the best possible chance to develop to the fullest every latent possibility."[105]

Bylaw supporters were well aware of precisely where lay the organized opposition, as in the 1919 assertion in the mainstream press that passage of the school bylaws would signify "to the outside world that such a City is in the hands of able administrators and not under the control of individuals who would sacrifice the child and his education for the dollar."[106] The Trades and Labor Council pointed out a year later that "it would be in the interest of the workers to solidly endorse" the bylaws, since they "would only necessitate a small payment on the part of the workers as against a large sum by the big

[102] *Sun*, 28 September 1919.
[103] *B.C. Federationist*, 16 April 1920, and *Labor Statesman*, 4 December 1925. See also VTLC meeting of 2 July 1920.
[104] *Province*, 16 and 18 June 1920.
[105] *Ibid.*, and *Sun*, 18 June 1920.
[106] *Sun*, 28 September 1919, and *Province*, 16 and 18 June 1920.

property interests" who were so "strenuously opposed to the bylaws."[107] The irony was not lost on the labour press which noted editorially how "Vancouver property owners" were even "too mean to educate the children so that they can carry on the system which gives them their property."[108] And the opposition was indeed vocal, a "Property-owners' Association" arguing publicly for defeat of money bylaws for schools until the tax base was broadened beyond the fifth of the Vancouver population which it claimed were liable to property tax.[109] Women were especially active in canvassing eligible voters across the city to vote for the bylaws and reported finding least support in the West End and Business District, where many property owners either resided or voted, as well as in the East End.[110]

Of Vancouver's eight areas of settlement, the two which consistently gave the strongest support to money bylaws for the schools, Hastings and Kitsilano, were almost entirely residential with a strong family orientation: the well being of the next generation took priority at the polls over a tax increase, both generally and even more so when proposed improvements would occur locally. Concern with adequate social infrastructure went beyond schools. As Table 11 indicates, when a money bylaw to construct a maternity hospital was first put to the voters in 1920, only there did levels of support exceed the city mean, and then by over 10 per cent in each area. Six years later the maternity bylaw passed, and again its strongest levels of support came in Kitsilano and Hastings, together with neighbouring Grandview.

Conversely, the West End was during the 1920s being dotted with apartments especially appealing to the genteel single and elderly: the 1931 census would find its proportion of children of school age less than half that in the city as a whole, its proportion of elderly significantly higher.[111] Indifference to public education may also have related to the tendency for West End families with financial means and a traditional British orientation to send their own children to one of the numerous private schools which proliferated there and in Point Grey during these years.[112] A 1921 editorial

[107] *B.C. Federationist*, 16 April 1920.

[108] *Ibid.*, 25 June 1920.

[109] *Sun*, 29 September 1919, and *Province*, 16 and 18 June 1920. The Vancouver School Board tried to neutralize their accusations, in 1923 even opening its books to the association in the hope, to quote the board's chairman, "that the more they know of them [the board] the more charitable they will become in their judgment of School Board financial methods." See chairman's address, 11 December 1923.

[110] *Province*, 18 June 1920.

[111] For detail, see Barman, "Neighbourhood," 106, Table 1.

[112] On the nature and location of private schools, see Barman, *Growing Up British in British Columbia: Boys in Private School* (Vancouver 1984), esp. 37-9; on ethnic orientation, Barman, "Neighbourhood," tables on 110-1, 113 and 115, which divide West End residents by birthplace, ethnic origin and religious affiliation in 1931, based on census data.

in the labour press observed in reference to the very low levels of support being accorded bylaws in the West End and neighbouring Business District: "Property says no, and the workers' children are the sufferers, for it must be understood that in the case of the children of the wealthy they are not compelled to attend the public schools, but have other places of education provided for them."[113] Even a proposed West End high school received only minimal support in the West End itself on the first two occasions it was put to the voters.

That the low levels of support accorded school bylaws in the West End did not reflect the area's decline from its earlier residential supremacy and thereby a perceived need to conserve finances on both the personal and public levels is indicated by strong support repeatedly given such status-type initiatives as a million dollar city hall proposed in 1927. More so than appears to have been the case with working people, the West End looked out for its own class-based interests, as evidenced also by the support given improvements to nearby Stanley Park compared with strong disapproval of a comparable measure for Hastings Park, located in working-class Hastings Townsite. Whereas Hastings voters accorded the two proposals fairly equal support, the West End favoured their local park with 79 per cent in favour versus a mere 28 per cent approval rate for Hastings Park.[114]

The Business District's opposition to school money bylaws far surpassed even that of the West End. Its eligible voters seem to have been a combination of residents, less likely than in the West End to have children of school age, local businessmen themselves living elsewhere, and what a newspaper ad backing the bylaws terms "'vacant lot' property owners [out to] destroy your child's life."[115] Shortly before the 1924 civic election, the labour press revealed that "one financial man in this city can vote once as an owner, once as a tenant, and 18 times as an agent for different corporations" even though he himself "resides in Point Grey."[116] Two years later a member of the

[113] *B.C. Federationist*, 28 January 1921.

[114] On the class orientation of Stanley Park, see Robert A.J. McDonald, "'Holy Retreat' or 'Practical Breathing Spot'? Class Perceptions of Vancouver's Stanley Park, 1910-1913," *Canadian Historical Review*, 65 (1984), 127-53. While the West End elite group identified by McDonald as supporting Stanley Park had largely moved out to the neighbouring municipality of Point Grey by the end of World War I, the West End population of the 1920s was probably not that different in its orientation, at the least in its aspirations, as suggested by 1931 census data; see Barman, "Neighbourhood," esp. 118-9.

[115] *Sun*, 29 September 1919. On children in the Business District, see Barman, "Neighbourhood," 106, Table 1.

[116] *Labor Statesman*, 5 December 1924. The individual was identified as H.W. Dyson. The article went on to discuss the case of real estate agents and others owning property in several wards and therefore also eligible to vote more than once. It asserted further that "most of the leading lights in the Property Owners' Association" were residents of Point Grey. For the VTLC concern with "plural voting," see meetings of 3 January 1928 and 19 November 1929.

Due in part to the ambivalence of working people, only in 1927 did a bylaw to construct a large new technical school receive voter approval. Located in the heart of working-class Vancouver, the impressive structure undoubtedly confirmed in some minds the probability that children of working people were destined for manual wage labour. (Vancouver Public Library, photo no. 4638)

Vancouver School Board spoke out vigorously against the electoral activity of a "small group of property owners" "holding powers-of-attorney from distant speculators."[117] Even more so than in the West End, status improvements took precedence over better social infrastructure: in 1920 almost 20 per cent fewer Business District voters than in Vancouver as a whole voted for the maternity hospital, whereas seven years later over a quarter more than was the city mean were willing to fund the million dollar city hall. So far as schools were concerned, the state of the economy may also have played a role, as evidenced by the diminishing differential between the Business District vote and that generally across the city as conditions improved during the early and mid 1920s. Nonetheless, the Business District never supported money bylaws for the schools at anywhere near citywide levels.

[117]March 1926 clipping entitled "Nicholson raps 'Property Owners,'" in clipping scrapbook.

Bylaw voting behaviour in the East End must have been profoundly affected by limitations on the franchise. While voters' lists did include numerous individuals identifiable by surname as not of Anglo-Saxon heritage, it is of course impossible to determine who actually voted and thereby reacted in such consistent fashion against school improvements.[118] Voters seem not to have been absentee property owners, as in the neighbouring Business District, since, as Table 11 makes clear, equally strong opposition existed to any expenditure of public funds, whatever its purpose. Any proposal which threatened to raise taxes was to be eschewed.

Thus, when working-class residents of Hastings Townsite, and to a lesser extent those in Mount Pleasant and Grandview, gave repeated support to the passage of money bylaws for schools, they were at one and the same time reflecting priorities publicly enunciated by representatives speaking for the working class and joining in a much broader coalition premised on family status and united in its commitment to improved social infrastructure for all residents. Once money bylaws for the schools began to receive approval, the general reaction among both middle and working-class supporters was relief "that the policy of steady civic development has wide endorsement."[119] The coalition remained in place, as indicated by the 1928 commendation of the Vancouver Inspector of Schools for "the activities of committees of parents and teachers in nearly every school district" in distributing 20,000 circulars to ensure passage of that year's bylaws.[120]

The technical education issue

THE ONE ISSUE ON WHICH bylaw voting behaviour diverged from established patterns was technical education. The extent to which schools should have immediate occupational utility was an especially thorny one for working people, as revealed by the difference in perspective between Angus MacInnis and his fellow contributors to the labour press. Business interests were equally divided. As the labour press ruminated editorially in 1921 following the defeat of three consecutive annual money bylaws to provide a new technical school, even though "the material interests of the ruling class determined that technical schools should be established," in Vancouver, its members were "too cheap to pay for what they are to receive, and too narrow to even see their own interests." If the ideal still lay for many working people in overturning the capitalistic system, in the interim, so the editorial continued, "proper facilities" should be provided "so that the children may be made efficient and productive workers."[121]

[118]See published voters' lists in City of Vancouver Archives.

[119]See, for example, *Sun*, 9 December 1926.

[120]VBST meeting of 21 June 1928.

[121]*B.C. Federationist*, 28 January 1921. David Hogan discovered comparable tensions in

In 1923, the Vancouver School Board set up an advisory board for technical education and solicited representatives from the local Trades and Labor Council and the Manufacturers' Association.[122] Its slow pace suggests limited interest. A whole year appears to have passed before a meeting was called.[123] Shortly thereafter one of the two labour representatives perfunctorily resigned, and virtually three months went by before the Council bothered to replace him, and then only at the behest of the remaining representative.[124] Early in 1926 the Trades and Labor Council representatives reported that "the [Advisory] Board had very little power, had submitted many suggestions for improvements that had been ignored by school officials."[125] The first strong indication of the Trades and Labor Council's position came later that year in a resolution "that we endorse the requests of the various School Boards to the Provincial government for special schools to be provided for Technical Education."[126]

The ambivalence of both working people and property owners toward technical education is also suggested by not a single bylaw being submitted to Vancouver voters between 1921 and 1926. A 1927 proposal to construct a large new technical school, while passing, garnered a bare 54 votes over the necessary 60 per cent.[127] Despite endorsement by the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council, a second money bylaw on technical education submitted a year later also received, so Table 10 indicates, smaller overall approval than had by this date become the norm.[128] As with education bylaws in general, working people in Hastings Townsite gave higher than average support, as did their Kitsilano contemporaries. West End and Business District voters also expressed greater favour than was usually the case on educational matters, lending some support to theorists of middle-class imposition.[129] Again, the area which seemingly might have most benefited by the proposed

his analysis of Chicago: *Class and Reform: School and Society in Chicago, 1880-1930* (Philadelphia 1985). Also see Katznelson and Weir, *Schooling for All*, 150-77; Peterson, *Politics*, 16-8; and essays in Kantor and Tyack, eds., *Work, Youth and Schooling*.

[122]VBST meeting of 30 October 1923 and VTLC meeting of 6 November 1923.

[123]VTLC meeting of 27 October 1924.

[124]VTLC meetings of 17 February, 17 March and 5 May 1925.

[125]VTLC meetings of 5 and 19 January 1926.

[126]VTLC meeting of 21 September 1926.

[127]For exact numbers, see *Province*, 26 June 1927.

[128]VTLC meeting of 15 May 1928. The VTLC subsequently endorsed VBST efforts to secure Dominion government support for technical education. See VTLC meetings of 6 November and 4 December 1928, and 5 February 1929.

[129]For this perspective, see Timothy Dunn, "Work, Class and Education: Vocationalism in British Columbia's Public Schools, 1900-1920" (unpublished master's thesis, UBC, 1978); and his "Teaching the Meaning of Work: Vocational Education in British Columbia, 1900-1929," 236-56 in David Jones, *et al.*, eds. *Shaping the Schools of the Canadian West*, (Calgary, 1979).

new facility, the East End, was especially vehemently opposed. Although educational proposals were by now receiving at least a bare majority even in the East End, the plans to construct a technical school on its very doorway garnered just 40 per cent, suggesting once again that so far as schooling was concerned area voters were indeed marching to a very different drummer.[130]

Other areas of action by working people

DURING THE 1920S VANCOUVER working people possessed other arenas, apart from school board participation and passage of money bylaws, through which to realize their educational priorities. Two of the most significant were the Putman-Weir Commission and local parent-teacher, associations. The interest of working people in the educational survey is suggested by a labour alderman's publicly stated desire in 1923 "to see a man with a worker's viewpoint on the commission."[131] Early the next year a delegation of the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council directly petitioned the provincial government to initiate the survey.[132] Groups representing labour, along with a wide variety of organizations from across the province, made recommendations to the two-man commission during its lengthy hearings in the second half of 1924.[133]

The Vancouver Trades and Labor Council's brief began on a very direct note: "It is extremely desirable that we should take advantage of this opportunity to make perfectly clear that the Labor Movement attaches very great importance to the subject of education." Mere occupational training was not enough. "There should be equal opportunities for education, including professional education for all children. In our public schools there are hundreds of children sufficiently endowed by nature with intellectual gifts to enable them to compete, if given a chance, with the best brains in the land." Military training was opposed: "Schools should be used not for the teaching

[130]A *Province* article of 14 October 1928 explicitly put its location "in the East End." Its exact address was 2600 East Broadway, which placed it on the western edge of Hastings Townsite, just east of the East End.

[131]See VBST meeting of 26 February 1923 and VTLC meeting of 6 November 1923.

[132]VTLC meeting of 19 February 1924.

[133]The commission's records appear not to have survived. For a list of groups submitting briefs, which included "trades and labour councils," see Putman and Weir, *Survey*, 1-2 and 67, and ongoing coverage in provincial newspapers. Typical is *Sun*, 18 August 1924, reporting J.S. Woodsworth's speaking out on behalf of the Native Sons of Canada for textbooks which would "develop a real Canadian patriotism." Information used here is taken from press accounts, as did B. Anne Wood in her Putman biography *(Idealism Transformed: The Making of a Progressive Educator* [Kingston and Montreal 1985]), whose chapter 8 (148-68 and notes 214-7) discuss the survey. The impact of the survey and its recommendations have been surprisingly little analyzed; see Jean Barman and Neil Sutherland, "Royal Commission Retrospective," *Policy Explorations*, 3.1 (Winter 1988).

of war, but for the arts of peace." And the "teaching of history should be reformed with a view of ... emphasizing the economic and social development of humanity." The brief also reiterated demands of "the Labor movement" for free textbooks and elimination of overcrowded classrooms.[134]

The Putman-Weir Report incorporated many of the priorities of working people. As the Vancouver Trades and Labour Council noted, the proposed "educational reforms will be of great value to all classes, [but] especially to those who have to work for a living."[135] The report came out firmly against military training: "The physical education of children is a part of their general education and should be given as such .... We think the schools would suffer no real loss if every vestige of military training were eliminated from the school program."[136] The report also strongly opposed high-school fees as a principal threat to their being "equal opportunities" for all children. As it noted, no issue had been "more vigorously and persistently argued before the Commission at practically every sitting throughout the Province than that of charging high school fees of sufficient amount to make the secondary school carry its own cost." After a lengthy analysis of the issue which pointed out that "the majority of the citizens of the Province" considered fees "a retrograde step, quite out of accord with the ideals of the age and the spirit of our democratic institutions," Putman and Weir proposed that the relevant section of the school law "be so amended as to make it impossible for school boards to charge high school fees except in the case of non-residents."[137]

Implementation of the survey's most immediate priority for Vancouver, the establishment of junior high schools intended to keep all children in school through grade nine, made overt the divisions among residents. In the critical Vancouver School Board vote of February 1926 on whether to support the proposal, Blackwood and two female trustees joined with a physician to oppose three business-oriented members who argued for "keeping the expenses of the schools down to a minimum consistent with efficiency."[138] One of the trio, an accountant, noted that the recent increase of the primary program to eight years "has already thrown upon local tax-payers an additional financial burden," and another year will only compound the damage.[139]

The lines were soon drawn. At its 2 March meeting the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council strongly endorsed the proposed junior high schools,

[134]Brief printed in *Labor Statesman*, 22 August 1924. The VTLC noted at its 5 August meeting the receipt of an invitation from the commission and at the 19 August meeting the delegation's reception.
[135]VTLC meeting of 2 March 1926.
[136]Putman and Weir, *Survey*, 96 and 396. The labour movement recognized the significance of the survey's position; see *Labor Statesman*, 4 December 1925 and 3 December 1926.
[137]Putman and Weir, *Survey*, 63-7.
[138]VBST meeting of 1 February 1926.
[139]VBST, *Annual Report*, 1926, 14.

attributing opposition to "organized selfishness in the form of the Vancouver Property Owners Association, because of their reluctance to pay for popular education and their undemocratic opposition to equality of educational opportunity."[140] Shortly thereafter trustee Dr. F.J. Nicholson, who was — so he proclaimed in election ads — "the son of a School Principal and Deputy Minister of Education,"[141] publicly blasted the continuing attempts by property owners to discredit the survey's recommendations:

> If the ratepayers and voters are to be stampeded by this propaganda before studying the question involved, a tremendous blow will have been struck at the education of the children of all classes, particularly of the working classes, and against the principles of democracy and education.[142]

By the end of March, supporters had organized. The middle-class University Women's Club took the initiative by calling a public meeting, to which interested groups, including the Vancouver Trades and Labor Council, were individually invited.[143] The resulting "Citizen's Committee" ranged extremely widely in its membership from parent-teacher activists to local eminence Sir Charles Tupper. Acting as official spokesman was none other than Angus MacInnis.[144] By the end of May the Trades and Labor Council had received assurances from trustees that "the Board is progressing very favourably on recommendations of school survey cOmmission."[145] The necessary money bylaws passed easily, and thereafter Vancouver led the province in implementing the Putman-Weir recommendations.

Many working people were also actively involved in local parent-teacher associations. Labour groups and the Vancouver Parent-Teacher Federation cooperated on numerous issues, including joint and common advocacy of money bylaws.[146] Such goals as maximizing textbook access equally concerned parent-teacher groups, which supplied books to children whose parents could not afford purchase.[147] Several labour candidates for the Vancouver School Board, including Lofting, were involved in parent-teacher

[140] VTLC meeting of 2 March 1926.
[141] *Sun*, 12 January 1921.
[142] 25 February 1926, clipping, "Economy First, Say Property Owners," and March 1926 clipping, "Nicholson raps 'Property Owners'," clipping scrapbook. A group called the Associated Property Owners had submitted a report to the school board urging economy, which it also released to the press without the board's permission.
[143] Invitation reported in VTLC meeting of 16 March 1926.
[144] The origins and membership of this group were given at the VBST meeting of 22 March 1926, when it made its first appearance as a delegation.
[145] VTLC meeting of 1 June 1926.
[146] See VTLC meetings of 20 May and 14 June 1920, 1 December 1925, and 6 April, 3 and 17 August and 16 November 1926; and *Labor Statesman*, 6 December 1929.
[147] *Labor Statesman*, 4 December 1925, and VTLC meeting of 4 March 1920.

associations and received endorsement at school or city levels.[148] This relationship would become even stronger after amalgamation, with many left-endorsed candidates of the depression years being long-time activists in their local parent-teacher associations.[149]

Working people in the schools

THE SUCCESS OF EFFORTS to improve schools was soon reflected in growing enrollments. As education became more accessible and appealing at both the primary and secondary levels, working people spoke through their actions. More pupils remained longer. At the beginning of the decade the norm was completion of primary school, in effect, grade seven. Table 12 details proportions of pupils retained from grade seven upward into each higher grade by the later 1920s. By 1927 virtually all Vancouver children were completing grade eight. The next year the proportion remaining for grade nine rose to almost 90 per cent. Given that almost half had reached the leaving age, consensus clearly existed that the third year of junior high school was essential to a basic education.[150] For the second time within a decade an extra year of schooling had become the norm. On the other hand, the lower proportion of pupils retained into grade ten argues that education beyond junior high school was not yet generally acceptable. A second measure, summarized in Table 13, also suggests that an increasing proportion of Vancouver young people were remaining in school a year or two longer by the late 1920s. Three-quarters as many 15-year-olds as 14-year-olds were in school in 1928-29, compared with just two-thirds as many a year previous. Such retention of older pupils was not, moreover, due principally to improved technical education or other occupational training, since, as Table 5 underlines, proportions opting for a non-academic secondary program remained relatively constant over the decade.

Some older children continued to leave school for work. Often it was family necessity, but in other cases they were probably lured there by the expansion in opportunities for young and old alike during the mid-1920s.[151]

[148] *Ibid.*, 4 December 1925. In the year he ran, Lofting was treasurer of the Vancouver Parent-Teacher Association. Among educational research waiting to be done is analysis of PTA leadership and membership; for a chronology of activities during the 1920s, see *Early History of the Parent-Teacher Movement in British Columbia* (n.p. 1939).

[149] The number includes Isabella Steenbekkers and S.T. Wybourn, running for the first time in 1929, and Susie Lane Clark in 1930; *Labor Statesman*, 6 December 1929 and 21 November 1930. The next year Wybourn proudly included among his credentials for school trustee having been "recently elected for third term as President of the Van Horne Parent-Teacher Association." Mrs. Clark was "a Past President of Florence Nightingale Parent-Teacher's Association." Van Horne was located in former South Vancovuer, Nightingale in Grandview. *Ibid.*, 3 December 1931.

[150] VBST, *Annual Report*, 1928, 73-80.

[151] On overall employment, see BC, Department of Labour, *Annual Reports*.

According to figures compiled by the provincial Department of Labor, summarized in Table 14, the number of British Columbia young women in wage labour doubled between 1921 and 1926, to peak in 1929. Much of the increase came in industrial work, largely located in Vancouver. While comparable male data was only compiled through 1926, it indicates similar growth, as does information on apprenticeships, which must have been largely directed toward the young.[152]

Some evidence suggests that young people entering the labour market at age 15 or 16 were increasingly those either not doing well in school or overage in terms of their grade level. In September 1927 a survey was undertaken of the 1,070 pupils who dropped out of Vancouver schools during the previous year. Over 70 per cent were aged 15-17. Although almost all appear to have found employment, albeit largely "in 'blind-alley' jobs," only half were considered by their principals as likely to have been promoted had they remained in school.[153] The tendency for overage pupils to leave school as soon as possible is also evident from Table 15. Concerned efforts over the past half decade to improve age-grade correlations may well have rebounded negatively on the two out of five pupils in grades eight and nine who were overage at the end of the 1920s, since the overage proportion than fell markedly in each higher grade.[154]

The two reasons many young people dropped out of school — overage and poor academic performance — likely correlated not only with each other but with a working-class background, particularly if also from a non-English-speaking family.[155] Indeed, to the extent that working people became more committed to the schools during the 1920s, that priority did not much extend to the city's East End. Neither in school board elections nor in votes on money bylaws did the East End evidence the interest in change expressed by residents on the East Side, who consciously identified themselves with the priorities of labour spokesmen for the working class. Moreover, unlike virtually all the rest of the city by the mid-1920s, a significant minority of young people did not remain in school through grade eight, much less continue into secondary education.

Much of the explanation lay certainly in the distinctive character of many

[152]From 1927 the relevant category included all males under age 21, rather than 18 as previously. Figures are skewed to some extent due to responses being received each year from a greater number of companies, which might or might not have been in existence previously.

[153]Of the 312 who could be followed up, all but 10 had jobs. VBST, *Annual Report*, 1927, 67-8.

[154]As a direct consequence of concerns expressed in the Putman-Weir Report, exact proportions of overage pupils in each grade were determined annually and a concerted effort made to rectify the situation through ensuring all children began grade one at age six. See VBST, *Annual Reports*.

[155]For a broader demonstration of this correlation, see Oakes, *Keeping Track*.

East End families. The Vancouver Trades and Labor Council tacitly acknowledged the reality of poverty in its 1924 appointment of a commission to investigate reports of "child immigrants" with "no schooling and long hours of employment."[156] School personnel repeatedly referred to East End children's "undernourishment." One survey found that, of underweight pupils in the East End, half were sleeping three or more a room, a quarter four or more, fully 14 per cent five or more, proportions far higher than anywhere else in the city.[157] The family economy demanded that children go to work as soon as they reached age 15, if not earlier. Since most jobs available were in any case "blind-alley," it made little difference whether or not schools provided technical training or even whether or not they were perceived as hospitable.[158]

For many East End children, schools were likely not very hospitable. Pupils who did not know English on entering school were often forced to repeat at least grade one and many must simply not have reached grades eight or nine before the school leaving age. A 1923 survey determined that less than 12 per cent of East End pupils were "of Anglo-Saxon extraction." What aroused most concern among school administrators was "a large foreign element."[159] The attitude toward such children even among some teachers is suggested in the comment by a Kitsilano elementary principal in 1922 that "the presence of Oriental children in schools will make it impossible for them [teachers] to transmit to the next generation the social inheritance of the present and past generation; and he considers this one of the chief functions

[156]VTLC meeting of 16 September 1924. No further information on the commission was located in the VTLC minutes.

[157]"Underweight" was defined as being 10 per cent or more under the prescribed weight for a particular height. VBST, *Annual Report*, 1919, 98, and 1920, 40-3.

[158]The information available on educational conditions in the East End is at best tantalizing, as Marlatt and Itter, in *Opening Doors* and *Fond Memories: Recollections of Britannia High School's First 75 Years, 1908-1983* (Vancouver 1983), and in the perceptions of school officials, as documented in VBST, Minutes and *Annual Reports*. Recent American research has postulated a relationship between the overall priorities of working-class families, such as home ownership, and the length of time a child was allowed to remain in school. See David Hogan "Education and the Making of the Chicago Working Class, 1880-1930," History of Education Quarterly, 18 [1978], 227-70; also his *Class and Reform*; and then Joel Perlmann ("Homeownership and Children's Schooling in Providence, Rhode Island, 1880-1925," *History of Education Quarterly*, 23 [1983], 175-93), which calls Hogan's argument into question based on data from Providence. Utilizing oral history techniques, John Bodnar ("Schooling and the Slavic-American Family, 1900-1940," 78-95 in Bernard J. Weiss, ed., *American Education and the European Immigrant* [Urbana 1982]) has sensitively documented the primacy of the immigrant family economy in urban and industrial Pennsylvania over prolonged schooling (for his interviews, see *Workers' World: Kinship, Community, and Protest in an Industrial Society, 1900-1940* [Baltimore 1982]).

[159]BC, Department of Education, *Annual Report*, 1923-24, 41.

of schools."[160] Similarly indicative of the pressures for Anglo conformity which must have alienated many East End pupils is the "revelation" of a 1924 press editorial that in one interior British Columbia school the principal had dared to ask, "jocularly perhaps—what percentage of his pupils were in favor of a Socialist state government." "Some fifty per cent of the pupils held up their hands," attributed by the editorial to the fact that "a considerable percentage of those pupils are *foreigners*."[161] In such circumstances, it is hardly surprising that East End families perceived schools as having little economic utility or social advantage.

* * * * * * * * *

IN RETROSPECT IT IS RELATIVELY EASY to muse on the extent to which working people in Vancouver during the 1920s were duped: in attempting to improve rather than overturn a system of public schooling firmly embedded within a capitalist economic order, they were only making more efficient and pervasive schools' reproductive function. Such an interpretation can be supported by a variety of evidence. The reforms that working people sought were equally espoused by other groups in society who perceived them in their interest. Opposition to fees at the secondary level was of such wide ranging concern that it was not labour but rather the Victoria University Women's Club which received press headlines for putting the matter to the Putman-Weir Commission.[162] The Child Welfare Association urged as eloquently as could have any spokesman for the working class that "hours of evening study were too long to permit growing children their proper rest."[163] Similarly, an attempt by the Vancouver School Board in late 1929 to impose high school fees raised such general opposition that the decision had to be rescinded.[164]

At least three measures of results can be interpreted as suggesting that working people were at best naive in thinking their actions would benefit their own class. In 1931, according to census data, the proportion of young people aged 15-19 living at home and still in school was far lower on the East

[160]Meeting of VBST Management Committee with Principals, 13 February 1922.

[161]*Colonist*, 10 July 1924.

[162]*Ibid.*, 18 July 1924 and July 1924 clipping, "University Women Present Suggestions to Commission," clipping scrapbook. It was the Local Council of Women which argued for "sympathetic treatment of the recreational life of the children"; *Colonist*, 17 July 1924. Likewise, the Anglican Rev. A.H. Sovereign spoke out for more "physical training," as did the provincial Parent-Teacher Federation; *Sun*, 9 August 1924, and *Province*, 16 November 1924.

[163]*Colonist*, 16 December 1924.

[164]*Labor Statesman*, 6 December 1929, and 1929 clipping from *Province*, titled "Federation Plans Vigorous Protest to School Board," clipping scrapbook. Concerted opposition by the Vancouver Parent-Teacher Federation, with the support of former trustee A.V. Lofting, led to the ruling being rescinded.

Side at about one in three and in the East End at under one in ten than in the dominantly middle-class West End and West Side, at three out of four.[165] A similar measure, based on occupation rather than geography, is summarized in Table 16. Whereas the proportion of children of working people aged 15-19 living at home and still in school grew by about half over the decade 1921-30, that of largely middle-class managers doubled. Thirdly, even if some working people achieved more schooling for their children, options beyond the secondary level remained circumscribed, as indicated by Table 17. At the end of the 1920s, but before the depression hit, just one in five students at the University of British Columbia — 60 per cent of whom came from Vancouver, South Vancouver, or Point Grey — were the offspring of working people even though such occupations employed fully two-thirds of British Columbia adult males. Conversely, half had business or professional parents, occupations enjoyed by just one in ten adult males.

An alternative, more liberal interpretation is possible from the same data: the cup three-quarters empty is also a quarter full. As Table 16 makes equally clear, the rate of increase in school attendance by children of unskilled labourers surpassed that of clerical employees and even that of wage earning professionals. Many working people — particularly those not constrained by race, ethnicity and poverty — opted for more schooling for their offspring, this despite relatively easy access to paid employment. Moreover, if middle-class offspring dominated the province's sole university, nonetheless one in five students did, as noted in Table 17, come from a working-class background. New options were opening up, if not for all children then at least for more than was previously the case and to a greater extent than existed elsewhere in Canada. During the 1920s Vancouver working people achieved much of what they sought for their children. A labour candidate of 1923 ran on a platform of "More Schools and Better Schools."[166] And by 1929 virtually every city child was being educated in facilities physically among the finest in the country. As Tables 12-15 suggest, the depression would then provide its own momentum, children remaining longer in school largely through lack of any alternative, even that of "blind-alley" work. As the Vancouver School Board acknowledged in 1931, "many who leave school are unable to find employment of any kind."[167]

During the 1920s Vancouver working people — male and female — gained confidence in their ability to effect change through reform rather than confrontation. As a left-endorsed school board candidate observed in 1927,

[165]Derived from *Census of Canada*, 1931, v.3, 68-9, and Bulletin XL, 16-31.

[166]*B.C. Federationist*, 7 December 1923, in reference to W.J. Downie.

[167]VBST, *Annual Report*, 1931, 17. On youth employment across Canada created by the depression, see *Census of Canada*, 1931, v. 13, 240-1.

Better educational opportunities have shown the workers that the employing class have no monopoly of the brains of the community, and they have also seen that when a representative of their own class was elected that he compared very favorably with the representatives of the other class.[168]

A similar conclusion may be inferred from the cynical assessment put to the Putman-Weir survey by a businessman formerly on the Vancouver School Board concerning the state of the city's schools: "Between the Trades and Labor Council and the Teachers' Federation the poor taxpayer gets it in the neck. One runs the business administration of the schools and the other runs the schools."[169] The Putman-Weir Report of 1925 was welcomed by working people, as it was by all families who cared deeply about their children's future. Such longstanding labour priorities as more accessible textbooks and elimination of military training formed part of the final report. More importantly, the overriding concern of working people for the physical and mental welfare of the individual child underlay the entire report, which would then form the basis for educational change in British Columbia over the next two decades.

While the theoretical issue of education's inherent bias toward the existing socio-economic order was not directly resolved — and to a considerable extent is unresolveable except on the level of ideology — Angus MacInnis, for one, remained convinced that schooling was beneficial to the children of working people, just as it was to all children: "Knowledge is essential for universal progress but fatal to class privilege." It was for this reason, he argued, that "property owners, financial magnates and others who live off the toil of the workers" acted "in an underhand way, such as refusing the funds for carrying it on" through opposing money bylaws.[170] And to a considerable extent business interests confirmed the charge, as exemplified by the Rotary Club petition to the Putman-Weir Commission urging that high school fees be imposed in an effort to limit attendance on the grounds "that high schools gave many students desires and aspirations which they would never attain and could never gratify. It created a dissatisfied class."[171] In this sense, the acceptance of working-class representation on the school board, the bylaw victories resulting in improved school conditions, and the Putman-Weir Report represented substantial victories for working people.

Possible explanations for working-class behaviour in Vancouver must

[168]*Labor Statesman*, 9 December 1927.
[169]*Colonist*, 12 August 1924.
[170]*B.C. Federationist*, 15 August 1924.
[171]*Colonist*, 17 July 1924, and July 1924 clipping, "Education Here Should be Made More Practical Investigators Are Told," clipping scrapbook. See also April 1925 clipping, "What Putman Thinks of B.C.," where he remarks on the "number of people in British Columbia with very conservative ideas as to education, and who retain the old idea that individual parents should pay for the teaching of their own children."

take into account the labour despondency of the 1920s. As unions retreated in the larger arena, so individuals turned inward to family and neighbourhood. Particularly in urban environments once public transportation made possible a choice of residential location for all but the very poor, considerable distance often existed between family and workplace. More significant than the blocks or miles was a psychological separation which meant that, once home, working people could reallocate their points of reference. In the case of Vancouver, where proportions of home ownership were relatively high, this could often be done in conditions of quiet pride.[172] While not abandoning the class identity which characterized relations in the workplace, they added to it other elements of identity also significant in their lives, including aspirations for family and neighbourhood which extended into support for common social infrastructure. Working-class women, whose lives were largely constrained within family and neighbourhood, may have played an influential and even decisive role in shaping priorities.[173] Wage-earning families, at least in Vancouver during the 1920s, were far more responsive to particular conditions of time and place than broadly based generalizations might have us believe.

Vancouver working people understood the conundrum inherent in schools' reproductive function but, due in part perhaps to their self-confidence emanating from a firmly based class identity, they also believed in their children's ability to use education as a liberating experience rather than being conditioned by it into the existing socio-economic order. That other groups in the society benefitted as much or more than did working people should not be equated with their receiving no benefit. Indeed, it was middle-class business interests, supposedly the prime beneficiaries of schooling perceived as class imposition, that led the opposition to its extension. To the extent that class confrontation existed over education, it was within the middle class, not between classes.[174]

[172]This point is especially well made by Deryck W. Holdsworth; see, for instance, his "Cottages and Castles for Vancouver Home-Seekers," *BC Studies*, 69-70 (1986), 11-32. McDonald's conclusions in "Working Class Vancouver" substantiate those of Holdsworth.
[173]The assumption of most labour historians that working-class culture has its roots in the workplace not only results in studies per force focussing on male culture but to some extent obviates any need to see women as potential decision makers or instigators of the range of activities in which working people might choose to participate. The difficulties of locating women within working-class culture is compounded by the nature of the sources, even for women within the work force. As Creese points out in her admirable effort to move beyond these limitations, the very term "worker" in the Vancouver labour press, 1900-39, assumed a white male ("Working Class Politics," 46).
[174]Vancouver's middle class was clearly more complex than use of the term would suggest. What seems in the case of schooling to have been intra-class confrontation undoubtedly had a logical basis, being possibly a division between business and other interests. Or it may

More generally, the Vancouver case study confirms the utility of searching out new points of intersection into the lives of working people and their relationships with other classes in the society. By so doing, we may well discover that in many areas of everyday life, not just in the matter of their children's schooling, working people in Canada have been far more pragmatic and resourceful than much of the historiography would have us believe.[175] Rigid, determinist models of social relations premised on ideological commitment limit as much as they expand the horizons for research and analysis. In Vancouver during the 1920s working people went far beyond merely reacting to imposition. By taking the initiative in ways consistent with their working-class identity but in combination with like-minded individuals across the city, they effected significant changes of benefit to the entire community.

An earlier version of this essay was presented at the Fourth B.C. Studies Conference, Victoria, November 1986. I am grateful to Elizabeth Lees, R.A.J. McDonald, Richard Mackie, Keith Ralston, Peter Seixas, and J. Donald Wilson for their thoughtful comments; to students in EDST 500, fall term 1986 at UBC, for their stimulating insights on related issues; and to the four manuscript assessors of Labour/Le Travail for their helpful critiques. Funds provided by the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council to the Canadian Childhood History Project facilitated research.

---

have been ideologically based with the priorities of the conservative — perhaps Conservative — faction coming to fruition in the Kidd Report, those of the liberal — Liberal? — faction in such activist documents as the Putman-Weir Report. The latter faction, which clearly included a number of organized groups in the city, may well have been more comfortable with a reformist working class than with conservative business and financial interests. Among entry points to the subject would be analysis of property owners' coalitions, including the Associated Property Owners, also active in the mid-1930s on the ward issue (see Andrea Smith, "The CCF, NPA, and Civic Change: Provincial Forces Behind Vancouver Politics 1930-1940," *BC Studies*, 53 [1982], 55).

[175]Certainly, exceptions exist, perhaps most of all within women's history, as in the work of Bettina Bradbury (for example, "Pigs, Cows, and Boarders: Non-Wage Forms of Survival Among Montreal Families," *Labour/Le Travail*, 14 [1984], 9-48).

TABLE 1
Status of Children Aged 10-14 in Canada, 1911, 1921, and 1931

	Male		Female	
	% in school	% at work	% in school	% at work
Canada				
1911	79.4	4.9	80.0	2.3
1921	88.7	5.3	88.7	1.1
1931	93.6	3.1	93.3	0.5
Maritimes				
1911	82.5	3.6	84.2	1.3
1921	86.8	4.2	87.4	1.0
1931	92.7	2.9	93.4	0.5
Quebec				
1911	78.5	5.0	79.0	2.4
1921	84.7	8.6	84.5	1.6
1931	88.9	6.3	87.7	0.9
Ontario				
1911	83.5	5.8	84.2	2.8
1921	91.8	4.0	91.7	1.1
1931	96.4	1.7	96.3	0.3
Manitoba				
1911	75.8	4.5	77.0	2.1
1921	90.9	3.7	91.0	0.7
1931	95.0	2.3	94.7	0.3
Saskatchewan				
1911	69.7	3.0	68.7	1.7
1921	89.5	5.7	89.3	0.7
1931	96.0	1.2	95.8	0.1
Alberta				
1911	65.8	3.3	65.5	1.6
1921	91.4	2.0	91.3	0.2
1931	96.6	1.1	96.5	0.1
British Columbia				
1911	76.6	6.5	76.7	1.7
1921	91.2	2.2	91.3	0.5
1931	95.8	0.8	96.0	0.2

Source: The Employment of Children and Young Persons in Canada (Ottawa, 1930), 26; and Census of Canada, 1931, v.1, 115-133; and v.7, 62-179. NB: Canada totals also include the Yukon and Northwest Territories. The Maritimes are grouped together for space considerations, since data was similar between provinces. Data is unavailable for separate ages.

TABLE 2
Status of Young People Aged 15 in Canada,
1911, 1921 and 1931

	Male		Female	
	% in school	% at work	% in school	% at work
Canada				
1911	40.6	NA	44.2	NA
1921	49.4	40.8	53.2	12.4
1931	65.7	26.6	67.6	6.0
Maritimes				
1911	49.6	NA	56.2	NA
1921	52.8	32.3	60.3	8.0
1931	62.8	24.6	70.1	6.1
Quebec				
1911	29.6	NA	32.9	NA
1921	38.5	49.6	40.4	14.3
1931	49.5	38.5	48.1	10.2
Ontario				
1911	44.4	NA	47.2	NA
1921	51.5	40.8	56.1	16.4
1931	76.1	19.5	78.0	4.5
Manitoba				
1911	49.1	NA	48.6	NA
1921	56.4	35.5	60.8	10.0
1931	68.0	24.9	71.7	4.1
Saskatchewan				
1911	38.4	NA	42.5	NA
1921	49.9	45.4	53.8	7.2
1931	65.7	29.5	71.6	2.9
Alberta				
1911	43.7	NA	49.5	NA
1921	65.1	26.5	68.8	4.7
1931	74.6	21.2	80.0	2.6
British Columbia				
1911	46.3	NA	55.2	NA
1921	64.1	24.5	69.4	7.5
1931	81.8	12.0	83.2	4.1

Source: As in Table 1.

TABLE 3
Status of Young People Aged 16 and 17 in Canada, 1911, 1921 and 1931

	Male		Female	
	% in school	% at work	% in school	% at work
Canada				
1911	17.6	NA	21.4	NA
1921	23.3	67.8	29.2	25.9
1931	35.0	55.1	39.8	20.7
Maritimes				
1911	20.2	NA	28.2	NA
1921	24.0	66.5	34.0	25.4
1931	30.5	53.4	43.6	17.1
Quebec				
1911	13.1	NA	15.0	NA
1921	18.8	71.6	21.1	26.3
1931	26.2	62.3	25.9	25.4
Ontario				
1911	19.2	NA	22.7	NA
1921	24.6	68.4	30.5	32.5
1931	40.8	50.4	49.8	23.7
Manitoba				
1911	22.1	NA	26.2	NA
1921	26.5	65.4	33.9	24.6
1931	38.4	52.8	43.6	17.7
Saskatchewan				
1911	16.0	NA	19.8	NA
1921	22.9	72.8	29.6	16.5
1931	32.7	61.1	41.8	11.4
Alberta				
1911	20.4	NA	24.4	NA
1921	30.4	61.1	39.3	15.6
1931	40.4	53.8	48.8	11.5
British Columbia				
1911	20.5	NA	27.5	NA
1921	31.9	55.2	43.1	23.7
1931	46.5	42.9	52.9	19.2

Source: As in Table 1. NB: Data is unavailable for separate ages.

TABLE 4
Status of Older Children and Young People in British Columbia, Urban British Columbia and Vancouver, 1921 and 1931

		Both Sexes		Males		Females	
		% in school	% at work	% in school	% at work	% in school	% at work
AGES 10-14							
BC:	1921	91.2	1.4	91.2	2.2	91.3	0.5
	1931	95.9	0.5	95.8	0.8	96.0	0.2
Urban BC:	1921	95.8	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	1931	97.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vancouver:	1921	NA	1.3	NA	1.7	NA	0.8
	1931	98.1	0.2	NA	0.3	NA	0.2
AGE 15							
BC:	1921	66.7	16.1	64.1	24.5	69.4	7.5
	1931	82.5	8.1	81.8	12.0	83.2	4.1
Urban BC:	1921	73.1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	1931	86.3	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vancouver:	1921	NA	16.1	NA	22.1	NA	9.9
	1931	NA	6.9	NA	9.9	NA	4.2
AGES 16-17							
BC:	1921	39.9	37.4	31.9	55.2	43.1	23.7
	1931	49.6	31.3	46.5	42.9	52.9	19.2
Urban BC:	1921	43.4	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
	1931	54.7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA
Vancouver:	1921	NA	40.1	NA	48.9	NA	31.8
	1931	NA	30.4	NA	37.2	NA	24.0

Source: *Employment of Children*, 26; and *Census of Canada*, 1921, v.2, 104-105 and 720-21; v.4, 554-75; and 1931, v.1, 115-33 and 1154-55; v.3, 36-37; and v.7, 62-179 and 238-49. NB: 1921 Vancouver totals exclude Point Grey and South Vancouver, amalgamated with Vancouver in 1929.

TABLE 5
Programs Chosen by Pupils Enrolled in Upper Three Grades in Vancouver High Schools, Selected Years 1920-32, by Percentages

	20/21	21/22	25/26	26/27	30/31	31/32
Academic	74.0	74.5	73.0	72.1	77.3	77.9
Technical	12.8	14.7	14.6	12.6	11.6	10.6
Commercial	13.2	10.8	12.3	15.3	11.1	11.5

Source: BC, Department of Education, *Annual Report*, 1920/21, F8-11; 1921/22, C8-13; 1925/26, R6-11; 1926/27, M4-6 and M12; 1930/31, L4-9; and 1931/32, L5-8. NB: Years 1920-27 exclude Point Grey and South Vancouver. The upper three grades comprised 8-10 in 1920-22, 9-11 in 1925-27, 10-12 in 1930-32.

TABLE 6
Pupils Enrolled in Grades 4-8 in Vancouver Schools, 23/24-26/27,
As a Percentage of Mean Number in Grades 1-3, by Geographical Areas

	Mean number in grades 1-3	Grade 4	Grade 5	Grade 6	Grade 7	Grade 8
West End						
23/24	242	.89	.88	.90	1.01	.99
24/25	227	1.10	.89	.88	1.12	1.07
25/26	221	1.28	.92	1.02	.86	1.24
26/27	215	1.03	1.07	1.07	1.13	1.00
Business District						
23/24	234	.82	.76	.77	.97	.54
24/25	200	1.05	.96	.71	1.01	.84
25/26	181	1.01	1.10	1.00	.75	1.14
26/27	205	.77	.80	.78	.88	.91
East End						
23/24	414	.70	.55	.61	.63	.37
24/25	403	.91	.74	.56	.59	.59
25/26	389	.84	.98	.68	.70	.51
26/27	389	.84	.81	.71	.70	.48
Hastings						
23/24	258	.88	.52	.79	.87	.64
24/25	247	1.02	.91	.63	1.03	.73
25/26	277	.89	.91	.80	.67	.94
26/27	329	.75	.77	.74	.54	.88
Grandview						
23/24	544	.77	.78	.75	1.12	.99
24/25	512	1.15	.91	.82	1.09	1.13
25/26	521	1.05	1.08	.98	1.02	1.07
26/27	542	.98	.98	1.03	1.05	1.01
Mount Pleasant						
23/24	256	.91	.77	.91	1.44	.80
24/25	244	1.09	.98	.93	1.07	1.14
25/26	234	1.13	1.14	.98	.92	1.25
26/27	263	.94	.96	1.02	.88	1.03
Fairview						
23/24	218	.83	.92	.97	1.03	.89
24/25	197	1.24	.87	1.01	1.28	1.03
25/26	199	1.11	1.09	.89	1.21	1.17
26/27	211	.98	1.02	.99	.86	1.08
Kitsilano						
23/24	405	.76	.86	.98	.89	.79
24/25	397	1.11	.84	.97	.98	1.25
25/26	430	.85	.92	.81	.79	1.09
26/27	388	1.11	1.02	.93	.97	1.09

Source: BC, Department of Education, *Annual Report,* and Putman and Weir, 431-32, map. NB: British Columbia pupils were not graded prior to 1923; later years cannot be calculated due to introduction of large junior high schools taking grade 7 and 8 pupils away from local schools. Where schools' locations were between geographical areas, enrolment has been divided. The reality was more complex and some pupils transferred between schools depending on space. East End calculations are ambiguous, since some children repeated early grades owing to lack of English.

TABLE 7
Employment of Boys and Young Men in Vancouver, 1921 and 1931

	Ages 10-14		Age 15		Ages 16-17	
	1921	1931	1921	1931	1921	1931
% of age group in selected occupations:						
Farming, fishing logging, hunting	Neg	Nil	0.5	Neg	1.3	0.4
Industrial work	0.3	Neg	5.0	1.5	10.6	11.8
Unskilled labour	0.2	0.1	4.6	1.7	10.1	6.9
Sales	0.2	Nil	2.7	0.7	8.7	3.7
Clerical work	Nil	Neg	2.0	0.6	8.1	3.8
Messenger work	0.7	0.1	5.6	4.6	4.1	8.4
Domestic service	0.2	Neg	0.8	0.2	1.8	0.7
% of age group employed:	1.7	0.3	22.1	9.6	48.9	37.2

Source: Census of Canada, 1921, v.2, 104-105; v.4, 554-75; 1931, v.3, 36-37; and v.7, 238-49. NB: 1921 totals exclude Point Grey and South Vancouver.

TABLE 8
Employment of Girls and Young Women in Vancouver, 1921 and 1931

	Ages 10-14		Age 15		Ages 16-17	
	1921	1931	1921	1931	1921	1931
% of age group in selected occupations:						
Professions	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil	1.3	0.2
Industrial work	0.1	Neg	2.0	0.9	8.7.	3.6
Sales	0.1	Neg	1.7	0.4	5.9	3.7
Clerical work	Nil	Nil	1.2	0.3	7.4	4.9
Messenger work	0.1	Nil	0.5	Nil	0.2	0.3
Restaurant work	Nil	Nil	0.2	0.3	1.4	1.7
Domestic service	0.3	0.1	3.4	2.0	5.5	7.2
% of age group employed:	0.8	0.2	9.9	4.2	31.8	24.0

Source: As in Table 7.
NB: 1921 totals exclude Point Grey and South Vancouver

TABLE 9
Proportions of Votes Received by Labour Candidates For the Vancouver School Board, 1920-27

	West End	Business District	East End	Hastings	Grandview	Mount Pleasant	Fair view	Kitsilano	Overall % received
Angus MacInnis [street railway conductor] (1921)	10.5	22.3	38.1	68.8	51.4	71.4	34.6	15.6	35.6
MacInnis (1922)*	24.0	32.8	66.1	89.3	68.7	89.2	47.1	27.9	55.7
W.J. Downie [sanapractic physician] (1923)	27.0	35.7	47.9	52.7	55.1	50.6	37.3	33.5	41.7
Downie (1924)	23.2	23.9	36.3	43.4	33.0	34.6	24.9	22.3	29.7
A.V. Lofting [motorman] (1924)	14.5	17.9	39.1	50.9	37.2	37.0	25.4	21.4	29.9
Robert Skinner [clerk] (1924)	9.6	13.8	21.9	25.8	23.7	23.1	14.4	14.6	18.2
Lofting (1925)	32.3	41.7	64.2	77.6	63.7	65.7	48.1	46.1	55.5
Lofting (1926)*	36.0	49.7	62.9	90.8	63.5	78.1	55.0	46.0	59.9
Fred Knowles* [mail carrier] (1927)	44.7	39.1	67.7	77.0	63.8	73.7	47.4	47.8	57.1
Mean % of nine candidates	25.3	31.9	49.6	62.9	51.1	60.3	35.9	30.7	42.6

Source: Press accounts and "Nominations and Elections," v.1-2 (MCR4), City of Vancouver Archives, NB: * = elected. Subsequent elections are not directly comparable due to Vancouver's amalgamation with Point Grey and South Vancouver.

TABLE 10
Voting Patterns on Money Bylaws on Schools, 1918-28, With Area Variations from Vancouver Mean

	West End	Business District	East End	Hast-ings	Grand-view	Mount Pleas-ant	Fair view	Kit-silano	Overall % in favour
1918									
High School	−0.6	−14.1	−9.5	+1.3	−0.3		+10.0		48.3
Heating	+0.5	−14.4	−9.8	+1.6	−1.4		+10.0		50.1
Construction	+1.1	−7.4	−8.9	−1.6	−0.7		+10.3		57.1
1919a									
Technical and other schools	−11.8*	−15.5	−2.1	+16.1*	−6.0		+5.2*		31.0
Equip above	−9.8*	−12.0	−0.6	+13.0*	−7.5		+4.8*		27.9
Sites	−8.0	−13.7	−2.5	+16.1	−7.3		+5.0		27.4
1919b									
Technical and Kitsilano school	−6.4	−20.6	−11.7	+3.3	+3.1		+13.4*		50.7
Equip above	−4.9	−22.0	−11.5	+5.6	+4.2		+11.6*		49.3
WE school	−4.3*	−18.3	−11.9	+5.5	+4.5		+10.1		19.1
Equipment	−5.0	−24.0	−12.6	+3.6	+4.4		+13.0		49.4
Hastings school	−5.9	−20.9	−11.0	+11.9*	+3.6		+10.1		44.4
1920									
Technical school	−3.5	−20.3	−11.5	+9.4	+1.1		+11.2		35.2
Construction	−5.1	−22.2	−13.7	+11.9	+1.3		+12.8		44.9
Equipment	−6.4	−22.6	−13.2	+9.8	+1.4		+13.9		42.9
Heating	−3.8	−21.2	−13.2	+12.1	+1.9		+11.3		41.1
1921									
Hastings school	−7.1	−13.1	−17.0	+8.1*	−3.3	+4.3	+1.6	+16.1	52.7
Equip above	−6.1	−12.4	−16.4	+6.1*	−0.3	+4.2	−0.4	+14.1	50.0
Heating	−8.7	−10.3	−16.7	+8.6	−2.0	+2.2	+2.0	+14.3	53.3
1922a									
WE high school	+3.5*	−2.4	−11.9	+1.1	+1.2	−3.4	+1.6	+9.1	30.1
Site for above	+6.4*	−2.0	−14.6	+1.1	−0.5	−7.1	+1.4	+10.6	31.0
Equipment	−2.4	−16.5	−16.7	+5.3	+1.9	−1.7	+5.9	+11.3	48.1
1922 b									
Grandview school	−3.9	−11.7	−11.4	−1.3	+15.4*	−0.2	nil	+4.7	60.3
1923									
WE high school	+0.4*	−8.7	−19.0	−0.7	+2.0	−5.2	+3.6	+11.6	43.4
1924a									
Kitsilano school	+0.3	−1.1	−28.0	−2.3	−2.3	−5.6	+3.4	+14.7*	53.0
Hastings school	−7.6	−5.8	−22.0	+12.2*	−1.6	+0.7	+0.9	+6.6	57.1
WE high school	+13.5*	−2.7	−16.1	+2.7	−6.2	−4.3	−2.9	+7.5	34.5
Sites	+1.0	−1.5	−20.0	+0.2	−3.6	−3.2	+1.0	+11.2	47.5
1924b									
Hastings school	−7.3	−13.5	−13.7	+11.1*	+2.2	−0.5	−2.5	+1.9	70.7
MP school	−5.7	−13.6	−18.4	+1.9	+1.5	+5.1*	−1.7	+5.4	68.8
Kitsilano school	−3.5	−11.2	−18.6	+0.6	+0.3	+1.3	−2.2	+9.0*	68.7

(TABLE 10 CONT'D)

	West End	Business District	East End	Hastings	Grandview	Mount Pleasant	Fair view	Kitsilano	Overall % in favour
1925									
Grandview and Hastings schools	−10.2	−10.1	−9.5	+10.7*	+8.5*	−1.5	−9.5	+0.4	73.4
1926									
Junior high schools	−2.6	−6.5	−8.6	+6.6	+1.0*	−2.0*	−8.2	+4.7*	68.4
1927a									
Primary schools	−5.1	−8.8	−16.5	+13.1*	−1.2*	+4.5*	−6.6	+1.8	65.6
Technical school	−1.5	−7.0	−19.6	+4.4	+1.6	+1.0	−4.2	+4.6	61.0
1927b									
Junior high schools	−7.2	−9.3	−8.5	+7.7	+7.9*	−2.9*	−6.9	+5.9*	66.9
1928									
Technical school	−0.9	−5.7	−23.6	+11.9	+8.6	−1.5	−11.1	+0.9	63.2

Source: As in Table 9. NB: * = area in which a proposed school or school improvement was located. 60% overall favour was necessary for passage.

TABLE 11
Voting Patterns on Representative Money Bylaws, 1919-28, With Area Variations From Vancouver Mean

	West End	Business District	East End	Hastings	Grandview	Mount Pleasant	Fair view	Kitsilano	Overall % in favour
Waterworks (1919a)	−9.7	−12.4	−2.8	+14.7	−9.9		+13.2		19.4
Bridge (1919b)	−15.3	−18.8	−9.7	+6.7	+7.2		+8.2		43.8
Maternity hospital (1920)	0.3	−18.3	−12.1	+10.2	−1.5		+11.2		31.8
Waterworks (1921)	−7.3	−9.7	−16.8	−1.8	−5.1	+7.9	+0.8	+12.5	54.2
Sewers (1922a)	−3.9	−14.9	−12.6	+11.3	+21.1	+1.3	+0.5	+9.7	53.9
City Hall (1922b)	+9.0	+7.2	−5.0	+1.1	−4.5	−5.3	+3.2	+1.0	24.4
Stanley Park (1924a)	+9.8	+0.8	−12.2	−8.4	−2.0	−0.5	+2.7	+8.2	69.1
Juvenile home (1925)	−1.5	−4.0	−11.3	+1.1	+2.4	−0.9	+0.9	+2.8	49.4
Playgrounds (1925)	+0.4	−2.0	−16.1	+5.8	−5.5	−5.6	−5.7	+11.2	59.8
Hastings Park (1925a)	−8.2	−11.7	−4.3	+16.1	+2.9	−2.5	−7.9	−4.0	36.6
Maternity Hospital (1926)	−5.2	−8.5	−5.1	+3.0	+4.9	−4.8	−4.3	+7.1	71.4
City hall (1927a)	+17.0	+25.4	−16.9	+2.5	−3.6	−5.6	−11.2	+2.7	54.3

Source: As in Table 9. NB: 60% overall in favour was necessary for passage.

TABLE 12
Percentage of Pupils in Previous Grade Retained into Grades 8-12
In British Columbia and Vancouver, 1927/28-1932/33

	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33
British Columbia:						
Grade 8	102.0	90.9	95.0	97.4	98.9	100.8
Grade 9	65.4	74.3	73.8	74.7	76.8	73.2
Grade 10	69.7	72.2	66.6	80.0	78.7	75.4
Grade 11	64.9	64.1	61.0	70.1	56.3	62.5
Grade 12	——	15.5	18.9	19.2	49.6	81.7
Vancouver:						
Grade 8	110.0	97.1	106.9	103.1	106.5	109.2
Grade 9	79.5	88.8	91.9	90.3	93.8	96.1
Grade 10	73.7	74.2	62.9	79.6	81.0	79.5
Grade 11	61.1	60.7	60.6	74.6	57.4	68.1
Grade 12	——	13.4	23.2	25.3	48.6	77.7

Source: BC, Department of Education, *Annual Report,* 1926/27, 9, M4-9, 12, 24-37, 53-57 and 63-69; 1927/28, 7, V4-9, 12-13, 25-36, 53-56 and 63-68; 1928/29, 7, R4-7, 13-15 and 27-47; 1929/30, 7, Q5-8, 13-15 and 27-47; 1930/31, 9, L4-8, 14-16 and 27-48; 1931/32, 9, L5-8, 15-17 and 28-48; 1932/33, 9, M5-8, 17-19 and 30-49. NB: Data is directly comparable between years, since Vancouver figures for 1927/28 and 1928/29 include Point Grey and South Vancouver. Incomplete data makes earlier years impossible to calculate.

TABLE 13
Vancouver Young People in Public Schools, 1927/28-1932/33
As a Percentage of 14-year-olds in school in the Same Year

	27/28	28/29	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33
15-year-olds	67.6	77.4	68.4	82.7	82.3	95.7
16-year-olds	40.1	44.9	39.1	44.4	59.0	71.0
17-year-olds	19.5	21.8	13.7	18.1	26.2	39.1
18-year-olds	5.4	8.2	4.2	4.6	8.7	12.0

Source: VBST, *Annual Report,* 1927, 73-76; 1928, 73-80; 1929, 77-84; 1930, 67-74; and 1931, 25-32; and *Census of Canada,* 1931, v.3, 68-69. NB: years 1927-29 exclude Point Grey and South Vancouver. Totals age-correlated to provincial totals to eliminate young people moving into Vancouver from elsewhere. Table presumes approximately equal annual cohorts of 14-year-olds, which was the case. Incomplete data makes earlier years impossible to calculate.

TABLE 14
Percentage Change over Base Year of 1921 in Youth and Apprenticeship Employment in Wage Labour in British Columbia, 1922-32

	Males under 18	Females under 18	Apprentices (all ages)
1921	0 (n=1048)	0 (n=412)	0 (n=747)
1922	+ 12.7%	+ 11.9%	− 15.3%
1923	+ 24.9%	+ 24.8%	+ 19.3%
1924	+ 18.8%	− 5.3%	+ 20.2%
1925	+ 31.1%	+ 36.7%	+ 49.3%
1926	+ 84.1%	+ 93.0%	+ 71.5%
1927	NA	+ 86.7%	+108.0%
1928	NA	+125.5%	+117.9%
1929	NA	+134.0%	+124.4%
1930	NA	+ 51.7%	+ 71.5%
1931	NA	+ 32.5%	+ 21.2%
1932	NA	+ 25.5%	− 3.3%

Source: BC, Department of Labour, *Annual Report*, 1921-32. NB: Over the decade, 1921-31, the number of 15 to 17-year-olds resident in British Columbia increased by 63.9 per cent. *Census of Canada*, 1921, v.2, 63, and 1931, v.3, 66.

TABLE 15
Overage Pupils in Grades 8-12 as a Percentage of Total Pupils in Each Grade in Vancouver Schools, 1929-33

	29/30	30/31	31/32	32/33
Grade 8	42.6	44.8	42.8	41.1
Grade 9	39.5	40.5	41.6	40.2
Grade 10	29.8	34.6	38.3	39.2
Grade 11	24.9	28.0	28.4	31.7
Grade 12	23.3	16.7	15.3	19.4

Source: VBST, *Annual Report*, 1929, 77-84; 1930, 67-74; 1931, 25-32; and 1932-33, 61-68.

TABLE 16
Percentage of School Attendance by Offspring Aged 15 and Over
Living at Home in Vancouver Wage-Earning Families, 1921 and 1931

	1921	1931	Rate of Increase
Offspring of:			
Wage earning professionals	31.7	50.5	+ 59.3%
Managers	23.7	48.5	+104.6%
Clerical employees	24.8	34.2	+ 37.9%
Skilled workers	21.8	30.4	+ 39.4%
Unskilled labourers	13.7	22.3	+ 62.8%
All wage earners	21.8	31.3	+ 43.6%

Source: *Census of Canada,* 1921, v.3, 524-30; and 1931, v.5, 908-17. NB: 1921 totals exclude Point Grey and South Vancouver, making "Rate of increase" at best suggestive. Offspring of all ages were included so long as they were living at home.

TABLE 17
Comparison of Parental Occupations of UBC Students, 1928/29, With Occupations Of Employed Male Population of British Columbia Aged 35 and Over, 1931

	Employed BC males, aged 35 and over	UBC parents, 1928/29
Professionals	4.4%	28.4% (n = 378)
Managers and business	6.0%	20.7% (275)
Sales and clerical workers	9.1%	20.8% (277)
Skilled workers and unskilled labourers	67.6%	21.5% (286)
Farmers	12.9%	8.6% (114)

Source: UBC, *Annual Report of the President,* 1928/29, 9-11; and *Census of Canada,* 1931, v.7, 168-70 NB: Age group 35 and over was selected as cohort corresponding most closely with UBC data, which, however, refers to "parents" rather than males.