

Victoria Debates Its Post-industrial Reality: Tourism, Deindustrialization, and Store-Hour Regulations, 1900-1958

Michael Dawson

Volume 35, Number 2, Spring 2007

The Politics and Memory of Deindustrialization in Canada

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1015918ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015918ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine

ISSN

0703-0428 (print)

1918-5138 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Dawson, M. (2007). Victoria Debates Its Post-industrial Reality: Tourism, Deindustrialization, and Store-Hour Regulations, 1900-1958. *Urban History Review / Revue d'histoire urbaine*, 35(2), 14–24. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1015918ar>

Article abstract

By examining local debates about store-hour regulations in Victoria, BC, this article highlights the extent to which the city's decision to pursue tourism promotion as an economic alternative to traditional industry divided the local community. Some community members championed tourism as an effective alternative economic strategy and fought to eliminate the city's store-hour restrictions, especially the Wednesday half-holiday, because they believed these restrictions limited tourist expenditures. Others strenuously opposed the elimination of these restrictions on the grounds that they served the social and cultural interests of the local community. The article calls for a more flexible understanding of "deindustrialization" that views the term less as an "era" and more as an inherent characteristic of capitalism and argues that the recent literature on deindustrialization holds important lessons for historians examining the period before 1970.

Victoria Debates Its Post-industrial Reality: Tourism, Deindustrialization, and Store-Hour Regulations, 1900–1958

Michael Dawson

Abstract

By examining local debates about store-hour regulations in Victoria, BC, this article highlights the extent to which the city's decision to pursue tourism promotion as an economic alternative to traditional industry divided the local community. Some community members championed tourism as an effective alternative economic strategy and fought to eliminate the city's store-hour restrictions, especially the Wednesday half-holiday, because they believed these restrictions limited tourist expenditures. Others strenuously opposed the elimination of these restrictions on the grounds that they served the social and cultural interests of the local community. The article calls for a more flexible understanding of "deindustrialization" that views the term less as an "era" and more as an inherent characteristic of capitalism and argues that the recent literature on deindustrialization holds important lessons for historians examining the period before 1970.

Résumé

En examinant les débats qui ont eu lieu à Victoria, en Colombie-Britannique, sur les heures d'ouverture des magasins, cet article souligne jusqu'à quel point la décision de la municipalité de poursuivre le tourisme comme alternative économique à l'industrie traditionnelle a divisé la communauté locale. Certains membres de la communauté défendaient l'efficacité du tourisme comme alternative économique et réclamaient l'élimination des règlements municipaux sur les heures d'ouverture, notamment la fermeture d'une demi-journée le mercredi, croyant que ces restrictions limitaient les dépenses des touristes. D'autres s'opposaient vigoureusement à l'élimination de ces restrictions sous prétexte qu'elles servaient les intérêts culturels et sociaux de la communauté. Cet article appelle à une compréhension plus flexible de la « désindustrialisation » qui voit celle-ci moins comme « période historique » que comme caractéristique inhérente au capitalisme et soutient la littérature récente sur le thème de la désindustrialisation contient d'importantes leçons pour les historiens qui examinent la période d'avant 1970.

Empty streets and shuttered doors are an anachronism in this age of modern merchandising. The loss in tourist dollars is incalculable.

—Victoria *Daily Times* editorial, 1954¹

I can't see why we would benefit much by staying open and catering more to the tourists—just because a few American snobs complain about stores being closed Wednesday afternoon . . . Let them come at our convenience.

—Victoria resident James L. Carter, 1956²

Introduction

At first glance these statements appear to have very little to do with the issue of deindustrialization. Neither quotation employs the term and both concern *retail* sales rather than *industrial* production. Moreover, both quotes are from the 1950s rather than the 1970s and early 1980s—the period traditionally identified with deindustrialization in North America.³ And yet these quotes represent opposing sides involved in a series of debates in Victoria, BC, that were shaped by the local community's divided response to deindustrialization—debates on the regulation of store hours. This study explores these debates and examines the impact on the local community of Victoria's increasing dependence on tourism—a dependence brought about by the fact that Victoria's place as British Columbia's leading industrial centre had been usurped in the late nineteenth century by its mainland rival, Vancouver. A key issue in the debates was the extent to which the local community should be catering to tourists. While some elements of the local community argued that doing so was the only way to secure economic prosperity for the city, others countered that the city was catering to outsiders at the expense of the living standards of its own citizens. In exploring this tension, the study reveals the tangible manner in which Victoria's economic transformation from an industrial to a post-industrial city affected the local community—in this case by challenging the legitimacy of the city's half-day mid-week holiday, which had been created as a bulwark against the growing power of consumption to colonize leisure time and, thus, dictate the rhythms of daily life. Victoria's emerging post-industrial reality pitted visitors' leisure time (increasingly spent enjoying the fruits of a consumer society) against retail merchants' and workers' attempts to preserve *their common leisure time*.

By no means were debates about store-hour regulations confined to Victoria. Communities throughout BC and, indeed, elsewhere in Canada, grappled with this controversial issue throughout the twentieth century.⁴ What distinguished the debates in Victoria from those occurring elsewhere was the central focus on tourism expenditures.⁵ It would also be too much to argue that deindustrialization *directly caused* Victoria to abandon store-hour regulations. The city did so only in 1958—long after city officials had recognized the industrial primacy of Vancouver, which was also embracing six-day shopping. But recognition of the city's post-industrial reality by employers, employees, politicians, and the general public directly affected the manner in which these groups understood and experienced the economic transformation that was taking place and certainly assisted opponents of store-hour regulations in their campaigns to eliminate such restrictions. And for these reasons it is important that we explore these debates.

My aim in this article is to examine the connection between tourism and the social and cultural impact of deindustrialization. In doing so, I highlight the extent to which the literature on

deindustrialization can expand our understanding of social and economic history for the period before 1970. But I also use these store-hour debates to argue for a more flexible understanding of deindustrialization, one that recognizes the term not as an era per se, but as an inherent characteristic of capitalism. Adopting this approach allows us greater insight into the manner in which employers, service-sector workers, and the general public understood the economic and cultural forces that were affecting their lives during the twentieth century.

In some ways Victoria seems to fit perfectly into the traditional post-industrial thesis. After an unsuccessful attempt at sustaining industrial development, the city turned to the service sector (in this case, tourism) as an economic alternative. Indeed, back in 1986 Peter Baskerville went so far as to assert that Victoria was well suited for “a leadership role in the post-industrial world.”⁶ And yet the timing of this transition, which occurred in the first half of the twentieth century, flies in the face of so much of the literature exploring the relationship between tourism and deindustrialization. This literature emphasizes the extent to which North American communities turned to tourism as their last best chance to secure economic security in response to industrial collapse in the 1970s and 1980s.⁷ To reconcile these contradictions, and to illustrate the complex ways in which the local community was affected by, and responded to, this economic transition, one needs to break free from the traditional understanding of the timing and impact of deindustrialization and to see the connection between tourism and deindustrialization as less a product of a specific moment, the 1970s and 1980s, and more as a long-standing relationship that informed the social, cultural, and economic experience of Canadians throughout the twentieth century. One way of doing this is by broadening our notion of deindustrialization. As John Lutz perceptively notes, the very term *deindustrialization* is problematic: “With its prefix of ‘undoing,’ and suffix ‘becoming,’ it is a word unravelling itself” and it implies “the existence of a single process of ‘industrialization,’ . . . that no longer has credence.” In his study of the decline of British Columbia’s boiler and engine industry at the end of the nineteenth century, Lutz explains that his use of the term is meant to indicate “an economy changing specialization towards resource processing and away from secondary manufacturing.”⁸ In focusing on a later time, this study also examines the economic shift away from secondary manufacturing, but toward tourism and the service sector, rather than resource processing.

The dominant understanding of deindustrialization owes much to the work of Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison, who pointed to the end of the postwar boom in the early 1970s as a turning point in economic history in which the postwar Fordist compromise came asunder and management employed capital mobility, most visible through plant closings and relocations, as a strategy for increasing productivity and decreasing production costs.⁹ As Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott explain, “The dominant method of studying deindustrialization” has been “to trace the death of mills . . . and workers’ experiences of that process.”¹⁰ And yet more recent work has begun to question the

traditional definition of deindustrialization. According to Cowie and Heathcott, “Deindustrialization is not a story of a single emblematic place . . . or a specific time period,” but instead a “much broader, more fundamental, historical transformation.” After all, they admit, “The industrial age is alive and well, even if the locations have changed, and even if the rules of investment have shifted.”¹¹

Most illuminating on this issue is Mike Wallace. For Wallace the term *deindustrialization* is problematic in a number of ways—two of which are important for the purposes of this article. First, it tends to invoke a “stages-of-development-theory” in which “pre-industrial gives way to industrial, which then moves on to a service (or, as it is often called, a post-industrial) economy.” Such an understanding of history, he reminds us, leaves very little, if any, room for human agency. Community debates and decisions about economic priorities seem hardly worthwhile if one assumes that the transition to post-industrial society is simply inevitable. Second, the very terms *pre-industrial* and *post-industrial* fail to “illuminate the key characteristics of the epochs they seek to describe, other than by reference to some other period.”¹² Rejecting the limited notion of deindustrialization, Wallace encourages us instead to think in terms of the “global reorganization of capitalism.” “Industry . . . has not been surpassed,” he explains, “it has just *moved*.” From a global perspective, what we are witnessing is not deindustrialization, but “capital flight” in which corporations have become more mobile in their pursuit of “tax breaks, cheap land, or the muscle needed to repress the economic and political organization of labor.”¹³ Informing this mobility, Wallace reminds us, is the logic of capitalism: “The point of industrial production under capitalism is to make a profit for the firm, not simply to produce socially useful items.”¹⁴ Failing to seek out such opportunities to increase profits would be illogical.

It is the tangible edifices of industrial capitalism that make this last point somewhat counterintuitive. Physically imposing structures such as factories, lumber mills, and auto plants obscure what Wallace terms capitalism’s “quicksilver reality of mobility and relentless transformation.”¹⁵ As Cowie and Heathcott explain, “The aura of permanence that surrounded the industrial culture of Europe and the United States throughout the twentieth century has made the experience of deindustrialization seem more like the end of a historical epoch.”¹⁶ “The solidity of factories and tenements and steeples,” they explain, “masked a fundamental impermanence; it obscured the forces that both created this world through investment and broke it apart by withdrawing investment.”¹⁷ Similarly, Sharon Zukin underscores the limitations of terms like *deindustrialization* and *post industrial* precisely because they fail to capture “the simultaneous advance and decline of economic forms, or the sense that as the ground shifts under our feet, taller buildings continue to rise.”¹⁸

There is an important lesson here for historians of the twentieth century, for what is true of capitalism in the late twentieth century was true in the decades before the 1970s and 1980s: its capacity for creative destruction made modern life contingent and

provisional.¹⁹ But this lesson can be appreciated only if we bridge the historiographical divide between the earlier decades of the twentieth century and the post-1973 era (or the “post-postwar period” as Sharon Zukin mischievously labels it).²⁰ As Steven High reminds us, “Plant shutdowns did not begin in the 1970s, but have always existed alongside industrialization. Plants open in one place, only to close in another.”²¹ Similarly, Cowie and Heathcott challenge the binary opposition that posits a stable postwar era against a period of decline in the 1970s.²² In fact, they remind us that “the process we call deindustrialization was uneven in its causes, timing, and consequences, and the effects rippled through all aspects of society.”²³ This point is echoed by High, who refreshingly suggests that “the ‘golden age’ of the 1950s was far less stable and not nearly as prosperous as has been commonly supposed.”²⁴ To understand this we might follow the lead of Max Page who has called upon urban historians to recognize the impermanence, or provisional nature, of urban centres by placing “the process of creative destruction at the heart of the story of urban development.”²⁵ Recognizing the provisional nature of the period before the 1970s helps us to see the social and cultural impact of deindustrialization on what appears, on the surface, to be a stable period of economic growth—the calm before the storm of the 1970s.

One way to overcome the existing divide between scholarship on deindustrialization and that focusing on the pre-1970s era, is to recognize that some communities embraced tourism in response to declining primary industries well before the 1970s and 1980s. For example, in his study of Ketchikan, Alaska, Mike Dunning points out that this city, which began as a supply centre for a mining boom in the early twentieth century, endured cycles of industrial development and industrial decline, which opened its eyes to the importance of tourism by the middle of the century.²⁶ Similarly, James Overton demonstrates that Newfoundlanders turned to tourism in the late nineteenth century as an alternative to the periodic crises of the fishing industry.²⁷ Historians of Nova Scotia have also highlighted the manner in which that province’s government embraced tourism in the 1920s as a response to deindustrialization.²⁸ In the case detailed below, Victoria embraced tourism as an alternative to industrial development well before the 1970s, and the manner in which the local community responded to this economic transition can tell us a great deal about local responses to deindustrialization; at the same time, the vibrant literature on deindustrialization that focuses on the 1970s and 1980s provides important new ways to understand the economic and social reality of the pre-1970 period.

The Store-Hour Debates: A Divided Community Confronts the Provisional Nature of Victoria’s Economic Development

Today Victoria’s economy relies primarily upon its tourism, service, and government sectors. During the 1880s, however, civic leaders could be forgiven for believing that the city could look forward to a promising future as a manufacturing centre.

During that decade, Peter Baskerville explains, the city’s “gross value of manufacturing production increased 3.5 times” and “when ranked by per capita value of manufacturing production, Victoria stood fifth out of the twenty Canadian towns and cities with a population in excess of 10,000.”²⁹ But the tide quickly changed. Bolstered by its newfound position as the CPR’s western terminus in the 1880s, Vancouver quickly supplanted Victoria as British Columbia’s leading port, and throughout the 1890s Victoria’s economy was outpaced by its mainland rival.³⁰ “By 1901,” Baskerville notes, Victoria “had dropped from fifth to twentieth place in per capital value of manufacturing output.”³¹ “The prospects of Victoria becoming an important and diversified manufacturing center, so bright in the 1880s,” he explains, “had been severely dashed by the turn of the century.”³² And it was in this context, he notes, that “manufacturing and wholesale trade gradually took second place to tourism and government as the mainstays of the city’s economy.”³³ Even during the economic boom leading up to the Great War, the city’s economic expansion occurred without substantial industrial and manufacturing development.³⁴ The quest for industrial development did not end; even during the post-World War Two era some members of the business community argued “that the city must take a more active role in attracting industry.” The results, Baskerville notes, were hardly encouraging: “Even tiny Moose Jaw had had success in attracting industry from Victoria to its prairie site.”³⁵ Victoria, like North America more generally, “was becoming deindustrialized,” and “the pace of deindustrialization in Victoria put the city in the forefront of a major social and economic trend in North American urban life.”³⁶ Victoria’s economic response to its increasingly post-industrial reality focused largely on tourism promotion.³⁷

Ironically, Victoria first turned to tourism promotion as a method of boosterism that would attract deep-pocketed investors to the city with the hope that they would return in the future to reside in Victoria and contribute to the city’s industrial development. Only later was tourism identified as an important means of attracting outside expenditure to keep the local economy afloat. Victoria’s response to deindustrialization, then, focused firmly on catering to outsiders. Visitors to the city needed to be presented with a positive view of the city’s possibilities. Early in the century this meant ensuring that potential investors and settlers saw the city as a vibrant and productive centre that offered attractive investment opportunities; later the key concern was ensuring that visitors keen to spend money in local shops were not inconvenienced and were given ample opportunity to part with their cash. A central concern in both campaigns was the city’s store-hour regulations.

Victoria’s store-hour debates began in earnest in the first decade of the twentieth century when local store clerks petitioned city council for a common half-day, mid-week holiday. Periodically the debates would include the issue of evening store hours, but for the most part the fate of the half-day holiday remained paramount. Embraced by many merchants in the city, the Wednesday half-holiday was enshrined in provincial legislation

in 1916. Because retail clerks were otherwise unaffected by the province's Hours of Work legislation, they worked a five-and-a-half-day week. The Lord's Day Act ensured they did not work on Sunday, and the province's Half-Holiday Act guaranteed an additional half-day off each week.³⁸ In the absence of any specific hours of work legislation affecting retail clerks, store hours and hours of work became, for many employees, one and the same. Despite growing opposition in the 1920s and 1930s from merchants and other commercial interests (especially those in tourism-related businesses), the provincial government retained the Half-Holiday Act and amended it as needed to ensure its continued efficacy. The half-holiday in Victoria remained a controversial but workable compromise among consumers, merchants, employees, and larger commercial interests into the 1940s.

The extension of the retail half-holiday to a full day of closing during the Second World War on the grounds of conservation and patriotism proved the undoing of this compromise. Victoria adopted all-day closing on a voluntary basis during the war, and the elimination or retention of this temporary war measure became a key issue for civic voters once the war was over. In 1946 Victoria residents voted to return to half-day closing. Seemingly decided once and for all, the issue of store-hour regulation was revisited in an angry and divisive manner almost annually until the early 1960s. A 1954 Vancouver plebiscite eliminating Wednesday closing in that city placed even more pressure on Victoria to embrace a six-day shopping week. Finally, in 1958, faced with the decision of the neighbouring suburb of Saanich to eliminate all of its store-hour regulations, Victoria declared retail stores "wide open," and left merchants to set their own hours.³⁹

Throughout the period under study proponents of tourism squared off against other members of the local community on the issue of store-hour regulation, with each side claiming to represent the community's long-term interests. Opponents of store-hour regulations focused primarily upon tourism's economic benefits. Supporters of these regulations, and hence those who took issue with the pro-tourism lobby, emphasized instead the social and cultural advantages that the store-hour limitations ensured. In particular, they championed the common half-day holiday that allowed community members to participate in shared leisure activities and insisted that store-hour regulations protected retail clerks from overwork and exhaustion. Both sides voiced their positions fully aware of Victoria's post-industrial reality, and the debates that resulted offer us a window onto the concerns that this reality engendered—particularly the ongoing worry that even during the ostensibly stable postwar era Victoria's economic prosperity was fragile and provisional.⁴⁰

My larger project, of which this article forms a part, explores the complex and multi-layered nature of these debates in Vancouver and Victoria. Store-hour debates in these two cities reveal a great deal about popular attitudes toward consumerism, religion, gender relations, government regulation of economic activity, and, of course, as I argue in the following pages, competing

visions of the ideal recipe for civic prosperity. Not surprisingly, the relative centrality of these themes to public debate was not static; nor were these issues integrated into the debate in a consistent manner. In the early decades of the twentieth century, for example, gendered arguments about the need to protect female clerks from unfair working conditions appeared quite frequently in local newspapers. By the 1950s, however, the once-dominant trope of the victimized female clerk had been replaced by that of the unfortunate housewife who lacked easy and consistent access to consumer goods. And yet a close reading of the debates suggests that gender does not appear to have intersected very much with the specific issue of Victoria's dependence upon tourism. In short, in order to offer a coherent article-length exploration of the links between these debates and the theme of deindustrialization, one must recognize that not all of the varied issues that informed these debates (gender and religion, for example) appear in the pages that follow.

Tourism and the Opposition to Store-Hour Regulation

As early as 1908, Alex Peden, president of the local Merchants' Picnic Association, signalled his opposition to a common mid-week half-holiday on the grounds that he and other local business people "were of the opinion that it was not business-like and besides the fact that merchants lost trade, it gave outsiders, who might happen to be in town, a very bad impression of the energy and progressiveness of the city."⁴¹ Arthur Lineham, a key proponent of the city's developing tourist trade, was more forceful in asserting his opposition to the half-holiday. In 1923 Lineham explained to his fellow citizens that over the previous eighty years Victoria had proven itself incapable of luring traditional industry. Drawing upon an understanding of tourism promotion that equated it with immigration literature, Lineham argued that the tourist trade was the key to creating the right conditions that would, in turn, promote settlement and attract industry. To this end, Lineham attacked the city's half-day holiday with vigour, arguing that "to close the town up tight any day in the week but Sunday is business suicide, and makes us the laughing stock of every stranger entering our gates. Every business man and patriotic citizen in Victoria will endorse me when I say that the time has come when we must wake up and use every means of securing additional population and money to meet our obligations."⁴² For Lineham, proponents of the half-holiday were putting their own interests ahead of the community's well-being. The half-holiday, he explained, allowed "retail clerks and small storekeepers to have what they term a good time, not caring whether it is a loss to the majority in the community or not."⁴³ "I, personally, have no objection to any person playing any game he or she likes best on Sunday or any other day that suits his or her convenience," he continued. "There is no necessity, in my opinion, to turn the town into a morgue one day in the middle of the week on this account, making us a subject of ridicule to all visitors and helping to ruin the retailers and responsible tax payers, who carry the burden of the day."⁴⁴

Given that local tourism promotion in Victoria was originally understood to be a means of attracting industry and population,

it is not surprising that into the mid-1940s, tourism's proponents attacked store-hour restrictions on the grounds that such regulations damaged the city's desired reputation as a progressive and modern business centre that was eager to attract new customers and industry.⁴⁵ Hence Dale Johnson's 1925 complaint that the city's half-holiday prevented visitors from seeing Victoria as a "business-like and attractive" urban centre.⁴⁶ A similar position had been voiced eight years earlier when the Victoria Board of Trade opposed what one of its members termed "grandmotherly legislation" that was giving outsiders the impression that Victoria was "a village of lotus-eaters."⁴⁷ Even as the rationale behind tourism promotion was transformed from one that emphasized attracting investment to reverse the city's trend toward deindustrialization, to one that reluctantly accepted this development and focused almost exclusively on securing tourist expenditures instead of new investment, the concern that Victoria's civic image suffered because of store-hour restrictions remained prevalent. On the eve of a local plebiscite in 1946, the *Victoria Daily Times* railed against the possibility of all-day Wednesday closing by charging that such a move would present an image of complacency to the outside world.⁴⁸ Outsiders, the *Times* charged, would reach the conclusion "that the capital city of British Columbia is so satisfied with its present and future business outlook that it can afford to cut its retail week from five and a half days to five."⁴⁹ Such concerns were echoed by individual citizens. In a December 1946 letter to the *Times*, J. H. Davidson argued that closing stores during the tourist season did not "betoken Victoria as an up-and-coming city," while Elizabeth Davidson similarly argued that doing so "indicates a distinct lack of business acumen and puts a stamp of a small town upon a growing city."⁵⁰ Economic growth, of course, required investment capital—capital, these observers argued, that would be increasingly difficult to solicit if potential investors found themselves questioning the community's work ethic.

By the 1920s, and increasingly in the 1930s, however, tourism's proponents were beginning to embrace a new rationale—one recognizing that Victoria would never be able to compete with Vancouver for traditional industry. As Victoria Mayor David Leeming put it in 1934, Victoria's consistent failure to attract investment now meant that "the only hope of the City was to extend its tourist trade."⁵¹ Once it was recognized that reversing the trend toward deindustrialization was no longer possible, and that a new approach to economic development was required, tourism was increasingly championed as an effective method of increasing consumer demand for local retail goods. Where tourists had once been understood primarily as potential long-term settlers and investors, they were now increasingly thought of as short-term visitors who could be relied upon to infuse the local economy with their disposable income. As tourism promotion came to be equated with the campaign to secure not industry but expenditure, the call for decreased store-hour regulation underscored both the central contribution this cash infusion made to the local economy and the potential damage the city's current store-hour restrictions did to this external source of expenditure. In later decades, as Victoria came to rely

on tourism for a direct infusion of expenditure rather than as a back-door route to settlement, secondary manufacturing, and agricultural development, many argued that the city's prosperity was now even more reliant on tourism than ever before. In making their case, opponents of store-hour regulations pointed to tourists' complaints as well as to the concerns of a sizeable element of the local business community.

Opponents of specific store-hour regulations, along with those who led a determined effort to eliminate such regulations entirely, could point to a good deal of direct and indirect evidence that tourists, themselves, were frustrated by the half-day holiday, limited evening hours, and other restrictions. Indirect statements on behalf of tourists ranged from examples voiced by individual citizens, to more general complaints levelled by the business community. In a 20 May 1925 letter to the *Victoria Daily Colonist*, local citizen Dale Johnson argued against the city's Wednesday half-holiday by pointing out the inconvenience this posed for visiting tourists. When the *Kathleen* arrived in port the previous Wednesday from Seattle "with several hundred passengers all ready and eager to avail themselves of the opportunity of purchasing several different kinds of merchandise," he lamented, they "were disappointed to see all our stores closed."⁵² A similar incident was relayed to the larger community by "Observer" who, in June 1927, informed the *Times* of the plight of several frustrated American tourists. Having been told by "Observer" that the store they wished to enter was closed for the half-holiday, and not for lunch as they had assumed, one of the tourists responded sharply, "I always heard Victoria was dead, now I know it. We came here on purpose to get certain things which we are allowed to take over the border to the value of \$100. Now we must go without them."⁵³ More frequently, the tourists took their complaints directly to the local tourist office, which publicized these laments within the local community, while endeavouring to limit such adverse publicity from reaching other potential visitors.⁵⁴ In 1956 local tourism promoter George Warren endorsed the idea of six-day shopping so that there would be no repeat of the recent Fourth of July scenario in which US visitors found themselves unable to spend money at local shops. "One of the reasons they come here on a holiday is to shop in our stores, and then they find them closed on a weekday afternoon," he complained.⁵⁵ Such claims were buttressed, at times, with statistical evidence purportedly demonstrating that tourists were now avoiding Victoria on Wednesdays.⁵⁶

While opponents of store-hour regulations seized upon tourists' views, the debate was primarily within the local community and focused increasingly on how to maximize much-needed tourist expenditure. And tourist-dependent businesses were among the most vocal participants in this debate. In 1951 Alan Vizard of the Victoria Gift House charged that supporters of the half-day holiday were short-sighted and failed to recognize tourism's central place in the city's economy. "You would not get holiday centres like Banff and Jasper closing down in early afternoon during the tourist season," he explained, "and the sooner Victoria realizes it is just a massive tourist resort and acts accordingly

the better.”⁵⁷ Vizard's position was echoed by the city's mayor, Claude Harrison, who in 1953 bluntly asserted his opposition to Wednesday closings by stating, “This is a tourist town.”⁵⁸ Harrison's successor as mayor, Percy Scurrah, offered a similar explanation for his own opposition to a campaign to bring back full-day Wednesday closing: “It is crazy to suggest that a city which depends on tourist trade for survival should close down all day Wednesday.”⁵⁹ Victoria Chamber of Commerce president Stickney Harris Jr.'s 1957 declaration that six-day shopping was a necessity in Victoria was sparked by his concern that such a relaxation of store-hour regulations was necessary, given “the continued departure of industry to the mainland.”⁶⁰ Informing these concerns, as Stickney's comments illustrate, was the recognition that Victoria's early efforts at developing secondary industry had been undone by the rise of Vancouver and the outflow of industry to that city. A fear that the city's tourism industry might fall victim to a similar fate convinced many opponents of store-hour regulations that outside competition, in the form of more relaxed store-hour regulations, might well prove the final nail in the city's economic coffin. Hence the position voiced by the chamber's Tourist Trade Group (TTG) in 1954 that the expansion of store hours was now an urgent necessity because both Vancouver and Seattle boasted six-day shopping.⁶¹ Even allowing six-day shopping during the summer months, TTG member Sam Lane suggested, would place Victoria on an equal footing with Vancouver, if only temporarily.⁶²

Central to the campaign to eliminate such restrictions were the assertions that tourism brought a significant amount of economic prosperity to the city, and that this prosperity was widely shared throughout the community. Opponents of store-hour regulations consistently pointed to the central role that tourism played in bringing “new” money into the local economy. In 1953, for example, A. E. Newberry pilloried city council, and the citizens of Victoria more generally, for viewing antique shops with “a condescension almost bordering on superciliousness or disdain.” In fact, Newberry asserted, such shops “attract more tourists, probably than anything else the city has to offer.” As such they made an important if chronically unrecognized contribution to the local economy by bringing “new” money into the city. “The tourists do not come here to admire the beauty of the civic architecture or the excellence of the garbage trucks,” Newberry maintained. “They may stand in awe for a few minutes to gaze at the Parliament Buildings and the Empress Hotel, but they have to pass these buildings anyway on their road uptown from the ferry boats.” Their key aim, according to Newberry, was shopping. Limiting tourists' access to antique shops and the like was a foolhardy and unfair move.⁶³ R. A. Mackie, general manager of the CPR hotel chain concurred, arguing that Wednesday closings were denying the city much-needed revenue.⁶⁴

While Newberry and Mackie were content to assert tourism's importance in quite general terms, others offered more specific estimates of tourism's economic contribution to the local economy in the hope that this might win support for the dismantling of store-hour regulations.⁶⁵ In 1936 proprietor Montague

Bridgeman argued that the city's half-day holiday cost him between \$300 and \$400 a year.⁶⁶ Ten years later, George MacDonald, then chairing the retail merchants' section of the city's Chamber of Commerce, urged Victorians not to adopt all-day Wednesday closing, by arguing that such a move would negatively affect the city's tourism business. In making his point, MacDonald pointed to a 1938 survey that suggested that each tourist visiting the city spent \$132.⁶⁷ In 1951, officials for the CPR's BC Coast Steamship Service and the Black Ball Ferry Line produced statistical details of auto and foot passengers, to support their assertion that each year half-day closing cost Victoria “hundreds of thousands of dollars.”⁶⁸

The desperation to cater to tourists by expanding the city's shopping hours was motivated by the belief, among many prominent citizens and civic officials, that with the loss of traditional industry the city's economic future was increasingly dependent upon tourism, and the pro-tourism lobby remained a consistent opponent of store-hour regulations. However, the rationale behind tourism promotion changed during the 1930s and 1940s and, as a result, so did the content of the tourism lobby's arguments. Once motivated by an “investment imperative” that viewed tourism promotion as the most efficient means of boosting the city and attracting long-term settlement and investment, tourism promoters now found that the economic dislocation of the Great Depression encouraged them to embrace the “expenditure imperative,” which viewed tourists primarily as a source of outside expenditure to be lured to the city to boost local aggregate consumer demand.⁶⁹ From the tourism lobby's perspective, store-hour regulations remained anathema to tourism promotion, even though the tourism lobby's specific complaints changed over time. What remained consistent, however, was the notion that tourism had come to replace traditional industry as the city's economic lifeblood. Faced with Victoria's failure to challenge Vancouver as an industrial centre, these proponents of tourism promotion were anxious to ensure that the city was as tourist-friendly as possible. And that view, in turn, informed their campaign to eliminate store-hour restrictions that raised the ire of tourists and placed the city's economic future in jeopardy. Like the more recent tourism proponents who view tourism as a panacea to the complex social and economic problems that plague post-industrial communities, Victoria's pro-tourism lobby was anxious to protect its ability to lure outsiders to town.⁷⁰ But of course not everyone in Victoria agreed with the suggestion that tourism was the best, or even an unproblematic, approach to securing the city's economic future.

Who Benefits? Supporters of Store-Hour Regulation

Opponents of store-hour regulations boasted representation from a wide variety of subgroups within Victoria, including employers, employees, consumers, and even some labour organizations. But each of these subgroups also included an alternative voice that embraced restrictions such as the Wednesday half-holiday, even in the face of the growing power of the pro-tourism lobby. Some supported store-hour regulations because they didn't benefit directly from tourist expenditures

and, in fact, argued that expanding store hours would simply increase operating costs. Others pointed to the social costs that expanded store hours might bring. In particular, they sought to preserve the retail clerks' mid-week respite and opportunities for common leisure time.

Tourist-dependent operations such as hotels, restaurants, transportation companies, and souvenir stores railed against the injustice of restricted store hours and came together, in particular, in support of a six-day shopping week. In this endeavour they were opposed by department and retail stores who did not benefit to a great extent from tourist expenditure. Instead, these operations pointed to the added costs that reduced store-hour restrictions would bring.⁷¹ On one side of this fissure were the tourist-dependent stores. The Chamber of Commerce's Tourist Trade Group was their most vocal champion and consistently worked to undermine the legitimacy of store-hour regulations. Central to the TTG's 1946 arguments against restrictive store-closing regulations was the assertion that the entire community benefited from tourist expenditures.⁷² Hotel owner James Neely summed up this position nicely in 1951 when he asserted that "what is good for the hotel association and the tourists is also good for Victoria."⁷³

Significantly, such arguments could find support among local labour leaders. In 1953 Retail Clerks' Union representative John Aubrey signalled his organization's willingness to see the end of Wednesday closing, so long as retail workers were guaranteed a five-day, forty-hour week, with a ringing endorsement of the notion that all Victorians benefited from tourist expenditures. "Whatever is good economy for the employers," he explained, "will benefit the store workers also and the shopping public at large."⁷⁴ Aubrey's Retail Clerks' Union faced opposition on this issue from a splinter group of employees that joined the Five-Day Week Action Committee, led by Peter MacEwan. In their attempt to garner support for a return to all-day Wednesday closing, MacEwan's group went so far as to seek out an alliance with the city's department stores—an indication, perhaps, that workers' class identity was occasionally trumped by their occupational allegiance to either small tourism-dependent operations or large retailers.⁷⁵

Arguments in favour of eliminating store-hour regulations, then, did not go unchallenged. And, as MacEwan's decision to pursue an alliance with department stores suggests, the local business community was divided on the issue. In fact, retailers whose clientele did not consist primarily of visitors countered that not everyone benefited from tourism, and that the general interest of the community was being sacrificed to serve the interests of tourism-dependent businesses. In response to Alderman Brent Murdoch's claims that the half-day closing was hindering the city's prosperity, Courtney Haddock, store manager of the city's Woodward's department chain store pointedly asserted, "The business you get on Wednesday is not worth the powder to blow it to hell."⁷⁶ Tom Denny, manager of Standard Furniture and a past president of the city's Chamber of Commerce, offered a more quantitative argument when he used provin-

cial Department of Trade and Industry figures to assert that Wednesday afternoon shopping would put just \$3 in the pockets of each of the city's merchants. Factoring in the additional operating costs that the afternoon opening would require meant that abandoning the half-day closing was, in fact, unprofitable.⁷⁷ Denny's claim was clearly rather selective and somewhat facetious. Some store owners were certain to benefit more than others, and it was unlikely that tourist expenditures would be spread so widely across the city. But of course that was an important part of the story. The debate over store hours in Victoria did not always pit the business community against the workers. Nor did it simply pit externally controlled chain stores against independently owned local stores. It frequently divided the local business community itself. Hence, Denny charged the TTG with "being dictatorial to the retail merchants" and asserted, in a clever play on the usual pro-tourism rhetoric, that "what is good for the retail merchants is good for Victoria."⁷⁸

The division over tourism's impact was not based solely upon careful calculations of where tourist dollars were going. During the 1920s and 1930s, some observers began to voice concerns that the city's single-minded determination to preserve its tourist business was placing store-hour regulations, and the half-holiday in particular, in jeopardy, and that this, in turn, would have negative affects on the community's social and cultural well-being. For the Hudson Bay Company's A. J. Watson, public debates about store hours in the mid-1920s boiled down to the question of whether or not tourists should be dictating local bylaws.⁷⁹ As the pro-tourism lobby pushed for expanded shopping hours, a spokesperson for local retail clerks reminded city council in 1929 that longer hours came with a social cost for the clerks, which could include "a discontented body" and the "break up [of] home life."⁸⁰ A 1936 letter to the *Times* from G. W. Robinson urged the city to place the clerks' welfare ahead of other concerns, while challenging the Chamber of Commerce's perception that the half-day holiday threatened the city's tourist trade. Improved roads, he argued, held the key to expanding tourism, not longer store hours.⁸¹

Not surprisingly, as the pro-tourism lobby stepped up its rhetoric in the 1940s and 1950s and embraced the expenditure imperative, the champions of local autonomy and the retail clerks' welfare responded in kind. In voicing his support for continued Wednesday closing, Reg Williams, president of the local Meat Retailers' Association, accepted the view that tourist expenditures were desirable, but argued that the concerns and welfare of local residents must continue to be the city's first priority.⁸² Williams's arguments were echoed by furniture retailer Roy Denny, though in a more forceful manner: "We live in the city, not the tourists. We should have things the way we like."⁸³ Peter MacEwan, not surprisingly, offered a similar view by asking rhetorically, "What we would like to know is this—who is running the city—the tourist trade group or the city council?"⁸⁴

Such concerns were not voiced solely by clerks' representatives or retailers, such as Williams and Denny, who had little contact with tourists. During the 1940s and 1950s the *Colonist* returned

repeatedly to this issue in its editorials. Acknowledging, in 1949, that "anything so firmly entrenched in the business life of the community as the weekly half-holiday cannot be disturbed without the strongest of reasons," the *Colonist* took its arguments a step further in 1951 by focusing directly upon the welfare of the retail clerks. Asking clerks to give up their weekly half-holiday, it argued "would be a lot to ask of them merely for the convenience of tourists."⁸⁵ The following year the *Colonist* expressed frustration that no solution had emerged that reconciled the welfare of the local population with increased shopping opportunities for tourists. Recognizing that the city's store-hour regulations were undoubtedly hampering its tourism promotion efforts, the newspaper nevertheless insisted that the common half-holiday was worth preserving. The holiday, it explained, provided a rare opportunity for communal recreation and allowed "one set afternoon" each week "so that friends may go places together" or "engage in organized sport and recreation." The welfare of retail clerks, the *Colonist* explained, was under threat and the city as a whole had a moral duty to protect their interests. "These are the people who make up the 'we' who have to live in the city."⁸⁶ At least one retail clerk concurred with this view. In 1953 H. A. Napper argued that what was being overlooked in the current controversy was "the right of retail clerks to take part, if they wish to, in group activities, such as cricket, football, baseball, or any other game they may fancy." "It took our fathers a long time to win this right," Napper explained, "and some of us don't want to lose it."⁸⁷ These observers recognized that Victoria's post-industrial reality left it reliant on outside forces, but they refused to accept that this situation necessitated abandoning the half-day holiday.

Central to the campaign to preserve the half-day holiday was the defence of common leisure pursuits.⁸⁸ In a reversal of Arthur Lineham's earlier arguments that a small number of clerks and merchants were putting their own needs ahead of the larger community, local citizen Harold Gray wrote to the *Daily Colonist* in 1953 castigating opponents of store-hour regulations for attempting to increase their profits by denying "some nearly 6,000 retail clerks . . . the right to enjoy together and with one another their weekly half-day holiday."⁸⁹ Retail clerk A. G. Kinnis concurred and argued that the abolition of the half-day holiday would mean that "groups would not be able to unite for sports or outings." Rejecting a popular pro-tourist lobby proposal that retail clerks stagger their days off to suit the needs of their employers, Kinnis argued that "a staggered holiday system" would prevent workers from undertaking common recreational pursuits.⁹⁰ Kinnis's position was endorsed by fellow letter-writer Alex McLeod Baird, who argued that the Wednesday half-holiday had "grown to be a recognized day on which all store employees gather together and enjoy themselves collectively." Collective leisure, Baird argued, should not be allowed to fall victim to "the exploded wolf cry—'Tourist.'"⁹¹ Forcing retail clerks to abandon their half-day holiday, yet another letter-writer argued, placed these workers in a unique, and unfair situation. "Today all banks, offices, all types of laborers, work a five-day week and none of them would consider a shift system," argued George Robinson

in a 1953 letter to the *Times*. "Why then compel the store clerks to work a shift system which would not allow any group activities[?]"⁹² The answer, for opponents of store-hour regulations, was Victoria's increasing dependence on tourism—a dependence brought about by the flight of industrial capital from the city in the late nineteenth century and the city's failure to re-establish itself as a leading manufacturing centre. The result was a seemingly unending and uncomfortable search for economic stability.

Conclusions: Lessons From and For the Study of Deindustrialization

Victoria's industrial decline in the late nineteenth century convinced the city to embrace tourism as a central component of its future economic development. In the long run this has proven to be a successful endeavour. As the store-hour debates demonstrate, however, this was a controversial enterprise. The campaign to cater to tourists divided the local community. The pro-tourism lobby campaigned relentlessly for the modification and elimination of store-hour regulations so that the city could meet the demands of tourists. In doing so tourism's proponents argued that, because the city had lost the battle for traditional industry, it was imperative that the city embrace tourism promotion—first as a last-chance method of luring deep-pocketed investors to the city, and later as a means of increasing consumer demand for local retail goods. Central to the latter argument was the assurance that everyone in the community benefited from tourist expenditures. Challenging these arguments were other community members who, like the pro-tourism lobby, were drawn from a wide range of backgrounds: employers, employees, civic officials, and consumers. They disputed claims that tourist dollars were spread evenly throughout the community and insisted that the social benefits—in particular, common leisure time—that the community accrued through institutions such as the half-day holiday should not be sacrificed to serve the interests of outsiders. Both sides were fully aware of Victoria's post-industrial reality; but both offered very different evaluations of tourism's role in alleviating the contingent and provisional nature of the city's economic fortunes.

The recent literature on deindustrialization is helpful in illuminating the lessons these debates hold for historians. First, as historians such as Hal Rothman have noted in other contexts, Victoria's reliance on tourism brought with it unexpected complications—in this case, a growing demand that the city's agreed-upon store-hour regulations be sacrificed on the altar of economic necessity.⁹³ Second, as was the case in larger centres such as Atlantic City in the 1980s, the reliance on tourism brought with it a growing sense of unease within the community—one that expressed its concern that the interests of "outsiders" were being served at the expense of local citizens.⁹⁴ Third, we can see in Victoria, as in other instances of deindustrialization, a shift in power from within the community to without. In the case of Victoria, however, this change happened indirectly. Instead of large, faraway, multinational corporations seizing control of the city's economic future through hotel or casino development, the

power to influence local bylaws shifted in favour of tourists indirectly and local tourist businesses directly. The constant desire to craft the city's reputation as a tourist-friendly destination helped to sustain the campaign to reduce and eliminate store-hour regulations.⁹⁵ Finally, the fleeting and provisional nature of post-1970 economic life that has been documented so well in the literature on deindustrialization points to an important element of Victoria's story throughout the twentieth century: these debates were the product of a community uneasy with its economic reality and desperate to pursue any means of securing economic stability, even if that meant transforming the rhythm of daily life and allowing individual consumer demand to colonize common leisure time.

And what lessons do Victoria's store-hour debates hold for historians of deindustrialization? They suggest that some assumptions about deindustrialization need to be modified and questioned. First, and most obviously, tourism certainly emerged here as an economic alternative to traditional industry, but much earlier than the current literature on deindustrialization would suggest. These debates, then, point to the possibilities of comparative studies of deindustrialization that focus not just upon the post-1970 period, but upon earlier periods as well. Second, while much of the literature on deindustrialization focuses on the tension between community and capital, the debates underscore the extent to which deindustrialization in Victoria nurtured divisions *within* the local community. Moreover, these divisions did not fit into tidy compartmentalizations such as workers versus employers, or outside chain stores versus local entrepreneurs. Instead, the divisions emerged primarily *within* the business community but also, at times, among retail clerks and between their labour organizations.⁹⁶ Third, Cowie and Heathcott argue that changes brought about by deindustrialization, unlike those ushered in by industrialization, "were more disorienting than overtly political, tended toward the elusive rather than the tangible, and marked a confusion of power relations that had seemed significantly clearer under the old order."⁹⁷ These debates challenge that assumption. After all, the issue here was a tangible one: a growing momentum in favour of eliminating store-hour regulations that affected when and how retail employers and employees worked. What was at stake here was a tangible reorientation of leisure time—a reminder that we must continue to factor leisure into our analyses of workers' lives.

If the store-hour debates are any indication, Victoria's failure to retain traditional industry haunted the city well into the postwar era. Some community members championed tourism as the most effective alternative economic strategy to industrial development and, in doing so, fought to eliminate the city's store-hour restrictions. Others strenuously opposed the elimination of these restrictions on the grounds that they served the interests of the local community, and local interests should not be sacrificed in favour of outsiders. Recognizing that Victoria's embrace of tourism as an economic strategy was contested is an important indication of the complex nature of community responses to deindustrialization. Recognizing the fact that Victoria's post-

industrial reality confirms some patterns unearthed by historians of deindustrialization, while challenging and modifying others, is an important indication of the extent to which historians of the late twentieth century and those focusing on earlier periods of economic disruption and transition can learn a great deal from each other.

Acknowledgement

My thanks to Catherine Gidney, Brad Cross, and the anonymous reviewers for their helpful suggestions. Research for this article was made possible by a SSHRC Postdoctoral Fellowship.

Notes

1. "Six-Day Shopping," *Victoria Daily Times*, 8 July 1954.
2. "Public Has Say on Shop-Closing," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 27 April 1956.
3. See, for example, Barry Bluestone and Bennett Harrison, *The Deindustrialization of America: Plant Closings, Community Abandonment, and the Dismantling of Basic Industry* (New York: Basic Books, 1982); Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott, eds., *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization* (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); and Steven High, *Industrial Sunset: The Making of North America's Rust Belt, 1969–1984* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2003).
4. For an informative institutional history of the province's leading retail employee organization, and its role in the early-closing movement in the early decades of the twentieth century, see Andrew Neufeld, *Union Store: The History of the Retail Clerks Union in British Columbia, 1899–1999* (Burnaby, BC: United Food and Commercial Workers Union Local 1518, 1999). No thorough study of store-hour regulation in Canada exists for the twentieth century, but newspaper coverage in Vancouver and Victoria periodically referred to debates about store-hour regulations elsewhere in the country. The motivations of retailers seeking such regulations are addressed briefly in David Monod, *Store Wars: Shopkeepers and the Culture of Mass Marketing, 1890–1939* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 27, 85. The innovative nineteenth-century campaigns by Timothy Eaton to shorten store hours are discussed in Joy L. Santink, *Timothy Eaton and the Rise of His Department Store* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 85–87, 115–117, 194–201. On the growing demand for leisure time among Canadian workers more generally during the mid-twentieth century, see Shirley Tillotson, "Time, Swimming Pools, and Citizenship: The Emergence of Leisure Rights in Mid-Twentieth-Century Canada," *Contesting Canadian Citizenship: Historical Readings*, ed. Robert Adamoski, Dorothy E. Chun, and Robert Menzies, 199–221 (Peterborough: Broadview, 2002). For a brief exploration of the retail store-hour issue in the United States, see Susan Porter Benson, *Counter Cultures: Saleswomen, Managers, and Customers in American Department Stores, 1890–1940* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1986), 196–200. The classic account of the American "early closing movement" in the 1830s and the extent to which it was led by retailers, rather than their employees, is Marten Estey, "Early Closing: Employer-Organized Origin of the Retail Labor Movement," *Labor History* 13, no. 4 (Fall 1972): 560–570.
5. Thorough analysis of newspaper coverage of the debates in Vancouver and Victoria between 1900 and 1970 confirms that tourism was much more central to Victoria's local store-hour debates than it was to Vancouver's, a point explicitly acknowledged by the *Victoria Daily Colonist* in 1956. See "What Are All the Facts?" *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 19 June 1956.
6. Peter Baskerville, *Beyond the Island: An Illustrated History of Victoria* (Burlington, ON: Windsor, 1986), 111.
7. In exploring the connections between deindustrialization and tourism, scholars have emphasized the extent to which declining industrial centres turn to tourism as an alternative economic strategy. In his study of the American West, for example, Hal Rothman notes that "tourism often becomes a response to economic desperation" and "serves as a replacement economy

- for declining industries." Hal Rothman, "Stumbling toward the Millennium: Tourism, the Postindustrial World, and the Transformation of the American West," *California History* 77, no. 3 (1998): 154. Noting a pattern in which urban centres have been transformed from industrial centres into "playgrounds," Bryant Simon notes that in the 1970s "local bankers and business leaders" in Atlantic City followed the lead of "their counterparts in other deindustrialized cities" by looking "for ways to bring middle-class families back to town, not to live, but to visit." Bryant Simon, *Boardwalk of Dreams: Atlantic City and the Fate of Urban America* (New York: Oxford University Press, 2004), 2, 170. Even smaller centres such as Anaconda, Montana, and Chemainus, BC, turned to tourism as local industrial economies (copper and lumber respectively) fell apart. See Kent Curtis, "Greening Anaconda: EPA, ARCO, and the Politics of Space in Postindustrial Montana," *Beyond the Ruins: The Meanings of Deindustrialization*, eds. Jefferson Cowie and Joseph Heathcott (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 2003); and Trevor J. Barnes and Roger Hayter, "'The Little Town That Did': Flexible Accumulation and Community Response in Chemainus, British Columbia," *Regional Studies* 26, no. 7 (1992): 647–663. All of these examples, fittingly, come from the 1970s and 1980s.
8. John Lutz, "Losing Steam: The Boiler and Engine Industry as an Index of British Columbia's Deindustrialization, 1880–1915," *Historical Papers* (1988): 170
 9. Bluestone and Harrison, *The Deindustrialization of America*.
 10. Cowie and Heathcott, "Introduction," in *Beyond the Ruins*, 5.
 11. *Ibid.*, 2, 3–4.
 12. Mike Wallace, "Industrial Museums and the History of Deindustrialization," *Public Historian* 9, no. 1 (Winter 1987): 13–14. The limited utility of such terms has been recognized by a number of observers. For example, John Urry has proposed the term *disorganized capitalism* in place of *post-industrial society*. More illuminating in describing the cultural shift that has occurred since the 1970s is Zygmunt Bauman's notion of *liquid modernity*. See John Urry, "Is Britain the First 'Post-industrial Society'?" in J. Urry, *Consuming Places* (London: Routledge, 1995): 112–125; and Zygmunt Bauman, *Liquid Modernity* (Cambridge: Polity, 2000).
 13. Wallace, "Industrial Museums," 14.
 14. *Ibid.*, 14.
 15. *Ibid.*, 15.
 16. Cowie and Heathcott, "Introduction," in *Beyond the Ruins*, 4.
 17. *Ibid.*, 5.
 18. Sharon Zukin, *Landscapes of Power: From Detroit to Disney World* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1991), 5.
 19. On this development, see Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity* (New York: Viking Penguin, 1988); Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994); and Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997).
 20. Zukin, *Landscapes of Power*, 4.
 21. Steven High, "Capital and Community Reconsidered: The Politics and Meaning of Deindustrialization," *Labour/Le Travail*, 55 (Spring 2005): 193.
 22. Cowie and Heathcott, "Introduction," in *Beyond the Ruins*, 14. The same is true, of course, of industrialization as well.
 23. *Ibid.*, 4
 24. High, "Capital and Community Reconsidered," 193.
 25. Max Page, *The Creative Destruction of Manhattan, 1900–1940* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1999), 2, 3.
 26. Mike Dunning, "Tourism in Ketchikan and Southeast Alaska," *Alaska History* 15, no. 2 (2000): 32–33.
 27. James Overton, *Making a World of Difference: Essays on Tourism, Culture and Development in Newfoundland* (St. John's: ISER, 1996), 102.
 28. Ian McKay, *The Quest of the Folk: Antimodernism and Cultural Selection in Twentieth-Century Nova Scotia* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1994), 33; Shelley Kyte, "'V-8 or Make and Break'—An Investigation of the Development of Tourism in Canada: A Case Study of Nova Scotia" (MA thesis, Queen's University, 1997).
 29. Baskerville, *Beyond the Island*, 46.
 30. In 1890 Victoria's exports were six times greater than Vancouver's. By 1903, these positions were dramatically reversed and Vancouver's exports exceeded Victoria's by a ratio of three to one. Charles N. Forward, "The Evolution of Victoria's Functional Character," in *Town and City, Town and City: Aspects of Western Canadian Urban Development*, ed. Alan F. J. Artibise (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, University of Regina, 1981), 359.
 31. Baskerville, *Beyond the Island*, 48.
 32. *Ibid.*, 55.
 33. *Ibid.*, 57.
 34. *Ibid.*, 74, 77.
 35. *Ibid.*, 104.
 36. *Ibid.*, 104–105.
 37. As Baskerville notes, city officials also took action to secure the city's place as the provincial capital, thus securing government jobs and supplementing the city's infrastructure. Baskerville, *Beyond the Island*, 48.
 38. Throughout the period under study, the closing of stores on Sundays remained uncontroversial, for the most part. Sporadically, individual merchants would contravene the Lord's Day Act, but opponents of Victoria's store-hour regulations did not campaign against Sunday store-closing.
 39. Such decisions at the municipal level were now possible because the provincial government had divested itself of responsibility over store hours in 1958 by revising its Municipal Act to transfer all regulatory power over store hours to local authorities.
 40. On the role of political ideology in these postwar store-hour debates, see Michael Dawson, "Leisure, Consumption, and the Public Sphere: Postwar Debates over Shopping Regulations in Vancouver and Victoria during the Cold War," in *Creating Postwar Canada: Community, Diversity, and Dissent, 1945–1975*, ed. Magda Fahrni and Robert Rutherford (Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, forthcoming).
 41. "A Summer Holiday Is Being Agitated," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 25 April 1908.
 42. Arthur Lineham, "The Half Holiday," *Victoria Daily Times*, 21 August 1923.
 43. *Ibid.*, 4.
 44. *Ibid.*
 45. Dawson, *Selling British Columbia*, chap. 2.
 46. W. Dale Johnson, "Wednesday Half Holiday," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 20 May 1925.
 47. "Ask for Repeal of Half-Holiday Act," *Victoria Daily Times*, 18 October 1917.
 48. "Why Drive Business Away?" *Victoria Daily Times*, 10 October 1946.
 49. "It Should Be Defeated," *Victoria Daily Times*, 12 November 1946.
 50. J. H. Davidson, "Echo of Store Closing," *Victoria Daily Times*, 17 December 1946; "Wednesday Closing By-law Labelled Tourist Hardship," *Victoria Daily Times*, 12 January 1949.
 51. Board of Directors Meeting, 6 November 1934, Victoria Chamber of Commerce fonds, 32 A 1, Victoria City Archives.
 52. W. Dale Johnson, "Wednesday Half Holiday," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 20 May 1925.

Victoria Debates Its Post-industrial Reality

53. Observer, "Re the Weekly Half Holiday," *Victoria Daily Times*, 16 June 1927.
54. See, for example, "Tourists from U.S. Soured by Wednesday Closing Here," *Victoria Daily Times*, 31 May 1956.
55. "Tourists Unable to Spend," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 5 July 1956.
56. "City to Ask 6-Day Week Cabinet Action," *Victoria Daily Times*, 14 June 1956, 27; "Closing on Wednesday Keeps Tourists Away," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 1 August 1956.
57. "Holiday Tourists Here Find Shops Are Closed," *Victoria Daily Times*, 30 May 1951.
58. "Mayor Would Grant Wednesday Opening," *Victoria Daily Times*, 9 March 1953.
59. "Merchants Rally for Six-Day Week," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 8 April 1956; "Council To Seek Law To Keep Shops Open," *Victoria Daily Colonist* 13 April 1956.
60. "52 Stores Now Favor Long Week," *Victoria Daily Times*, 26 April 1956.
61. "Store Opening Disputed Topic," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 11 May 1954.
62. "New Surge of Pressure Looms for Six-Day Shopping in City," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 24 June 1954.
63. A. E. Newberry, "Antique Shops And Early Closing," *Victoria Daily Times*, 19 March 1953.
64. "Closing Policy Costly," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 5 March 1957.
65. On the growing influence of social science techniques on the quantification of tourist behaviours, see Alisa Apostle, "Canada, Vacations Unlimited: The Canadian Government Tourism Industry, 1934–1959" (PhD diss., Queen's University, 2003), chap. 4 as well as Dawson, *Selling British Columbia*, chap. 6.
66. Montague Bridgeman, "Handicapping Tourist Industry," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 17 June 1936.
67. "Circularize All Local Stores for Views on Five-Day Week," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 1 November 1946.
68. "Half-Day Closing Here Costs Thousands, Claim," *Victoria Daily Times*, 11 December 1951; "Executives Say Wednesday Closing Losing City Hundreds of Thousands," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 11 December 1951.
69. On the changing rationale of tourism promotion in BC, see Dawson, *Selling British Columbia*, chap. 2.
70. On these more recent pronouncements, see Rothman, "Stumbling toward the Millennium," 141.
71. "Pledge List Mounting for Long Store Week," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 6 July 1954.
72. "Tourist Group Opposed to Stores Closing All Day," *Victoria Daily Times*, 30 October 1946. On postwar campaigns aimed at convincing Canadians to support the tourism industry because its economic dividends were widely shared, see Karen Dubinsky, "Everybody Likes Canadians: Canadians, Americans and the Post–World War Two Travel Boom," in *Being Elsewhere: Tourism, Consumer Culture, and Identity in Modern Europe and North America*, ed. Shelley Baronowski and Ellen Furlough, 320–347 (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2001); and Alisa Apostle, "The Display of a Tourist Nation: Canada in Government Film, 1945–1959," *Journal of the Canadian Historical Association*, n.s. 12 (2001): 177–197. On similar campaigns in British Columbia, see Dawson, *Selling British Columbia*, chap. 6.
73. "Open Wednesdays Favored in Vote," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 31 July 1951.
74. "Retail Clerks Support Wednesday Opening," *Victoria Daily Times*, 12 February 1953.
75. "Big Store Lead Favored," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 15 April 1953. On the tendency for close cooperation between employers and employees on the issue of store-hour restrictions, see Estey, "Early Closing," and Neufeld, *Union Store*, 13, 15.
76. "Chamber Group Favors Open Wednesday," *Victoria Daily Times*, 10 February 1953.
77. "More Than Dollars in Early Closing," *Victoria Daily Times*, 31 July 1951; "Foes of Six-Day Week Predict Scant Gain," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 7 July 1954.
78. W. T. Galt, "Open Wednesdays Favored in Vote," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 31 July 1951.
79. "Suggest Ballot of Merchants on Midweek Holiday," *Victoria Daily Times*, 3 November 1924.
80. "Butter and Eggs Voted Out of Sale," *Victoria Daily Times*, 22 January 1929.
81. G. W. Robinson, "Half-Holiday Law," *Victoria Daily Times*, 27 June 1936.
82. "Williams Defends City Council on Subject of All-Day Closing," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 27 October 1946.
83. "Group Favors Store Opening," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 23 August 1952.
84. "Wednesday Store Opening Supported," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 11 February 1953.
85. "Merchants' Vote Settles Half-Holiday Issue," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 22 March 1949; "Americans and the Wednesday Half-Holiday," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 1 June 1951.
86. "Wednesday Half-Holiday," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 26 August 1952.
87. H. A. Napper, "Wednesday Closing," *Victoria Daily Times*, 16 February 1953.
88. I explore the tension between individual and collective rights in these store-hour debates in Dawson, "Leisure, Consumption, and the Public Sphere."
89. Harold Gray, "Wednesday Closing," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 18 February 1953.
90. A. G. Kinnis, "Wednesday Closing," *Victoria Daily Colonist*, 22 March 1953.
91. Alex McLeod Baird, "Wednesday Half-Holiday," *Victoria Daily Times*, 1 April 1953.
92. George Robinson, "Wednesday Closing," *Victoria Daily Times*, 3 June 1953, 4.
93. Rothman, "Stumbling toward the Millennium," 141.
94. Simon, *Boardwalk of Dreams*, 174.
95. On the extent to which communities can be convinced to sacrifice long-term interests in order to maintain a positive reputation among tourists, see Ivan Light and Charles Choy Wong, "Protest or Work: Dilemmas of the Tourist Industry in American Chinatowns," *American Journal of Sociology* 80, no. 6 (May 1975): 1358.
96. On the importance of recognizing that industrial and deindustrial communities are complex entities, see High, "Capital and Community Reconsidered," as well as High, *Industrial Sunset*, 165–166.
97. Cowie and Heathcott, "Introduction," in *Beyond the Ruins*, 4.