

Power: A Case Study of the Ontario Hockey Association, 1890-1936¹

Alan Metcalfe
University of Windsor

One of the defining characteristics of the emergence of organized sport was the development of local, provincial, national and international organizations to administer and control sport. Decisions of organizations such as the International Olympic Committee impact upon sport wherever it is played. Similarly organizations at a national, provincial and local level reach into all corners of their areas of jurisdiction. While the basic history of their growth has been charted, little has been done to investigate the degree to which they controlled their sports and the ways in which this control was achieved.² Therefore the nature of these organizations, the degree of control and the ways in which they make decisions raise important questions with respect to the ways in which sport is organized and formed in democratic countries. It would be reasonable to expect that in democratic countries the organization of sport would reflect the democratic values which underlie the society. However, Janet Lever in her book *Soccer Madness*, in a comparison between North America and Brazil, questioned why "A country proud of its democratic institutions allows what amounts to dictatorial control over sports, while numerous authoritarian regimes, like Brazil's military government, coexist with democracy in sport."³ Are North American sport organizations as dictatorial and authoritarian as Janet Lever suggests? It is this and the more fundamental question of power that lies at the heart of this paper.

The question of the nature of sporting organizations will be addressed by examining the history of the Ontario Hockey Association (OHA) from 1890 to 1936, from its formation to the break from the Amateur Athletic Union of Canada (AAUC). While the ultimate focus is upon the nature of power and the degree to which the OHA was a powerful organization this paper will approach the question from a different direction. First the paper will provide an historical outline of the decision-making processes within the OHA, the individuals and

1. I wish to thank the reviewers for their critical comments.

2. In a Canadian context it is somewhat surprising that little has been done to investigate the amateur organizations that did so much to shape sport in Canada. Little has been done to add to Keith Lansley, "The Amateur Athletic Union of Canada and Changing Concepts of Amateurism" (Ph.D. diss., University of Alberta, 1971). Don Morrow looked at the role of the powerful and influential Montreal Amateur Athletic Association in Don Morrow. *A Sporting Evolution* (Montreal: MAAA, 1982). The latest addition is Bruce Kidd, "Improvers, Feminists, Capitalists and Socialists: Shaping Canadian Sport in the 1920s and 1930s" (Ph.D. diss., York University, 1990). chapters 3 and 4.

3. Janet Lever. *Soccer Madness* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983).

groups who made the decisions, the changes that took place over time, the dominant issues that faced the OHA, and the mechanisms used by the OHA in their efforts to administer and control ice hockey in Ontario. This will be followed by an assessment of the degree to which the OHA controlled ice hockey in Ontario and its influence on sport and hockey in Ontario and beyond. Finally, the paper will focus on an assessment of the degree to which the OHA could be considered a powerful organization and the nature of power, itself.

The OHA was formed on November 27, 1890 at the Queen's Hotel, Toronto.⁴ During the ensuing six years the basic guidelines which were to guide the OHA until the Second World War were created. In 1891 a sub-committee was formed to prepare a constitution. This constitution, adopted in 1892, became the foundation stone of the OHA, institutionalizing the annual meetings as the ultimate decision-making body while vesting the power to run the organization between the annual meetings in the executive committee. This basic structure remained in place throughout. From the outset, decisions were not made at the grassroots level. There is no evidence that the majority of players and local administrators had any real say in the decisions related to the definition of an amateur or the mechanisms to control players. According to the constitution, policy decisions were made at the annual conventions. The individuals who gathered at these conventions were appointees of local administrators. Thus, it was an already select group that gathered in Toronto every November. From the beginning, it was the executive who brought forward motions to the annual meeting. This was recognized by the executive themselves. In 1927 D. L. Darroch, a longtime member of the executive, stated "I think perhaps it would be well if the delegates stood upon their hind legs and said a word or two. This association should not be governed entirely by the officers or past officers or the Executive Committee."⁵ In fact, he was right in his view. The OHA was run by the executive committee.

During the first decade of its existence the OHA was a small organization whose members were, for the most part, located east of Toronto. The executive was dominated by Toronto with over 60 percent of executive members being drawn from that city. More importantly Toronto laid an indelible imprint on the organization in 1891 when a committee of four Torontonians was given the task of writing a constitution.⁶ In effect it was a case of the elite running its own exclusive club.

Between 1893 and 1896, as ice hockey gained in popularity and teams flocked to the OHA, a problem that was to beset the OHA throughout its history emerged, the use of ineligible players. At the same time, resident requirements were introduced in an attempt to control the movement of players. Finally, in 1896, the basic three tier championship system had been put in place through the inauguration of senior (1890), junior (1893), and intermediate (1896)

4. A most valuable introduction to the OHA is Scott Young, *100 Years of Dropping The Puck: A History Of The OHA*. (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1989), pp. 7-192.

5. Minutes of 38th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 19, 1927.

6. Toronto *Globe*, December 1, 1891.

championships. These three elements provided the foundations of power and the mechanisms of control. However, it was not until 1897 that the issue that was to dominate the councils of the OHA for the next 40 years raised its head. In that year, the first non-Toronto president, James A. MacFadden of Stratford, accused an unnamed team of offering two Stratford players \$7 and \$5 respectively.⁷ The response was immediate, ruthless, and to at least two representatives, illegal. It was moved, seconded, and carried “nearly unanimously” that “when the status of any individual is questioned the burden of proving his innocence shall rest with the accused . . .”⁸ In matters of amateur standing a player was judged guilty until proven innocent. It was the threat of professionalism and the protection of amateurism that lay at the heart of the OHA and was the foundation of its power.

The years 1897 to 1904 were critical to the development of the foundations of amateurism. It was during these years when amateur sport in Canada was in an uproar over professionalism in lacrosse, soccer, and baseball that the OHA forged its own particular approach to the question. The OHA was the first major organization to articulate the ideological foundation that was to remain at the heart of the OHA and AAUC until the 1930s, the all or nothing approach to professionalism, once a professional always a professional. Central to the movement to articulate an approach to the amateur/professional question was John Ross Robertson, Member of Parliament, philanthropist, and owner of the *Toronto Telegram*.

Robertson, president from 1899 to 1905, enunciated the amateur creed at the annual meeting on November 30, 1900:

The aim of the OHA is today just what it was ten years ago, to further and promote honest sport on amateur lines . . . In line with this our endeavour is to foster a generous, broad minded sporting spirit, one that will not be disturbed by either the complaints of defeat or by the joy of victory. Our creed is to encourage the amateur and discourage the professional sport . . . The latter is our enemy. He preaches and preaches but he never practises.⁹

This typifies early pronouncements on amateurism, full of flowery phrases but lacking in concrete suggestions. The next few years witnessed the creation of mechanisms to control amateur ice hockey. Robertson was the first of a series of presidents who placed their imprint upon amateur ice hockey. His basic approach was to professionalize teams and individuals who knowingly or unknowingly competed with or against professionals. The issue came to a head in 1903 after the formation of the first professional league. It focused on the reinstatement of Peel, a London player, who had played professional hockey for Pittsburgh. The battle over Peel’s reinstatement revealed that there was no consensus in the OHA over the approach to be taken. The issue was first addressed at an executive meeting held on December 10, 1903 when the executive, by a surprisingly narrow margin of four to three, supported

7. Toronto Globe, December 6, 1897.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid.

Robertson's conservative position of "Once a professional, always a professional," and turned down Peel's application for reinstatement.¹⁰ In January, 1904 Robertson left for Europe. At the next executive meeting in February 1904, the executive reopened the question and reinstated Peel. Subsequently, on his return Robertson declared the action null and void, appointed two Torontonians to the executive and overturned the reinstatement. The conservatives from Toronto had defeated the liberals from the rest of the OHA. At the subsequent annual meeting the vote was 43 to 27 for Robertson's position. More importantly they adopted the position that was to become the foundation of the OHA's approach to amateurism; "once a professional always a professional."¹¹ This was a critical moment in the history of the OHA and amateurism. Liberal voices which supported a more flexible approach to the question of professionalism lost out to the "hard line" approach adopted by the ultra conservatives. The die was cast. More importantly the position adopted by the OHA was also adopted by the AAUC on its formation in 1909. The next 30 years were devoted to protecting this conservative definition of an amateur.

For a number of reasons the year 1904 was a turning point in the history of the organization. In that year the OHA adopted the definition of an amateur that was to remain its bulwark until 1936, Robertson served his last year as president, and W. A. Hewitt began his association with the OHA. It was also the commencement of a new era in the organizational history of the OHA and in particular in the process of decision making. The OHA moved toward a more rational system of ensuring continuity by requiring executive experience before assuming the mantle of president, creating a sub-committee to run the organization, and appointing W. A. Hewitt as secretary. After 1908, no president assumed office without previously serving at least four years on the executive followed by terms as second and first vice president. Although the system was never formally articulated, every president from 1909 followed this clear route. In several elections alternative candidates were on the slate of officers but never once were the unstated requirements violated. Starting in 1919, every president spent several years on the executive followed by two years as second vice president and two years as first vice president before assuming the role of president. By 1930 every president had served at least ten years on the executive. Therefore, the critical step was election to the executive. The slate of officers submitted, to the annual convention, by the executive was never rejected. Thus, the OHA was a self-perpetuating organization run by men who controlled the selection of their own successors.

In December, 1905 John Ross Robertson resigned as president after six years of nearly absolute rule in the OHA. His prestige and skills were not lost to the organization because he was appointed, with the secretary Hewitt and the treasurer, to a three man committee which became the decision-making group during the period between executive meetings. In effect this Toronto based

10. A full account of the issue was given at the Annual Meeting. *Toronto Globe*, December 5, 1904

11. *Ibid.*

committee was in the frontline of the OHA's battle against professionalism and dealt with eligibility, amateur status, and other questions. Within a few years this sub-committee became known, in hockey circles, as "The White Czars."¹² In 1918, after the death of Robertson, the sub-committee was institutionalized. Until 1933 it consisted of the president, secretary and treasurer. In effect this was Hewitt, Paxton and the incumbent president. The OHA was run by a triumvirate. Infrequently, when they stepped outside the accepted policies of the OHA a gentle reprimand was issued at the annual meeting warning the committee to stay within OHA policies. The most important member of this group was the secretary, W. A. Hewitt.

W. A. Hewitt's involvement in and contributions to sport were truly amazing.¹³ He started his career in his native Toronto playing football and baseball. He became more deeply involved in sport in 1890 when he became a reporter for the *Toronto News*. By 1900 he had been sports editor of both the *Toronto News* and *Montreal Herald*. In that year he assumed the position of sports editor of the *Toronto Star*, a position he held until 1931 when he became the first Attractions Manager at the new Maple Leaf Gardens. His major interest, however, was amateur sport. In 1903 he was appointed secretary of the OHA, a position he held in either an active or honorary capacity until his death in 1966. In 1914 he was one of those instrumental in the formation of the CAHA. In the early years he served in the capacity of secretary treasurer, before accepting the position of registrar-treasurer of the association in 1923. He held this position until 1961. In 1920 he refereed the first World Championship game between Sweden and Belgium, at Antwerp. "W. A. ," as he was known, managed the first three Olympic hockey champions in 1920, 1924, and 1928. His involvement in hockey was not his only contribution to sport. In 1907 he was one of the founders of the Big Four football league and in 1919 was president of the Canadian Rugby Football Union. For 47 years he was a patrol judge and chief steward of the Canadian Incorporated Racing Association and a steward representing the Ontario Racing Commission. In 1925, along with his more famous son Foster, he broadcast the first horse race to be described anywhere in the world. This only touches the surface of his multidimensional contributions to sport. W. A. Hewitt may have been unique but many other amateur sport promoters contributed in much the same way.

After the victory of the conservatives in 1904 the OHA moved to protect the purity of amateur hockey by developing a system of residence rules, certification and amateur cards which effectively restricted access to OHA hockey to specific groups. In 1905 certification of players was made mandatory.¹⁴ The next year residence rules were strengthened which lead the OHA to state that "The game will be more and more restricted to those whose qualifications are beyond

12. Young, *100 Years*, p. 91.

13. W. A. Hewitt was, perhaps, the most influential figure in Canadian sport during the first half of the century. For a brief summary of his contributions see *Toronto Globe and Mail*, September 10, 1966 and *Toronto Daily Star*, September 9, 1966.

14. *Toronto Globe and Mail*, November 13, 1905.

doubt.”¹⁵ Their power was expanded in 1914 when the OHA played a leading role in the formation of the Canadian Amateur Hockey Association (CAHA). With respect to their power to determine amateur status, one of the unintended consequences of the formation of the CAHA, in 1914, was that the OHA could now turn to three other organizations—the AAUC, its Ontario Branch, and the CAHA. In effect, it was virtually impossible to alter the definition of an amateur without the consent of four apparently separate but, in fact, closely linked organizations. Amateur hockey was in good hands.

In 1918 John Ross Robertson the arch enemy of professionalism died, the World War ended, and sport entered a new era, one in which it became increasingly difficult to live by the precept “once a professional always a professional.” Looking as though they recognized the new threats to amateur sport the administrators of the OHA and CAHA moved to strengthen their control of players. In 1919, the OHA made it mandatory for players to hold an amateur card issued by the AAUC.¹⁶ During the next few years W. A. Hewitt, secretary of the OHA and registrar-treasurer of the CAHA, developed “a complete card index of all players participating in organized hockey in Canada.”¹⁷ This became very useful as the problem of “tourists,” players moving around the country to play hockey, moved to centre stage. By the mid-1920s the threats to amateurism were met through a complex system of playing certificates, residence requirements, amateur cards, transfer rules, eligibility requirements, and regulations governing reinstatement. From 1925 to 1936 it was these issues that were central to the concerns of the executive and annual meetings. Eighty-five percent of the 108 executive meetings during this time were devoted to these issues.¹⁸ Ultimately the power of the OHA revolved around control of players and it was their perception that they were losing this control that led to the denouement of 1936.

During the 1920s, decision making power was held by a small group of men. First the president, while in office, was the spokesman for the organization and held real power. Perhaps more important were the presidents who continued to play a role after their terms of office. It was a small group of past presidents who were at the heart of the OHA. Varying in number, these presidents played an important role in the debates over the definition of an amateur. At the 33rd Annual Meeting on December 2, 1922 it was moved and carried that “all past presidents form an advisory board.”¹⁹ They were invited to attend two executive meetings a year but not allowed to vote.²⁰ In 1927, the annual convention extended the privilege to include all executive meetings and gave them the right to vote. In reality, the past presidents were already proposing motions and voting at executive meetings. The importance of this to the decisions made by

15. *Ibid.* November 19, 1906.

16. Minutes of 30th Annual Meeting of OHA, December 8, 1919.

17. Minutes of 34th Annual Meeting of OHA, December 1, 1923.

18. Minutes of Executive Committee meetings, November 6, 1925 to December 4, 1936.

19. Minutes of 33rd Annual Meeting of OHA, December 2, 1922.

20. Minutes of 38th Annual Meetings of OHA, November 19, 1927.

the OHA executive lay in the fact that these men's roots lay in nineteenth century Canada and thus reflected different values.

While the past presidents and the executive committee played a large role in determining policy decisions the base of real power was even narrower. There were a number of individuals who, through regular attendance and appointment to the sub-committee, effectively controlled the organization. While the overall attendance at executive meetings was over 50 percent, there was a small group whose dedication made them more regular attendees.²¹ It was these men who became the leaders during the 1920s. George Dudley, the Midland lawyer who joined the executive in 1924 led the move to disaffiliate in 1935; Alvin Schlegel of Preston joined in 1925 and assumed the role of president in 1936; and Sheriff J. F. Paxton of Whitby joined the executive in 1911 and remained until his death in 1935. More important than any of these was W. A. Hewitt, Secretary from November, 1903 to 1961. It was Hewitt who provided continuity and leadership, who was the catalyst for the organization and was the only ever-present member of the powerful sub-committee.

The threat to the OHA's control of amateur hockey was a consequence of changes both inside and outside the world of hockey. In the first place the OHA lost some of its autonomy to the CAHA who became the supreme arbiters on hockey matters. However, throughout the 1920s and 1930s members of the OHA played a dominant role in the affairs of the CAHA. It was the largest branch accounting for nearly 50 percent of all players. Additionally, between 1914 and 1936, the OHA provided 25 percent of the 30 executives. Several served as president and W. A. Hewitt, secretary-treasurer (1914-1923) and registrar-treasurer (1923-1961), was a powerful force in the CAHA. Thus, while some autonomy was lost, the OHA still had powerful voices in the places that counted.

More important to the daily running of the OHA were the problems that emerged as a result of the expansion of both amateur and professional hockey; increased numbers of players, the emergence of commercial and industrial hockey, the migration of players, and the development of professional hockey. In 1924 the OHA registered 3,124 amateur players. By 1933, the membership had tripled to 9,383.²² This was not the result of gradual expansion but rather the consequence of doubling the membership between 1927 and 1928. It was the emergence of industrial and commercial hockey that posed a threat to the OHA. Previously, in 1912, the OHA had banned the Eatons of Toronto because they were associated with a commercial concern. Interestingly, of the eleven man executive who unceremoniously "dumped" the Eatons in 1912 six were still active on the Advisory Board and executive in 1927, including Hewitt and Sheriff J. F. Paxton. This time their response was different, they brought the industrial and commercial teams under the benevolent umbrella of the OHA.

21. Data taken from Minutes of Executive Committee Meetings, 1925-1937.

22. Minutes of 43rd Annual Meeting of OHA, November 25, 1933.

The reasons for this about-face were clear. As George Dudley, who eventually led the OHA and CAHA in the break from the AAUC, stated, the OHA had a responsibility to control industrial and commercial hockey before abuses (professionalism) crept in.²³ This was the first breach in the dike; the OHA had sown the seeds of change.

The growth of hockey was not limited to Canada. Increasing numbers of players gravitated to the United States and Britain where hockey had taken hold. The problem of player migration, which was exacerbated by the depression in the early 1930s, brought inter-provincial differences to the fore. From the early 1920s the prairie associations had been pressing for a more liberal approach to the question of amateurism. While the more liberal associations posed a threat to the OHA they were always contained by the numerical power of Ontario within the CAHA. A more serious threat was posed by the United States and Britain over whom the OHA had no power. Since the inauguration of Olympic and world ice hockey in 1920 other countries had shown a greater interest in the game. In the early 1930s both Britain and the United States turned to Canada for players to bolster their efforts in the international arena. Concern erupted in 1935 when Britain and the United States syphoned off Canadian players. The response of the OHA was swift; on October 29, 1935 they voted unanimously "to refuse all applications this season by Ontario hockey players to play in the United States."²⁴ The problem was solved not by the OHA but by the CAHA when agreement was reached with the AAUUS and the British Ice Hockey Association. Ironically, the decision came too late to save the Canadian team from losing the gold medal at the 1936 Olympic Games to the British team comprised of Canadian players. This dispute and the failure of the AAUC to intervene on behalf of hockey was one of the underlying reasons for the break with the AAUC in 1936.

While the migration of players between different amateur associations caused problems it did not significantly erode the power of the OHA within its own jurisdiction. It was the growth of professional hockey that posed the greatest threat to the OHA. From the formation of the professional International League in 1903 the OHA had fought the threat of professional hockey by adopting and maintaining the precept "Once a professional always a professional." They were able to do this until the mid-1920s because professional hockey was plagued by instability of franchises and the amateur championship games provided a real alternative to the professional game as the best hockey in the country. Relative stability was achieved between 1925 and 1927 when the NHL expanded into the United States. By 1927 the whole focus of professional hockey, in terms of the location of franchises, had shifted from Canada to the United States. Two Canadian teams in Toronto and Montreal were joined by teams in Boston, New York (2), Chicago and Detroit. Gradually the OHA championship games became recognized as an inferior brand of hockey. By the late 1930s, the NHL

23. Minutes of 38th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 19, 1927.

24. Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, October 29, 1935.

was recognized as the site of the best ice hockey in the world.²⁵ The golden days of Canadian amateur hockey were gone.

The problems resulting from the NHL's expansion into the United States were addressed by President George B. McKay at the 38th annual meeting of the OHA on November 19, 1927. He expressed concern over young players who signed a professional contract and thus had "their hockey lives practically spoiled for all time."²⁶ The OHA simply reaffirmed their traditional stance-no contact with professionals. At the 1929 meeting the delegates enthusiastically endorsed George Dudley's motion that reaffirmed the traditional stance. In fact, changes were already in the wind. At the same meeting, Class B professionals were accepted as eligible for reinstatement. This category included men who unwillingly and unknowingly had played with or against professionals or who had become professionals as minors. During the next six years the old ideas crumbled. On June 20, 1929 the first professionals were reinstated by the executive.²⁷ In 1930, amateur teams were allowed to play against professionals for charity purposes. While there was resistance to these moves, the future direction was clear and there was no returning to the more rigid definition. The path toward a more reasonable approach was, in some respects, eased by the onset of the Depression since charity games between professionals and amateurs were justified on moral grounds. Such was the case on January 3, 1933 when the OHA endorsed a charity game between the Toronto Maple Leafs (pros) and OHA teams.²⁸ In 1933 the OHA in conjunction with the CAHA moved toward the reinstatement of Class A professionals. This had been proposed by the western associations in 1929 but had been rejected. By 1934, many of the cherished ideals had disappeared. Reinstated professionals were allowed to play and amateurs were allowed to try out with professional teams without loss of status. These actions moved the OHA and CAHA inexorably toward a confrontation with the AAUC which held jurisdiction over questions of amateur status.

Ice hockey entered 1935 in crisis which was reflected in the financial instability of the OHA and CAHA. In 1933 the OHA had an all time high balance of \$20,000, most of which had been generated by gate money from the championship games. During the next two years it plummeted to \$11,000.²⁹ If the trend continued the financial viability of ice hockey would soon be in question. The declining finances were partly a result of the onset of the Depression and partly because of a perceived decline in standards of play in the lucrative championship games, the OHA's largest single source of income. This decline was in part due to the improved standard of professional hockey and in part to the one way drain of players into professional ranks. In fact, it was more complex than that. Migration of OHA players across Canada and the

25. Kidd, "Improvers" pp. 336-337.

26. Minutes of 38th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 19, 1927.

27. Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting, June 29, 1929.

28. *Ibid.*, January 3, 1933.

29. Minutes of 44th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 27, 1933; Minutes of 46th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 30, 1935.

United States and Britain also drained players away from Ontario. Accordingly to Capt. J. T. Sutherland of Kingston, the OHA teams in Kingston were losing 20 to 30 players to the United States and the same number to Britain. While these figures undoubtedly exaggerate the true number, there is no doubt that substantial numbers were crossing the border and the Atlantic to play hockey. At the same meeting, Sutherland, an old dyed in the wool amateur, moved that professional athletes of good reputation should, at the direction of the executive, be reinstated directly into the OHA.³⁰ Reflecting a new found realism Sutherland stated, "the time has come when we should realize that this is 1935 and not 1890."³¹ Although the motion was defeated it was not because of the idea of reinstatement per se but because there was some uncertainty over the jurisdiction of the OHA in such matters and over whether reinstatement should be immediate. Therefore, although the motion was defeated, the concept of reinstatement was condoned.

The tide of opinion in amateur hockey was solidly behind moves to liberalize the definition of an amateur. Only the AAUC stood in the way and it was at this juncture that the OHA in the person of President George Dudley assumed a pivotal role. At the 1935 CAHA annual meeting discussion focused on the critical question of amateur cards. It was the powerful Resolution Committee, of which George Dudley was a prominent member, that brought forward four amendments to the definition of an amateur that entailed the destruction of the basic ideals of amateur ice hockey. These principles were:

1. That payment to hockey players by their clubs or employers, for salary or wages deducted while playing hockey shall be permitted.
2. That a hockey player shall be allowed to capitalize on his ability as a player to obtain legitimate employment and if he obtains legitimate employment as a result of his ability as a hockey player he should not lose his amateur status.
3. That exhibition games between professionals and amateurs should be allowed at the discretion and judgement of the various branches.
4. That, so far as the CAHA is concerned, a professional in another sport may still play in amateur hockey.³²

Dudley's argument in support of the motion was simple and forthright. For years money made by successful teams had been going to the players. Therefore, let the CAHA do away with hypocrisy. The motion was given strong support by representatives from the Prairies, Ottawa, and the OHA. The lone voice of dissent was W. A. Fry, President of the OHA in 1922-23 and now President of the AAUC. It was his opposition to the fourth principle that illustrated the degree to which the CAHA had moved from the basic principles of amateurism. The first three principles allowed amateurs to maintain the facade of amateurism but the fourth stripped away all pretense—professionals were no different from anyone else. By allowing professionals in one sport to

30. Minutes of 46th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 30, 1935.

31. Ibid.

32. Minutes of 19th Annual Meeting of CAHA, April 10-14, 1936.

compete against amateurs in others, the social difference, which underlay all previous definitions of an amateur, was effectively destroyed. Since acceptance of money did not destroy the integrity of a man, the essential characteristics of the amateur code were destroyed. The twenty-seven delegates to the CAHA, including six from the OHA, recognized the implications of their action, the delegates to the AAUC were empowered to disaffiliate if their demands were not met by the AAUC.

The final act was played out at the 49th annual meeting of the AAUC in November, 1936, when the CAHA was unsuccessful in its attempt to get the definition of an amateur amended.³³ As a result, they disaffiliated. Later in the month, at the 47th annual meeting of the OHA, President Dudley asked the delegates to endorse his actions with respect to the four principles. A heated discussion followed during which all the old cliches were trotted out and dire consequences for amateur hockey predicted. After the smoke had cleared, the delegates endorsed the actions of the President and the OHA entered a new era.³⁴ Of course, this was not the beginning of a golden age. The administrators were still ardent amateurs and still propagated the rhetoric of amateurism, the belief in pure sport undertaken for the love of the game. They were still wary in their relationship with professionals and above all continued to maintain control over players-in this nothing had changed. What had changed was that the OHA was free to determine who would or would not play amateur ice hockey. Additionally a continuing intercourse with professional hockey had been established. Symbolic of this relationship was a motion at the annual meeting to adopt NHL rules in their entirety.³⁵ In a more concrete sense, the CAHA had reached an agreement with the NHL which eventually led to an increasing dependency upon the NHL. No longer was the division between amateur and professional hockey based on ideological grounds, although the amateurs maintain this to the present day, but simply one of power-the ability to control the lives of other people.

It is apparent from the above that the foundations of the power of the OHA lay in their control of who could or could not play amateur hockey. This, then, raises the question of actual control. To what degree did the OHA control ice hockey in Ontario? The OHA was never in a formal sense a large organization. After 1918 the number of affiliates fluctuated between 150 and 190. A far greater number of teams played outside the jurisdiction of the OHA. For example, in 1928, when there were only 151 affiliates, there were over 4,000 teams within the OHA district. On the surface, it would appear that they were a small organization but appearances were deceptive. In reality, their influence was felt throughout hockey in Ontario and even beyond. Their power and influence was exerted in various ways. With regard to laws and procedures they ruled supreme. They controlled the size of the rink, the rules of play, eligibility, residence requirement, access to the pros, and the stated ideology of ice hockey.

33. Toronto *Globe*, November 23, 1936.

34. Minutes of 47th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 28, 1936.

35. Ibid.

Additionally teams had to accept the OHA's jurisdiction if they wished to enter the prestigious championships. Since the acquisition of prizes and championships became a defining characteristic of twentieth century society the OHA exerted a great deal of power. At the same time, however, there is evidence of groups rejecting the jurisdiction of the OHA and playing outside the boundaries of amateur hockey and thus rejecting, in part, the prestigious championships. More important was the inability of the OHA to impose its will on how the game should be played. Throughout, the OHA was guided by a view of sport played within the context of a particular ideology. Their history is a chronicle of failure to have the game played the way they thought it should be. From its inception they fought a continual battle against violence, cheating, and unethical practices. The OHA was never successful in imposing its view of amateur hockey upon the players of Ontario. They never solved the problems, they merely addressed the symptoms, and thus, in some respects, failed to exert their power. In fact, their power was very much a negative force-keeping people off the ice. In many ways they worked through coercion and not consent. Like many organizations with top-down administrative structures the gap between theory and practise remained great. The OHA never achieved what it set out to achieve-to play hockey for the fun of the game.

Perhaps the most pervasive and central element of the OHA's power lay in its identification with the concept of amateurism. In hockey circles throughout Canada and even the world the OHA was recognized as the premier upholder of "true amateurism." The adherence of the OHA to amateurism and their primary position in the world of amateur ice hockey was no accident. They were the first permanent hockey organization in Canada and as such established the rules of the game, the approach to amateurism, and the guidelines for all future organizations. It was this position as the oldest hockey organization that gave them great prestige. However, it is more appropriate to speak of influence rather than authority, potential power rather than actual control. The influence of the OHA spread beyond the boundaries of the organization partly because teams and leagues that lay outside the boundaries of the OHA believed in the ideology of amateurism.

More overt, but still subtle, was the way in which the OHA controlled teams and players outside the OHA. For the first twenty years it effectively controlled all ice hockey even though the majority of towns and cities boasted only one or two OHA teams. In the majority of cases the OHA team was either the winner of the local league or an aggregation chosen from the best players in the league. For example, in 1905, the Peterborough Intermediate team was selected from the six team City Hockey League. Thus, while Peterborough boasted only one intermediate team, in fact, the City Hockey League had to abide by the rules and regulations of the OHA. This system of selecting a representative team became less popular in the 1920s but was still practised in some of the smaller towns like Sault St. Marie, Simcoe, and Exeter.

It was just prior to the First World War that the first threat to their power surfaced, the emergence of commercially sponsored teams. This first occurred

in 1910 when Eatons of Toronto entered a team. The action of the OHA was swift. At the annual meeting on November 18, 1911, Dr. G. Wood of Toronto gave notice of motion “. . . to provide for the exclusion of any team representing or playing under the name of a commercial organization.”³⁶ In 1912, after the Eatons had won the Senior championship they were unceremoniously thrown out of the OHA. The problem of commercially sponsored teams did not resurface until 1927. In this case the response was different and reflected the OHA's understanding of the need for change. It was the development of industrial and commercial leagues in Toronto, Hamilton, Ottawa, London, and Peterborough that precipitated the problem. The question was first raised in 1927 when the president expressed concern over the growth of industrial hockey. It was precipitated not by the OHA but by the Canadian National Railway, Canadian Pacific Railway, and Bell Telephone who applied to affiliate with the CAHA. George Dudley recognized the threat this posed to amateur hockey and proposed that the OHA reassert its jurisdiction over amateur hockey before abuses crept in.³⁸ The proposed solution was markedly different from the solution adopted in 1912. These organizations were given associate membership in the organization which allowed full membership except for participation in the prestigious championships. A year later the industrial and civil service teams were granted membership under the same conditions. By extending membership to a variety of groups the OHA effectively contained a major threat to their jurisdiction over amateur hockey.

The 1920s witnessed a massive expansion of ice hockey. Short-lived leagues and local organizations developed across Ontario. In some instances these became permanent organizations, especially in the larger cities. Two of the most important were the Toronto Amateur Hockey Association (TAHA) (1920) and the Hamilton Amateur Hockey Association (HAHA) (1927).³⁹ These organizations coordinated all outdoor hockey in Toronto and Hamilton. By 1927, the TAHA, which affiliated with the OHA in the early 1920s, controlled over 500 teams. On December 13, 1928 the executive granted the HAHA affiliation on the same conditions as the TAHA.⁴⁰ This mechanism of group affiliation was used to bring other leagues and organizations within the purview of the OHA. For example, in November, 1932 the Ontario Rural Hockey Association was granted associate membership and the Central Hockey League intermediate status. A year later the executive granted affiliation to four leagues from Kitchener, London, and Western Ontario.⁴² At this stage, it was no longer the OHA that initiated the moves to gain affiliation but the other organizations. Such was the perceived power and prestige of the OHA in hockey circles that affiliation was a much sought-after prize. While it is evident that the OHA was

36. *Toronto Globe*, November 20, 1911.

37. *Ibid.*, November 18, 1912.

38. Minutes of 38th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 19, 1927.

39. T.A.H.A. was formed in 1919 and joined OHA in 1920. *Toronto Globe*, November 11, 1920.

40. Minutes of Executive Committee, December 13, 1928.

41. *Ibid.*, November 25, 1932.

42. *Ibid.*, November 24, 1933.

widening its circle of influence its absolute domination must not be over emphasized. Its authority, control, and power were always contested. Associations, leagues, and clubs were continually being lost, some because they succumbed to financial failure but others because they resisted the power of the OHA. Such was the case with the Ontario Rural Hockey Association. It applied for affiliation when it was organized in 1932. However, it broke its affiliation in 1936 over perceived mistreatment. Thus, nineteen leagues moved outside the orbit of the OHA. The more popular hockey became, the more difficult became the task of the OHA in maintaining control over amateur hockey.

One of the OHA's greatest sources of influence lay in its control of the prestigious local and provincial championships and thus access to the national championships. From its inception in 1890 the OHA season was highlighted by the eventual crowning of a champion. At first this was limited to the Senior championship. However, this soon expanded to include Junior (1893) and Intermediate (1896) championships. These three levels remained the foundation of the championship system although by 1928 there were Senior A and B, Intermediate A and B, and Junior A, B, and C. These championship games were the focal points of the season. Prior to 1910 OHA teams were rarely good enough to challenge the more powerful teams from Montreal and Eastern Ontario for the Stanley Cup, symbolic of the national amateur championship of Canada. They were just coming into their own in 1909 when the Stanley Cup became the symbol of supremacy in professional hockey. However, the donation of the Allan Cup (1908) for the amateur championship of Canada saw the OHA move into the highest levels of amateur hockey. Thenceforth the OHA Senior champions were always serious contenders for the coveted trophy, winning on twelve occasions between 1908 and 1936.⁴⁴ In 1920, the Allan Cup winners were sent to represent Canada in the World Championships. In the following sixteen years ten World Championships were held and on four occasions the title was won by an OHA team.⁴⁵ National championship opportunities expanded in 1919 when the Memorial Cup was donated for the Junior Championship of Canada. The OHA representative won on eight occasions between 1919 and 1936.⁴⁶ Thus, as the years passed, the OHA controlled more and more avenues to the plums of amateur hockey. Therefore, any team or individual aspiring to reach the pinnacle of amateur hockey had to abide by the rules and regulations of the OHA.

Paradoxically, the OHA gained influence and power by its control of access to professional hockey. As long as there was no system of by-passing the OHA they maintained this power. In fact, it was a threat to this control that lay at the heart of the conflict between the CAHA and AAUC over the definition of an amateur and the denouement of 1936. While the OHA first faced the profes-

43. Minutes of 47th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 28, 1936.

44. Nancy Howell and Maxwell L. Howell, *Sports and Games in Canadian Life: 1700 to the Present*. Toronto: Macmillan, 1969), p. 209.

45. *Ibid.*, p. 210.

46. *Ibid.*, p. 209.

sional problem in 1897, it was not until the formation of the National Hockey Association (1910), the Pacific Coast Hockey League (1912), and the Maritimes Professional League (1911) that the relationship between professional and amateur organizations became a primary concern. During the 1920s approximately 40 percent of professional players passed through the ranks of the OHA. Paradoxically before becoming a professional, the antithesis of an amateur, a player had to meet the stringent amateur requirements of the OHA. During the 1930s increasing numbers of players found alternate routes to professionalism and thus the OHA's power was eroded.

If the OHA was atypical and its influence was limited to hockey within Ontario, then it would be of limited value. If, however, it typified Canadian sport organizations and its influence permeated the country, then its theoretical impact would be greater. Thus, the larger questions of the degree to which the OHA was typical and the ways in which it influenced sport not only in Canada but indeed in the international arena must be addressed. These questions can be answered in two ways. First is to examine the degree to which the OHA was representative of Ontario sport and second to examine the ways in which the OHA influenced sport in Ontario, Canada, and the world.

By the early 1920s amateur sport in Ontario was run by a number of formally constituted sport organizations. There were no other organizations that exactly paralleled the stability and continuity of the OHA. There were two, the Ontario Rugby Football Union and the Ontario Amateur Lacrosse Association, whose organizational structures were different but afforded, for other reasons, absolute control over their sports. The ORFU was run by "permanent president" John De Gruchy with the assistance of five other permanent officials. Lacrosse was run by its secretary, Eugene Dopp and treasurer, Dr. Wendell Holmes. Both organizations maintained control because their sports were relatively small and there were no other outlets. Interestingly the two most popular games, softball and baseball, were organized on a more democratic basis with decision-making power being located at the local level. The provincial organizations acted as administrative bodies, processing information and organizing championships. At the same time these two organizations were lukewarm in their approach to amateurism neither being as doctrinaire and inflexible as the OHA. However, it was the question of amateurism that provided the link between the organizations. In 1909, with the formation of the AAUC, provincial branches were formed. The Ontario branch, which until the late 1920s was always regarded as an unimportant organization, was comprised of representatives of all the amateur organizations. Invariably the representatives were leaders in their own sports. When the question of amateur status moved to center stage in the late 1920s the Ontario Branch became the key organization in Ontario. Comprised of men whose formative experiences were in pre-war Canada, it maintained a rigid approach to the amateur question. It was the conservatives of the OHA who played a role in the Ontario Branch, Hewitt, Paxton, Fry, Davidson and

47. Data from Bob Ferguson, *Who's Who in Canadian Sport*, (Scarborough: Prentice Hall, 1977).

Mulqueen. Adherence to amateurism in its purest sense was the glue that held the organizations together. Nowhere was this identification stronger than in Toronto. Over 70 percent of the members of the Ontario Branch came from Toronto! If there was any homogeneity to sport in Ontario, it focused on the commitment to amateurism. The less committed to amateurism the less organizations were drawn within the orbit of the OHA. As the primary exponent of amateurism its shifting values in the 1930s represented a critical moment in the history of Ontario and Canadian sport. The break with the AAUC was one of the critical events in Canadian sport history.

If the OHA's power and influence were limited to Ontario, they still would have had a significant impact. In fact, their influence spread far and wide through amateur sport in Canada. At this level, even more than at the provincial level the power resides with individuals who represent their organizations. A small number of members of the OHA were central to the development of amateur sport in Canada through their involvement in the AAUC and CAHA. A group of six men represented the OHA in the councils of the AAUC and CAHA during the 1920s and 1930s. Hewitt, Paxton, Fry, Bond, Dudley, and Mulqueen were central figures in amateur sport. It was they, with the backing of the OHA, who were instrumental in the formation of the CAHA in 1914. It was they who articulated the concerns of the most powerful organization in the CAHA. It was they who defended the interests of Ontario and the OHA in amateur sport, and it was George Dudley who spearheaded the move to disaffiliate from the AAUC. In the final analysis it was a relatively small group who controlled amateur sport.

The above analysis indicates that the OHA was a powerful organization. Its tentacles reached into all levels of hockey. In some cases the intrusion was conscious and calculated; in others the recipients were unaware of the power of the OHA. The issues faced and the mechanisms used to exert control remained very much the same throughout the 46 years—the purity of amateurism and mechanisms of control remained central to the OHA. The administrators of 1897 would have felt at home in the debates of 1936. The question is how did the OHA maintain this unity of purpose while at the same time change to meet the demands of a changing society?

Perhaps the first answer, as to why the OHA remained dedicated to the same principles for so long, lies in the stability of the organization after 1904. During the first fifteen years a total of 81 men sat on the executive of the OHA. In the next thirty-three years only 83 men were on the executive. This ensured continuity. Additionally the executive was a self-perpetuating organization since they controlled the selection of their own successors. The stability of the group and the continuation of traditional practices and values was reinforced in the 1920s with the creation of the Advisory Board of Past Presidents which quickly became de facto voting members of the executive. Thus, in 1925, the official twelve-man executive was augmented by eight past presidents. It was the influence of these men, whose formative life experiences were in Victorian and Edwardian Canada, that acted as a bulwark against change. Invariably it was

Sutherland, Darroch, or Copeland who argued for the maintenance of pure amateurism. Four other figures, whose formative years were spent in pre-war Canada, were identified with the protection of the most rigid definition of an amateur: Hewitt; Paxton; P. J. Mulqueen, an honorary member of the executive and one of the strongest proponents of amateurism in Toronto; and W. W. Davidson the OHA representative to the AAUC. Eventually change did come. Even though past presidents continued to attend executive meetings, their numbers were gradually eroded by the passage of time. D. L. Darroch and A. E. Copeland died in 1929, H. E. Wettlaufer, in 1934 and Sheriff J. F. Paxton in 1935. All died in the saddle, actively participating in the affairs of the OHA. By 1936 the executive was dominated by men who had joined the executive in the mid-twenties and thirties. While they were still dedicated amateurs, their own experiences were different. At the same time it must be remembered that the most powerful figures in the organization were committed amateurs, in particular W. A. Hewitt. What then changed these amateurs so that at the 1935 meeting there was unanimous support for Dudley's action in breaking from the AAUC? Very simply, an underlying realism, an understanding that change was necessary if the OHA was to retain power. This realism was revealed in 1927 in their reaction to the threat of industrial and commercial hockey. Instead of placing themselves beyond the pale, as they did in 1912, they moved to incorporate them within the OHA. In 1935, Sutherland, one of the strongest proponents of the conservative definition of an amateur, completely reversed his position when he stated "we should realize that this is 1935 and not 1890."⁴⁸ In the final analysis they did what they had to do to retain control of the organization and, perhaps, of ice hockey. Finally, the reasons for the success of the OHA in imposing its will are reflected most graphically in the position of the president. A president was a creation of the group, selected by the group as an appropriate representative, serving an apprenticeship of up to 10 years, and then acting as the spokesman for two years. In reality the president represented the basic ideals of the OHA. Thus, the change in president did not reflect real change. He was, in the truest sense, an organization man.

What, then, does this analysis of the OHA suggest about the nature and practise of power? That the OHA was a powerful organization is in some respects obvious. Yet in other respects the OHA was ineffectual. If their objective was to have hockey played within the context of the spirit and letter of the law they were ineffectual. There is little evidence that the mass of the public and many hockey players and administrators agreed with the OHA over their policies. From the mid-1890s there is persistent evidence of players, administrators and newspapers rejecting the values of the OHA. The ongoing problems over the definition of an amateur, the incidences of violence and cheating reflect an underlying problem. Additionally, the proliferation of short-lived hockey teams and leagues playing outside the jurisdiction of the OHA attest to alternative avenues for playing hockey. Why, then, did the OHA manage to

48. Minutes of 46th Annual Meeting of OHA, November 30, 1935.

retain control of hockey for such a prolonged period of time and why was its influence so widespread? In the first place the creation of a self-perpetuating executive was critical to their power. In reality, while there were individual differences, they truly were organizational men, thus the change in president was a change in name only. In addition, for a group to be powerful it must have a cause, in this case it was their dedication to amateurism. During the first two decades of the century this gave them legitimacy because many people thought alike. However, in the 20s and 30s this changed and in reality the power of the OHA decreased. More critical to their real control was their control of access to and return from professional hockey, their absolute right to ban teams and individuals from amateur hockey, and their control of access to the prestigious championships. As long as these championships remained prestigious, the OHA retained power. It was control over players and teams that gave the OHA its greatest power. In fact, the late 20s and early 30s were the zenith of their absolute power. The denouement of 1936 was the beginning of a new era in which the OHA gradually lost power in particular to the professional NHL.⁴⁹ Much of the power of the OHA flowed from the constitution. There were real barriers to change, for example, 75 percent of membership at the annual meeting must approve any constitutional change. The constitution, adopted in 1892, institutionalized power in the executive, this never changed. Thus, by definition, power lay with a small group of men. Additionally after the destruction of Toronto domination in 1904 executive members were spread throughout Central Ontario. As a result the sub-committee system developed whereby effective power lay with a group of three. Between 1919 and 1935 power lay with the incumbent president, W. A. Hewitt and Sheriff J. F. Paxton. Here we have an organization whose influence spread through hockey in Ontario, Canada and the international arena which was, in reality, run by a small group of people.

In some respects the history of the OHA has served to identify more questions than it has answered, in particular with respect to the nature and exercise of power.⁵⁰ At a superficial level, it appears tautological to state that the OHA was powerful. Yet a more searching analysis reveals the inadequacy of this statement in terms of an understanding of what power means. How is it possible to claim that the OHA was both powerful and ineffectual? The answer to this question lies in how power is defined. There is no consensus on the meaning of power. A reading of the literature reveals a wide variety of definitions from Max Weber's: "The chance of a man or a number of men to realize their own will even against the resistance of others who are participating in the action,"⁵¹ to Talcott Parsons's "capacity of persons or collectivities to get things done effectively, in particular when their goals are obstructed by some kind of

49. For an insightful and provocative discussion of the 1920s and 1930s see Kidd, "Improvers," pp. 414-437.

50. The literature on power is abundant. However, the following discussion is heavily influenced by the following. Jeffrey Pfeffer, *Power in Organizations* (Boston: Pitman, 1981), Steven Lukes, *Power: A Radical View* (London: McMillan: 1984), John Kenneth Galbraith, *The Anatomy of Power* (London: Corgi Books, 1983). However, the best single introduction to the concept of power is Steven Lukes, ed., *Power* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1987).

51. Max Weber quoted in Lukes, ed., *Power*, 2.

human resistance or opposition” to Alvin Goldman’s⁵² “Getting what one wants.”⁵³ All imply a degree of control, all are based on different assumptions, and all are extremely difficult to test through empirical research. What these definitions, and others, reveal is the complexity of the concept. How, then, can we examine the nature of power in the OHA? Everything flows from the definition used. Let us start with a more diffuse, less concrete definition of power. Steven Lukes suggests “that to have power is to be able to make a difference.”⁵⁴ Therefore, the first question to be addressed is did the OHA make a difference to the world of ice hockey and amateur sport?

Did the OHA make a difference?⁵⁵ Yes, but only in particular ways and particular times. The OHA influenced who played, where hockey was played, and how it was played. However, the decisions that created these conditions were only made at certain times. Through their control of amateur status, residence requirements, etc., they waged an ongoing battle to control who played hockey. However, there are two different elements of power involved. First, the decision to accept a particular definition of an amateur in 1904 entailed the exercise of power within the OHA. Second, the implementation of this decision entailed a different kind of power, the ability to enforce it within the teams of the OHA. The OHA created the structures within which hockey was played and the mechanisms for enforcing these decisions. It was these mechanisms that formed the foundations of their efforts to control ice hockey. It was, thus, an arena that was ever changing as circumstances changed.

The question remains as to who made a difference? In fact, there were three inter-related elements; the OHA, its component parts, and individuals. Each was involved in determining and enforcing who played, where hockey was played, and how it was played. The OHA existed as an entity outside of the individuals who comprised it. Over time the OHA acquired a reputation within ice hockey in Ontario, then within Canada, and finally in the international arena. This reputation was historically created and reached its apogee in the 1920s—when the OHA spoke, amateur sportsmen listened. At the same time, the OHA was comprised of component parts, in particular the annual convention, the executive, and the sub-committee. It was in a complex interaction between these groups that decisions that made a difference were made. To complicate the picture even further was the special position and power accorded to the incumbent president, Sheriff J. F. Paxton and W. A. Hewitt. In fact, there was a four level, interlinking hierarchy. The secretary carried out the day to day business of the OHA, the sub-committee addressed problems that emerged between executive meetings, the executive ran the organization, and, theoretically, the annual convention was the ultimate decision-making body. However, the secretary was the only person officially involved at each level.

A further question remains to be answered, what makes a difference? Much

52. Talcott Parsons, *Power and the Social System*, in *ibid.*, 94.

53. Alvin I. Goldman, *Toward a Theory of Social Power*, in *ibid.*, 157.

54. *Ibid.*, 5.

55. The following discussion follows the theoretical position outlined by Lukes, in *ibid.*, 1-17.

of the day to day work of the OHA simply entailed the performing of administrative tasks. This did not entail the marshalling and use of power. Power was a resource that was marshalled at particular times when important issues were involved. Of course, this answer avoids the issue of what determines an issue is important. To be deemed important an issue had to be important to the powerholders, in this case the executive, and those affected, in this case the players and club officials in the OHA. There is no doubt as to what was important to the power holders. Amateurism dominated the meetings of the OHA throughout. However, it is not at all clear that the players and club officials were as concerned. What the players and club officials railed against were the mechanisms of control, the vehicles of power, used by the executive to achieve their ends. It is apparent that the making of a difference depends upon the things individuals and groups deem to be important. For the exertion of power, in the classic sense, there has to be a degree of congruence between the aims of the power holders and the expectations of those affected.

Obviously important issues only arise at certain times and thus, in one respect, power is exerted at certain times. These moments in time, branching points, emerge when important issues arise and there are "alternative feasible paths" to be followed. It is at this juncture that resources are mobilized and power exerted. This occurred on several occasions during the period 1890 to 1936.⁵⁶ Perhaps the most important of these was 1904 when two critical events in the history of the OHA occurred; the adoption of the conservative definition of an amateur which was to guide the OHA until 1936 and the election of W. A. Hewitt as secretary. The adoption of the precept "Once a professional, always a professional" was the result of a power struggle, within the OHA, between the liberals and the conservatives. The victory of the conservatives contoured the history of the OHA until 1936 and a great deal of time and energy was devoted to protecting this ultra conservative approach. Thus the victory of J. R. Robertson and the conservatives had both intended and unintended consequences. The election of W. A. Hewitt cannot be regarded as an exercise of power yet the consequences to the organization and to ice hockey in general were, perhaps, even greater than the definition of an amateur. The difference between the two events illustrates the extreme difficulty of determining when power is exerted. Perhaps intent is the critical variable. Certainly the moguls of the OHA intended to keep amateur hockey pure and, in pursuing that end, continually marshalled their power to protect amateur hockey. At the same time, many actions not involving the use of power had unintended consequences whose importance far outweighed the intentions of groups seeking power.

This paper started with two basic questions. Are North American sport organizations as dictatorial and authoritarian as Janet Lever suggested and what was the nature of power within the OHA. With respect to the first, the history of the OHA supports Janet Lever's contention but does not help us answer the

56. Other branching points were 1891-92, the adoption of the constitution; 1899, the election of J. R. Robertson; 1922, the formation of the Advisory Board; 1936, the break from the AAUC.

question why. With respect to the nature of power, the paper has illustrated both its simplicity and complexity. The fact that the OHA made a difference to the development of ice hockey is clear. However, the complex ways in which decisions were made and the impact of these decisions is less clear. Perhaps the power of the OHA lay in their ability to get what they wanted when they wanted it. What it does demonstrate is the fact that organizations did create the structures within which sport was played and thus, in general terms, determined the agenda or path to be followed. At the same time, the paper raises basic questions about why this happens in a, so called, democratic society. Perhaps the answers lie in alternative approaches to the concept of power such as Gramsci's hegemony or Foucault's concept of disciplinary power.