

B C

HISTORICAL

NEWS



BRITISH COLUMBIA HISTORICAL NEWS

No. 1.

February, 1968

President: Mrs Mabel E. Jordon
First Vice-President: Mr H. R. Brammall
Second Vice-President: Mr G. E. Bowes
Secretary: Mr P. A. Yandle
Treasurer: Mrs G. E. Bowes
Executive Committee: Mr H. B. Nash
Col. G. S. Andrews
Editor: Mr P. A. Yandle

The British Columbia Historical Association Conference at Williams Lake last May might not have been the most outstanding, but for me it will most certainly be the most momentous. The first day's snow-storm and some of the nearly impassable roads were but a memory and this, to-day, would be the wind-up. It was Saturday morning, a beautiful hot sunny early summer day with the promise of many more to come. The day's programme was - the General Meeting in the morning, a leisurely afternoon on the hills, and the Banquet and guest speaker, Hon. Robert Bonner, at night. What a delusion that day's plans turned out to be! The General Meeting followed its usual pattern and the problems of the Association came up for discussion, arising from the report of the Secretary, who made the point that he did not wish to continue as Secretary due to pressure of work, and that the closest bond between the member Associations - to wit - the Newsletter, was also suffering from the same ailment. He elaborated that the Association should purchase a duplicating machine and combine the two positions of Secretary and Editor of the Newsletter.

I have never believed in sorcery or devils or anything of that nature, but there must have been several present at that meeting because during the long "buck passing" session when everybody not only wanted to leave it to George, but found a lot of Georges to propose, I heard my own voice make the grand pronouncement that if "nobody else will do it I will". No sooner had the message sunk in to the realization of what I had said in a moment of Walter Mitty thinking, than I knew my day was ruined. What in the name of all that was reasonable had I been thinking about to say an idiotic thing like that. I hadn't even been one of the Georges suggested, and here I was, saddled with something like one of the trials of Tantalus.

Since the passing of what must have been the most beautiful summer on record (my first historical fact), like a good builder, I've completed the excavation and foundation and I'm starting now to frame. What I build for a newsletter is yet to be seen, but it has always been my experience that it's easier to tear down than it is to build up. It might be possible

that I might have to use some "good used material", but then nobody starts with the raw materials and by only his own endeavours turns out a finished product.

To the best of my ability and with the help of the member societies I will in each issue publish their accomplishments and items of interest. My ability in the scholarly direction will probably leave a lot to be desired, but at least it will be the lay man's thinking and will in no way infringe on the authenticated publications of the experts. Suggestions and material will always be welcome and I make no promises that some won't be printed. As editor, I will be sensitive to nasty remarks and will not accept more than ten critical remarks per letter.

FIRST COUNCIL MEETING FOR 1967-68

The President, Mrs Jordon, called the first Council meeting in November at Vancouver, for the purpose of fixing dates and a tentative programme for the 1968 Convention to be held in Victoria, and other business matters.

The future of the B.C. Historical Quarterly, as outlined by Mr Willard Ireland, was that since two new professional appointments have been made to his staff at the Provincial Archives, it was his intention to commence publication of the Quarterly with an issue in March 1968. The subscription rate would be \$5.00 per year or \$1.25 per quarter. To Historical Association members the rate would be \$3.00 per year and it would be mailed out by the Archives, at their expense, on membership lists and addresses supplied to him by the secretary of each individual Society. Those that have "on record" prepaid subscriptions would receive the Quarterly for \$1.50 per year for a "to be determined" period. Mr Ireland pointed out that institutions holding a membership at large or group membership, both not presently covered in the Constitution, would receive only one subscription at the reduced rate.

The publishing year would be the calendar year and issues would come out in March, June, September and December, and it would be only on a yearly basis that the mailing lists could be considered. It would be the duty of the individual society to work out their own method of determining whether the subscription would be a part of the membership dues or a separate charge. In any event the Council would not again become a collection agency for subscriptions either current or prepaid.

On the question of the prepaid subscribers list being compiled as accurately as possible, Mr Ireland suggested, and the Council agreed unanimously, that a committee composed of Mr Brammell, Mrs Bowes and Mr Yandle would work with Mr Ireland to achieve this end.

Mr Ireland stated that the format of the Quarterly would remain much the same with a few exceptions, that an Editor had been appointed, and that there was plenty of material on hand. The exception would be the deletion of the "Notes and Comments" section.

The Quarterly will be a new publication and will have no definite tie with the B.C. Historical Association, although Mr Ireland would try to have included some specific reference to the Association. He would like to depend on members for book reviews. This is to be a Provincial Government publication of the B.C. Provincial Archives and will commence with a new series. The proposed subscription rate would cover only approximately one third of the cost of publication.

The Council agreed that in view of Mr Ireland's presentation it would await with considerable interest and appreciation the first copy of the new Quarterly. Mr Bowes felt that the Quarterly when published would strengthen the B.C. Historical Association, as the subscription rate would be an inducement to affiliate, as the preferential rate would be only applicable to members.

It was agreed that with regard to the fund of prepaid subscriptions held by the Association, once the mailing list of traceable subscribers has been made, a joint letter from the Association and the Archives would be sent to all known affiliates, making it clear that a "deadline" would be placed on acceptance of names of prepaid subscribers, and any claims for refunds would have to be made prior to that date. In the event of claims exceeding the amount of the Fund, any monies left after the amended traceable subscriptions had been satisfied would then be disbursed on a percentage basis.

The report of the Centennial Scholarship Fund as presented by Mr John Gibbard was read and accepted on motion, and that the Secretary write a letter of thanks to Mr Gibbard for his report. The Council unanimously approved the appointment of Mr Brammhall to represent the Association on the Judges' Panel for the Scholarship Fund.

The dates for the 1968 B.C. Historical Association Convention to be held in Victoria were to be Thursday, Friday and Saturday, May 23rd, 24th and 25th. In consideration of the Centenary of Victoria as the provincial capital in 1968, the suggested theme for the Convention "100 years of Capital Living" or, as Mr New suggested "100 Years of Capitalism". The tentative suggestion of a programme of events:-

Thursday, May 23rd. 2.00 p.m. Registration, Museum Theatre Foyer.
8.00 p.m. Get together " " "

Time after registration would probably be required to find accommodation and get settled in.

Friday, May 24th. 10.00 a.m. Council meeting. Afternoon tea at Government House. Evening - Film showing of old pictures.

Saturday, May 25th. Morning tour of old Victoria (conducted by Willard Ireland)

2.00 p.m. General meeting. Museum Theatre.

7.00 p.m. Banquet in Empress Hotel. Suggested speakers -

The Mayor of Victoria, Mr Clifford Wilson; Mr Helmcken.

Council meeting to be held after General Meeting or Sunday morning.

SOCIETY NOTES AND COMMENTS

ALBERNI

The Alberni Society has a small group working on a project to place trail markers at the Qualicum and Alberni ends of the Horne Lake Trail. They plan to publish soon the first of a series of historical booklets on the Alberni Valley. It is entitled "Pioneer women of the Alberni Valley", and is written by Margaret Trebett, herself a daughter and granddaughter of pioneer settlers. The Society sells hasti-notes, the covers of which depict the Anderson Mill, the first in B.C.

GULF ISLANDS

The Gulf Islands Branch had two summer trips. The first was to Mayne Island with a trip to Miner's Bay and tea at the Old Vicarage built on land donated by Warburton Pike. The second trip was to Sooke along with the Victoria Society.

During August two candidates were selected for the Annual Bursaries of \$100. They were Alvin Walkus, handicapped by poor sight and lack of family support, to study carpentry; and Hilda Tallio to study nursing.

In September Captain Archie Phelps gave an illustrated talk on the ships serving the West Coast and Gulf Islands since the days of the white settlers. Saanich pioneers and local old timers were present at this meeting. In November Mr New's recorded address given at Williams Lake was heard, and a report was received on the cross Canada trip by the Saturna school children as their Centennial project.

A major project for the winter months when weather hampers inter-island meetings is a collection of tales of open boat and small craft travel among the islands before the advent of the ferry system.

KOOTENAY, EAST

At the annual meeting of the East Kootenay Branch the focal topic was the promotion of a name for a lake to be formed above the Libby Dam on the Kootenay River. The Society's first choice went on record as being Lac Morigeau, after one of the earliest pioneers in the area. "Kooanus" was the second choice, this name having been strongly favoured by a considerable delegation from Montana, who attended the meeting along with guests from as far afield as Vernon and Bonners Ferry in Idaho.

The forest closure regulations precluded all field trips until mid-September, when the Branch had an international get-together with the Bonners Ferry Group.

The East Kootenay Branch, although not officially connected with the Fort Steele restoration, has been doing all in its power to assist in the project by collecting old-time items suitable for the Fort. The project of the Secretary, Dave Kay, has been the reconstruction of the old newspaper office, the Fort Steele Prospector.

KOOTENAY, WEST

Activities of this Society focussed recently on mining history. Several illustrated talks were given on this subject, and on the botany and topography of the region. The annual field trip was to Slocan and Kaslo, with stops at other places of historical interest.

NANAIMO

The Nanaimo Branch records on tape all addresses given at its meetings and keeps them on file. During the past year these topics included Nanaimo Harbour - Past, Present and Future, Nanaimo Fire Department, and History of Nanaimo Trade - ships and men.

Every year Pioneer Rock is the scene of a gathering behind the Bastion to commemorate the arrival in 1854 of pioneers from England after first disembarking at Esquimalt from the Princess Royal. Each year since then there has been at least one representative from one of the original families. In 1967 there were four generations of two families present.

VANCOUVER

The Vancouver Historical Society's annual dinner was held in the Stanley Park Pavilion in April, at which Dr Margaret Ormsby gave an address on Different Aspects of Canadian Confederation. Some of the members modelled gowns of the late 1800's belonging to Mrs Walton of Victoria.

Several car loads of members visited the Cowichan Valley Forest Museum at Duncan on the annual field trip in June. About 35 members enjoyed the hospitality of Mr and Mrs B. Hawkins at a garden party and barbecue in July.

Topics for papers read at the regular monthly meetings included Seattle, Vancouver and the Klondike, Aspects of a Political Career by Hon. Howard Green, Settlement Patterns in British Columbia history, and Banning of a Book in B.C., the text of which is included in this Newsletter.

VICTORIA

Topics at the Victoria meetings, at which the average attendance is over 100, included Municipal History in the Making, the Chinese of Old Victoria, the West Coast trail, Commemorative Monuments in Canada bearing on the History of B.C., and Confederation. The annual field trip was to the Sooke district, near the potholes.

In September two University of Victoria students received the annual prizes of books. Elizabeth Bunyan and Arlene Rich received copies of Dr Large's Skeena and the recent volume on William Fraser Tolmie.

The annual Christmas party was held at the Empress Hotel. At this event Mr Gerry Wellburn read an amusing letter describing life in 1841, and Mr Willard Ireland gave a talk on Christmas 1867.

The following is a report of a paper given by Professor Charles Humphries, Department of History, University of British Columbia, at the January meeting of the Vancouver Historical Society.

THE BANNING OF A BOOK IN B.C.

On the morning of Saturday, January 3, 1920, Dr J. D. MacLean, Minister of Education and Provincial Secretary for British Columbia quietly announced in Vancouver that W. L. Grant's History of Canada would no longer be used in the schools of the province. "In adding the subject of Canadian history to the High School curriculum," he explained,

this book had been selected for a trial as a text book. After a year, owing to unfavorable comment and as the best results can not be obtained from the study of a text that is the subject of criticism, the department has decided to discontinue its use as a school book. For the remainder of the year teachers will be asked to stress the teaching of Canadian civics.

The announcement provoked little initial public comment; two days later, in an editorial, the Vancouver World stood squarely behind the cabinet minister and hinted at some of the reasons for his decision:

... The Minister of Education...will find general support amongst teachers and others familiar with the publication.

The Council of Public Instruction which is the authority in control of education in the province, it appears, never authorized the textbook. It has, however, been in restricted use in high schools for some time past; but criticism of some forms of expression and its somewhat anti-British tone has made it unpopular.

It is possible, surely to obtain a book on Canadian history not open to such objections. At any rate the decision to abolish the use of this book is wise. History for school purposes is inadequate enough as it is without permitting the suspicion of bias to attach to it.²

After that expression of opinion, there was public silence on the matter for almost a week and then began a modest debate in the columns of Vancouver's newspapers which gradually made clear the substance of the criticism which had caused the book's removal. If it took time for the public to become aware of the causes of trouble, such was not the case for W.L. Grant, the author of the text.

In 1920, William Lawson Grant occupied the office of principal of Upper Canada College in Toronto, a position he was to hold until his death in 1935. Previous to this appointment he had lectured at Oxford University and at Queen's in Kingston; during the First World war, he had served overseas as a major in the Canadian Expeditionary Force and had been wounded

in the Battle of the Somme. The book in question had first been published in Toronto in 1914 by the T. Eaton Company. A revised edition had been published in 1916 by William Heinemann in England and by the Renouf Publishing Company in Montreal. It was the latter which became the subject of dispute.

Grant had been aware of criticisms of the book for about a year before its banning in British Columbia. In December of 1918, the Sentinel, a publication of the Orange Order, had accused him of displaying disloyalty in the expressions which he used in the book.³ By June of 1919, such criticism was being received by the Department of Education in Victoria, and the Superintendent of Education for British Columbia wrote to Grant:

I...beg to enquire from you whether it would not be possible for you to modify your Canadian history in such a way as to render it acceptable to people of all classes and creeds in this Province. Personally I see nothing objectionable in your book whatever and I need not add that I think it the best Canadian History on the market, but we have in British Columbia some people more loyal than King George V, and others more ultra-Protestant than Calvin and the views of these people must of course be respected by any department depending on its existence on popular suffrage....⁴

Grant did nothing in the face of these attacks, but they apparently continued with sufficient strength for the next six months to prompt J.D. MacLean to remove the publication from British Columbia's schools.

To the point of its banishment from British Columbia's classrooms, there had only been hints as to what was wrong with Grant's book. This vagueness disappeared, however, when Mack Eastman and W.N. Sage of the University of British Columbia History Department and fourteen school teachers moved to defend Grant and his book in a letter sent to the Sun, the Province and the World. These defenders sketched out Grant's background as proof of his pro-British stance and his reliability as a scholar.⁵ This was an approach not without its flaws, as one critic noted:

A perusal of the letter is all that is necessary to show that there are a good many teachers and some professors plying their trade in the schools and University of British Columbia whose services should be dispensed with at the end of the year, if not sooner. Any class of individuals who would seek to defend a textbook because of the personality of the man who wrote it is employing a system of reasoning which no teacher who is worth a salary should employ.

The argument began and, in the somewhat disjointed debate which then ensued, the chief complaints against Grant's history were strongly enunciated: the book was, in sum, anti-British and anti-Protestant or, to turn it around, pro-German, pro-Roman Catholic and -- worst of all -- pro-French-Canadian.

On the count of being disloyal to Great Britain, the critics cited several passages which they found particularly useful in sustaining

their argument. A few of the keen-eyed started, quite literally, on the first page; and noted that Heinemann was his English publisher. "Heinemann", Grant commented in his own defence

is undoubtedly of German descent, and has about as much German blood in his veins as has His Majesty King George V. He is himself above military age, but more than one of his nephews, one of whom I knew at Balliol, died in the war fighting for the Empire about which these people are shrieking.

But the text, more than the publisher, provided the critics with their ammunition for the attack. Grant, it was argued, was favourably disposed to the concept of hatred as an essential component of patriotism, a most Germanic idea. In his discussion of Canada in the immediate post-Conquest period, Grant had written:

Great Britain had thus taken over a people who differed from herself and from her other colonists in North America in race, religion, language, and customs. England and France had been at war for generations; Englishmen and Frenchmen considered hatred of each other to be a patriotic duty; nowhere had the fires of hatred blazed so high as between the Canadians and the English colonists. The religious history of the two countries ever since the Reformation had given Roman Catholic and Protestant loathing of each other.

In providing the background to the Battle of Beaver Dam during the War of 1812, Grant had stated:

...At Queenston, Sergeant James Secord was lying helpless from his wounds. Both he and his wife, Laura, were children of Loyalists, and hated the Americans for the wrongs done to their parents....¹⁰

And, when evaluating the consequences of the War of 1812, he had remarked:

To Canada the war gave an heroic tradition. Men of French, Scotch, Irish, English descent had stood side by side with the regulars of Great Britain and had fought as gallantly as they. It was our baptism of blood, and so far in this world that has been the only real baptism of a nation. It is less pleasing to think of the long years of hatred of the United States which date from this war; but to many men patriotism is impossible without a little hatred, and memories of the war did much to steady Canadians in the lean years which were to come.¹¹

These were the chief examples cited as proof of Grant's view of the close relationship between hatred and patriotism. "This," stated one critic, "is exactly what Germany taught in her schools prior to the war, and we are following her example..." He went on:

This is the very way the enemy works with propaganda and under our present lax system it appears there is no trouble for any stranger to publish whatever they (sic) may see fit and introduce it into our schools, and poison the minds of children

as they (sic) see fit. This is a British country and if we are to maintain it as such, and raise British subjects we must instil nothing but British ideas and British principles into the minds of the children and have a more loyal and national spirit exhibited in our schools...¹²

Further evidence of Grant's disloyalty was culled from his statements about various British personages. His description of Charles Bailey, "the English official at the Bay", who quarrelled with Radisson and Grosseilliers as "a red-faced and choleric John Bull, who hated Frenchmen",¹³ upset at least one critic. There was annoyance with his descriptions of Pitt as "overbearing" and proud,¹⁴ George III as "narrow-minded", and Edward Grenville as "obstinate" and "tactless";¹⁵ and unhappiness over his decision to quote from Tecumseh, the War of 1812 Indian chieftain, who compared General Henry Procter to "a fat dog with its tail between its legs".¹⁶

Grant was charged with deliberate over-magnification of British military defeats. The fact that he had included a picture of a medal struck to commemorate Frontenac's defence of Quebec in 1690 was put forward in evidence; although no one seemed to be alarmed by the fact that on the reverse side of the medal was a Latin inscription reading: "Kebeca Liberata".¹⁷ And it was argued that he had detailed all too vividly General Braddock's defeat at Fort Duquesne in 1755.

Naturally enough, the material to sustain the accusation that Grant was anti-Protestant and pro-Catholic was found in the initial pages of his History, pages dealing with the era of New France. "Grant's so-called history", declared one sharp-eyed reader,

is nothing more than a commentary on Canadian history borrowed from the early writings of the Jesuits who, under the guiding hand of Champlain in Canada, and the master mind of Cardinal Richelieu in France were out to bring this North American continent down to the level of Mexico and Peru.¹⁹

Grant's generous appraisal of the work and motives of the Jesuits;²⁰ his inclusion of a picture of the arrival of the Ursuline nuns in 1639;²¹ and his quotation from Frontenac to the effect that ending the brandy trade would simply drive the Indians to "rum and Protestantism";²² were all cited as proof of his ultramontane and Jesuitical position.

The other side of the charge that Grant was pro-Catholic was that he was pro-French-Canadian, a trait -- whether real or imagined -- which his accusers found most distressing. It was pointed out that, in dealing with the battle of the Plains of Abraham, Grant devoted most of a page to a discussion of Montcalm, his tactics, his wounding and his death;²³ an obvious sign of his basic softness on the subject of French Canada. No one apparently noticed that Benjamin West's quite inaccurate but famous The Death of Wolfe occupied another page. His treatment of Riel proved to be another sore point. Statements that Riel "was no coward, and met his fate with something of the high constancy of the martyr";²⁴ and that "the French in Quebec had sympathized with the endeavour of Riel to win justice for their compatriots";²⁵ seemed to drive Grant's opponents into a frenzy.

But it was his words on Henri Bourassa -- referred to as "that traitor" by one commentator²⁶ -- that incensed all. In Quebec, Grant had written,

there is still a "nationalist" party with, however, a more moderate programme than that of Mercier, and its leader, Mr Henri Bourassa, has always stood manfully for honest and progressive administration.²⁷

Even Grant considered this phrasing unwise: "...I am willing", he told a correspondent,

to expunge or modify the reference on page 302 to Bourassa, which, though correct, is inadequate in the light of his war record.²⁸

Most of Grant's critics, however, would have been willing to expunge Bourassa himself because of the latter's sharp criticism of conscription and Canada's participation in the First World War.

These, then, were the chief trouble spots in Grant's History but, once begun, his opponents did not rest and, lifting statements out of context, read a variety of meanings into them. He was accused of stating that, in the Red River affair of 1869-70, Riel "did nothing more than fight for his rights".²⁹ What Grant had actually said was this:

...So far, Riel had done little more than fight for his rights, but in March 1870, he put himself for ever in the wrong by the execution on a charge of treason of Thomas Scott, an Ontario Orangeman. Scott seems to have had a great contempt for all French Catholics and for Riel in particular, and had undoubtedly made himself disagreeable, but for the charge of treason there was no evidence whatever, and the so-called execution was a barbarous murder.³⁰

In his discussion of the English-American traders who arrived in Quebec after the conquest, it was said that Grant had called them the "most immoral collection of men I ever knew".³¹ The author had, in fact, written:

Quarrels soon broke out between the English settlers and Governor Murray, who called them on one occasion "the licentious fanatics trading here"; on another "four hundred and fifty contemptible sutters and traders", and on another "the most immoral collection of men I ever knew". His anger was probably due to the dislike of the soldier for the business man. By "licentious" the Governor only meant disobedient to his authority, and by "fanatics" that they were not members of the Church of England, but New England Independents. As for immorality, they were certainly much more sober than the average British officer of the day, and they made trade and commerce thrive as never before.³²

While denouncing the supposed tendencies of Grant as displayed in his writing, his opponents chose to ignore passages such as the following which give the lie to most of their comments:

Thus every Canadian is at once a citizen of a municipality, of a province, of a Dominion, and of an Empire. We must all love the municipality in which we live... But we must love our municipality as part of a province... We must love the province as part of our native land... And beyond even Canada we must love the worldwide Empire...³³

Most present-day critics would argue that such an admonition has no place in a Canadian history text-book. But, on the whole, they would probably also agree that, if his book had flaws, they were minor; and that, in some ways, it presented a fresh and lively interpretation of Canadian history.

Grant had his defenders in 1920, but they could not win the battle against an assault which, an "old boy" of Upper Canada College who worked for the Province told Grant, "was being engineered by some of the baser members of the Orange Order".³⁴ His book had been banned and it remained in that condition. The only note of the event which the Department of Education took in its annual report for 1919-20 was a stray remark contained in the submission of the Free Text-Book Branch:

In conclusion, it is desired to express an appreciation of the very valuable assistance rendered by principals in large centres in helping to meet a very trying situation which occurred in January, 1920, when owing to the wholly unexpected demands made for supplies at that time, the Free Text-book Branch was unable to furnish some of the items asked for on all requisitions presented.³⁵

Obviously there must have been some scrambling by teachers in January to find something to replace Grant's History of Canada.

In an effort to restore his book to the good graces of the British Columbia Department of Education, Grant offered to remove the pictures of the arrival of the Ursulines -- although he stated that it no more implied "approval of the Ursulines or of the Roman Catholic Church than a picture of 'The Temptation' would imply approval of the proceedings of the serpent; and of the commemorative medal of 1690. He would treat Bourassa "in the light of his war record" and would omit "the sentence on page 155 to the effect that to many men 'patriotism is impossible without a little hatred.'" "But", he added,

I am certainly not willing either to make a book so colourless that it can give no possible offence to anybody, or so partisan that its chief use would be as a club to belabour the priesthood.³⁶

Grant was also prepared "to add four or five pages, either in bulk or in various parts, with special reference to the West".³⁷ But the Department simply countered that it would wait and take a look at any revised edition, a statement which scarcely provided Grant with the grounds for confidently proceeding with the revision. By February 1, the book was out of all the schools and there was no Canadian history being taught.³⁸

Mack Eastman took a strong interest in the case and continued to press for a new authorization of Grant's book --- presumably in some satisfactorily revised form -- from the Department of Education; but he could not report that the future looked very promising. Eastman and

W. N. Sage continued the quiet fight for Grant's book with the Department of Education, but they got nowhere despite periodic bursts of hope.³⁹ And, later in October, 1921, Sage wrote Grant a letter over which he agonized before sending it off in the mails:

This morning I received a letter marked "Private & Confidential" from Mr. (S J.) Willis (Superintendent of Education). I gathered from it that there is no chance of your History being again authorized...

...Opposition to the book seems to have been much better organized & more wide-spread than we knew. You know, of course, my own opinion of the book & of its opponents.⁴⁰

Grant's book was never again put out on the desks of British Columbia's classrooms.

The militant opponents of the text-book, who certainly won the day, were generally described as Orangemen, and there seems to be no reason to doubt this. But to offer their opposition and intransigence as an explanation of what had occurred in British Columbia in 1920 is inadequate. The question still remains: why did they succeed in achieving their end?

The composition of the population of British Columbia at that point in time must be considered. 73.7% of the population claimed either British origin or descent,⁴¹ while a mere 2.1% could be classified as of French origin or descent.⁴² To view it from another direction: 50.5% of the population claimed Canadian birth; 30.5% claimed British birth; and 19.0% were of foreign birth. It seems safe to assume that a significant number of that 50.5% would be children of parents of British birth.⁴² Roman Catholics formed only 12.2% of the population and they were handily outnumbered by Anglicans with 30.7% and by Presbyterians with 23.5% and rivalled by Methodists with 12.4%.⁴³

Both French-Canadians and Roman Catholics were even less significant in those urban centres of British Columbia which placed the greatest pressure on the government for the removal of Grant's book. In Vancouver, 79.9% of the population was of British origin or descent, and only 1.9% was of French origin or descent.⁴⁴ Victoria held a population which was 84.8% British origin or descent and but .9% French origin or descent.⁴⁵ And, in New Westminster, 80.8% were in the former bracket and 1.8% in the latter.⁴⁶

In Vancouver, 9.3% of the population was Roman Catholic; 29.9% Anglican; 26.9% Presbyterian; and 12.7% Methodist.⁴⁷ Victoria looked like this: 6.3% Roman Catholic; 40.2% Anglican; 20.3% Presbyterian; and 13.0% Methodist.⁴⁸ And New Westminster divided in this fashion: 9.6% Roman Catholic; 26.8% Anglican; 26.3% Presbyterian; and 17.6% Methodist.⁴⁹ In British Columbia, the ground was scarcely fertile for the growth of generous historical treatment of either French-Canadians or Roman Catholics.

But there was more to it than that. The critics really did not discuss Canadian history; they were talking about the proper handling and dissemination of British history. A sense of Canadian history did

not permeate their ranks. They were agitated about the anti-British spirit of the text and they felt as one of their number expressed it: "These are days when it becomes everybody to show their British loyalty if they have any".⁵⁰ Canada was not their concern; Britain was.

Such feelings, of course, had been heightened by the First World War and out of this combination came the extremism to which Grant's book fell victim. The Orange Order in British Columbia, which claimed growing strength in the province after the conclusion of the conflict, was proud of the fact that "over 35 per cent. of the total membership in British Columbia had enlisted for overseas, a sign that Orangemen had not forgotten the basic force and loyal principles of their order."⁵¹ These people were not going to remain silent when the accusation of being anti-British was levelled against Grant.

In his Memoirs, Robert Borden noted, in another context, that at the war's end "the state of mind of the people in general" was "abnormal". He continued:

...There was a distinctive lack of the usual balance; the agitator, sometimes sincere, sometimes merely malevolent, self-seeking and designing, found quick response to insidious propaganda.⁵²

Emotions roused by the war -- particularly bitterness and hatred towards French-Canadians because of their attitude toward conscription -- were sustained in strength long after November 11, 1918. In fact, among the extremists hatred of French-Canadians was an essential part of their patriotism towards Great Britain; they proved what they had denounced in Grant's History. And no government in its right mind was going to challenge such feelings if they appeared to have any strength.

In a statement to the Ubyyssey on another matter in 1921, Mack Eastman took the opportunity to defend Grant once more and he sourly observed: "The war has sorely disturbed the minds of many non-combatants!"⁵³ And, in one sense he was right: W.L. Grant's History of Canada had become another casualty of the First World War.

FOOTNOTES

1. Province (Vancouver), January 3, 1920, p.1
2. World (Vancouver), January 5, 1920, p.4
3. Public Archives of Canada, W.L. Grant Papers, W.L. Grant to the Minister of Education (Victoria, B.C.), January 14, 1919.
4. Ibid., Alexander Robinson to W.L. Grant, June 20, 1919.

5. Sun (Vancouver), January 10, 1920, p.6; Province, January 10, 1920, p.7; World, January 10, 1920, p.4. Grant was also defended by "Lucian" in a column called "The Week-end" in the Province, January 10, 1920, pp. 12-13; "Lucian" was Dr S.D. Scott; see: Grant Papers, W.L. Grant to C.F. Hamilton, January 16, 1920. M. Ross, a retired school teacher, also spoke up on Grant's behalf; see: Sun, January 13, 1920, p.6.
6. World, January 12, 1920, p.4, letter from J.H. Ingram. Identical letter in Sun, January 12, 1920, p.6.
7. Grant Papers, W.L. Grant to C.F. Hamilton, January 16, 1920.
8. World, January 10, 1920, p.4, letter from E.E. Sykes. Identical letter in Sun, January 10, 1920, p.6.
9. W.L. Grant, History of Canada (London: William Heinemann; Montreal: Renouf Publishing Company, (1916)), p.119.
10. Ibid., p.149.
11. Ibid., p.155.
12. See footnote 8.
13. Grant, History p.74.
14. Ibid., p.100.
15. Ibid., p.130
16. Ibid., p.151.
17. Ibid., pp. 82-83.
18. Ibid., p.93
19. World, March 19, 1920, p.4, letter from W.O. Black.
20. Grant, History.... p.50.
21. Ibid., p.59
22. Ibid., p.61
23. Ibid., p.114
24. Ibid., p.283
25. Ibid., p.285.
26. See footnote 19.
27. Grant, History.... p.302.
28. See footnote 7.
29. See footnote 19.
30. Grant, History.... p.260
31. See footnote 19.
32. Grant, History.... pp. 120-121.

33. Ibid., pp. 377-378.
34. See footnote 7; also: Grant Papers, Mack Eastman to W.L. Grant, January 23, 1920.
35. Forty Ninth Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Province of British Columbia, 1919-20 (Victoria: King's Printer, 1921), p.C9C.
36. See footnote 7.
37. Grant Papers, W.L. Grant to Mack Eastman, January 30, 1920.
38. Ibid., W.N. Sage to W.L. Grant, February 1, 1920.
39. Ibid., W.N. Sage to W.L. Grant, July 22, 1921 and October 16, 1921.
40. Ibid., W.N. Sage to W.L. Grant, October 20, 1921. The opposition was "better organized". On January 13, 1920, a letter appeared in the World (p.4) from W.O. Black which, although strongly anti-Catholic and anti-French-Canadian in tone, defended Grant and apparently viewed the banning as some dark Catholic plot. Then, on March 19 and March 30, 1920, letters appeared in the World (p.4) from a W.O. Black - presumably the same man - and they were strongly anti-Grant as well as anti-Catholic and anti-French-Canadian in tone. If this was the same man, then someone had taken him aside during a two-month period and showed him the flaws in Grant's book.
41. Sixth Census of Canada, 1921. I: Population (Ottawa: King's Printer, 1924), pp. 354-355. The total population of British Columbia in 1921 was 524,582; of this number, 387,513 were of British origin or descent (English: 221,145; Scotch: 104,965; Irish: 54,298; and others: 7,105) and only 11,246 were of French origin or descent.
42. Ibid., p.337. Canadian born: 264,046; British born: 160,752; and foreign born: 99,784.
43. Ibid., pp. 752-753. Roman Catholics: 63,980; Anglicans: 160,978; Presbyterians: 123,022; and Methodists: 64,810.
44. Ibid., p.542. The population of Vancouver in 1921, exclusive of Point Grey and South Vancouver, was 117,217. British origin or descent: 93,609; French origin or descent: 2,252.
45. The population of Victoria was 33,727. British origin or descent: 32,821; French origin or descent: 359.
46. Ibid., p.545. Population of New Westminster was 14,495. British origin or descent: 11,706; French origin or descent: 259.
47. Ibid., p.756. Roman Catholics: 10,842; Anglicans: 35,137; Presbyterians: 31,595; Methodists: 14,968.
48. Ibid., p.757. Roman Catholics: 2,448; Anglicans: 15,562; Presbyterians: 7,877; Methodists, 5,245.
49. Ibid., p.760. Roman Catholics: 1,388; Anglicans: 3,886; Presbyterians: 3,809; Methodists: 2,551.

50. See footnote 6.
51. Sun, July 13, 1919, p.24.
52. Henry Borden (ed.) Robert Laird Borden: His Memoirs, II (Toronto, Macmillan, 1938), p.972.
53. Ubyssy (Vancouver), April 7, 1921, p.2.

-
* * * * *

A notice was mailed to all Secretaries giving the deadlines for the issues of the B.C. Historical News. There will be two more issues for this season before the summer break, with deadlines of February 15th and April 15th. This issue will not reach the members by February 15th, so would all Secretaries take note and send in their news as soon as possible. If any society has had a paper of particular interest and would like to submit a copy (preferably typewritten) it would no doubt find its way into a future issue of the B.C. Historical News.