

semi-skilled Italian workers, explain much of that niche's formation. Despite the high turnover among both employers and workers, the niche enabled a number of ambitious and talented Italian immigrants to experience a substantial degree of social mobility, some of them even ascending to the highest echelons of entrepreneurship. At the same time, the unsafe working conditions prevailing in that niche condemned many others to a life of infirmity and poverty. Thus, as Agnoletto shows, the ethnic homogeneity characterizing that construction sector did not translate into ethnic cooperation or harmony: it had its inner class dynamics as employers imposed a highly exploitative labour system frequently accompanied by threats of deportation for workers who dared to revolt against it. The result is one of the most compelling studies we now have in the literature dealing with the formation of occupational ethnic niches.

Another innovative aspect of *The Italians Who Built Toronto* lies in the author's attempt to contribute to both labour and entrepreneurial history, thus bridging two historical fields that traditionally are shaped by separate objectives, perspectives, and methodologies. While one cannot but welcome this two-pronged approach, it yields unequal results. On the labour side, in fact, the author was able to rely on several autobiographies by workers who were participants in those events, as well as on oral history accounts by workers who were willing to be interviewed by the author. This is in contrast with the dearth of employers' sources in an industry where contracting and sub-contracting companies were short-lived, and where employers proved reluctant to share their experiences with the author. Still, this book will likely remain the definitive work on a crucial chapter in Toronto's immigration and labour history.

Bruno Ramirez, *Université de Montréal*



Building Sanctuary: The Movement to Support Vietnam War Resisters in Canada, 1965–73, Jessica Squires. Vancouver, University of British Columbia Press, 2013. xxi, 348 pp. \$34.95 Cdn (paper).

Drawing on newspapers, archival documents, oral histories, and an array of secondary sources, Jessica Squires shows that while Canada allowed American draft dodgers, deserters, and others to find refuge from the war (or from complicity with the nation that waged it), its status as a ready sanctuary is largely a myth, as such a conclusion omits how that refuge was actually achieved. Squires reconstructs the complex social movements that grew in response to the influx of young Americans fleeing both the

draft and a country engaged in an unpopular war in Southeast Asia. The author traces the burgeoning Canadian anti-draft movement's interaction with law enforcement and government officials and investigates the complex interactions between activists and war resisters, finding that support for these new immigrants to Canada was far from monolithic. In doing so, the author delves into the much neglected links between the anti-draft movement and the nation's immigration policy.

As Squires reveals, the Canadian government made considerable efforts to block this group of prospective immigrants. She also challenges the idea that leaders, including Liberal Prime Minister, Pierre Trudeau, and his government were unequivocal in their support of war resisters. Indeed, the federal government's approach was at best ambivalent; few politicians publically supported draft resisters, wary of a perceived alignment with so called radicals, coupled with concerns about straining relations with the United States government. Squires shows how the RCMP, complicit with local Canadian police forces and the Federal Bureau of Investigation, routinely monitored and targeted resisters, efforts that at times resulted in deportations. But the approach on how to address those coming north was anything but uniform or even coherent.

Prior to the spring of 1969, draft evaders found it much easier to enter the country than other Americans who were deserters from the military. As Squires points out, Ottawa's 1968 move to have border agents discriminate on the basis of military status created enormous difficulties for those hoping to gain entry, and challenges for those looking to provide aid. In 1967, the government of Canada adopted a system in which prospective immigrants amassed points based on employment opportunities, language proficiency, and educational attainment. To gain landed immigrant status, hopefuls needed to have fifty points or higher. But the new directives allowed border agents to deduct these points based on military status. Deserters already faced increased scrutiny with their military status, and lacked what many draft dodgers had by way of college education and professional skills. Squires shows how an intense lobbying effort by this grassroots Canadian movement was crucial in ending much of the discrimination based on military status in 1969, which had in effect closed the border to many dodgers and deserters.

The author is at her best when examining the politics around northward-bound war resisters, especially the complex exchanges between bureaucrats and politicians, and connecting these accounts to those inside the social movement, including the media and the police. The internal government discussions concerning immigration policy in light of the war and within the context of the anti-war movement is also important to a better

understanding of Canada's immigration history and the development and implementation of public policy.

While Squires recounts discord among resisters, in particular, between those who became Canadian citizens and others, including many deserters and draft dodgers who hoped to return home as soon as conditions allowed, discussion of the dissimilarities between war resisters extends little beyond how they related to Canadian government policy and the movement's response. While the book's central purpose is to deal with the Canadian social movement's response to the arrival and needs of war resisters, the author nevertheless argues that such discussions about the differences within categories of draft evaders, for example, create "[f]alse polarities between voluntary expatriates and political exiles, the politically motivated and those who were not, and so on" (p. 8). Curiously, Squires does not offer a complete explanation or support for this position.

There were important differences between draft dodgers and other war resisters, as individuals and as groups, especially among those who actually evaded military conscription when they received a draft notice from the Selective Service. Those experiences and motivations might have differed significantly from those who left the country because they disagreed with their nation's foreign policy, and different yet from those who were drafted or deserted but who intended to return to their home country as soon as it was possible, and then there were the thousands who came to Canada with no intention of returning, regardless of an end to the draft or amnesty. The convenient catch-all of "war resister" regardless of age, gender or Selective Service classification can become problematic when the particulars of individual decisions to leave the United States or to return are left unexplored. In this respect, the book lacks a broader historical context regarding the Vietnam War and opposition to it in the United States.

Despite these criticisms, the book is important in several ways. The work's examination of left nationalism in the context of Vietnam-era draft resistance provides a solid contribution to the collective conversation on national ideals. Squires effectively destroys the myth that Canada as a whole welcomed draft dodgers and resisters with open arms, revealing that as a refuge from militarism, it was "a contingent and partial one, at best" (p. 228). *Building Sanctuary* provides a thorough and clearly argued account of Canadian social activists supporting young Americans who ventured across the border. The author's exploration into the grassroots activism that led to a change in the country's immigration policy is a worthy contribution to the literature. As such, this work will be useful not only to scholars of the 1960s but to students, as it could be used in undergraduate and graduate-level courses dealing with international relations, immigration and naturalization, and law enforcement tactics. The book's

“bottom-up” approach to examining the formation of public policy within the context of resistance to the Vietnam War, provides not only a valuable addition to political theory and history but illustrates brilliantly the enduring significance of social activism.

Frank Kusch, *University of Saskatchewan*



Conservatism, Consumer Choice, and the Food and Drug Administration during the Reagan Era: A Prescription for Scandal, by Lucas Richert. Lanham, Lexington Books, 2014. viii, 221 pp. \$90.00 US (cloth).

Lucas Richert frames the Food and Drug Administration (FDA) within the rise of conservatism, a force within the Republican Party and one that attracted Ronald Reagan as perhaps its exemplar. In this sense *Conservatism, Consumer Choice, and the Food and Drug Administration during the Reagan Era* is as much about the FDA as it is about the ideology that has attempted to constrict the agency. In this context the book may be best understood as an example of the triumph of conservatism in modern American life. Scholars have produced many studies of the pharmaceutical industry and the FDA. What Richert delivers is a political narrative of conservatism within the context of capitalism, scientific research, and the rise and fall of ideologies.

The author begins his treatment with a brief history of the FDA, tracing its roots to what one might call its proto inception in the US State Department in 1839. Much credit of course is due Upton Sinclair and Harvey Wiley in the first decade of the twentieth century, but the story is too well-known to merit treatment. Within this historical framework it is useful to trace changes in the scope of the FDA's authority. Over the short term Richert focuses sharply on Reagan as the catalyst of modern conservatism. Well-known was the president's penchant for portraying government as antithetical to freedom. Accordingly the discourse shifted toward the prospect of shrinking the size and scope of government. As president, Reagan had the federal government in mind, but plenty of his sycophants applied his principles to state and local governments. Reagan took aim at a number of federal agencies including the FDA. In this context arose questions about the FDA's actions. To what degree did the FDA have the authority to regulate drugs and other substances that Americans ingested? Did this authority conflict with freedom of choice? Did the FDA operate outside the confines of capitalism?