Unlike some prominent Canadian historians, whose widely consulted and reissued textbook on Canadian history still claims that the Fathers of Confederation chose to call Canada a dominion based on a passage in the book of *Lamentations* (never mind that the word dominion never appears in *Lamentations*), these students probably knew that it was taken from Psalm 72. They would also most likely be able to state why it is important for young Canadians to know such things.

Most praiseworthy in *The Lord's Dominion* is its author's even-handedness. Semple acknowledges that Canada's Methodists often acted in pig-headed ways towards Natives, Blacks, and other minorities and that Methodist men did not always hold Methodist women in the highest regard. Absent, however, are those pernicious oblations some fashion-conscious social scientists so love to pour on the alters of race, class, gender, and other trendy spectres. Semple, it appears, made it a point to understand his subjects on their own terms — a refreshing thing indeed.

Preston Jones
University of Ottawa

Donald H. Avery — *Reluctant Host: Canada's Response to Immigrant Workers, 1896–1994*. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart, 1995. Pp. 342.

This book is a logical outgrowth of Donald H. Avery's Ph.D. dissertation on Canadian immigration policy (1973) and his subsequent work, *Immigrant Workers and Labour Radicalism in Canada* (1979). As he has worked on this monograph intermittently for over 20 years, it is his *magnum opus*. Its essence is that Canada's immigration policy has always been based on self-interest: people were admitted depending upon the country's manpower needs as articulated by various lobbying groups, especially by business interests.

Between 1896 and 1919, the Canadian government actively recruited certain kinds of immigrants, discouraged others, and deported a third group. Since the federal government as well as the railroad, mining, lumber, and farming interests believed that Canada needed cheap labourers to help develop the West, they all recruited ''stalwart peasants'' in Eastern Europe to meet these needs. Meanwhile, the business interests also recruited Asian immigrants, much to the consternation of the white population of British Columbia, which began to agitate against them. As a result, the federal government proceeded to pass legislation limiting, and ultimately banning, most Asian immigrants from Canada. At the same time, fearing socialist political agitators among the immigrants, the government deported those it deemed to be labour radicals, especially after the ''Red Scare'' of 1919.

In the inter-war period Canada's immigration policy changed gears several times. During the first half of the 1920s the Canadian government responded to various nativist attacks upon the previous policy of admitting hundreds of thousands of Eastern European peasants by banning them and encouraging immigration from Great Britain and Northern Europe instead. However, Northern and Western Europeans did not wish to move to Canada to work as seasonal farm-hands, lumberjacks,

or domestics, which were deemed to be Canada's greatest labour needs. Thus in 1925 the government bowed to the business interests once again and began to admit Eastern Europeans to fill these roles. After the Great Depression broke out, however, this policy was quickly rescinded, and only well-off agriculturalists, who could afford to purchase entire farms, were admitted into Canada. Meanwhile, the government remained indifferent to the plight of political refugees seeking a haven in the west. It refused to admit Armenian or Russian refugees after the First World War, and it turned a blind eye to anti-fascist Germans, Spaniards, and especially Jews in the 1930s.

Between 1945 and 1967 Canada struggled to redefine its immigration policies. On one hand, to appease world opinion as expressed in the newly created United Nations, Canada appeared to liberalize its immigration laws. On the other, it still insisted that no one had a right to immigrate to Canada; immigration remained a privilege to be defined by the government. Thus, even though Canada accepted over 160,000 post-war political refugees from Europe between l945 and 1952 (and 37,000 Hungarians in 1956), it did so in the naive belief that they would make good agricultural workers, lumberjacks, and domestics. While all of them had to accept such manual labour for a short time to gain entry into Canada, most of these highly educated refugees quickly left such jobs at the earliest opportunity and found suitable professional employment in Canada's principal cities of Montreal and Toronto. Canada reformed its immigration laws in 1952 to allow family reunification, and thousands of Italians, Portuguese, Greeks, and others from Southern Europe came in response. This shift in the source of immigration greatly alarmed the Conservative government of John Diefenbaker. His Minister of Citizenship and Immigration, Ellen Fairclough, tried to stem the tide by proposing to reform Canada's immigration laws to make them more equitable. By then she had so alarmed the new immigrants that a coalition of them defeated her in her Hamilton riding in the 1963 election, returning an Italian-Canadian instead!

The debate about Canada's immigration policy continued in the 1960s and is still alive today. Concerned about an alleged ''brain drain'' to the United States, the federal government produced a White Paper on immigration which resulted in a new Immigration Act in 1967. For the first time, Canada decided to promote ''brains over brawn'' and established an elaborate points system which opened up the country to immigration from all over the world, but only for those possessing the education or skills which Canada wanted. The result was an influx of highly educated Asians, but a sharp decline in unskilled and semi-skilled workers and a growing labour shortage in Canada. Therefore, the government produced a Green Paper on immigration and passed yet another Immigration Act in 1977, which was a compromise that promoted family reunification and the admittance of political refugees and well-educated or skilled immigrants. Meanwhile, the government also began to recruit ''guest workers'' from Mexico and the Caribbean to try to fill the need for farm labourers and domestics. By the 1980s the majority of immigrants arriving in Canada were from Asia, the Caribbean, and Latin America (Eastern Europe was cut off by the Iron Curtain), and the descendants of earlier European arrivals began to worry about the changing nature of this immigration. At the same

time, the Canadian government established annual targets or quotas for immigrants, depending upon the economic prosperity of the country. In 1990 the quota was set at between 220,000 and 250,000 per year to meet Canada's economic and demographic needs. However, in 1995 the Minister of Immigration imposed a $975 ''landing fee'' upon all immigrants, which critics charged was a ''head tax'' similar to the one imposed upon Chinese immigrants in the early twentieth century. Its effect would be to exclude poor immigrants and to admit only the well-to-do.

Avery concludes that Canada's immigration policies over the last hundred years have reflected both continuity and change. Continuity can be seen in Canada's never-ending search for cheap labourers. Change usually came during a crisis, whether economic or political. However, when compared with the immigration policies of other receiving countries, Canada's appeared to be the most generous in the number of immigrants it admitted in relation to its population.

Reluctant Host is a major scholarly contribution to the field. It contains almost 100 pages of footnotes, which reveal that Avery has not only read most of the literature in the field, but has also mined the National Archives of Canada, the National Archives in Washington, and various provincial and private archives. It is a book of which he can justly be proud.

My only regret is that Avery did not publish a bibliography. He does discuss the historiography of the field in the introduction, and he provides the serious reader with a wealth of sources in his footnotes, but a traditional listing of his secondary sources, broken down into books and articles, would have been of immense value to graduate students. It is to be hoped that the author will remedy this shortcoming in the second edition of this very valuable book.

M. Mark Stolarik
University of Ottawa

Paul Robert Magocsi — *Our People: Carpatho-Rusyns and their Descendants in North America*, 3rd revised ed. Toronto: Multicultural History Society of Ontario, 1994. Pp. v, 220.

There once was a man, so the fable goes, who was born in the Habsburg Empire, went to school in Czechoslovakia, got married in Hungary, spent his adult life in the Soviet Union, died and was buried in Ukraine, in the village where he had lived all his life. This imaginary man was a Carpatho-Rusyn, whose native land has changed hands many times since the collapse of the Dual Monarchy of Austria-Hungary in 1918. The home of the Rusyn people in the past several centuries — historians do not agree exactly as to when they had migrated to their present homeland — has been the northern and northeastern ranges and foothills of the Carpathian Mountains of Eastern Europe. In the western part of this Rusyn homeland (from the Tatra Peaks in the west to the western border of today's Ukraine), they used to inhabit the regions both north and south of the mountains; in the eastern part, they were predominantly confined to the southern slopes and valleys