

22273

THE COUNTRYSIDE ON THE DEFENSIVE: AGRICULTURAL
ONTARIO'S VIEWS OF RURAL DEPOPULATION, 1900 - 1914.

by

William Robert Young

B.A. (Hon.), York University, 1969.

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of
the Requirements for the Degree of
Master of Arts

in the Department
of
History

We accept this thesis as conforming to the required
standard

The University of British Columbia
March, 1971

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfilment of the requirements for an advanced degree at the University of British Columbia, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for reference and study.

I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Head of my Department or by his representatives. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Department of History

The University of British Columbia
Vancouver 8, Canada

Date March, 1971.

A B S T R A C T

Rural observers of the acceleration in Ontario's urbanization witnessed, in the years before the Great War, both the concentration of industry in urban areas and the spread of communications and technological advances from the towns to the surrounding countryside. All sections of rural society, however, recognized that to them, the drift of population from the rural concession lines to the cities formed urbanization's most important aspect. Debate generated by increasing urban dominance centred around this depopulation of the countryside as the rural inhabitants tried to explain and to solve 'The Problem.'

A split over the issue of depopulation developed in the ranks of the vocal section of the rural opinion-makers. One group, led by W. L. Smith of The Weekly Sun, H. B. Cowan of Farm and Dairy and W. C. Good of the Grange, registered increasing alarm at the continual seepage of the rural population into the towns. To them, depopulation placed a series of challenges before rural society. As migration proceeded, they perceived that farmers lost their philosophy of life, Canadian democracy and political morality was threatened and rural social life ruined. Blame for the economic uncertainty facing Ontario agriculture could to a great extent be laid at the feet of the diminished numbers working the farms. A second group, however, comprising the Ontario Department of Agriculture, the staffs of The Canadian Countryman and The Farmer's Magazine, declined to espouse this complete pessimism. In addition to the less beneficial results of depopulation, the latter group viewed the rationalization of land usage, the consolidation of the schools and churches as well as the modernization of rural social attitudes and practices as advantages

ultimately accruing to the rural population by reason of their diminishing numbers.

'The Problem' resulted in much heart-searching among these two affected groups who spent much of their time and energy determining possible origins and their solutions. In their reappraisal of the purpose of the rural family school, church and newspapers, both groups agreed that these institutions could provide valuable aid in stopping the population lead from the countryside. By reforming these basic foundations, traditional agrarian values would be reaffirmed and deficiencies in urban life highlighted. Lack of social amenities became, in the eyes of rural observers, a cause of outmigration which could be remedied by bringing to the countryside the urban telephones, electricity and running water which exercised such an attraction for rural folk. Increasing profit by improving agricultural methods gained popular approval by the farm press as a means of arresting the cityward trek.

All these causes and remedies were generally endorsed by the Good-Drury faction and the Farmer's Magazine-Canadian Countryman group. The former held, contrary to the latter, that these reasons were not sufficient explanations of all factors underlying depopulation. This more radical group believed that solving these issues alone would not stop depopulation. In fact, some of the Good-Drury followers pointed out that adoption of many of these urban-developed mechanical devices and cosmopolitan social outlook would only modify traditional rural society beyond recognition. Rural life as a copy of urban life style could be but a pale and unsatisfactory imitation. In addition to promoting unique social institutions for rural areas, the Good-Drury 'radicals' extended their economic arguments farther than the more adaptive group were prepared to

follow. Depopulation, the radicals averred, resulted mainly from economic inequities perpetrated by the control over the system of distribution exercised by urban bankers, railroaders, manufacturers and land speculators. These men, by controlling the political system and instituting devices such as the tariff, raised their own and lowered the farmers' profits. Specifically, the radical farmers proposed lowering tariffs and stricter control over land-sale profits and railroads in order to check urban exploitation of the countryside. They recognized, however, that a general solution could only completely end depopulation and economic serfdom if rural voters united and captured control of the political system.

Throughout the years prior to the Great War, both the 'radicals' and the 'adaptors' gained adherents among the rural population in numbers large enough to maintain an equilibrium. A rural political revolt against urban domination did not succeed, but agitation to reform the system of distribution continued. Only the pressures of the Great War and the organization of the United Farmers of Ontario finally caused depopulation to dethrone the provincial government in 1919.

Table of Contents

	Page
CHAPTER I	INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCESS OF URBANIZATION, DEPOPULATION AND GENERAL RURAL REACTION 1
CHAPTER II	'THE PROBLEM': THE NATURE AND PERCEPTIONS OF DEPOPULATION 11
CHAPTER III	"I CAN REMEMBER WHEN....": PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOSS OF THE OLD RURAL POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE 23
CHAPTER IV	THE GUARDIANS OF THE RURAL MYTH: DESTROYERS AND BUILDERS..... 38
CHAPTER V	"SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL:" IMPROVING RURAL SOCIAL LIFE..... 67
CHAPTER VI	"SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL:" 'SALVATION' THROUGH PRODUCTION MARKETING AND LABOUR..... 83
CHAPTER VII	IDENTIFYING THE ENEMY: DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND THE MOVEMENT TOWARDS POLITICAL ACTION..... 98
CONCLUSION 128
NOTES:	
	CHAPTER I 134
	CHAPTER II 140
	CHAPTER III 148
	CHAPTER IV 155
	CHAPTER V 165
	CHAPTER VI 173
	CHAPTER VII 186
	CONCLUSION 201
BIBLIOGRAPHY 202
APPENDIX A	CIRCULATION OF AGRICULTURAL JOURNALS 223
APPENDIX B	CIRCULATION OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS..... 226
APPENDIX C	ATTENDANCE AT FARMERS' INSTITUTES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS..... 228
APPENDIX D	MIGRATION FROM RURAL AREAS OF ONTARIO COUNTIES..... 229
APPENDIX E	POPULATION CHANGE IN RURAL AREAS OF ONTARIO COUNTIES..... 232

Table of Contents (continued)

	Page
APPENDIX F ONTARIO CITIES - MIGRATION AND POPULATION CHANGE, 1900 - 1921	234
APPENDIX G FARMERS' SUBMISSION TO THE GOVERNMENT ON THE TARIFF - 1920	235
APPENDIX H A NOTE ON METHODS AND USE OF SOURCES	237

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis has been completed only with the assistance of many people, especially Professor Margaret Prang who supervised my work and provided encouragement, ideas and criticism for the past two years. Professor J. L. Granatstein was instrumental in the conception of the problem. In his classes at York he promoted my first interest in rural social history, although his interest and aid extended to the present, far beyond his classes. Other friends and critics who read parts of the manuscript and gave needed cheer include Robert McDonald, Patricia Oxley, Virginia Careless and Catherine Davison.

Research assistance came from Mrs. Roberta Gilbank, Archivist at the University of Guelph who provided help in collecting the primary material from the Guelph collection of agricultural journals, unmatched in Canada. The financial support of the H. R. Macmillan Foundation and the Ewart Fund of the University of Manitoba provided sustenance for two years.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROCESS OF URBANIZATION, DEPOPULATION, AND GENERAL RURAL REACTION

During the recent explosion of urban studies, social scientists, including historians, are analyzing the social, economic, political, psychological and demographic effects of urban growth in Canada. However, despite the fact that until recently Canada's history was predominantly rural history, the decline of the countryside accompanying the rise of the cities has been a neglected theme. Although rural sociology has been an established field since the 1920's, Canadian sociologists did not organize the first seminar of the changes in the Canadian rural environment until 1965.¹ Historians are still catching up. The political manifestations of the agrarian revolt engendered by growing urban dominance have been exhaustively analyzed,² and some biographies of agricultural leaders³ and histories of the Ontario and Canadian Departments of Agriculture are available.⁴ The social roots of the declining rural civilization, however, and the social changes, the foundation of the post-1914 Canadian rural political movements, have not yet been explored.⁵

A study of urbanization must involve analyzing the effect of technological advances on traditional society. From 1900 to 1910, technology emanating from the cities dominated and integrated the Ontario countryside with the province's towns. Today, the technology spreading from the United States threatens to dominate and to integrate the cultures as well as the economies of the Western countries, particularly

Canada. With regard to technology, then, a choice similar to that confronting the countrymen of fifty years ago faces Canadians today. Adapting their traditional loyalties as best they can, are Canadians to submit to the cultural penetration carried by the American technology's seductively attractive good life? Or are they going to try to preserve a distinctive way of life and to control this cultural homogenization?

(i)

By 1910, over fifty per cent of the population of Ontario lived in centres of 1,000 or more people. During these last ten years, reported one well-supported study of population growth, "the increase in urban population was both relatively and absolutely the largest in the Province's history."⁶ The urban population increase of 41.3 per cent profoundly affected the whole province, since the southern rural section underwent as great a transformation as the cities themselves.⁷ While this population growth provides the clearest indicator of the increasing degree of urbanization, the process consists of a composite of social, cultural and economic changes. Under the label 'centralization', urbanization includes three sub-processes: concentration of industry and technology,⁸ consolidation of metropolitan control over diffusion of information, and the concentration of population.⁹

In its broadest sense, urbanization denotes "a process whereby both countrymen and townsmen come to share an increasingly similar and mutually interdependent set of life experiences."¹⁰ What sort of interdependence was this? In effect it was "a situation in which there are multi-faceted rural-urban contacts that are urban dominated. The concept does not imply a one-way process.... It merely acknowledges one way (urban) dominance."¹¹ The achievement of urban dominance was not the reversal of

a rural-urban dichotomy, but was a shift towards the urban end of a continuum. This shift towards the urban end of the scale accelerated from 1900 to 1914. As urban dominance was achieved, the relationship between farming and metropolitan centres completely reversed. During the early period of settlement in Ontario

after it [agriculture] had broken the shackles of a closed economy, farming formed the basis of a lively trade, largely an export trade. It created an important flow of traffic, and with the resulting increased prosperity, this formed the main basis for urban growth. Soon after 1880, the urban population reached such strength that it began to mould the agricultural land use pattern.... 12

Cities dominated not only the economics, but also the politics and society of rural areas.

The transfer of the functions of manufacturing from the Ontario countryside to centralized operations in the cities commenced about 1851 and had been generally completed by 1881.¹³ As all hamlets and villages, home of the rural non-farm population, were affected, the cobbler was replaced by the shoe factory; the blacksmith by the implement plants; homespun by mass-produced cloth from urban textile mills; and local merchants by mail-order goods from department stores. The increasing division of labour affected the agricultural population in other ways. The farmer specialized only in food production to feed neighbouring cities, by giving up home industry and staple production for export. This modern farming formed a basis for urban industrial development which refined and processed its products. Meat packers, fruit and vegetable canners and dairies set up large establishments.¹⁴ Agricultural producers became more reliant upon neighbouring metropolitan centres for both market and supplies. In their eyes they were "almost as dependent upon the city as is the city on the farmer."¹⁵

The second process of concentration, tying the country to the city's life style, resulted from improved technology and communications. The first areas affected lay closest to the metropolis as urban control spread like a spider's web along the roads, railways, and other communications connections to the more distant areas. The diffusion of city conveniences and tightening of urban control dated from the establishment of both farm and town. From 1900 to 1914, however, the consolidation of urban influence accelerated. Rural free mail delivery, improved provincial road systems, radial railways, rural telephone and electricity, all facilitated the adoption in rural areas of urban attitudes, in business, society, and education.

Needed urban workers had to come from somewhere; hundreds of thousands moved from the farm. The concentration of population and movement to the cities had ceased to be a new phenomenon and by 1900 was a chronic condition. In some areas, those bordering cities and towns directly, depopulation began in the 1850's. From 1860 to 1870, the magnitude of the movement gradually increased, until by 1881 only the northern and western areas of the province gained population through migration.¹⁶ The departure from the rural areas of organized counties was so general by 1891 that only Muskoka and Renfrew registered migrational gains. Sixteen counties, from 1881 to 1891, registered not only a loss of population through migration, but an actual population decline.¹⁷

Far from abating, this trend increased in the intra-censal years 1891 to 1901. Twenty-two counties registered absolute population declines. In not one county in the Province could the rural portion show migration less than the figure of its natural increase.¹⁸ Some towns, those "fairly old centres whose prosperity had been based on

agricultural marketing and distributional functions," also showed a decreasing population during this decade.¹⁹ Between 1901 and 1911, two-thirds of the counties lost more than five per cent of their population, despite some rural population increases in those townships adjoining prosperous and expanding urban centres.²⁰ During these years, two-thirds of the total timespan covered by this study, six counties (Bruce, Dufferin, Haliburton, Huron, Grey and Lambton) lost over twenty per cent of their rural inhabitants, and twenty-four counties in the province registered absolute population declines.²¹ The total migration from the southern rural areas amounted to a minimum of 125,741 or a more accurate maximum of 198,088.²² Movement to the United States and Western Canada siphoned off some of the rural migrants, but at least one hundred thousand people left the farm to live in the cities of the Province.²³

The final census period from 1911 to 1921 demonstrates little difference in established trends: the exodus from rural areas continued; the suburban areas increased their growth.²⁴ However, the rate of depopulation and outmigration from rural areas did slow down. All but ten counties showed a lower rate of outmigration from 1911 to 1921 than in the previous ten years. The total rural decline is still impressive; 56,277 country inhabitants left the rural areas, although the total probably amounted to 154,202.²⁵

(ii)

The country-dwellers' reactions to depopulation provide the key to pinpointing the changes overtaking Ontario society and providing a deeper explanation of the agrarian movement which resulted in the rural political revolt of 1919. As they confronted depopulation's various phases, the agricultural population shifted their responses in confused

and contradictory directions, although two basic reactions to depopulation emerge. (See Appendix H "A Note on Methods" for an explanation of the use of the term 'opinion' in this thesis.) The advocates of one position promoted adaptation to urbanization and depopulation and pointed out the inevitability of the population movement in Ontario's rapidly industrializing society. For the sake of efficiency, they argued, the central urban factories had almost completely taken over functions formerly performed by home and local industry. Despite the inconveniences of tariff-protected industry, central banks, land speculation and monopolies, urban concentration of the major economic and manufacturing functions provided agriculturists with benefits of savings in both time and money. These adaptors accepted the improved technology and willingly applied it to the farm. They spent little time contemplating reversing the decline of the self-sufficient rural communities. As well as maintaining only the necessary population on the land, these communications improvements, along with most urban technological inventions, could mean a more comfortable social and economic existence for the members of every farm family.

Advocates of this position included the agricultural interests most closely involved with urban institutions. The two publications, The Farmer's Magazine and The Canadian Countryman, both presided over by members of the Toronto financial establishment, adopted this view of urbanization and depopulation. The former, set up in 1909 by John Bayne Maclean, shared a place in his publishing empire with The Financial Post.²⁶ The Canadian Countryman was established when most farm journals, led by The Farmer's Advocate and The Weekly Sun, had been campaigning for a radical revision of the Bank Act. Its executive included Zebulon Lash, Q. C., as President and Sir Edmund Walker as a Director. Both men

were firmly entrenched in the Toronto banking and trust company elite. These two journals of reconciliation, while most sympathetic to agriculture, were among the least militant in promoting fundamental reforms. In their status quo approach to depopulation, they were joined by high officials of the Ontario Department of Agriculture who perhaps believed that the problems accompanying inevitable paramountcy of the provincial metropolises could be eased by a conciliatory approach.²⁷ Of the other magazines, The Farmer's Advocate and The Farming World for several years after 1900 partially supported rationalizing urbanization. When The Farming World left Toronto in 1908 and was published in Peterboro as Farm and Dairy under the militant eye of H. B. Cowan, it moved into a more radical group. It was joined after the General Election of 1911, by the largest-circulation rural weekly, The Farmer's Advocate which finally supported more fundamental attacks on the metropolitan power structure.

The 'radical' section which these two journals joined did not gear its ideas towards preparing farmers to accept all aspects of urbanization. It deplored the declining farm population along with increased concentration of industry and control which could not be justified as inevitable under any circumstances. The 'radicals' even went so far as to express serious reservations about the utility of the wholesale adoption of urban technological innovations in stopping rural decline. Unwillingness to compromise with concentration in any of its forms resulted from their almost instinctive perception of the relationship between the various aspects of urbanization. They viewed industrialization as a cause of depopulation and technological control as its handmaiden. They, therefore, attempted to halt all three. With fundamental economic and legislative reform, they believed they could reassert the supremacy

of agriculture in Canadian society. They were, in one sense, economic determinists. They believed that the currently-prevalent social and business accommodations to industrialization would prove ineffective by themselves in re-establishing a viable rural society. Suitable business and social systems would naturally follow their more fundamental economic reform. Their dislike of the economic status quo accompanied a desire for freer trade, the single tax on land values, combines restraint legislation, and elimination of subsidies to industry. The aim of these proposed reforms was to change the direction of the growing metropolitan centres in Ontario.

The membership of this reform group maintained few ties with urban economic institutions. Among its leaders was Goldwin Smith who lent his journal The Weekly Sun to the agrarian cause.²⁸ Under the editorial guidance of W. L. Smith, the Sun continued Goldwin Smith's programmes after his death, although it became even more emphatically rural and less cosmopolitan in emphasis. The remnants of the Patrons of Industry Movement (Jabel Robinson, former M.P. for Elgin; D. D. Rogers, M.P. for Frontenac; C. A. Mallory, leader of the Patrons in the Ontario Legislature) were joined as reformers by a younger generation. E. C. Drury, W. C. Good, J. J. Morrison and H. B. Cowan, the editor of Farm and Dairy, took over the leadership of the Dominion Grange and of the Farmers' Association, and established the United Farmers of Ontario. These major public figures led many others, some connected with the various agricultural organizations, the rest just ordinary farmers.

The 'reformers' can be distinguished easily from the 'adaptors' by studying their respective general underlying assumptions. These differ greatly, particularly on the question of the priority to be accorded to reforming the economic system. These two groups, however, shade into

each other on some specific issues. Both sections, as we will see, justified rural existence through the accepted agrarian mythology and recommended strengthening this vision in the countryside.²⁹ The 'reform' section did not hesitate to promote improved technical methods in agriculture. Although some members of this more radical section held doubts about the utility of unthinking, wholesale rural adoption of all urban social innovations, even these men generally had little objection to improving rural life with urban conveniences. On the other side, the more conservative opinion-makers sometimes printed unsympathetic comments in the rural media criticizing increasing concentration and monopolization of industry. In the final analysis, however, their fierce desire to protect the old rural society separated the 'reformers' from those who would adapt this society to fit their new metropolitan existence.

Not confined to the years from 1900 to 1914, these two points of view found advocates among the rural opinion-makers since Confederation. In 1878, for example, the strength of the adaptive strain in rural thought could be seen in the support the rural population gave to Sir John A. Macdonald's National Policy. The rural 'reform' element grew stronger in the following years as agriculture discovered and protested exploitation by the tariff-protected urban industries. Political protest of the 1890's against the tariff took form in both the Patrons of Industry's entry into politics and in the free-trade platform of the federal rurally-based Liberals. After Sir Wilfrid Laurier formed his Liberal government in 1896, his moderate tariff and railroad concessions to the agriculturists defused the immediate danger of an agrarian political revolt but preserved the basic economic structure which was making the rural areas fiefs of the cities. Rural resentment remained after 1900,

but strong agricultural voices counselled acceptance of the Laurier-style compromise and adaptation to the changing social situation. A balance between adaptation and protest existed from the turn of the century to the Great War, although the agrarian activism of 1911 indicated the precariousness of this equilibrium. The social strains of the war increased the pressures resting upon the agricultural population to an intolerable level. Obscured during the war by the patriotic smoke-screen of the Union Government, rural concern about depopulation and urbanization became the issue which dethroned Ontario's Conservative government of Sir William Hearst in 1919 and aided in setting up the federal Progressives as a threat in the House of Commons.

The years from the turn of the century to the outbreak of the Great War are crucial, therefore, in establishing the foundation for understanding the post-war political protest in Ontario. Growing urban dominance of agriculture and depopulation created an increasingly insupportable situation. From 1900 to 1914, the two possible solutions to the problem were considered by the agricultural population, but neither adaptation nor reform gained overwhelming support among the rural population. The war provided the stimulus to make the growing urbanization of agriculture the basis for a political revolt in rural areas.

CHAPTER II

'THE PROBLEM':
THE NATURE AND PERCEPTIONS OF DEPOPULATION

In the eyes of the agricultural population, the departure of the men and women from the countryside to the cities of Ontario was known as 'The Problem'. In fact, there were two separate difficulties, a chronic labour shortage as well as a decline of the old rural social institutions. To rural writers and speakers, 'The Problem' or rural depopulation meant either of these two associated complaints; but not only contemporary observers had difficulty separating these two aspects of depopulation. One economist, in a discussion of labour difficulties besetting agriculture, noted in 1943 that "economic considerations cannot be divorced arbitrarily from the ever-present social factors."¹

Confusion is understandable; both components of depopulation stemmed from similar causes (working conditions, social disadvantages, technological advance, economic injustices). Although some causes contributed more to the labour shortage than to the social decline, most causes affected both.² Results of and solutions to the social and labour aspects were connected; social decline and labour shortage even resulted from each other. In general however, the labour shortage generated poorer farming methods, forced mechanization, higher wages, and a higher cost of living. The social decline brought about a corresponding drop in rural self-esteem and difficulties in the rural school, church and family.

(i)

Most farmers must have had some personal experience with 'The Problem.' If they had not, vast numbers came into contact with the

publicity generated by the editorial writers, government publicists, leaders of farm organization, teachers and students of agriculture, women's editors, advertisers and letters to the editor (See Appendices A, B, & C). Farm activists, setting forth lengthy estimates of the movement, began a campaign to dispel rural apathy toward the population drop. Figures, gleaned mainly from the Dominion censuses of 1901 or 1911 and from the Ontario statistics agency (The Ontario Bureau of Industries), gained in emphasis what they lacked in accuracy. They demonstrated an acute awareness of the magnitude of the movement. The front page of The Weekly Sun told farmers of a rural decline of 116,852 from 1890 to 1909,³ combined with an urban increase of 176,000 from 1898 to 1907.⁴ Another story declared that an estimated 20,000 per year left rural areas following 1890.⁵ Articles advertising the same dismal tale appeared in the various rural journals. The Canadian Countryman,⁶ The Farmer's Advocate,⁷ Farm and Dairy,⁸ The Ontario Agricultural College Review,⁹ and The Farmer's Magazine¹⁰ all contributed stories detailing to the ordinary farmer the extent of the declining population. No matter what methods the journals used to study the population statistics, the story remained the same.¹¹

Apart from the rural press, other agencies popularized knowledge of the population decline. The Canadian Methodist Church conducted a survey of Huron County's rural churches from 1880 to 1914 and published a chart which showed a total population decline in that particular area of 23,696. The rural sections of the county declined by 35,900.¹² A book by Rev. John Macdougall published under the auspices of the Board of Social Service of the Presbyterian Church delved into the figures for the population change. Macdougall emerged with the horrifying estimate of 373,567 who migrated from the rural areas prior to 1914.¹³ Statistical

breakdowns of the declining population indicated the concern of the students at the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph,¹⁴ as the rural 'Problem' became a favourite subject for discussion.¹⁵

Speeches delivered by agricultural leaders at public meetings made the masses aware of the 'Problem's' extent. Gordon Waldron, editor of The Weekly Sun, estimated to The Canadian Club of Toronto that a rural decline of 86,000 in the twenty years before 1900 would increase to 170,000 if immigration and natural increase were taken into account.¹⁶ W. C. Good, the Master of the Dominion Grange, told its members in his 1913 presidential address that despite a 17.16 per cent increase in Canadian rural population from 1901 to 1911, the Ontario rural population lost between 100,000 and 375,000 of its members.¹⁷ His estimate revised E. C. Drury's report in 1908 placing the rural exodus at 6,520 annually compared to an annual average increase of 8,869 in towns and 17,457 in cities.¹⁸ The Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, C. C. James, told various bodies such as the Dairymen of Ontario¹⁹ that the rural population had dropped from 1,108,874 to 1,047,016 between 1900 to 1910. Rural people ought to notice, said James, that the rural population of 1911 constituted only forty per cent of the total provincial population compared to sixty per cent in 1900.²⁰

Rural publicity gained such momentum that politicians felt they could improve their lot in rural areas by taking up the numbers question. N. W. Rowell, Liberal leader in Ontario in 1911, called for a Royal Commission to investigate the decline.²¹ Party campaign literature pointed out to provincial voters that rural population had dropped by 50,000 in the preceding decade.²² Federally, M. S. Schell, Liberal member of parliament for Oxford South, cited a rural decline of 62,000 in the previous ten years to support the Liberals' advocacy of reciprocity in 1911.²³ When the

provincial Liberals again raised the question of decline in rural Ontario in the Legislature in 1913, the Conservative Minister, W. H. Hearst, defended the government's policies and accused the federal Liberal government of refusing Ontario's request of 1910 for a Royal Commission to investigate rural problems.²⁴

The rural opinion-makers, if no other agricultural group, had some estimation of the numbers involved in the flight from the countryside and tried to awaken general concern. Some figures, such as The Sun's estimate of 20,000 per year are remarkably accurate, while others miss the mark. They realistically perceived the general nature of the problem. The press, for example, pinpointed the beginning of the movement to the 1870's and the net population decline to 1881.²⁵ The Weekly Sun remarked on the widespread nature and unconfined extent of 'the Problem.'²⁶ One editor noted that "practically the only cases in which an increase is shown is in townships adjoining the large urban centres where what may properly be classed as urban population has overflowed into the country." The usefulness of land for agriculture did not affect the amount of the rural exodus for the best sections "as well as the poorer sections have suffered. Mariposa, in Victoria County, one of the best townships in Ontario in so far as soil is concerned, a township with excellent roads and within easy access both of Lindsay and Toronto has dropped from 4,190 to 3,857."²⁷

The rural press recognized that 'the Problem' was not unique to Ontario or even Canada, but was tied to the difficulties confronting agriculture all over the world. Naturally, the similarity of conditions was most obvious with regard to the United States. Some articles in the Ontario agricultural journals went to great lengths to publish statistical accounts of the decline in American rural population.²⁸ They did not, however, limit their comparisons merely to American parallels, but included most

European countries as well. Agricultural France's loss of 25,000 farmers per year to Paris²⁹ rated a comment in the Ontario press, as did the "grave trouble ahead" foreseen in England if depopulation were not checked.³⁰ Similar accounts related to comparable situations in Germany, Belgium and Australia.³¹

(ii)

Statistics give a good picture of how the contemporary farm journals viewed the extent of the exodus from the countryside. They do not, however, provide an adequate perception of the degree to which these same writers apprehended its seriousness. The press and much of the attentive public was well aware of the social and economic dislocation involved in the depopulation of the countryside. Farm and Dairy went so far as to advocate a federal Royal Commission to assess the situation in the Province caused by depopulation.³² The most animated discussions in the columns of the rural newspapers were not "those touching important practical problems of soil culture and stock husbandry, but the ones aroused by disputatious views on matters of social and business relationships,...the perennial debates as to 'Why the Boys Leave the Farm', and the occasional exchanges of opinion regarding the profits of pork production, embellished with fairly unanimous views about the attitude of the pork packers."³³ The number of editorials, stories, advertisements and letters which pointed out the seriousness of depopulation verifies the accuracy of this statement.

The first aspect of depopulation, the labour shortage, was generally separated from the social decline in the press discussions. Its seriousness was made worse by the comparatively abundant labour at low wages available in the 1890's.³⁴ Stories stressing the gravity of the labour situation appeared in 1900 and continued throughout the period. Few questions of the day, emphasized the editors of the optimistic and

progressive Ontario Agricultural College Review, confronted the agricultural employer with the need for such "serious consideration" as hiring an adequate supply of labour.³⁵ From this beginning in 1901, stories on the labour shortage provided much grist for the rural complaint mills for the following years. A farmer from Ontario County remarked that he "almost had to get down on his knees to get someone to dig a ditch."³⁶ This situation occurred not only because "during the busy seasons, when the farmer is almost hurried to death it is impossible to find a man worth hiring," but also "if, by chance, a farmer does happen to find a man...he will do very little work when alone. His employer needs to work with him all the time, and keep pushing him on, as it were. The average hired man is far more interested in wondering if it is near mealtime and longing for pay day to arrive than he is in doing work satisfactorily."³⁷

The labour shortage pushed aside other problems in the attention it merited. According to this view, there was "no question as materially affecting the farmer's welfare, and as a natural consequence, the welfare of the whole country. Tariffs, cattleguards, transportation, and all other subjects dwindle into insignificance compared to this."³⁸ The situation appeared unparalleled for "at no time have farmers of Ontario been met with a condition of such vital importance, as that with which they are now confronted in the labor problem."³⁹ Publicity given by the press included inch-high headlines such as "Rural Depopulation Creates a Crisis in Ontario."⁴⁰ Many farmers were driven to advocate reconciliation with the condition since the problem continued for such a long time and never seemed to improve.⁴¹ Despite occasional lapses into optimism at minor relief,⁴² the demand for farm help continued to outstrip the supply.⁴³ Questionnaire results compiled by one agricultural journal which asked farmers to describe their greatest problem showed that "almost without exception the answer is

found in the scarcity and high price of labor."⁴⁴

Near the end of the period complaints about the dearth of farm labour were as numerous as during earlier years. If there was one thing more than another, reported The Canadian Farm that had "hampered the farmer in recent years in satisfactorily conducting his business, it is the scarcity of help.... This scarcity of help is not confined to any particular area, it is general, and there are few farmers in any part of Canada who do not feel its effect in some way."⁴⁵ In support, The Farmer's Magazine reported that "the hired help question is one that is accounting for nearly all the hardships upon the farm today."⁴⁶ Reports of newspaper correspondents scattered throughout the province invariably mentioned the labour shortage in their stories.⁴⁷

Dismay over the lack of help on the farms was not the sole prerogative of the farm press. Speaker after speaker brought this question to the notice of the assembled agriculturists at farm gatherings. At local Farmers' Institutes as early in the period as 1900,⁴⁸ and at the larger meeting of the Dominion Grange in Toronto in 1903,⁴⁹ agriculturists listened to speeches describing the labour shortage. York County Council took the matter to Queen's Park when a deputation visited Premier George Ross in 1903. At some of the conventions of the professional associations such as the dairymen and the corn growers almost every speech would include some reference to the difficulty of obtaining labour to perform all the tasks associated with the different aspects of farming.⁵⁰ Even the fairs, events for both amusement and instruction, often provided an occasion for an address on the timely topic of the Provincial labour shortage.

The pervasiveness of the labour shortage in rural life and consciousness is demonstrated by its use as an advertising theme in the rural

journals. The National Cream Separator Company sold its products under advertisements titled "The question with every farmer is, 'What Shall be Done to Solve the Farm Labor Problem?'" ⁵¹ One journal, The Farming World, opened a promotional campaign under the half-inch heading, "Farm Help". The basis of the campaign was the offer of a free book on the subject of obtaining farm labour for readers who sent in new subscriptions. ⁵² Agencies were set up to deal with the rural employers' demands for farm labour and to supply workers for rural areas. The Salvation Army, ⁵³ the Ontario Provincial Government, ⁵⁴ and several smaller private operations ⁵⁵ attempted to provide farmers with immigrants recruited to help relieve the shortage. Their advertisements joined those of the labour-saving machinery in the rural publications.

The rural opinion-makers, therefore, mobilized the means of communication available to bring about awareness of the seriousness of the labour shortage. This action may not have been necessary; if the problem of a labour shortage were as widespread as the statistics indicate most rural employers must have had some experience with difficulty in obtaining hired help. Figures on the decline, nevertheless, publicized in the rural press and at the agricultural meetings, along with the comments on the seriousness of the problem, must have helped the average farmer to gain a more accurate assessment of the difficulty and to see the need for some further study.

The problems engendered by depopulation had another aspect: the decline of the old rural social structures. The departure of thousands of rural offspring, many journals and writers believed, threatened the way of life of those who remained. Expressions of dismay at the social consequences of depopulation formed as popular a subject in the agricultural press and conventions as did the complaints at a lack of labour. Perhaps

one reason for this, an explanation which did not make its way into very many public statements, was that the farmers' children formed the major labour reservoir for agricultural pursuits. Variations under the title "Why the Boys and Girls Leave the Farm" or "The Rural Social Problem," formed a regular topic of discussion in rural journals⁵⁶ and at agricultural meetings.⁵⁷ The articles often emphasized that the long duration of the migration from rural areas had meant that the problem was becoming a crisis.⁵⁸ One metaphor, notable for its gruesome comparison, related how the onset of rural social decay was

akin to that terrible disease, consumption. At first, there is a slight cough, a little weakness, but no serious symptoms to cause alarm. Then the cough gets worse, the weakness more noticeable. Spasmodic attempts are made to check the disease, but neither the patient nor his friends are seriously alarmed. But if the disease is not resolutely taken in hand at this stage, it is almost certain to result in suffering later and perhaps death. ⁵⁹

Weekly editorials in most of the agricultural journals served to bring the worsening social situation to the notice of the general farm populace.⁶⁰

A series of conferences discussed the quality of rural social life and suggested improvements. The Presbyterian Church held a conference at Geneva Park in 1912, at which Reverend John Macdougall gave a series of lectures discussing the rural social decline. He repeated these lectures at Knox College in Toronto.⁶¹ At a conference in Ottawa in 1914, the Social Service Council of Canada, a body established by the various Protestant churches, spent much time going over solutions to problems in Canadian life such as slums, white-slavery, social welfare, Lord's Day legislation, and temperance. One section of this conference dealt with the "Problem of the Country." In this session, E. C. Drury⁶² and W. C. Good, officials of the farm organizations, rubbed shoulders with Rev. John Macdougall,⁶³ Rev. W. F. Sharp⁶⁴ (Organizer of the Huron Survey), along

with others such as Rev. Hugh Dobson,⁶⁵ Alphonse Desjardins⁶⁶ (Organizer of the Caisses Populaires), and Professor Reynolds of O.A.C.⁶⁷ The Huron Survey, conducted by the Methodist Church in 1913, provided an occasion for another series of studies and conferences on rural life. It gained much notice for its findings⁶⁸ on rural social dislocation. The organizers of this survey attempted to carry its conclusions to the rural populace by organizing discussions of the exodus from the countryside by the remaining population.⁶⁹

(iii)

The reception and reaction to rural depopulation accented by the rural opinion-makers was not unanimous. While the considerable majority of articles in the agricultural journals showed concern and dismay at the consequences, a few comments designed to calm rural feeling counselled acceptance of the labour shortage. The basis of this advice lay in the conclusion that the labour shortage indicated rural progress. Articles in this vein were generally confined to the journals which viewed most sympathetically the process of urbanization and advocated the quick adaptation of agriculture to urban standards.⁷⁰ "A great deal of pother," was the way one writer viewed concern over the labour shortage since "all manner of inferences are being drawn" from the census figures. He remarked that many journals urged that " ' unless something is done to remedy this state of thing, ' the day of disaster is already at Canadian doors...." An investigation of the 'facts' proved to this journalist that "things are not as bad as the figure compilers would have us believe."⁷¹ Another unsympathetic article told agriculturists to let depopulation run its course since "any restriction put upon this natural proceeding would inevitably react against the best interests of the country."⁷²

Occasionally, even some of the usually uncompromising defenders of the farmer's right to labour appeared to advocate acceptance of the permanent labour condition. The existing situation had to be recognized and "though we may decry this fact, and weigh the pros and cons of this tendency, it nevertheless remains and aggravates the situation in the country. The tendency is too strong to be reverted [sic] by individual or even combined effort on the part of the farmer." ⁷³ C. C. James, Deputy Minister of Agriculture, urged acceptance of the labour shortage although, he said,

there was a day in this country when farm labor was plentiful and cheap, when it could simply be had for the asking. But that day is gone by and it will never come back to us again. We need never again expect to have cheap labor in the Province of Ontario, and it is exceptionally difficult for the majority of our farmers to recognize that fact and to act accordingly. Year by year, the cry for cheap labor comes up...and if we are going to carry on our farm work, we have got to work this thing out. So to work it out with the labor at our command. ⁷⁴

In another speech to the Dairymen, James told his audience that "the success of our towns and cities depends to a large extent upon their being recruited by the strong vigorous straightforward young men and women, who come from the farms." ⁷⁵ In all these comments counselling reconciliation to rural depopulation, only one aspect of that two-headed monster was dealt with. Those speakers and writers who urged the farmers to deal with the labour shortage and to adjust their practices never condoned the social decline in a similar manner.

(iv)

Despite the few publicists who downgraded its importance, 'The Problem' remained an element of anxiety to rural opinion-makers. The agriculturist, according to most of the agricultural press, had good reason to grow alarmed at the declining population. To observers living in the

period, the rural exodus must have appeared ready to leave the thickly-populated countryside completely stripped of its hard-working families who had pioneered Ontario's development. The apprehensions of the opinion-makers did not diminish throughout the entire period from 1900 to 1914. Their particular concerns centred around the major results of the movement from the country--the social problems and the labour shortage. Each of these two aspects of the problem of depopulation contained its own consequences, evident to observers of the time, which gave a more specific form to the foreboding they expressed about the future of rural Ontario.

CHAPTER III

"I CAN REMEMBER WHEN...." :
 PERCEPTIONS OF THE LOSS OF THE OLD RURAL
 POLITICAL, SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC LIFE.

The rural population's concern over the labour shortage and the decay of its social institutions occupied the journals and speeches devoted to agriculture. Examining the effects as the people of the time perceived them explains the anxiety aroused by these twin problems. According to the view of the agricultural populace, the results threatened their political, social and economic situation in the country. Even very few of the 'adaptors' could see any benefits accruing from the drastic changes induced by depopulation.

(i)

The worries of the countrymen partly centred around the challenge presented to their whole world view by depopulation. The country dwellers still wanted to believe, as they had for generations, that "a contented, prosperous, God-fearing, rural population is the tap-root of national vigour. As the farmer is, so is the nation." They still believed in the corollary to this assumption to the effect that "any force that tends to deprive rural life of its most valuable asset [its people] should be sought out and eradicated as a source of public danger." Because they held these convictions very strongly, they had many "heartsearchings to determine the cause of the exodus of young men and maidens from the country."¹ These natural advantages which rural inhabitants believed the country possessed no longer appeared to be sufficient to support their agrarian philosophy. "There is freedom, fresh air, good water, health

in its eternal measure and eternal joy for the lover of nature in the unlimited outdoor life of a Canadian farm," enumerated The Farmer's Advocate, "but all this has existed through the years in which the sons of the soil have been shaking the clay of their fathers' farms off their boots and donning the patent leathers of city pavements."²

Not only did rural-bred young people ignore the advantages of country life, but they also would "persist in remaining in the city and out of employment when comfortable homes, fair wages, good board, and honest, faithful, elevating labour awaits them only a few miles distant in the country...."³ Again, this situation forced farmers to consider why, "If the attractions of the farm are so great, do so few people appreciate them?" To the ordinary farmer, the answer to the question 'Why should young men stay on the farm?' ought to be as simply and easily answered as it had been for generations. On second thought, farmers concluded that "judging by the apparent tendency of young men born in the country and reared on the farm [to move to the cities] it may not be so very easy to solve the problem."⁴ The suspicion that those who were leaving were the brightest and most alert rural offspring strengthened this uneasiness. Evidence of decay in the calibre of the farming population cropped up in the number of "overly conservative farmers, who have, as a general thing, been slow to adopt the improvements in methods that would increase the productiveness of the labor they employ."⁵

A change in the composition of both the rural and urban population gave further cause for alarm in the rural journals. The press viewed the abandonment of the countryside and the growth of urban industrial dominance as a threat to the very foundations of Canadian society and democracy. The multiplication of "armies of employees more or less under control of their corporations," did not bode well for Canadian political

freedom. Because these urban men were dependent upon their employers for their economic livelihood, they would not be tempted to assert any political independence if it threatened their economic security. The cities were growing so large that they could not help but pass under sinister influences. W. L. Smith, editor of The Weekly Sun, voiced rural fears when he noted that :

the most common complaint is apparent on the face of it. In a large city, there is large patronage in the way of contracts concessions and offices. There is something to give which costs each individual member of the community comparatively little but which is of immense value to the few who receive. The natural result is for the few to organize with a view of control while the great mass, lacking acquaintance with each other and with those who should be community leaders are powerless to resist.

He contrasted this situation to that of the countryside where "men know each other, they know men fitted for public office, and it is much easier to work out democratic institutions there than in a great city." Indeed, he concluded, "great cities furnish the natural conditions for the creation of despotic government, the despotisms of organized selfish interests as in New York or the personal despotism as in some European countries."⁶

Not only did the development of industrialization and the decline in political morality which accompanied it threaten democracy, but the "growing presence of vast colonies of recently imported aliens who do not understand the English language and are still more ignorant regarding the proper working of our systems of government"⁷ aggravated the problem. Goldwin Smith in his 'Bystander' column remarked that the immigrants, not good farm hands or artisans for whom Canada had vacancies in her labour force, were "the scum and refuse of Europe...[who] even if they are good workers, which they appear by no means universally to be, are bad citizens.

It is notorious that the foreign element in our great cities is bought wholesale at elections...."⁸ A large number of immigrants crowding into the cities would "lay into the foundation wall of this democratic structure, elements of vice and weakness and squalid helplessness," reported the editor of The Farmer's Advocate.⁹ People were reminded that the population of Toronto contained a one-seventh proportion of foreigners, all aliens in language and wholly untrained in popular government. Large numbers of them "suffer from moral and mental debasement due to having lived for centuries under despotic and corrupt and altogether vicious forms of government. Not even in the best of newcomers has a sentiment of Canadian citizenship as yet been developed..." Immigrants joined the displaced rural population as tools in the hands of the great urban corporations which corrupted them" as a means of attaining their own ends."¹⁰

If the rural population continued to depart from the homes it built, the descendants of the pioneers of Ontario in the Methodist and Presbyterian communities of the early days would disappear. As they gravitated to the cities, their place on the land would be taken by the Central Europeans or French Canadians. The rural bastion of Canadian democracy was threatened by depopulation. Peasant farmers "unfit to serve the place in a democratic government" took over the land of "those trained for generations in the principles of democracy. We shall be in danger of losing the Lincoln ideal of government, by the people for the people. In its place we shall be in danger of having set up government by the corporations which control the avenues of employment in the city and a down-trodden mass of peasants on the land such as there are now in parts of continental Europe."¹¹ Such unabashed racial prejudice abounded in the rural press which often described immigrants as "hirsute, low-browed,

big-faced, with an obviously low mentality, in every face of whom there is something wrong."¹² As evidence for this view, the press pointed out the 'degradation' and degeneration of rural areas in the United States which had been spreading to the Ontario countryside and increasing the crime rate.¹³ The call of the Ontario Fairs Association for a rural police force gave further proof of the widespread nature of these sentiments among the rural opinion-makers.¹⁴

In the eyes of the agriculturists, depopulation produced little illusion as to its immediate political consequences. Recognition dawned that "agriculture is no longer the paramount industry of Canada, that the value of the output of Canadian factories is now about double the value of the output of Canadian farms." The implication of this statement was that agriculture could no longer depend upon its overwhelming economic and numerical importance to compel action on its legislative demands.¹⁵ Not only would the profession lose its power in lobbying for favourable legislation, but the decline in population meant that in actual voting and redistribution of seats, provincially and federally, rural areas would lose members. Country dwellers would become politically subservient to large urban majorities in the adjacent towns of their ridings.¹⁶ One estimate placed the number of ridings under urban control in federal contests in the 1911 election at one-half the total.¹⁷ The Weekly Sun. pointed out that the small towns in both the federal and provincial elections of that year voted almost solidly Tory while rural areas, divided on party lines, did not exercise the determining factor in the elections, swamped as they were by the towns. Several members, favoured in the rural areas, were soundly beaten by the huge majorities against them in the urban centres.¹⁸

Appeals to racial prejudice and reminders of the erosion of political influence were not as painfully felt by the rural population as the personally-experienced effects of depopulation. The fall in numbers meant a corresponding decline in rural social life and an increase in rural isolation.¹⁹ Abandoned homes sprinkling the countryside provided testimony to the breakdown in rural social institutions.²⁰ One country-man reminisced that he could remember

when social life was abundant and good. It was before the industrial boom started in Canada.... We then had glee clubs, temperance societies, literary and debating societies.... Now we have none of these; the young people to a large extent have left for the city. Scarcity of labor with all the work falling on a few shoulders, makes us too tired to want to run around at night.

These conditions meant to the old timers that "on the whole, the country is not as attractive a place to live in, in spite of all the improvements we have made, as it was twenty-five years ago."²¹

The little hamlets and towns had disappeared, as the "country surrendered to the city a multitude of occupations which once gave it social wealth.... This loss confined the choice of occupations in the country to one, that of agriculture." It had reduced social groups to the uniformity of a single class.²² Social stimulation and spirit died out. A gap had formed in the life of the rural districts so that the people were living "more as individual families than as communities."²³ Community spirit sometimes lacked even in matters directly concerning the agricultural livelihood. Farmers could not maintain interest, attendance or finances for their organizations, as the Farmers' Institutes and some local agricultural societies registered serious declines in membership, leadership and enthusiasm.²⁴

Rural institutions affected by the population migration included the two mainstays of the community, the school and the church. School attendance declined drastically. Those buildings which "were filled with forty children as many years ago [1873] now shiver with a beggarly half-dozen," reported W. C. Good to the Dominion Grange in 1913.²⁵ According to a report released by the Ontario Department of Education, the actual drop in attendance numbered 27,529 from 1903 to 1910. The continuing shrinkage by a further 6,239 in 1911 indicated little change in the trend.²⁶ The situation had worsened to the extent that many rural school sections would have to close for lack of pupils. One school reported that not a single student registered in 1906,²⁷ while most reported minimal attendance.²⁸ Rural students were also represented in low proportion in the high schools compared to the number of urban students.²⁹

Lacking the stimulation given by teaching to large classes of enthusiastic pupils, country teachers changed positions frequently. They left the remaining children in their schools without any stable guidance.³⁰ Full blame could hardly be laid on the teachers' shoulders, however, for the majority were underprivileged and underpaid.³¹ The trustees, skimping on funds, hired cheaper, underqualified teachers when these were available.³² Male teachers deserted the teaching occupation in increasing numbers, leaving the care of the country children to young women. They could scarcely be faulted, for they often earned an average rate of pay less than that of a hired hand.³³

Many of the school buildings presented a sad appearance. They suffered a lack of maintenance so that from the exterior they were "desolate-looking places." They were left "bare and unattractive" with no shrubs or trees. The grounds were too small and lacked play equipment.³⁴

Sanitation, lighting, heating, medical inspection, all left much to be desired in most rural schools.³⁵ These conditions, one rural school inspector believed, existed mainly because of the paucity of both pupils and taxpayers.³⁶ Too much money was lavished on the ten per cent of the pupils in the high schools expected to enter the professions. Not enough was spent on the seventy percent who remained in rural areas.³⁷ Of the money devoted to rural education, much indirectly subsidized the cities as rural sections bore the cost of educating many a prospective townsman.³⁸

Concern over the condition of the country church can be measured partly by the interest of denominations in organizing surveys and publishing books about their problems. Sharing the agrarian philosophy, they believed that "the interests of religion are today imperilled by the disintegration of the farming population. When men become dissatisfied with the sober and honest life of the farmer...there is cause for religious people to be afraid, and today they are afraid."³⁹ Rural clergy complained about the centralization of the church organization. The denominations confined their major efforts to towns and cities, "giving them of their best to the neglect of the open country...."⁴⁰ Excessive denominationalism and overlapping, another partial result of depopulation, left a hamlet with three, four or five churches in a centre of population able to support one.⁴¹ Rural ministers, forced to look after several small congregations and to preach at them all each Sunday, had little energy to do a proper job in extending church work. They expended all their efforts in the bare maintenance of each small congregation⁴² and in the upkeep of "poor shabby buildings displeasing to the eye in architectural design,... unattractive within and without."⁴³ Ministers also had to cope with a chronic, disheartening decrease in numbers; a continuing loss of workers

and young people affected all denominations.⁴⁴ Attendance showed a particular decline among the men.⁴⁵

Along with church and school, the most important of all rural social institutions, the family, suffered under the impact of the declining rural population. The size of the rural family shrank because of the exodus to the cities. As the young deserted the farms, the rural areas were left to older people.⁴⁶ The average family-size shrank considerably,⁴⁷ and an imbalance in the sexes resulted from the larger proportion of women leaving the countryside. A male surplus of almost 86,000 developed in rural areas, while women exceeded men by 11,000 in the cities.⁴⁸ A female majority in a rural area prevailed only in one county (Grenville).⁴⁹ The problem of farmer-bachelors became a bandied-about topic of discussion in the rural press,⁵⁰ as rural bachelors had difficulty in ferreting out suitable mates.⁵¹

(ii)

Economic consequences of depopulation were considered almost as disastrous as the social and political results by the rural population. Farmers feared the growing instability of their business. A farm leader reported to The Sun that although he "may have made some money out of the bacon hog or dairy cow, the farmer is not sure of staying in the business, and this unsettled state is working great harm for the future."⁵² The sense of economic security had left the countryside.

The uncertainty of the labour supply became a gnawing source of this unease. Rural employers blamed the lack of labour for a retrogression in the cultivation methods. In deciding his line of agriculture, a cultivator was governed almost entirely by his ability to get help. Many a farmer was "not directing his energies in the channels he thinks

best or in those for which his farm and surroundings are best adapted because of this one thing--not sufficient help."⁵³ Agriculturists interviewed by the press about the effect of the scarcity remarked that they were forced to give up profitable operations because of their inability to get hired help.⁵⁴ In many areas, buildings were abandoned and homes still worth hundreds of thousands of dollars stood with broken windows and slamming doors. Costly barns and equipment left idle, rapidly deteriorated.⁵⁵ The drive of farm businessmen towards intensive cultivation appeared in some respects to have been halted. The press reported that much of the most tillable cropland in Ontario was being converted into pasture.⁵⁶ Labour conditions forced farmers to abandon the more labour-consuming branches of agriculture such as dairying and market gardening where "nothing has yet been devised to successfully take the place of a pair of hands in the weeding, picking, marketing of vegetables and in the care and milking of cattle."⁵⁷ Orchard men had to reconsider their type of farming as their trees were attacked by diseases they could not control.⁵⁸

An increase in livestock-keeping accompanied the lessening production of other branches. The land was minimally used and expansion was limited; moreover, the lack of outdoor grazing during Ontario winters forced farmers to sell surplus cattle they could not afford to feed over the cold season even if prices were low.⁵⁹ According to one estimate, because of the increased grazing, the value of possible output from the land declined by seventy-five per cent.⁶⁰ Everywhere farmers planned their operations with a view to reducing labour to the minimum. "A minimum of labour usually means a minimum of output as well," commented a disgruntled farmer. The increased ravages of insect pests which

accompanied the growing amount of land devoted to grazing caused part of the decline in production.⁶¹ Cattle 'finished' on grass alone also had not the quality to command top prices on the world's leading markets.⁶²

For those still cultivating their fields, the labour shortage meant that the weed nuisance aggravated working conditions. Weeds proliferated because farmers could not adequately deal with them.⁶³ Only by putting his land to pasture could a man control the weeds spreading through his fields, although he had to sacrifice a year's crops and suffer a drop in his income.⁶⁴ In some respects, increased grazing land was the agriculturist's best alternative. The crops he did produce suffered from the lack of labour due to inefficient cultivation of the soil.⁶⁵ The situation was summed up by one cultivator who remarked that "I am ashamed of the weeds on my farm, but I cannot help it: I can get no help; I am about discouraged."⁶⁶

The social results of the labour shortage resulting from the switch to grazing land deserve a mention. Due to the increase in pasture-land, bachelor landowners could work tracts otherwise too large for them individually. The land, therefore, supporting only a fraction of the population it could, added less than it should to the provincial wealth.⁶⁷ Families that attempted to keep their land in cultivation often had to put the wives, mothers and daughters of the farm to work in the fields in order to make ends meet. Boys, kept home from school, worked the land with their parents. Many did not even receive a common school education. These social results exercised a detrimental effect on the strained rural situation.

Although the jeremiahs foresaw dire consequences if the rural decline were not halted, some observers of change in farm life noted that

the inadequate and costly labour supply produced beneficial results for farm methods. Wages had risen tremendously and complaints about the high pay of farm labourers were common in the rural journals.⁶⁹ This situation forced farmers to make the best use of available manpower to maintain profits. They discovered that one way to do this was by increasing their use of available labour-saving machines. Farmers re-evaluated the comparative cost of labour versus machinery.⁷⁰ One farmer forced to adopt the cream separator remarked that:

as long as a hired girl could be had for five or six dollars a month, to make butter, lug milk pans up and down stairs, and skim milk out to the barn, we were quite content to do without a separator. Now that we can't get a good girl under \$15, we find that old way out of the question. We have had a cream separator now for ten years, sending our cream to a butter factory, and it has been a good investment in more ways than one.

In the fields, the hay-tedder, self-binder, two furrow ploughs, four-horse harrows, side delivery rakes, all improved efficiency and cut costs.⁷¹

This equipment, while expensive, still cost less than inefficient hired help, or so believed many advocates of mechanization.⁷² Labour-saving competitions were held by the farm newspapers to popularize new methods of alleviating the shortage in all lines of farm work.⁷³ "Evidence accumulates," wrote the editors of The Farmer's Advocate,

that the farm-labor problem of the past decade, while a hardship for the time being has, by hastening the adoption of labor-saving practices, resulted in an immense, permanent uplift to the industry of agriculture, an uplift which, though entailing undeniable hardship in the transition state during which it was being brought about, has greatly improved the farmer's position in the long run, and will yet improve it still further.

After all, it concluded, "the farm-labor problem has not been such a very severe hardship to the foresighted. It is chiefly those who resist progress that are crushed by it."⁷⁴

These sentiments were realistic, if not widespread. Even the increase in the use of machinery had detrimental social consequences, believed others. Mechanization placed great financial pressure upon small farms. Since these operations could not sustain or generate the amount of capital required for machinery, horses and buildings, mechanization provided an incentive for consolidating farm holdings into higher revenue-producing units. If carried too far, however, this situation would result in the creation of a permanent class of farm labourers or tenants who could be imported Polish, Italian or Chinese working for a landed aristocracy. This resolution of the labour shortage was entirely unpalatable to the farm press since the creation of such an alien labouring class would carry severe social problems with it. Tenants, for example, would be apathetic to needed rural improvements since they had no stake in the country, and a rural proletariat would corrupt the country and reduce it to the level of the degenerate cities.

Another economic consequence of depopulation included the rising prices for farm products in the cities and towns.⁷⁶ Urban dwellers, under the impression that "farmers are rolling in wealth,"⁷⁷ began complaining of unconscionable profits in the farm products trade. This accusation started a campaign by the rural publicists who repeatedly pointed out that this condition resulted from 'The Problem', which encouraged the poor methods and increased farmers' costs.⁷⁸ Editorials told the city dweller that he could blame only himself since his support of policies which encouraged depopulation resulted in his suffering the consequences.⁷⁹ City readers ought to "exert their influence towards inducing men to engage in farm work," if they desired to help in the campaign to reduce the cost of their food.⁸⁰ The agriculturist, his journals emphasized, was only a scapegoat. Laying

the blame on this "most patient of men, the farmer, when things go wrong in the community or when attention is to be diverted from the real culprits, the big dealers..." was nothing but "...uncalled for and shameful slander ...and insult beyond endurance." ⁸¹

In their further defence, countrymen declared that "in spite of working from daylight to dark and making use of every device possible to cut down expenditure, the average farmer after allowing himself only a fair return for labor is not making bank interest on his investment...." ⁸² The high rate of per capita taxation, another result of depopulation, contributed to the rising rural cost of living. Each farmer had to pay more to support remaining rural services such as schools and township roads. ⁸³

Farmers pleaded common cause with the consumer. Exploitation by the professional landlord who performed no service and made money "simply because he has control of a piece of land God created" resulted in increased costs for both groups. ⁸⁴ Since the local mills and services had come into the hands of large corporations, farmers had to pay more for their raw materials such as machinery and seed. ⁸⁵ Price increases were justified in many cases since they were "not a matter of life and death but purely a question of a fair return upon investments." ⁸⁶ Sydney Fisher, Minister of Agriculture in Laurier's cabinet, told a gathering of dairymen that he was "glad that the prices of our agricultural products are so high. I am glad for the farmers...they have only come into their rights." ⁸⁷ These statements did not aid in restoring good relations among the rural and urban dwellers in Canada. The rift between town and country seemed to widen year by year.

(iii)

This widening breach between the sympathies of the rural and urban population formed the final consequence in a chain of results. The links in this chain, as the rural population perceived them, joined together

their range of experiences, social, political and economic. Rural self-esteem had declined along with the agricultural population. Fears for Canada grew as the farmers projected a future in which the corporations controlled the urban masses and both city and country were overwhelmed by aliens. The political power of the countryside was in danger because of the falling proportion of rural population. The social consequences affected the most important rural institutions; for school, church, and family all suffered under the impact of the declining population. Economically, methods had to change to accommodate the labour shortage, often in the direction of short-cuts and inefficiency.

These direct outcomes of depopulation, as the contemporary population viewed them, forced the countrymen, if not to attempt remedies, at least to think about the real challenge which confronted an agricultural existence. Some of the rural publicists, the adaptors, could see in this threat an incentive to force the agriculturists to adopt up-to-date methods. Most agriculturists, however, were bewildered by the threats arising on every side. The changes in society and business seemed, to most, to sweep away the stability of the life-style which had prevailed in the province since its settlement.

CHAPTER IV

THE GUARDIANS OF THE RURAL MYTH:
DESTROYERS AND BUILDERS

In the eyes of the population living in the countryside, the exodus to the cities brought disastrous consequences. The situation in which the agriculturists suffered assault after assault on their way of life forced them to ask themselves, "Why?". In fact, the questioning induced by depopulation constituted its most important result. Opinion-leaders began a thorough analysis of rural life aimed at finding the causes and gaining an indication of solutions to halt the worsening situation. Although their arguments and discussion were generally futile in stopping the exodus, the debate provides interesting reading. It brought to the fore perceptions of the relationship of the country to the metropolis, since the search for the true authors of depopulation led to revealing examinations of the rural-urban aspects of 'The Problem.' No social or economic institutions touching rural life remained immune from this scrutiny.

(i)

The rural opinion-makers placed much of the blame for the exodus from the countryside on social causes. One of the major social origins as well as results of depopulation lay in the undermining of the rural myth by rural social organizations.¹ This decline in agrarian idealism came about partly through the work of the rural press, the farm family, the country school and the rural church. The boy, one farmer remarked, was

exposed to the mischievous effect of the class of literature that belittles country life. In too many

of our papers and books for young people, the hero is represented as one who finds no scope for his talents amid farm surroundings, and who comes to his own only upon leaving the old home for a life of adventure.... 2

The children of the farmer read about the poor lad who became a brilliant financier, speculator or politician; of the fancy dress balls and glittering social functions of the wealthy. Not unnaturally, the young concluded this was typical of city life and "they can hardly be blamed, in the absence of real and true knowledge of many city lives from entertaining the belief that this apparent success and like pleasures await them as soon as they can join the throng moving cityward."³ The libraries to aid the education of the rural youth contained little but this 'cheap trash' which helped only to further the breakdown of a proper conception of country life.⁴ Cities could be excused for publishing newspapers which constantly pointed with pride to the glories of their metropolis; but their emphasis on this attractiveness served the purpose of honey for flies. The farm papers, on the other hand which were "supposed to devote themselves entirely to the interests of the farmers and to show the country boy why he should stay on the farm, are edited in the cities and by men who left the country to do the work."⁵ At times, the agricultural journals portrayed the farmers as penurious, cheap, contemptible wretches.

Much of the criticism which destroyed rural idealism and led to the depopulation of the countryside, in fact, originated in the agricultural journals. Farm women, particularly, were told that they must avoid being 'limited' by their country existence and by not knowing what lay beyond the nearest hamlet.⁶ One columnist whose writing provided a focus for much of the debate complained that the 'agricultural ideal' which

implied the superiority of the agricultural métier, had not fulfilled its function. The treatment of the farmers' wives provided an example, since

in no other occupation are we offered so great a contrast between the superior advantages of the male and the acquiescent humility of the female.... No--for and so poorly paid, so complacently considered as only a chattel, a mere machine, a possession valuable only according to her working and child-bearing capacity. 7

The hard-fisted farmer portrayed in the rural press by novelist Jean Blewett could do little to persuade girls to stay in rural areas. He seldom had the grace to die young and "let his pale, soft-hearted wife wear weeds. Oftener, he wore the wife out and when she was sound asleep under the granite shaft--the really handsome granite shaft--took another who...proceeded to spend his money and make him 'toe the mark'...."⁸

Farmers' daughters, according to some writers, fared little better than their mothers and also spent their lives "working, planning monotonously, faithfully, gradually losing sight of all outside the narrow horizon of her duties," since "little of reward or of romance enters her own life."⁹

The farmer showed himself in the eyes of these writers to be not only a hard-hearted, selfish man, but a boor who had next to no regard for the social graces admired by all women. The press repeated a tale about the farm wife who had just cleaned her house when her husband 'reeking of the stable' came into the parlor to transact business. Instead of going to his desk to write, he shoved back "the nicely-arranged cover of the table," upset a bouquet of flowers, water and all, tore up several sheets of paper, and ignoring the wastepaper basket, threw them broadcast over the floor.¹⁰ Another countryman might show his uncouth nature by sleeping with his trousers over his head. "Imagine a sensitive woman having a nosegay like that in her bedroom, let alone at her very nose!"

exclaimed a horrified neighbour. Other men spit on the stove fender after having sat and watched their wives clean it, or took seed potatoes out and cut them on the kitchen table, or moved their egg incubator into the bedroom, or changed their underwear once a year. Swearing, noted a nurse, appeared "to be the chief accomplishment of a good many so-called men."¹¹ Generally, the agriculturist failed completely to provide the elementary courtesies all women enjoyed. Every farmer's daughter "seeing the deferential courtesy accorded by the well-bred city man to his lady companion, who takes it so naturally and unconsciously as a matter of course, feels a lump rise to her throat and a mist to her eyes, that such things are not for her."¹² Little wonder, these articles suggested, fewer women than men stayed in the countryside.

Most farm journals, proud of the success of the 'sons of the soil' who had left the farms and made names for themselves in other occupations, published many stories about these men. The aim of the articles, to show how rural childhood gave everyone an advantage, could not but be subverted to give the impression that fortunes were waiting in the cities to be gathered in by most countryboys. President James Mills of O.A.C. asked an audience at the Guelph Winter Fair "where all our leaders in professional, industrial and commercial life come from? Is it not from the farms of the country? Where then, do the brains come from that lead in the avenues of trade?"¹³ W.E.H. Massey provided an example, remarked upon in the rural journals, of a farm boy who 'made it' and who never forgot his rural origins.¹⁴ J. J. Hill, the U. S. railroad magnate was also known to be the son of an Ontario farm.¹⁵ These shining examples were complemented in The Canadian Countryman by a series of addresses each week by prominent men discussing the value of the various, urban, occupations.¹⁶

George C. Creelman of C.A.C., interested in a similar series of lectures for the students of his college, asked J. S. Willison, editor of the Toronto News for help in securing speakers.¹⁷

The papers pointed out that not only businessmen, but also many cultural leaders originated from concession lines of the Province. Included in this category were Professor Adam Shortt of Queen's University, and the President of Victoria University, R. P. Bowles, who "still a loyal son of the soil" would have chosen farming as his 'second' profession.¹⁸ Rural men dominated public life. The cabinets of Woodrow Wilson, Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Sir Robert Borden provided examples for rural youth of the great number of farm-bred politicians. In the United States, Wilson called all but one country-born men to his Cabinet. Of the members in the Canadian Cabinet of 1913, all but one had been raised in rural sections. Of the Provincial Premiers of the age not one had been born in a city. These examples pointed to the conclusion that "a childhood spent next to nature inculcated more of the attributes that lead to greatness than do childhood days spent in the rush and roar of the city."¹⁹ These stories must have proven as effective in luring boys from the farms as the articles about the lack of social amenities were in attracting girls to the cities.

Not only the newspapers, however, failed to maintain the 'right' attitude to agriculture; many farmers also lacked a belief in their occupation. They either deserted it for that reason or failed to imbue their offspring with the type of enthusiasm that would encourage the young people to remain on the farm. Some agriculturists felt that "in some way agriculture is degrading", and that the cultivator of the soil ought to defer to and seek the favour of the professional men. He treated this group too much "as little gods," tendered them the highest places and grovelled at their feet.²⁰ Farmers, by not upholding the 'dignity of their

calling', also created a feeling of unrest in the minds of their children.

Farmers' sons constantly heard agriculture spoken of as "an out-at-the elbows, ambitionless sort of business." ²² Frequently, a countryman said,

"If I had my life to live over again, I would never be a farmer; I would go to school and enter one of the professions." Farmers spoke longingly of the day when they could retire to the town with enough money to live comfortably. ²³ They thought of agriculture only as drudgery while the

travail of the cityman was easy in comparison. ²⁴ "What," demanded The Farmer's Advocate,

are the sons of these men likely to think of their fathers' occupation? Are they likely, after having this sentiment instilled into them from the cradle up to a high school age to show any great respect for agriculture?.... The child naturally believes the parent is right in his or her estimation of the calling engaged in.... ²⁵

These young people had "no knowledge of the world, and accept as gold all that glitters." Like many other cynical souls, the farmer stopped believing in his occupation, convinced that "he alone bore all this earth's burdens.... The man behind the plow appeared to have no friends, he was left alone." ²⁶ Few rural homes had exerted a rational influence in the direction of a wholesome appreciation of country life because the parents themselves did not feel it, except half-heartedly. This lack of appreciation of a farm life, believed many rural publicists, was "the strongest repelling force in the rural communities." ²⁷

Agriculturists, complained this same group of critics, had sold their idealism short by accepting the growing commercial spirit of the age. They became believers in the prevailing "gospel of success" which preached that popular acclaim greeted only those who gained "money and the power that goes with the possession of wealth." ²⁸ The means of acquisition had become unimportant, only the possession of vast riches

mattered. The disease had infected the whole urban population, for the working man in the cities pursued material goods with as much vigour as the financier.²⁹ Farmers, also debilitated, had become too money-hungry to esteem their occupation properly. They just drudged "away from morning till night, from day unto day, year unto year, with one aim in view, i.e. to make money...."³⁰ Infected with this spirit in the rural home, the youth could see that other occupations than farming provided a better opportunity for the rapid acquisition of the money he had been taught to esteem. He preferred to take his chance in the city rather than "follow the slower surer path of agriculture."³¹ W. C. Good told the Dominion Grange that this unhealthy attitude on the part of the countrymen themselves partially explained depopulation by their contribution to the "unhealthy commercialism of America with its lowering of ideals, its sensation-seeking and its tendencies to luxuriousness and display."³²

Not only were the home and press attacked by those wishing to stop the exodus, but the rural school system also suffered criticism for its adverse influence on the young people's outlook. "It is not exaggerating very much," believed the editor of The Farmer's Advocate, "to say that about all that an ill-conceived school system could do to depopulate the rural districts has been done by ours in the older provinces of Canada."³³ Some journals used up their space to emphasize that the "much-lauded" school system possessed lamentable tendencies to draw people away from the land, to fill towns and cities at the expense of the rural districts and to overcrowd professional and clerical employments.³⁴ This result was especially shameful since education was particularly important to country children. Rural life could lead towards a narrow outlook. Because the farmer often had only his own mental resources to rely on he should be trained to use his capacity to appreciate the rural life style.³⁵

The whole course of the province's school system led its students into higher echelons of study: from public to high school, to university; then, finally, into a profession away from agriculture. This educational ladder, beloved by the theorists in the Department of Education, had to stop leading away from agriculture if the farm life were to be preserved from complete destruction.³⁶ Adelaide Hunter Hoodless, the education reformer and Women's Institute pioneer, commented that the public school system had "sapped the rural districts of many of their brightest and most valuable members. Just so soon as a boy or girl discovers a special aptitude for text-book work--and country life rather conducts to a more retentive memory--finding themselves at the head of an examination list; they become convinced that their intellect is on the genius order and they are destined to shine as bright professional lights."³⁷

The changes needed to counteract this city bias in the public school system would be difficult to achieve. The course of study was outlined by city men, the text-books prepared by city men, the teacher was trained in a city Normal School by inspectors with city ideals.³⁸ The whole curriculum, many believed, was too 'bookish' and 'professional.' It extolled virtues antagonistic to those needed on the farm. It promoted militarism, for example, and also "scholarship and pedantry, then later...professional employment and finally...mercantile and industrial emprise." Dealing as it did with books and booklore, it developed only the mind and never the muscle. It dissociated the student from manual employment throughout the impressionable years of his school days. This led to centring the ambitions on realms of effort peculiar to the town and to a preference for sedentary occupations.³⁹

Testimonials in the columns of the farm press confirmed the extent of the belief in this accusation among farmer-readers. One farmer's

son reported that he went home from school "filled with a positive loathing for what seemed to me to be the undesirable drudgery of farm work. There was nothing in that course of study, as I remember it, that inspired me to look with favor on the farm or the farmer, yet that was the impressionable time of my life."⁴⁰ When success was achieved by those of rural origin, the press always attributed it to education. This reinforced the prestige of the city-oriented education system in the eyes of those whose minds it was directing.⁴¹

The individual teacher in the rural school also contributed to the glamourization of city occupations. A teacher brought to her classroom "an impression that the farm is a good place for all the clever children to get away from if possible. So she encourages the brightest of them to secure an education and become 'something better' than a farmer." A survey made of the staff of one of the farm journals discovered that not one of the members could recall ever being encouraged by his teacher to educate himself especially for farm life. Whenever a teacher appealed to ambition, he aimed at promoting more education and rousing a child to 'do better' than his parents.⁴² "Go back reader!," urged one article

...to the old school. You probably studied under half a dozen different teachers or more. Did ever one of them uphold farming or manual labor? Did they not incite you to study by holding up the prospect of a job without hard work? Our schools have been saturated with the pernicious idea that education was a means of avoiding physical exertion, a means by which the son might rise above the station of his parents. The father was 'only' a farmer or 'only' a day-labourer, or 'only' a mechanic as the case might be. The son if he was clever aspired to something 'better' and was encouraged in this ambition.⁴³

The teacher, in many cases, could not be expected to do otherwise for she was generally "a young person who has spent all her life among brick walls and sidewalks, dumped all at once into a country section."

She could not prevent herself from being out of harmony with her new environment. She would be homesick, not like country ways, unable to see anything 'in' farming and "in ninety-nine out of one hundred cases doesn't know enough about nature study to be interested even in that." Teachers, many critics believed, showed only their discontent with their jobs. At the first opportunity, most would apply for positions in town or city schools or else would leave the profession altogether.⁴⁴ They had not been trained to work in the rural sections. They all learned their teaching methods in the urban environment where the Normal schools had been established; they did not learn such prosaic daily chores as lighting the stoves in the rural schools where there was no caretaker. There was little doubt in the mind of ruralists that "the rural-school teacher has much to gain by getting his training under conditions not too remote from those where his work is to be done." To effect any change in attitude on the part of the pupils, there was little doubt that reform would have to be founded on a different system of teacher training in the public schools,⁴⁵ as well as better buildings⁴⁶ and larger specialized classes.⁴⁷

The higher educational systems did little to correct this early bias of rural education. High schools were located in the towns and cities. Any country children who went on to this level had to go into the town at the immature age of 12 or 13 years and were early weaned away from country ways.⁴⁸ Very few returned to the farm, reported the Department of Education.⁴⁹ Anti-high school feeling, very pronounced in some articles, led to at least one recommendation that the number of high schools be reduced.⁵⁰ Disgruntled farmers felt that the high schools and universities pointed the way

to the surgery, to the chemist's laboratory, to the mine, to the pulpit, to the bar or to the legislative hall, but in how many cases is there a serious effort made to teach the students the wealth of the sun-swept valley and meadow, and that satisfaction that comes to mind and heart and fortune by a pursuit of agriculture, the most ancient as it remains the most honorable of the arts? 51

Even the most agriculture-oriented of the schools in Ontario, The Ontario Agricultural College, was criticised for the tendency of its graduates to accept jobs in positions other than those associated with field cultivation. One joke making the rounds in the rural press reported the conversation of two farmers, as follows:

Hiram: Has your son given up farming?

Obadiah: I guess so. He's attendin' one of them agricultural colleges in the city.⁵²

In this case, however, a spirited defence of the agricultural college was put forward by Professor Reynolds of the College (who later became its president). He admitted that attending O.A.C. 'unfits' a man for farm work, because it opens his eyes to the other modes of life available through an agricultural education. At the same time, many graduates of O.A.C. did better work for agriculture outside the fields as teachers, leaders and demonstrators. Reynolds pointed out that for a graduate, "O.A.C. opens his eyes to the disabilities of farming." The blame, therefore, for the direction of most college trained farmers away from the farm lies "not in the education he has received, but in the conditions of farm life."⁵³

Other levels of the school system gained a measure of defence against criticism of their place as causes of depopulation. Of all the arguments used to search for and explain the causes of the declining countryside, blaming education was "to say the least, the most ignoble and

groundless," declared one rural commentator. "If farming does not allow developed ability or permit the mind to be so trained that it may appreciate and value the accomplishments of high minds in the literary or scientific world, it is not to be recommended to the ambitious youth."⁵⁴

"Personally," reminisced one rural woman,"

I do not believe that the teacher is one-half--no, not one tenth as responsible in this matter as the general home atmosphere. Looking back over my own primary school days, spent wholly in a country school, and with a number of teachers, I cannot remember one sentence nor one impression from that school that could possibly have prejudiced me against the rural life. As children we spent our time on reading, writing, arithmetic, geography, history, and grammar, with a little drawing and a few Latin roots thrown in. I have wished many a time since that the Latin roots had been vastly increased in number. We needed every one of the things taught. The curriculum was none too broad to give the breadth of mind that even children need, and I for one have not the least sympathy with those who wish to oust history and grammar from the public school curriculum. 55

The aim of the schools ought not to be to teach country children to be farmers and urban children to be professionals. This solution would only increase the already existing division between the two populations. The schools ought to be arranged so that a child, no matter where he attended classes, could follow such courses of study that he could enter any profession.⁵⁶

The country preacher was criticized for his lack of agrarian idealism. The urban-centred nature of the problems which occupied the thoughts of most of the churchmen left the country church outside the major consideration of most denominations. The minister no longer served as an example of dedicated ruralism to those debating whether to remain in the country or to move to the city because he quite often led the parade away from the hamlets.⁵⁷ The minority championing rural causes accused the majority of being one-sided in its interests. "The men who

minister in our cities are rated higher than those in the country, even though men in the country may have had the highest rating in college classes," they complained. Further, the "reports of advances through the Laymen's Missionary Movement are generally written from the standpoint of a city or town church."⁵⁸ The church leaders, usually city men, saw their mission from that point of view. The churches' policies were "city-born and city-bred." The country churches, regarded as being merely of secondary importance, were expected to accept the policy of the city churches and to adopt such policies as best they could.

The rural minister, like the teacher, too often took the country charge with reluctance. His hope was that one day he would be called to a big city church. His sermons were prepared and preached with a view to the greater future he felt he deserved. He regarded himself only as a sojourner among the country people. The city was his home; he busied himself with city problems so that his church activities aped city church activities. In the meantime, he failed to realize the fine opportunities for service in the rural community. Such a preacher soon found himself out of touch with his parish. Often, he would directly express his preference for city life. A possibly apocryphal story recounted the tale of the minister who questioned a Sunday-school class about their choice of occupations. He "praised the first for his desire to be a farmer, but told the second his desire to be a teacher was better and the third that his desire to be a minister was best of all."⁵⁹ The theological colleges hindered any reform in this attitude because in the training of new preachers they completely ignored the problems unique to rural life.⁶⁰

One embittered correspondent reported to that press: "I do not think I am far wrong when I say that the Agricultural Colleges, the Farmers' Institutes, and the Agricultural Press, are doing far more for the

salvation of Canada, than all the ministers of all the churches we have." Churches ought to be reminded that if it were not for farmers and their financial contributions, they would be in serious trouble.⁶¹ As much of the responsibility for the decline in the agrarian self-esteem which resulted in depopulation could be laid at the feet of the church as could be attributed to any other institution.⁶²

(ii)

The rural press, school, church and family, all suffered condemnation for their respective roles in contributing to the decrease in rural self-respect. This decline in self-esteem led to a fall in occupational pride and increased the likelihood that any farmer accepting this criticism would move to the city. This cause of depopulation, in the eyes of the agricultural opinion-leaders, suggested its own remedy. Publicists with access to the impersonal channels of communication showed through their published expressions a thorough awareness of the need to shore up agrarian mythology. Writers in their articles demonstrated their knowledge of the need to instill feelings in the agricultural populace which would make them unwilling to leave it for another urban profession.⁶³ Their remedy, 'showing the facts as they are' could be accomplished through reasserting the traditional philosophical justification of agricultural life.

The approach, used by the promoters of an agrarian world view, consisted of an unremitting criticism of those who attacked rural life from an urban viewpoint. If any urban businessman, housewife, or newspaper dared to comment upon conditions in the countryside, prompt condemnation echoed from the rural press. The criticism would be roundly condemned as coming from an interfering nobody who presumed to give advice from a position of ignorance and false superiority. An example of this type of

journalistic scorn stated that the offending views were "the product of a brain whose store of knowledge...is very limited indeed, and might be such as one would acquire by spending a few days with some fourth rate farmer...."⁶⁴

Farming formed the foundation of all wealth and prosperity, reiterated the speeches, poems, editorials and articles published by the press. E. C. Drury, for example, told the assembled agriculturists at the Dominion Grange that "we believe that our national well-being demands a steady increase in the numbers and prosperity of our agricultural class, as the only sure foundation of all other forms of prosperity...."⁶⁵

Farmers provided by the major market for the world's manufactured goods and much of the raw materials which kept the city capitalist and workman in business.⁶⁶ Positive thinking prevailed, as one rural historiographer explained: "The nineteenth century was the century of the town, but the twentieth century will be the century of the country...."⁶⁷ Farming was the only industry capable of unlimited expansion.

A favourite and often-repeated story told how the young immigrant lad who came to Canada to work on the farm saved his money frugally for a few years so that he could make a down-payment on a few acres of his own. Labouring under the great disadvantage of a huge mortgage, but undeterred by adversity, he cleared himself from debt in a few years and, expanding his operations, built himself a bigger house and barns. The final paragraph, accompanied by a picture of his magnificent acres, told how he had set up his sons with similar farms around his own and ended his days the patriarch of a large clan of contented farmers.⁶⁸ This creativity contrasted to the dull possibilities in manufacturing.

This attitude led easily into the next justification included in the beliefs of the rural population. Agriculture, in that it predicated

itself on Divine natural law, was unique since it had been "set apart by the Creator as the first of all callings."⁶⁹ Cultivators became partners with God and nature in producing food. As a result, agriculture provided the greatest satisfaction in life, much greater than any offered by trade and commerce. Unnaturalness marked the life of the townsman, for the artificial conditions of life in the city forced men to work all night and to sleep all day "reversing the order of things as nature intended."⁷⁰ Unconsciously, city dwellers showed in their desire to move to the land that they realized their lives were distorted.⁷¹ Agriculturists became involved in the surroundings and seasons of nature in ways undreamed of in the town. Almost endless descriptions of rural surroundings filled the agricultural journals; articles rhapsodized over the country sunsets "where every bird puts forth its sweetest strain of music and every breath is filled with the scent of new-mown hay...."⁷² The contrast with the city forced itself into each scene.⁷³

Innumerable other advantages sprang from the practice of such a natural profession. Economically independent, the countrymen could assert with a degree of pride that they had not "deigned to accept a bounty from the public treasury."⁷⁴ Rural areas maintained a constant standard of living more easily than the cities with their boom and bust atmosphere.⁷⁵ Reminiscing about the depressions of the 1890's, one old-timer remarked that Canadian farmers felt little of the depression, the worst in forty years. "How many agriculturists were pinched for the necessities of life?" he asked:

Without fear of contradiction, I say not one. The farmer sat down every day to his usual fare, the best that this earth can afford.... No one could feel by looking at the well-fed, sturdy-looking, self-satisfied agriculturist that he was at that moment passing through the greatest depression, perhaps, that agriculture

had ever seen. It made this difference to him, and this only. His bank account did not increase so rapidly. 76

Economic independence formed only one side of a triangle. Freedom of thought and action composed another. Farmers could, explained John Dryden, Ontario Minister of Agriculture,

whistle when they like; they run when they like; they yell when they like; they are not under the control of our city brethren..... It would very strange to see me run down Yonge Street on a full run. Everybody would wonder what would happen and I would have a policeman after me, but you, gentlemen, on your farms are used to this sort of independence, and you do not like criticism, you resent it more than anyone else. 77

The greatest independent political movement in Ontario, the Patrons of Industry, was based in rural areas. Farmers were not always 'hidebound partisans',⁷⁸ and were a source of Canada's independent political thinkers.

Rural life provided a contrast to the uncertainty of life in the cities according to the agrarian ideal. The 'true' picture of urban-dwelling would have been enough to scare any farmer's son into remaining on his father's acres. Only an exceptional man succeeded in the city (albeit he was born and raised on a farm), and only after he had laboured long and arduously.⁷⁹ Ordinary workers led unpleasant lives, working strenuously but vainly for advancement. Vulnerability to the whims of his employer constituted one of the greatest real threats to a labourer's position. Farm and Dairy pointed out that the manufacturers realized their power and that "a successful business must be established in a town or city where labor is easily obtained and can be fired at will."⁸⁰ Repeated variations on this theme found their way into the rural press. One country boy, drawn to the city by the prospect of wealth, died alone in a hospital from overwork. This story proved the moral that "if boys on the farm could only realize the awful struggle for a mere existence in a

great city, they would hesitate about paying the price. If only they knew that eighty per cent of the city workmen become mere machines...!"⁸¹

Other publicized examples recounted how a townsman after labouring for fifteen years did not make enough even to pay for his house, or told of the life of the urban man pursuing "the deadly routine in blind-alley offices, tied to a treadmill existence and unable to get away from it."⁸²

The girls who left their comfortable rural homes to work in the city did not face an easier time than their brothers. A girl depended on her landlady's good graces for many of the conveniences offered on the farm as a matter of course.⁸³ Female factory workers degraded themselves and regressed in the social evolution of womanhood. "It is in vain that these women may bedizen themselves with either cheap or costly finery.... Without the stability and refining influence of home life...there can be no real social uplifting...nothing is more hideous and sterile than work which is purely selfish, sordid and unblest."⁸⁴ Girls ran the danger of losing their health in the hot summer days at a sewing machine, or in dark, evil smelling, tumbledown shops, or being laid off work in winter.⁸⁵ Not very pleasing pictures made up the rural myth which would discourage those thinking of entering the life of the city or town.

Not only the workmen, but also the businessmen, professionals, promoters, and manufacturers lived uncertain lives compared to that of the agriculturist, for all the men of the town were in competition unknown in agricultural pursuits. Ten or fifteen years of history in towns of over ten thousand people would generally record the failure of at least half the men engaged in business. An exemplary tale in The Farmer's Advocate told of a prosperous farmer who sold his farm and went to town to set himself up as a storekeeper. He quickly failed because of his lack of skill in buying and his soft-hearted credit policy. A second failure in

the liquor-selling business followed on the heels of the first. The former well-to-do man ended up as an occasional labourer. Finally, he set up a cobbler's trade so that, as he said, "now I am sitting here on a cobbler's bench driving nails day after day and not skilled enough at the trade ever to hope to make anything more than the barest livelihood for my wife and myself."⁸⁶ Professional men appeared in such an abundance in Canada that it was beyond the capacity of the population to support them liberally or even adequately. Competition forced men to become status seekers in efforts to overcome their disadvantages. Many remained in business long after they had been due to retire, because they had previously lived beyond their financial means.⁸⁷ These examples countered those enticements which drew even established agriculturists into towns.

The mythology boosted pride in the morality associated with agricultural living. The vices fostered by materialism were "scarcely heard of in the 'real country' and the moral leper there is a leper indeed."⁸⁸ The influx of young people from the countryside was the only reason cities had been preserved from total dissipation. Wealth and money played a less important role in the countryside than in the city⁸⁹ so that corruption did not flourish to nearly the same extent. The farm, explained one editorial,

is more generally appreciated as the tendency grows to revolt against the sordid vulgarity of wealth. The artificialities which money alone procures will probably never be enjoyed so largely on the farm as among the privileged few of the cities.... Let us look on these not envying, but pitying, the purse-proud rich who think to purchase happiness with gold.⁹⁰

The 'fanfare of commerce' and 'dollars and mammon' held no attraction for the true son of the soil.⁹¹ Many things substituted for money in rural eyes. "How many men," demanded a ruralist, "lose their health in the rush after the dollar, where is they had been satisfied to gain a reasonable

competence on the farm, they might have been happy and healthy men."

The argument that countrymen were not only morally better but physically sounder than their city relatives formed another round in the battery of the mythology of country life. Physical fitness resulting from farm labour increased the soundness of the physiques of the cultivators of the soil and their families. One doctor published a pamphlet supporting this theory. It described how the early physiological development most important to youngsters was aided by a life and childhood in the country.⁹³ The farmer who retired to town usually spent his time lolling in an armchair or hammock and quickly began to "lose ground in physical and mental powers."⁹⁴ Rural wives, kept busy by the farm, frequently were less bothered by mental complaints than women who moved to the cities to live in apartments.⁹⁵

The physical setting of the North American metropolitan areas formed another aspect of the rural vision of the city. The mythology of the farm journals presented a very special picture of the urban areas. This view, summed up in one word, was 'the slum.' No matter which city came under discussion, the rural press invariably used up the greatest amount of space in describing the slums. The slums became a symbol not only of "bad houses, or unsanitary conditions or poverty; it means greed, bitterness, unbrotherliness, the hardening of the heart against a fellow mortal, of which is born a desire to ignore their distress or even to profit by it."⁹⁶ Like packing boxes, dwellings seemed "tumbled without calculation or order...with their thin walls and chimneyless roofs, through which crooked pipe ends protruded...."⁹⁷ Numberless families inhabited 'rears', squalid houses on back alleys, for which landlords could collect double rent like a "hole shelters rats."⁹⁸ The inhabitants' view of life was limited to another row of dirty tenements. Slum dwellers,

however, did not want to leave since "...it is those of broad outlook, sane views, pure minds and noble sentiments who hold country life in the highest esteem. The habitués of the slums shun the farm as they would a plague, and if by chance induced to make this experiment [moving to the country] quickly forsake it for their old haunts and ways."⁹⁹ One editorial titled, "City Heal Thyself," bluntly told urban people to stop using the countryside to cure their social ills and to quit attracting the whole populace into the degradation associated with urban life.¹⁰⁰ A metaphorical view of the metropolis portrayed all its social, economic and physical aspects as a "great eddy in the stream of life; which "first attracts, then carries its victims round and round with the current" to their ultimate destruction.¹⁰¹

Reassertions of the tradition beliefs in the inferiority of urban life reaffirmed the countrymen's creed. Rural people were not 'moss-backs' or 'hay seeds' but the inheritors of a long line of dignified men who lived an open-air independent existence and who did not merit any townsman's epithets or scorn. The rural view of the city man, farmers were told, depended entirely upon the "viewpoint which we ourselves have adopted.... Let us show in our bearing that we recognize the dignity of our calling."

(iii)

The rejuvenation and reassertion of rural mythology, promoted by the rural opinion-makers as a means of persuading the agricultural population to stop deserting the land, could not be accomplished without the co-operation and reformation of rural institutions. The country school, church, family and newspaper by-changing their attitude and structure could become saviours of the old rural society instead of perpetrators of its decline. They could all play a role in keeping the children on the

land by convincing them of the attractiveness of country life and work.

The farm journals, a Halton County farmer remarked, should print articles which proved to rural youths that for the vast majority of young men who could not inherit a fortune, a farm life was the best existence. Papers should instill "a higher ideal of living and social life" into rural inhabitants."¹⁰² When journals were writing about the farm they should "speak well of it," wrote another correspondent. "It is worthy so to be talked about."¹⁰³ Another ruralist exhorted agriculturists to "think of the farm and its home as an end to be enjoyed and perfected rather than a temporary place in which to toil and exist until we can escape."¹⁰⁴ When he was speaking to his children every farmer ought to say that agriculture "is the best occupation in the world when all things are considered." A rural organization to inculcate agrarian values in youth was another suggestion to stop the population drain. To be called the "Young Canadian Yeomanry," it should aim at "stimulating the imagination and ambition of the boys and girls."¹⁰⁵ The proponents of such a change in outlook believed these schemes would mean that "the trek to the city would not be so serious and the rising generation would grow up with a larger percentage remaining on the land."¹⁰⁶

The renovators of the agricultural mythology saw the schools as a most important factor in re-educating rural youth. As President Creelman of the C.A.C. remarked, "we must start very early to interest the boy and girl in the ethics of rural living."¹⁰⁷ The 'get-'em-while-they're-young' approach resulted from a belief in the possibility of the beneficial influence of a child's environment. "As the Twig is Bent so is the Tree Inclined," was their motto and they tried to put it into effect through school reform.¹⁰⁸ Their ideas for the schools were very similar to those

they promoted for the family: namely, that if a child were indoctrinated with the rural stereotype early enough, he would be loath to leave the farm.¹⁰⁹ As evidence, they produced the result of an experiment in North Dakota rural schools comparing the future plans of boys before and after a course in agriculture was taught in the state schools. Before taking the course, most children aimed at leaving for the cities, while after the course the majority planned on making the farm their permanent home.¹¹⁰ The convention of the Grange resolved that the aim of the rural schools ought to be to help imbue "a better understanding of, interest in, and respect and love for agriculture and country life."¹¹¹

Children could no longer be taught by teachers unprepared to promote this world view or the rural exodus would continue. The first object of the reformers was the retraining of public and high school teachers; summer courses in Nature Study had been established at Guelph, and the rural press urged teachers to attend. The director of the programme, S. B. McCreedy, had written his B.S.A. thesis¹¹² on methods of teaching agriculture in schools, and he took on the task of teaching teachers the best methods of inculcating a love of agriculture in their students.¹¹³ This was only a stop-gap measure, for the most ardent reformers wanted a full-time course in agricultural education established at Guelph's O.A.C., similar in nature to courses taught in Household Science. Rural Normal Schools ought to train those looking forward to careers in rural areas. All these institutions would maintain an experimental farm and a rural model school to give practice under actual conditions to the would-be teachers.¹¹⁴

The curriculum, naturally, formed another sector of attack by those who wanted the merits of an agricultural life to receive special emphasis in the schools. More agriculture-oriented subjects ought to be taught, or

at least the old subjects should use agricultural examples rather than examples drawn from town life. This would do much to make language books, readers, and arithmetic more compatible with the aims of the farm.¹¹⁵

Combined with substitution in the classroom of the 'mental pabulum' such as classics, history, geometry and algebra by more science courses, these reforms would encourage children to appreciate agriculture more. Botany, physics, and chemistry, along with political economy, manual training and domestic science, should be taught, particularly as these applied to the farm.¹¹⁶ One teacher who followed this modified curriculum had his pupils carry out a cow census in their neighbourhood. This exercise showed them how to perform creamery testing, impressed them with the importance of keeping high-producing cattle and increased their practice of mathematics.¹¹⁷

Another way the agrarian life could receive a favourable boost from the school system would be by inaugurating nature study in the classroom. This, from all impressions, was the cure-all for the deficiencies in the curriculum. It would, remarked one observer, "make school life more interesting because it responds to the activities of the child. It will give the child an interest in his environment and make him a better citizen. He will find 'sermons in stones, books in the running brooks, and good in everything.' It will fit him better for his life work on leaving school for which it has all along been a preparation."¹¹⁸ By teaching him to appreciate his surroundings more, this course in school could recompense the farmer for his lack of urban excitement.¹¹⁹ The farmer dealt intimately with nature all his life and it was only just and proper that his education adequately prepare him for this life. Children would learn the value of labour from working in the school garden. The boy could be taught, for example, that digging out weeds was not just a dirty, boring job, but that

"weeds are 'thieves' stealing the nourishment which should 'go to the plant itself,' and, naturally, he becomes interested in their destruction." Such a programme of study could do much more to "counteract the distaste for agriculture than any choice of particular subjects of study in later years."¹²⁰ Agricultural school fairs also would help in correcting the cityward bias of the educational system. Children were told to bring to their schools the fruits of the summer and school-time labours. Teachers and the local District Representative of the Department of Agriculture would judge baking, manual training projects, the keeping and care of animals, as well as the crops.¹²¹ Supported by the Deputy Minister of Agriculture, the fairs were endorsed at the Farmers' Institute meetings as a means of increasing the attractiveness of country life in the eyes of the children.¹²² The district representatives promoted the fair idea as a means of interesting children in agriculture by "taking the children into the fields, by making them think in terms of the farm, and by teaching them the value of labor skilfully applied."¹²³ Not a strict preparation for agricultural work, nature study and school fairs were a more subtle sort of propaganda. They made the choice of an agricultural occupation 'easier' than it would have been under the prevailing system of education.¹²⁴

If the Department of Education set up rural high schools in each county to teach agriculture along with their other subjects, the exodus of the young students to attend school in the cities would end.¹²⁵ Agricultural classes in the high schools, set up by the Whitney administration in 1907, gained much praise from the agricultural press as a step in the right direction.¹²⁶ The Department could also set up continuation classes, they believed, for those who desired further education beyond public school, but who did not want a full high-school education, or desire to go to the cities. The aim of the continuation classes attached to the

existing public schools would be to provide a rural-centred education for those who desired to continue which did not direct pupils towards the professions.¹²⁷ As such, it ought to aim at convincing the rural youth to remain at home. Change, however, was slow. Ruralists often believed that it would take a generation before the schools had been reformed sufficiently to correct their cityward bias. Two or three generations would pass before Ontario could be peopled by "a race of farmers...who will not only see more in the farm, but will make more out of it."¹²⁸

Ministers preaching to country congregations ought to do their part along with schools to maintain the agrarian philosophy of their congregations. The educational reformers also promoted summer courses in agriculture for rural preachers to enable them to understand the needs of their flocks and to learn how to cater to particularly rural problems. Ministers should know something of the principles of rural co-operation and be familiar with farm literature, agricultural economics and rural social organization. "Why should these things not be?" asked The Farmer's Advocate. "The congregation of the country preacher and village pastor is made up of farmers, their wives, sons and daughters. These are his people, his associates, his friends, his peculiar charge. Until he can meet them as friends, talk to them not only on the beauty and character of Christ but on the beauty and character of their Clydesdales; until he can show a mastery of the everyday problems of the farm and of the youth thereon, he cannot expect to command their respect and confidence when he essays into higher realms."¹²⁹ President Creelman of O.A.C. noted that since the church realized it had been drawn into the current of industrial, educational and social forces 'resulting in the abnormal development of the city at the expense of country life and interests' it ought to readjust itself to provide proper precepts and example.¹³⁰ The church ought to become the

centre of the neighbourhood. It should not be content with merely holding social and religious gatherings but ought to make itself into a force "affecting the tone of the entire community.... The part of church work is educative and it should culminate in giving to all the young people a love for the country and an intellectual appreciation of it."¹³¹

(iv)

The agricultural opinion-makers did not dispute among themselves the fact that the achievement of a better self-image by the rural population and the reassertion of the rural mythology was a desirable condition. The more radical section of the farm leaders worked as diligently as the more moderate group to attain this end. A measure of debate between these groups began, however, over the question of the utility of this achievement in bringing an end to the exodus from the countryside. The Weekly Sun, Farm and Dairy, and the more extreme group presented the view that those who believed the rejuvenation of the myths would end depopulation were mistaken.

Instead, this group believed in the economic origins of depopulation. The Sun accused the protectionist press of trying to blame depopulation on education and other social malaises in order to obscure the real, economic cause. This would, therefore, protect the corporations and shield them from pressure to shoulder their share of the blame. Faulting education could only be ridiculous, many argued, for who could deny that every Canadian had a right to be educated for the sake of gaining knowledge alone. Young rural people did not have to attend educational institutions merely to become either farmers or mechanics. This solution would serve only the ends of the manufacturers and was not necessarily, as some educationists seemed to believe, the best solution for the young people.¹³² Farm and Dairy and The Farmer's Advocate both agreed editorially

that neither ideological nor social reasons could explain the magnitude of the decline, particularly since action had been taken to remedy these complaints with rural life.¹³³

The remedy for "The Problem" could not be found in palliatives which "only scratched the surface of the question"¹³⁴ nor in education and propaganda campaigns for better attitudes towards the farm, nor in advanced techniques applied to farming. "While intensive farming and homiletics for the farmer are well enough in their own way, the only remedies worth serious consideration are those which will enable the farm to attract labor and capital, that is to say, which will make the rewards of agriculture equal to or greater than those of other pursuits."¹³⁵

(v)

All sections of the rural media co-operated in deploring the decline in agrarian values. They pointed out the role played by the various rural institutions in this decay. The agricultural press, by its praise of the success of country boys who succeeded in the towns and by its criticism and contrast of rural and urban life, was as guilty as the other elements in rural society. The farmers themselves drove their children to the cities by their materialism and by their cynical attitude towards their occupation. The country schools and teachers at all levels taught subjects which led into urban professions instead of preparing the youth for a life on the farm. The spiritual side of life on the concession lines, as exemplified by the ministers of the organized religious denominations, also pushed the population in the direction of the towns.

A rural population could be contented on the land only if its members believed in their occupation. A campaign to promote the rural mythology received the blessing of most of the agricultural press as a method of solving the problem of depopulation. Criticism of the cities for

their materialism, excessive competition, disregard for the needs of the workers and slums ensued. This effort tried to make the traditional rural values such as economic, social and political independence, along with a high physical and moral tone appear desirable in comparison. If these views could be adopted and promoted through such institutions as the schools, churches, press and family, the rural population had a better opportunity of remaining happily in their country existence. Although some rural thinkers doubted the utility of this method of stopping the erosion of the rural population, most of the writers in the media appeared to believe that it could provide a partial solution.

CHAPTER V

"SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL:"
IMPROVING RURAL SOCIAL LIFE

Problems concerning the interaction between various members of rural society were as important in promoting depopulation as a declining belief in agrarian philosophy. These defects arose out of life in the countryside. The isolation of each family, the generational conflict between the farmer and his children, combined with other difficulties which hampered social life, all reinforced the pressure to move cityward. While these problems were internal, the most popular solutions involved bringing the towns more deeply into the regulation of the rural life style. The best solutions to these situations, most believed, involved importing into the countryside the social amenities and practices which worked well in attracting the rural folk to the metropolises.

(i)

The most widespread complaint of the young people and women regarding life in a rural township centred around the isolation it forced upon them. There were fewer opportunities for excitement or an active social life than in the cities.¹ "Man and woman too," recognized the agriculturists, "likes to be in a crowd. The wild beast and domesticated alike, congregate in herds and flocks. The native and civilized people alike want to be together. Why talk of the peace and quiet of the country? Man's nature craves excitement.... Man is a hermit only when disappointed in love; he wants to be with the crowd...."² One farm woman remarked that her parents and grandparents had more social life, since "their quilting parties, logging bees, plucking bees, and barn raisings, brought them

together frequently and they were free to enjoy themselves. Now, if we wish for any social intercourse, it is almost necessary to go into the town or village."³ The type of relaxation offered in the nearest hamlet, however, was not the most desirable kind. A boy could pitch quoits with the gang around the blacksmith shop, or loaf on the corner swapping yarns about the neighbourhood, or listen to some not very clean joke from the mouth of the village story teller. Even this entertainment was infrequent for life on the farm began early in the morning and there was little profit in late nights. Once or twice a year, the local community and surroundings had a church social during which the "boys would cut up with the girls while the old folks whispered the latest complaint against the preacher--they didn't like him, yet we couldn't get rid of him to save our lives--and the latest example of his wife's meanness."⁴ Occasionally a father would take his boy to town to let him wander around "until the old man gets through shopping or a horse trade,...and then he takes the boy home and thinks he has had a holiday. But that does not work with the average boy."⁵

The other side of this coin included the farm knowledge that urban centres contained many organizations of a social, literary, religious, musical, and athletic nature to which young people could belong and soon form a circle of friends. If a man in the city desired an evening's entertainment, it was close and he felt in better shape to work the next morning because of the pleasant recreation. Only farmers near the towns had the fortune to be able to provide the same social advantages as an urban employer. Proof of the importance of their advantage came from the facility with which they could attract labour to their farms compared to the other rural employers.

The most widely advocated methods used to relieve the isolation of life in the country consisted of importing the social advantages of the city. Combined with the importation of urban technology into rural areas, these methods were widely acclaimed in the rural press as being the panacea for the social ills of the countryside. Village life was made much more attractive by modern conveniences, better modes of living, and a freer commingling with other rural inhabitants. Some opinion-makers claimed that the effect of these changes would be to bring back into rural sections many of those who had deserted to the towns.⁷ The telephone received the greatest notice as a means of lessening the isolation of the countryside. With this in her house, the farm housewife who did not often see anyone in the winter but members of her own household was not denied that opportunity she needed to come into contact with the outside world.⁸ The Weekly Sun proclaimed to its readers that "the loneliness and isolation which used to be drawbacks of life on the farm need no longer exist."⁹ The farmer with the phone became no more isolated than his brother in the city, or even less so because the city man often did not even know his next-door neighbour.¹⁰ Medical care was close at hand.¹¹ This particular advantage was used to great effect by the telephone companies in their advertisements. A telephone broadened the farmer's horizons, brought him into direct contact with the outside world, and reduced the narrowness of his outlook.¹² Like the city man, the farmer who once installed a phone would never do without it. It became part of his very life and he would sacrifice other things before consenting to part with the telephone.¹³ The farm position emphasized that:

There are some things about which there can be no two opinions. One of these is the rural telephone. No sound argument can be adduced against it. It is cheap for the service rendered.... A community without a rural phone service is not availing itself of all the privileges of modern civilization as it should. 14

Instructions on the incorporation of rural telephone companies, details of construction and maintenance, and lengthy discussions over the desirability of small companies filled the pages of the press. The farm community became extremely excited over the prospect of the extension of phone service.¹⁵

Electric railways and trolley systems expanding into the countryside caught the imagination of the rural press. These innovations were expected to end the depopulation by making urban activities accessible to country-dwellers. The inhabitants on a trolley line could send their children to urban schools,¹⁶ get a daily newspaper the day it was published, or board the trolley for an evening's visit to a nearby city to enjoy a concern or attend a meeting.¹⁷ The rural housewife could go to the city and browse through the more attractive products sold in town shops.¹⁸ The extension of the radials, noted some perceptive commentators, moved the city directly into the countryside. Farms along the routes were broken up and sold for suburban housing lots.¹⁹ Economically, the expansion of the roads increased the value of the farm lands along the routes and made formerly depressed areas valuable to farmers as their land became useful to the cities.²⁰ Town-country borders were blurred as the city's conveniences came within easy reach of the farm. The population of the cities could also come to visit the country's parks on Sunday and would, some believed, destroy the traditional, quiet, rural Sunday.²¹

Improved communication between country and town was the purpose of the Good Roads Movement. Rural highways had been notorious for their poor condition; bogs in spring, they became dusty and rutted in summer and impassable with snow in winter. In fact, highways constituted a main difficulty hindering social intercourse, or school and church attendance.²² Sydney Fisher remarked to the Good Roads Convention that to remove "these

difficulties, give to the people of the country something of the same advantages that are found in the cities, and you will go a long way towards checking the present drift towards the cities...."²³ Accordingly, the countrymen pressed for reform of the financing and maintenance of the provincial road systems. They strongly advocated appropriating increasing grants for road-building.²⁴ This widespread movement suffered temporarily under the impact of the farmers' hostility towards the automobile. They felt that their poor roads kept that 'menace' out of the countryside.

The change in attitude towards the automobile showed the willingness of the rural population to adopt any urban communications improvement which could lessen depopulation. For many years, the vast rural majority believed that autos were among the least desirable urban inventions.²⁵ The countrymen fought to have the hours during which cars were allowed on their roads strictly limited;²⁶ they urged high taxation of motor vehicles;²⁷ they lobbied the legislature to have car drivers made liable for injury to horses and people frightened by the appearance of the machines in the countryside.³⁸ Eventually, however, even the much-hated auto changed its image. From the toy of the rich urbanite, the car became the means for a farmer to achieve the necessary mobility for a more congenial life.

Some of the rural opinion-makers, after 1910, reconsidered their opposition to the auto in rural areas. "The motor vehicle," wrote one commentator, "comes closest to breaking down the barriers of distance and isolation."²⁹ Ownership of a car allowed a short afternoon visit to relatives in nearby areas instead of a two-day vacation from work. Farmers need no longer suffer their customary enforced aloofness but could mingle more with the rest of the people. "They are made broader men, more intelligent men and better citizens. It [the car] is making a new life for farmers' wives, the isolation and loneliness of the farm home is a thing

of the past. Picnics at campgrounds, socials, theatres, chautauquas, all the impossible things of earlier days are now easily attainable." Car-owning preachers discovered that they could "do more faithful work with an auto than a horse. They find that the general ownership of autos brings more people to church."³⁰ Farmers became the best customers of the car manufacturers, as the auto replaced the electric railroad as the major hope for breaking down rural disadvantages. The auto brought the farm and town together, shortened the distance to market and worked out a social, industrial and educational revolution. Its justification in rural areas came about through its achievement of a position of practical value to the mass of agriculturists.

The good roads movement, the expansion of radial railroads, the introduction of the automobile in rural areas, all served to enable the rural dwellers to communicate more easily with each other and with the towns. The introduction in a limited way of rural free mail delivery in 1908 further improved this communication. After years of agitation, the farm community received this most desired improvement.³¹ By enabling the farmer to get his daily newspaper promptly, this service put him "on an equal standing with his city brother" who had previously had an advantage.³² The benefits justified any extra expense. Rural free delivery allowed the mail order systems of urban department stores to expand so that the countrymen could choose their purchases from as large a merchandise selection as their urban relatives.³³ By forcing the governments to take measures to keep the roads open in winter it removed another cause of complaint.³⁴ In fact, reported The Farmer's Advocate, if rural free delivery were extended throughout the countryside,

every phase of country life would be toned up. One item of drudgery on the farm would be wiped out forever with one stroke. The conditions in the country

would begin to balance more evenly with those in the city. With an attractive landscape and a comfortable fireside and his mail brought to his door, the young man would hesitate before sacrificing these things to enter the city.... 35

Introducing the urban-developed communications devices made the affected rural areas more suburban than truly rural in nature. As suburbs, these areas become more and more functional adjuncts to the town. As the urban centres were carried into the country by the telephone and trolley, "not far behind [came] the electric light, and other conveniences making life in the rural areas not much different from the urban existence."³⁶

Not many years before, the farmers

seemed to have nothing in common with the commercial and professional men. There was a pretty clearly defined line between the people of the towns and the cities and those whose lives were spent upon the farm. This state of things, for the good of all concerned has, in large measure, passed away. All classes now seem to realize that there is a close association of interests between all classes. 37

As a remedy for depopulation, this introduction of urban communications devices appeared to work in some areas. The suburban townships gained in population. One writer reported to the farm readers that "where there has been urban growth there has been suburban progress."³⁸

(ii)

The isolation which had plagued country life was only one of the difficulties involving social interaction on the farm. The farmer had to arrange his social relations with his own family before he could expect both his spouse and his children to be content with their rural lot. In patching up these relationships the town again provided the model. The backwardness of the social graces practiced by the agriculturists, it was alleged, drove boys and girls from the countryside.³⁹ in vast numbers.

Farmers laughed at refinement and had "no time for the little things that make life pleasant."⁴⁰ A farmer visiting the town became a rustic in his own eyes when he compared his overalls with those "dainty garments" worn by the townspeople.⁴¹ The social manners, even of the clerks, who "smiled blandly...behind counters and thanked them for small coins laid down in exchange for candy, with the air of a French count," impressed the rural visitors. Gentlemanly-looking businessmen passed to and fro from splendid banks.⁴² The farmer's boy could not but see visions and dream. The young girl who dared not shop in the best stores because of her homespun appearance was the girl most likely to leave the country for the town.⁴³ Frustrated social ambitions provided a prime cause of the rural exodus.

The country wife believed she suffered from the lack of material as well as social comforts. The mere fact of having to do less work drew the eyes of many women to the towns.⁴⁴ A survey showed that once their eyes had been opened to the labor-saving household equipment available in towns, women were content no longer to endure the primitive, rural way of living. Of those wishing to desert the farm, the women had been far more anxious to get away than men. Ninety per cent attributed their dislike of the country to its isolation and lack of conveniences. Seventy-five per cent of the women pinpointed the lack of running water in the house as the most serious fault of the farm.⁴⁵ The farmer's wife was too well aware that "even the meanest of city homes" were supplied with conveniences lacking in many of the best country homes.⁴⁶ A city girl visiting her farm birthplace would meet an old public school classmate, "a tired-looking woman, old beyond her years, and three children...." "This is what I escaped!"⁴⁷ was her reaction. The farmer, his detractors loudly pointed out, spent more time buying fixtures for his cattle and barns than fixing

up his house for his wife. It was, commented The Canadian Farm,

all a question as to how much value the farmer places on his wife. Is she not worth all the up-to-date appliances, such as her city cousin enjoys? If her services do not count for any more than a rigid regime of slavery, day after day, why...the farmers of today are a dead lot, thinking more of their stock than of their woman who makes homes of their houses. 48

The wonder was, exclaimed one editor, "that so many of the women and young folks have remained passive so long."⁴⁹

The remedy for this social deprivation again seemed simple. "We should not let the city people have all the good things," urged one editorialist. "We can have them on the farm. There is no valid reason why we should not live in good comfortable houses with lofty rooms and broad verandahs.... The fat of the land is none too good for the man who tills it. All the graces of life are the right of the farmer's wife and daughters."⁵⁰ The greatest urban advantages were not peculiar to or inseparable from the towns. While countrymen did not desire rural life to be an imitation of city life, they did want running water, a modern bath, an up-to-date heating system, and numerous other conveniences.⁵¹ A continuous press campaign urged farmers to modernize,⁵² publicized labour-saving conveniences through articles and advertisements,⁵³ and gave instructions for installation and adaptation to rural homes.⁵⁴ Titles such as "City Conveniences on the Farm" promoted the new-fangled inventions of the age.

Refurbishing the home as well as keeping women contented could also keep the boys and girls on the farms. Too many homes, little better than pens, were uninviting to boys and girls, who had no space for themselves. This was a defect indeed for the Shorthorns, Yorkshires and Plymouth Rocks, were attended to in every detail that would further their improvement and comfort.⁵⁵ Attractive homes surrounded by a garden provided a greater incentive for the children to remain there.⁵⁶ Stories and advertisements

described to the farmer and his wife methods of fixing up their kitchens, bedrooms, dining and living rooms.⁵⁷ The population could live in as "elaborately-furnished and beautifully-arranged" rooms as their city relatives.⁵⁸ The city provided the reference point from which the rural people drew their comparisons.

Generational conflict was also a threat to rural life and resulted in many sons leaving their father's farm. John Dryden, Ontario Minister of Agriculture, told farmers to try to keep the brightest lads on the farm by treating them better.⁵⁹ George C. Creelman told of instances where a farmer would "give the boy a colt and he will break it and drive it once or twice, and as soon as it is fit for work, it is the boy's no longer...."⁶⁰ Boys often were assigned the most monotonous work on the farm. The scarcity of labour in the countryside tended to make the farmer work his sons harder and in turn, this drove them in greater numbers from the farm.⁶¹ Boys given no chance to help in the management of the farm went to the city where they expected greater appreciation of their efforts. Their individuality would not "be wholly merged in another."⁶² Under the prevailing conditions, boys, deprived of their needed fun and recreation, lost their spirit. Little wonder, many became moody and dissatisfied.⁶³

The conflict between parents and children included daughters as well as sons. A girl found it difficult to understand why the daughter who baked, cooked, washed and ironed and looked after chores inside and outside the house was not able to buy all her own clothes and put some money aside for a rainy day. If she worked half as much in the city, she would earn good wages. "I cannot," she remarked, "see why, I say, she should not have a certain sum given her every month regularly so that she may feel a little more like other girls who are free to earn...."⁶⁴ If the farmers were

forced to hire girls, they would have to pay out high wages. They would have to stop treating their children like slaves if they wanted them to work at home.

Just as the businessman gave his boy an allowance, the farmer was advised to dole out pocket money to his children. Boys liked to be independent so that they could buy their own entertainment and sports equipment.⁶⁵ Taking their children into partnership, farmers could give them some stock of their own,⁶⁶ and go to the market together to interview the produce dealers, wholesalers, retailers, fruit dealers and horse dealers.⁶⁷ Following the businessman's example of paying a salary to the son who remained with his father to work the land⁶⁸ would keep the boy on the farm. "James Smith and Son, Farmers," would be just as common as "William Jones and Son, Drygoods Merchants."⁶⁹ In return for a portion of the receipts, boys could pay a share of the expenses. Entering the boy's cattle, pigs or horses in the local fair or livestock show would raise his pride in accomplishment.⁷⁰ By giving the boys more interesting labour, a farmer could maintain youthful enthusiasm for the farm and its work.⁷¹

Boys should be allowed to spend their money as they wished. "I was startled," reported a farm woman, "by a young fellow whizzing past me on a motorcycle.... He was a farmer boy whose parents were not favorably inclined to the new-fangled auto, but who did not object to their son's having the best to be had.... He had earned it."⁷² Boys should have the social independence to decide the course of their life. The farmer-father ought to remember he could not prevent his son from marrying despite the fact he may disapprove and he should remember that "there are too many old bachelors.... Surely that [letting him marry] will be better than to lose your honest, industrious boy."⁷³

(iii)

While most of the rural opinion-makers approved of adopting urban technology to help restore rural social relations, some, anxious to preserve the rural life they were used to, did not receive these proposed innovations favourably. Improvements such as rural mail, parcel post, good roads, trolley lines and telephones, all permitted country people to trade in larger centres, fifty, sixty and one-hundred miles away. This drew the business from the small villages. "Just as a large horse can outdraw a lighter animal," believed F. E. Ellis of Farm and Dairy, "so the town store can undersell the village store," and cause the decline of local institutions. By accepting mail order advertising, Ellis and the other editors of the farm press aided in the lamented destruction of the local merchants.⁷⁴

With the economic ruin of the hamlets came the wane of rural social life. Far from making country life more bearable, the final result of these improvements could increase its loneliness,⁷⁵ and have a direct bearing on the exodus to the towns. The extension of communications from the city diverted the thoughts of most members of the population in that direction. The trade and population movement soon followed.⁷⁶

The large number of farm families situated near towns who had access to urban conveniences and still moved to live in the city caused the Master of the Grange, Henry Glendenning, to doubt the beneficence of the impact of technology. In his speech to the Grange in 1912, he noted that farmers of his age were much more independent than those of his father's. The farm telephone had come to replace personal communication. Further, since rural areas could never keep up completely with the latest social conveniences of the towns, urban technology could perhaps slow down but never ultimately solve the problem of depopulation. The more dedicated

ruralists believed that "the farm as a mere replica of the city, can be but a second rate imitation after all. The real, positive, dominating influences that will hold people to the land are the distinctly rural and argicultural features.... The boys and girls must be interested not in the city facilities transplanted on the country but in the farm and country itself."⁷⁷

Only by preventing the decrease in local centres and by encouraging distinctly rural organizations could farmers maintain social institutions which would bolster country life. No one denied that rural social organizations were needed. During the leisurely winter evenings, young people were told to "get out of that narrowing groove. If there is a local book-reading circle, a rural Canadian Club, a musical society or other organizations of young people for mutual improvement in the locality, by all means take advantage of its membership and push it along."⁷⁸ Along with the rural youth groups,⁷⁹ the Grange could provide an organization which, while politically inclined, would stimulate rural social life.⁸⁰ Reviving the disappearing rural institutions such as the singing classes would be better than third-rate imitations of urban concerts and lectures in developing local talent and social interest.⁸¹ Farmers could "spend many evenings enjoyably as well as profitably...affording some entertainment other than that to be found in public houses where intoxicating liquors are kept for sale."⁸² Teachers in local communities could improve the social life by encouraging and organizing societies for their pupils.⁸³ Nature study meetings in rural organizations such as the Y.M.C.A. to discuss subjects such as 'Plant Life', 'Bird Life', 'Weather', 'Bacteria,' would be both practical and interesting for countrymen.⁸⁴ Agriculturists welcomed the Y.M.C.A. because it secured "earnest and competent local leaders around whom groups of young men or boys will be formed and

everything done that is found possible and practical to develop their interests...."⁸⁵ Rural libraries also filled the void in rural social life by encouraging reading and providing relief from winter-time monotony.⁸⁶ Travelling libraries set up by a Farmers' Institute should replace the village's Mechanics Libraries filled with the trashy material luring country-men into the towns.⁸⁷

The social pages of the rural journals promoted contests to discover the best method for organizing a rural library society, and outlined subjects for discussion in this stay-at-home rural club.⁸⁸ Distances were great, roads often poor, time always limited, yet "scattered over our farming districts are many who would appreciate to the full the opportunity to exchange original ideas. The younger men and women who have received educational advantages and have wisely gone back to the farm need some mental polishing to keep the rust spots from the mind's bright surface."⁸⁹ In addition to a good library, every farmer's parlour should possess a musical instrument: piano, organ, violin, mouth organ, accordion, zither or mandolin.⁹⁰ Boys should be allowed to buy sports equipment and play with their friends at home.⁹¹ All home entertainment promoted education, kept the family out of mischief, and developed a love of the farm which kept the boys out of the cities.⁹²

Socials and picnics provided a means of bringing the neighbourhood farmers together in a social way. "If more outings of this nature could be arranged," remarked the organizer of a picnic in South Renfrew, "the pleasure of living on the farm would be increased and there would be more unity of spirit among farmers in matters in which they have common interests."⁹³ In the Women's Institutes, wives came into contact and at the same time learned improved household methods. This gathering would

relieve the disaffection of many farmers' wives.⁹⁴ Farmers who organized a local winter fair relieved the monotony of the cold season and provided themselves with an opportunity to socialize.⁹⁵ The school building was a good location for social activities. With little effort, the community could use it for a library, a playhouse, or a meetingplace for the literary and debating society, the Christmas entertainments, and Grange meetings. A baseball diamond, swings, basketball and tennis courts set up in the grounds could be used after school and during the summer.⁹⁶

(iv)

The proposed remedies for the problems of social interaction which plagued the country raised a curious question. The effect of the wholesale takeover of urban conveniences and practices by the countryside could only make rural districts more like the towns in outlook and life style. Isolation could be minimized by using mail orders, telephones, automobiles, radials, and better roads, but these 'improvements' rang the death knell of the old rural society. Similarly, household conveniences and generational relationships modelled after an urban ideal diminished the 'rural' character of the countryside. These results, in fact, diluted the effect of the revival of the agrarian myth. While the agrarian terminology set up criteria which differentiated farmers from townsmen, the introduction of urban conveniences increased the similarity of the two life styles. Further, when it adopted urban innovations, the agricultural population depended on the towns for leadership.

Some ruralists, however, questioning the beneficence of urban technology in a rural setting, recognized its homogenizing capability and the fact that technically, rural life could only approximate but never equal urban life. Once a farmer tasted the possibilities of an urban

existence of comparative ease, he would often not be satisfied until he moved to the city to live. A distinctive rural life-style was the only preventative for this. Moreover, the men who doubted technology often questioned the importance of social interaction in causing depopulation. Neither dislike of isolation nor a craving for companionship could explain the continuing decline, especially since technology had removed many causes for complaint.⁹⁷ Only economic disadvantages could possibly explain the continual wearing away of the rural population.

CHAPTER VI

"SUPPING WITH THE DEVIL" :
 'SALVATION' THROUGH PRODUCTION
 MARKETING AND LABOUR

All agricultural opinion-makers agreed that economics played a role in explaining depopulation. Increasing the returns of the farmers for their labour became, accordingly, an aim of all agricultural journals. Some believed that the farmers' adoption of prevalent urban business techniques could most easily increase profits; others, as will be discussed in another chapter, were convinced that the introduction of these more efficient production methods would like social improvements ultimately end in futility. They postulated that although they supported technical innovations as temporarily increasing profits, a more fundamental re-organization of the distribution of wealth was necessary to put an end to the exodus from rural areas.¹

(i)

Despite the most scrupulous economy and unremitting toil, all agreed that agriculturists managed only to eke out a bare existence. There was, complained rural labourers, "no harder-earned dollar today than that earned by the farmer."² Sydney Fisher, the Federal Minister of Agriculture, bolstered this assertion by telling the Ontario Dairymen that people left the countryside because they could make more and easier money in the city.³ The Ontario Department of Agriculture agreed with its counterpart. Its spokesmen reiterated that the future of agriculture would "depend upon its being made profitable, and if we can keep the profits increasing upon the farms of this country, there will not be any great movement from the

country to the city."⁴ One young farmer reported that his elders advised him not to go West but to "go to the city and don't farm; for on the farm there is lots of hard work and mighty poor pay."⁵ Years passed before an agricultural neophyte who started as a hired hand could accumulate enough money for a down payment on land and implements. Many more years of hard work were needed before he could be clear of debt.⁶ Series of articles emphasized the theme that the decrease in agricultural population had resulted from inadequate profits.⁷ Professors from the Ontario Agricultural College agreed with this assessment.⁸ Editorials concluded that "the profitability of cultivating the soil and its power to attract capital and labor must be increased...." in order to prevent total rural collapse.⁹

Given its other advantages, "if farming were as profitable as other enterprises,...people will flock to the land and display ample skill as well as a love for the fruitful soil."¹⁰ The vaunted advantages of rural life, however, could not compensate for the profits of the city. "People," the realists believed,

cannot live on beautiful scenery, fresh air leaded [sic] with the scent of apple blossoms and water, be it ever so pure. While these, with conveniences not being enjoyed, are factors towards improving conditions, they are not life itself. They may aid in throwing agriculture into a new light, but they are not destined to be the fundamental cause of the changed conditions which are coming. If the majority of our farm boys are to make farming their occupation, they must see in it an attractive life and the greatest incentive to the young man is a fair and sure profit on his operations. 11

(ii)

The phrase "industrial business efficiency" became the hallmark of the agricultural opinion-makers who saw adaptation to industrial society as the best course for agriculture. The farmer increased his chances for a profit if he became a "speculative," business-style agriculturist.¹³

Manufacturers had carefully developed efficiency in their factory methods through long years of trial and error. If these were applicable to the farm, they ought to be used there. A total change in outlook marked the 'business' farmer. He regarded his cows and farm animals as machines rather than as "Dolly" and "Bess". Once their efficiency declined, they were replaced.

For this group, depopulation was an efficient result of the growing industrialization of farm techniques; they believed that the exodus could be halted at the desired point by a greater application of urban industrial methods to agriculture. Urbanization, for them, both caused and solved the problems associated with depopulation of the countryside. They rationalized the problems raised by the exodus from the country. Efficiency could not be achieved if all those who had been born and raised on the farms remained in agriculture for the rest of their lives. "A Gladstone should not spend his life behind a plough, nor a Lincoln splitting rails...." they argued. Many farmers marked time in agriculture when they could have achieved greatness elsewhere.¹⁴

This attitude accompanied a Darwinian belief that those who moved to the towns were those most unfitted for a life in agriculture. "Farming is a man's job.... It is a business requiring the greatest industry, the keenest intellect and the best training of all professions." Those who did not possess the required attributes were better off in the towns.¹⁵

Since there was not enough land in Ontario for all farmers' sons, some of the young must leave the homestead to carve out new places in town or out West.¹⁶ The increasing division of labour drove the rural population to the cities; no longer did the previously essential labour need to till the fields, to spin and weave or to bake bread.¹⁷ This logic forced marginal areas as well as marginal people to adopt a rational usage.

Areas which ought never to have been cultivated had to be returned to pasture as the soil, worn out, was choked with weeds.¹⁸ In such cases, fewer farmers produced more food. Systematized agriculture meant fewer drones since the residue remaining on the farms worked at a higher capacity and efficiency. These arguments exuded the progressivist belief that sentimental opposition to depopulation mistakenly attempted to halt processes which ultimately resulted in the economic betterment of the individual and the best interests of society.

The promoters of rationalized agriculture retained the opinion that those necessary for the production of the food required to maintain the population ought to stay on the farms. They feared that depopulation, if not checked, could lead to a dearth of supplies. Accordingly, they encouraged schemes for rationalizing farm labour. These would end the drudgery of farming and would raise the agricultural occupation in rural estimation. Diffusing knowledge of the latest farm methods would lead to the adoption of practices which by increasing profits would encourage a stable farm population. Just as urban professionals needed special training to prepare for their occupations, the agriculturists, through the lower schools,²⁰ practical travelling demonstrations,²¹ the Ontario Agricultural College,²² farm journals and magazines,²³ a home agricultural library,²⁴ professional organizations,²⁵ experimental farms,²⁶ and other extension facilities²⁷ could gain more professional knowledge of improved business methods. This group believed that "the day has gone by when the self-made man can make the greatest success in agriculture.... Practical experience counts for more in agriculture than any other profession, but it will not do everything.... Today, scientific practice must go hand in hand [with practical experience]." ²⁸

Agricultural magazines provided in overwhelming detail the practical and scientific knowledge for increasing farm returns. Farmers learned the advantages of specialization and the division of labour. Themes of the age, the agriculturists were not excepted from their effects. Most men, as well as most land, was suited to a particular form of farming. A farmer could not thoroughly master all branches of agriculture, although he could sometimes include two complementary activities such as dairying and fruit growing in his specialty. Along with beekeeping, these specialties all could make quick profits.²⁹

Extending this argument, 'rationalists' concluded that agriculturists could gain the most money from their specialty by intensively farming their land. Smaller farms, better worked, would bring higher profits than partly cultivated large farms. Large acreages near cities if subdivided into smaller holdings and cultivated for market gardening would support the right density of population for increased social contact. This type of agriculture would return to the land those who had not enjoyed town life but who could not afford a large farm.³⁰ Intensive farming, its promoters believed, was the most profitable branch of agriculture. It would inevitably spread throughout the Eastern Provinces as the growing population put increased pressure on the cultivable land.³¹ Fruit growing provided a good example of a successful combination of the principles of intensive farming and specialization.³² Even in stock-raising, by specializing in pure-bred stock, a farmer increased returns and encouraged his boy's interest in the agricultural experience.³³ The products this system produced set standards of quality and price. Higher returns provided greater incentives to remain on the soil.³⁴ In Welland County, these agricultural principles caused a return to the land, and other increases in rural population near urban centres suggested this result could solve

'The Problem.'³⁵

Copying urban techniques of book-keeping and production records was another form of this 'New Agriculture' rural farm businesses imported from the city. The modernizers believed these could raise profits by showing the farmer where to expend his efforts most profitably.³⁶ Measures promoting quality control pointed to an urban systematizing and rationalizing influence. These efforts included persuading butter-makers that uniform methods and pasteurization, as well as new tests for tuberculosis in milk, could only help the agriculturist.³⁷ Ontario had been divided into various districts for inspection of cheese factories,³⁸ and the farmers wanted to have cheese and butter factories licensed to promote better quality.³⁹ If milk were more closely inspected in the cities, agriculturists would be forced to pay more attention to the improvement of their herds.⁴⁰ Other agitation to regulate poor methods included efforts to have more stringent weed inspection schemes established.⁴¹

Co-operation in buying and selling was among the most attractive of the efforts to systematize agriculture. This innovation occupies a peculiar position compared to the other business principles. By following big business' example of competing on one level and co-operating on another, the farmer could assure himself of greater returns. The radicals saw co-operation as a means of farm combination to break the power of the middlemen and manufacturers over the individual farmer.⁴² It was, for them, a part of a general mobilization of agriculture to gain its economic rights. Co-operation could also be a purely business enterprise to sell when prices were high and buy in quantity when costs were down. The experience of the Grange's co-operative ventures suggested that most farmers supported co-operatives only when they proved to be economically advantageous and that they deserted these enterprises when competing businessmen cut their prices.

George Creelman, President of the Ontario Agricultural College, pointed out to Sir John Willison, Editor of the Toronto News, that co-operation was

probably our most pressing need at the present time--not so much as to cut out the middleman and that sort of thing, but that all the people might have peaches, while peaches are rotting in Niagara...and all of our lands might be underdrained if our farmers would combine to purchase ditching machines. 43

These co-operatives could be organized in partnership with urban consumers and were not necessarily anti-urban.⁴⁴ They ought, believed the moderate group, to confine their objectives to non-contentious issues. Intrusion of political discussions into their business operations impaired the usefulness of co-operatives for the farm community.⁴⁵ Dairy co-ops showed the possible achievements of co-operation⁴⁶ in rationalizing production and distribution. Fruit-growing, another branch of farming noted for the application of co-operative principles, increased farmer profit. The growers set up a central co-operative body, The Fruit Growers of Ontario, for buying supplies and selling their products. Some fruit-growers had a cold-storage plant at St. Catharines to store and ship their fruit and get special discounts on bulk shipping rates.⁴⁷ The head of the Fruit Division of the Department of Agriculture at Ottawa suggested the co-operative system be extended to include canning factories.⁴⁸ Proposed co-operatives involved laundries,⁴⁹ poultry co-operatives,⁵⁰ rural telephone companies and agricultural credit institutions,⁵¹ as well as general large-scale buying and selling companies.⁵²

(iii)

Business methods and systematization extended beyond the marketplace into the relationship between the farmers and their hired help. High wages did not result from the labourers' ability to extort money from the

employers; but arose from the agriculturists' inability to make their labour worth its cost. Farmers ought to adapt their methods to get maximum returns from the available labour.⁵³ The farmer's unbusinesslike attitude towards his hired man showed in the poor working conditions.⁵⁴

Lack of regular work drove the hired men to the towns. The more congenial and steadier conditions of labouring life in the city meant that no hired man would willingly undergo extra uncertainty and hardship to remain on the farm.⁵⁵ The hired man, engaged only for a few months during the busy season, had to remain idle or seek employment in some other line for the remainder of the year. Seeing nothing in farm life to induce him to remain he drifted to the city, or took up land for himself in a new district. The farmer in older districts had difficulty in getting sufficient help during the busy season properly to carry on the work of his farm.⁵⁶ It took a few seasons to train a foreigner unacquainted with Canadian techniques. Wages for the immigrant worker were seldom as high as the immigration agents pictured them, and many dishonest farmers gypped workers out of their pay. The holiday issue, another contentious question, often led to a hired man's discontent. He had little time off if he were forced to do chores every day while his boss hitched up and went off to the fair or to town and left him all the work.⁵⁷ Once a man moved to the towns, there was little an employer could do to get him back on the farm.

Too many farmers engaging a hired man approached the contract by trying to get as many hours of work as possible at the least cost. They could not be persuaded that it was not the man who put in the longest hours who rendered the best service to his employer. If the "day's service begins with sunrise and ends with sunset, a young man and an old man...will hesitate to make a year or six months' engagement...."⁵⁸ Frequently, apart from his farm work, a hired man was expected to put in four extra hours

per day on chores. Little else proved as annoying to the majority of men. "One reason why many a young man prefers the city to the country is because working hours there are more regular and afford an hour or two for reading or relaxation in the evening," believed many observers. Nothing aggravated the labour relations question more than the indefinite working hours in vogue on the farms.⁶⁰

As the social position of the hired man changed, he was no longer quite as acceptable to the family as in earlier generations. Previously, the hired man, the son of a neighbour, tried to save up enough money to start a farm of his own. On the same footing as his employer, he became a member of the family. By 1900, however, the hired man was becoming a member of a class apart and not socially equal to the family. The family desired to have their home to themselves while 'the Man' resented having to take an inferior place although he lived in the family's house.⁶¹ He was forced into association with his employer for more than the ten hours a day which prevailed in the towns. He had no separate existence; in extreme cases he was "cursed and sworn at all the time...."⁶² He was a labourer twenty-four hours a day, never an individual.

The farmer usually treated his hired man fairly as far as the terms of employment were concerned. This made little difference to many hired men for help was so scarce that they had their choice of bosses.⁶³ The rural propaganda machine provided many employers with arguments to sway their labourers to stay with them. The strenuous work in the factories compared unfavourably to the healthful country life.⁶⁴ Farm labourers ought to understand that weather and other factors ruled the farmer's work schedule. Besides, the hired man was better employed on the farm than in "lounging around hotels, and in company that only depraves...."

such as the town mechanics.⁶⁵ Feelings of inferiority were the man's own fault. All these arguments were used to convince the hired men of the importance of the Canadian farming class.⁶⁶

Apart from reasserting the agrarian philosophy, the rural employers took measures to remedy the complaints by reducing the informality of the hired man's tenure. They formalized the employer-employee relations so that these became very similar to those prevailing in urban industries. The desire to make the profession more business-like and increase the productivity of labour promoted this outlook. The customs of the previous forty years no longer pertained to the prevailing labour relationship. Farmers ought to introduce a more rigidly defined work schedule. Definite hours gave the hired man a better idea of his free time so that he had no cause to feel overworked. Men were inclined to work extra hours when needed and the position of farmer's helper became more attractive compared to the factories.⁶⁷ Hiring a man for a full year and spreading the available work over a longer period of time reduced the insecurity of a hired man. More men could be induced to remain in the country.⁶⁸ The agriculturist would profit by having a man available the whole time even if he were idle occasionally.⁶⁹ Better living accommodation for the hired man and his spouse countered the attraction of the privacy they found in city life. Supplemented by a plot of land and a cow, these arrangements made a man's life more contented and secure.⁷⁰ They cost the farmer less than the often-scarce equivalent in cash wages. Social relations between the farmer and his hired hand would be on firmer ground for neither could intrude on the other's privacy. With this separation, formalization of labour relationships could proceed more easily. The outlay necessary was a "good investment."⁷¹

Practically and efficiently, farmers bent their energies towards increasing the supply of farm labour and, therefore, reducing wages to levels which rural employers believed they could afford. Using the business principle of 'supply and demand,' they tried to increase the labour supply so that prevailing practices could be retained. Farm employers proposed that more immigrant farm labourers be allowed into Canada to work. The journals complained that immigration agencies, forgetting the agricultural workers, had brought only the urban classes from the British Isles.⁷⁴ Urban immigrants refused the farmers' offers of work and would take any kind of job just to remain in the cities.⁷⁵ Lacking experience, they were of little use to farmers in any case, or else the farm immigrants to Canada frequently moved to the West. Farmers believed the provincial government ought to set up offices in Great Britain to attract labourers to the rural areas and to increase assistance to this desirable group.⁷⁷

The hunger of agriculturists for labour became so great that they were willing to relax the race restrictions on prospective Canadian citizens. In a scene reminiscent of the C.P.R.'s importation of navvies to build the railroad, The Farming World suggested an investigation of the Chinese as farm workers. A successful result followed by migration to Ontario would solve the labour shortage as well as British Columbia's race problems. Instead of a head tax on the Chinese immigrants, the paper urged indentured service for each of three to five years on a Canadian farm.⁷⁸ This suggestion created great reader interest, the paper reported later. The editor concluded that "the more one thinks over the matter, the more one is inclined to the view that the Chinaman might help to solve the farm help problem which has reached such an acute stage in the older parts of Canada."⁷⁹ This cold-bloodedly economic suggestion⁸⁰ was extended to the

Negroes and the Hindus. Occasionally, charitable statements remarked that immigrants could make Ontario "what it should be"⁸² if they could be assimilated quickly.⁸³

Different organizations set up schemes to secure the immigrants desired by the agricultural employers. Canadian farmers could hire young Britishers and teach them Canadian farm methods.⁸⁴ The Ontario Bureau of Colonization published advertisements in the farm journals offering for hire the English labourers it assisted.⁸⁵ The Salvation Army arranged for thousands of agricultural labourers to be transported to Canada, while Cunard Lines opened an immigration department to deal with farm labour, and the Boys' Farmer League advertised its supply of labourers.⁸⁷ The Central Emigration Board of Great Britain announced in 1907 that it would bring British unemployed to work as Canadian farm helpers.⁸⁸ The labour shortage, however, outstripped all the efforts to relieve it.⁸⁹

(iv)

The prophets of the "New Agriculture" saw application of urban technical inventions to farming as a major rationalization of agricultural methods which would raise income. Efficient land use resulted from greater mechanization of agriculture as well as from specialization and intensive farming. Mechanization could be a solution to "The Problem" instead of a cause. Through extensive use of machines, the hired labour shortage could be made bearable or be overcome, and working life on the farm would be pleasant enough to overcome the rural family's desire to move townward.⁹⁰ The proponents of mechanization believed that the interests of every farmer demanded that he buy the machinery which would save him the most labour and cause him least trouble in installation and maintenance. As early as 1900, farmers asked, "What is to become of the

hired man?" Would he

soon pass away and become extinct, or will he still be found, a curious occasional specimen of a departed genus? The inventors have been trying to retire him to the bench this summer. In swift succession, have appeared in the pages of the Patent Office Gazette, cow-milkers, automatic [sic] watering troughs, automatic feed bins, fence machines, corn huskers, corn pickers, pea and bean harvesters, cotton pickers, potato diggers and every sort of seed or vegetable planter. None of them want to borrow the buggy Sunday or demand pie. 91

No longer did the farmer have to trudge home from the fields behind his team at the close of the day and see before him only the prospect of a multitude of small jobs which had to be done. These never-ending jobs around the house, barn and yard took time and labour. Water had to be pumped, stock fed, stables cleaned, wood sawed, various machines run by hand or by supervised horse-power.⁹² Efficient new machinery could not but offer a much greater return for infinitely less labour.

All types of machinery were popularized through the rural press in the years before the Great War.⁹³ The number of implement advertisements increased greatly. Prices, it was felt, had decreased proportionately to value received.⁹⁴ The machines for use on the farm included the mechanical milking devices,⁹⁵ along with fruit tree sprayers,⁹⁶ farm buildings of the proper design,⁹⁷ binders and assorted field machines⁹⁸ such as mowers,⁹⁹ manure carriers,¹⁰⁰ steam powered machinery,¹⁰¹ and field drainage equipment and ditchers.¹⁰² While these all aided the agriculturist in more efficient production, the gasoline motor received the greatest publicity as a boon to farmers. It was the newest, cheapest farmer's power.¹⁰³ It could be used to pump water, run threshing machines or cream separators, saw wood, grind tools, mow grain and, when driving the newest form of tractor, to perform the work of a plough horse.¹⁰⁴

In the more isolated areas, the gasoline motor could produce through a generator all the electricity required for the house and barn.¹⁰⁵

Electricity from generators or rural power lines provided another source of power which, when tapped, would bring as many advantages to agriculture as the electric motor.¹⁰⁶

Increased efficiency of labour and increased profits resulted not only from technological devices invented specifically for the farm or those used directly for work purposes. The imported technology of the cities which improved rural social conditions also aided the agriculturists economically. While good roads, for example, improved social interaction among the farm population, they also increased the farmers' economic returns by allowing easier and cheaper communication with and transportation to the market centres.¹⁰⁷ The radial railways,¹⁰⁸ mail delivery systems,¹⁰⁹ telephones,¹¹⁰ and the automobile,¹¹¹ were among the other technological devices which saved time, money and labour, thereby increasing the profitability of agriculture.

(v)

These mechanical improvements gave agriculturists a better opportunity to increase their profits. The economic situation, as we have seen, could also be improved by farmers copying urban business practices and labour relationships. As a result of these devices, the economic reasons for the movement toward from the back concession lines could be decreased. The result of this full scale adoption of principles of urban efficiency and systematization could not but carry with it an integration of rural and urban life styles, especially because of the impetus it received from a parallel social movement. As the farmer became as much a businessman as the hardware merchant or shoe manufacturer, he became less the man of

nature and more independent of the natural forces which had hitherto ruled his life. As the farmer lost his economic independence, he specialized his production and was integrated into the urban, industrial economy of the cities. He produced for their markets and consumed their products.

The split in the ranks of the agricultural opinion-makers over the ultimate value of this integration widened. Those who supported the increased social contacts possible by using urban technology in rural areas maintained that economically, technology and integration would benefit the countrymen. Those who viewed the effects of social integration skeptically, doubted these economic improvements could stop depopulation. They insisted that production advances would ultimately be futile in halting depopulation unless they were accompanied by more fundamental distributional reforms.¹¹²

CHAPTER VII

IDENTIFYING THE ENEMY:
DISTRIBUTION OF WEALTH AND THE MOVEMENT
TOWARDS POLITICAL ACTION

Accepting the argument for economic causation, a strong group of the agricultural elite believed that any reform movement to put an end to 'The Problem' must correct worsening and fundamental inequities in the system of the distribution of wealth. H. B. Cowan of Farm and Dairy, W. C. Good, E. C. Drury, and W. L. Smith, editor of The Weekly Sun, joined forces with the Grange to assert that both cause and solution to the depopulation of the countryside lay in the growth and concentration of industry, and in the organization of modern economic activities. Despite all the material advances of the age, the gap between the material position of the prosperous farm and the urban businessman widened considerably between the 1880's and the decade following the turn of the century.¹

While the Grange at the time of its organization promoted educational and technological reforms,

no farm organization of later date [post 1880] seriously accepted the view that production questions were an appropriate field of study for the organized farmers. Farm spokesmen challenged the agricultural organizations sponsored by the provincial government because they diverted the attention of farm people to problems of production when the real problems were those of distribution. It was not knowledge of the laws of the market which was essential if farm people were to get a just return for their labour.

The most important method of education which farm organizations could undertake would be to foster an understanding of the functioning of the economy. Once farmers understood how they were being exploited, they would rise and demand an equitable distribution of wealth.²

The only feasible solution to end the exploitation involved organizing the agriculturists to force changes in legislative programmes.

Once the external economic inequities had been resolved, technical and social questions would resolve themselves.³ A special article by the editor of

Farm and Dairy asked

what improvement in material or social conditions is needed most urgently by the farmers of Canada? The answer is becoming clearer every day. It is a greater control over those influences off the farm which largely control conditions on the farm.... Transactions of this character [loss of rural power] are piling up such burdens on the residents of the farm while concentrating immense industrial enterprises in our towns and cities that there is little need to wonder why rural depopulation proceeds apace. 4

To correct these injustices wrought upon the farm by outside sources, organized action was needed.

(i)

The radical section of the rural opinion-makers rejected reliance upon the self-help and make-do philosophy which prompted continuance of the old systems modified by introducing business principles to increase returns minimally. In their eyes, co-operation, intensive cultivation, specialization, and technological advance did little to smooth the farmer's rocky path to profits strewn with the boulders of transportation charges, landlord's and middleman's profits and market restrictions. E. C. Drury told a farm audience that farm improvements worsened the labour shortage by increasing the need for manpower.⁵ W. C. Good pointed out that farm improvements had not resulted in higher production and lower costs.⁶ W. L. Smith remarked that although every invention available from 1891 to 1911 should result in an easier life on the farms, those years saw a continuing and disastrous decline in population.

The farmer's sense of grievance encompassed most urban groups. "Did it ever occur to you," inquired The Farmer's Advocate, that

the farmer is the last man in the row? After everybody else from the banker, the railroad man, the manufacturer, the merchant and the speculator, down to the trade unionist has taken what he can get, the farmer takes what's left. Every important class, except the farmer, has more or less to do with naming the price of his product. The farmer has to take what is offered or let his produce spoil.... His chief hope of increased profits lies in thinning of his numbers through stress of circumstance.... Eventually, however, enough drift away from it /farming/ to lessen competition prices for farm produce advance a peg and another factor among many is added to the citizen's high cost of living. Where will it end? 7

Anti-urbanism grew. The seat of the countryside's problems lay in the metropolis and its economic control over the farm. An urban-rural confrontation loomed. The cities, despite their dependence upon the farm, had taken a united stand against agriculture, and they selfishly promoted policies which redounded to their immediate economic advantage.⁸ Urban selfishness encompassed both the manufacturer who made inordinate profits out of protection and the urban labourer who supported this policy.⁹

Examples of urban exploitation faced the agriculturists on all sides. The Bell telephone company tried to destroy the independent rural telephone systems and increase its monopoly at the agriculturists' expense.¹⁰ The urban milk dealers unfairly colluded to pay milk producers less than half the retail cost of milk.¹¹ Implement manufacturers 'ruled' the farmer through outrageously high prices and built obsolescence into their machinery.¹² Meat packers secured profits from the prosperity created by the hog raisers; farmers fed hogs for a loss so that meat packers could make over 100 per cent profit.¹³ Peter McArthur pointed out to the readers of The Farmer's Advocate the great advantages gained by the Canadian chartered banks at the countrymen's expense.¹⁴ Every time farmers adopted new methods and became moderately prosperous, urban financial interests decided to make another squeeze.¹⁵ The retailers, incensed at attempts to

establish rural co-operatives, blocked enabling legislation.¹⁶ Middlemen took unjustified profits and left the producer a minimal return for his labour.¹⁷

The country did not get a square deal; it was "bled white in nearly every way by the greedy cities."¹⁸ Everyone was "down on the poor farmer"; everyone tried to "do him in every way."¹⁹ Preachers, doctors, lawyers and newspapermen, all had an interest in the special advantages enjoyed by those who put the economic squeeze on the agricultural population. Townspeople performed services at artificially inflated prices to keep the oversupply of urban professionals supplied with an adequate income.²⁰ The towns had "united in action" and were "keenly aware of their own interests." They tried to get as much as possible from the rural areas and give as little as they could in return. Opposed to these, the agricultural classes, unorganized, seemingly incapable of concerted action, had no proper influence over their destiny.²¹ Such economic reasons abounded for the rural exodus.

The metropolitan centres insidiously maintained their advantages over the countryside. The urban interests secured control of the legislative policies of the government to guarantee their economic benefits. The decrease in the rural and the increase of the civic population represented, to the radical ruralists, the fruits of a system of legislation which had for years disregarded the rights of the farming community and laid heavy financial burdens upon the agriculturists. W. C. Good emphasized the relationship between depopulation and the legislative system which placed the masses at the mercy of the combines which exploited them.²²

The cities maintained their advantages through the concentration of corporate economic power which gave them political control to run the country in their interests and to disregard the needs of the rural

population. The process of urbanization involving the concentration of industry, therefore, promoted policies which led to the concentration of population. This process of concentration arose, one writer explained, because of

a few great central banks with innumerable branches scattered all over the country. These branches are mere collecting agencies by means of which the savings of the country are poured into the great centres. Industries naturally develop where the capital on which they depend is located. Railways centralize their activities and means of employment at the same points. Governments spend at the same centres in ornate buildings and in the employment of an army of civil servants. 23

The dangers of such a concentration were expounded on at length in the more militant rural journals.²⁴

Once begun, this process did not cease until the companies of any industrial sector consolidated into a few giants administered by a handful of men who exercised "supreme power over the fortunes of men and communities."²⁵ These economic giants had not combined to reduce prices and aid the agricultural and other consumers. They raised prices to pay the dividends of over-capitalization.²⁶ Behind the tariff walls they demanded for 'patriotic' reasons, they exercised free rein over their competition²⁷ and became a major deterrent to new business.²⁸ Trusts prevented

that spontaneous expression of opinion and freedom of action which is the inalienable right of every free-born citizen. It should be possible to do business with the company without forfeiting freedom of speech or action, but experience shows that at the present time it is not so possible. 29

The trusts forced the workers to feed, clothe and house the idlers in incredible luxury. The industrial revolution, by centralizing industry, enabled the few thus to exploit the labour of the many. An antiquated political system, maintained by those interested in concealing their control, allowed legislative bodies to become mere tools in the hands of these

'Big Interests' who used their mastery to gain special legislative favours.³⁰

Rural economic complaints centred specifically around the obvious favours enjoyed by urban industry at rural expense: tariff protection and industrial bounties. Reciprocity, for the farmers, aroused the greatest political debate.³¹ According to the Drury-Good faction, tariffs contributed the largest factor in the economics of the declining rural population. All segments of industrial life had combined to secure tariff legislation. They all charged the farmer higher prices for goods than they could under a system of free competition. This was the foundation of the Canadian cities.³² E. C. Drury calculated that the tariff directly cost the average Ontario farmer \$200 per year plus an incalculable indirect expense. Farmers paid more for clothing, tools, vehicles, agricultural implements, stoves, household furnishings, everything they used except their food. Manufacturers vastly increased the value of their output; they had, according to Adam Shortt, economics professor at Queen's University, expanded their wealth more rapidly than any element in the country.³³

Pretending customs taxation did not press heavily upon the farm, contended the agriculturists, was ridiculous. The tariff, a tax, placed its chief burden on the 'broad shoulders' of the man who dug his wealth out of the soil. The assumption of the protected industries and the pro-tariff urban working class "must be that without the tariff taxes these manufactured goods would not be made here. This is another way of saying that if the consumers of Canada were compelled to pay more than the world's price for Canadian-made goods, they would be out of employment in that particular industry." The only logical conclusion farmers could draw was that manufacturers admitted "they are able to make their living only by the general public being taxed to maintain their industry."³⁴ The tariff

could not work in favour of the Canadian farmer as long as he produced an agricultural surplus. This condition would prevail in Canada far into the future.³⁵ Because the home market was not large enough to support the Canadian agriculturist he exported farm produce to keep ahead. The home market would not force higher prices until the domestic agricultural surplus disappeared. In selling on the free world market, farmers claimed they were completely at the mercy of vagaries in prices.³⁶ Despite Canadian post-1900 prosperity, higher prices in the United States meant free trade would benefit Ontario farmers. According to the radicals' interpretation of the business philosophy of farming, the businessman-farmer would not be content once he found that a change in the tariff would increase his profits.³⁷

By citing the importance of agriculture in the Canadian economy, the agitators hoped to marshall arguments to support reversing the trends. Manufacturers had exaggerated the value of the tariff to themselves. By reversing the policy and ensuring rural prosperity, the foundation for Canadian future well-being could be ensured. Industry, too dependent upon government support, ought to follow the self-denying example of the agricultural population. Manufacturers would soon forget about the need for tariffs in the rush of increasing business following their abolition. Industry in Canada had passed the infant stage that the Canadian tariff system had been designed to protect. Growing economic power and rapidly rising returns showed that manufacturing no longer needed protection from foreign competition. The claim that existing protection was not enough was, to the radicals, "the plainest possible proof" that these burdens on the Canadian population ought to be tolerated no longer. Manufacturers had to be encouraged to develop a greater spirit of self-reliance. All arguments, the agitators stressed, were based not on 'mere' theories, but were founded on

the hard facts of practical experience with the system of protection.³⁸

Only by the abolition of the tariff could the profitability required to maintain the rural population be secured.

Another feature of the economic system allied to the tariff in the farmer's mind were the subsidies granted to various industrial enterprises. "Being a captain of industry," remarked one editor, "must be a pleasant job when the industry consists, in the main, of working complacent governments for subsidies."³⁹ In the rural view, the major offenders were the railroads, the iron and steel manufacturers and the ship builders. The iron manufacturers in 1905 received over \$1.5 million in subsidies.⁴⁰ Petitions flooded into the House of Commons protesting the amounts.⁴¹ Corrupt politicians benefitted from the money they granted. Agriculturists believed that:

Railway magnates in their palace cars have only to blow the whistle and apply the brakes when approaching Ottawa and the governing powers haven't only time to listen to their appeal but to grant charters and bonuses and millions of acres of land. But let the farmers approach Ottawa, hats in hand to make an appeal and show cause and state fact, the ministers are so pressed for time...there is not time to be wasted in common stock. ⁴²

Never content with existing bounties, greedy manufacturers kept hounding the government for more. A wealthy farmer "would scarcely be seen asking the Government to pay interest on another farm he proposed buying with borrowed money. And, if a farmer should so far forget himself as to make such a request, he would get an exceedingly short hearing at Ottawa. Still we are told that this Levis-St. John crowd of big capitalists were assured that their request [for a bonus] would be most carefully and sympathetically considered by the Government."⁴³ Another bitter commentator on the subject of the Canadian railroads remarked that it was

entertaining to those who know the actual history of the Canadian Pacific Railway, to read or listen to the cock and bull stories told and printed about the patriotic optimism, the wonderful sagacity, the steely nerve displayed and the tremendous risks taken by these original

syndicators. Most of them were pretty clever men, but they risked little or nothing of theirs. What they did risk they had back in their pockets with a good profit before the road was even completed and they as a group then held enough stock to put them in control of the property.

As a matter of fact, the Canadian Pacific was built with the cash and credit provided by the Canadian Government. To any Canadian who knows these things it is amusing and perhaps at the same time humiliating to hear at very frequent intervals some 'statesman' or public body or newspaper indulging in some rhapsodical and subservient eulogium on one or other of these enormously wealthy men or noblemen who are described as having been 'Makers of Canada'. The fact is that Canada has made them. 44

Subsidies raised the price of consumer goods and added further burdens to the farmer's already inordinate costs. 45

Why did agriculturists claim the "duty business is what is sapping the heart out of our farming profession." 46 Tariffs enabled the manufacturer to pay wages which could not come within the farm employer's ability to pay. Farmers could not compete with railway builders who received enough in subsidies to pay the wages of all construction workers, or the iron manufacturers who received more than their total wage bill in government bounties. The protected industries used their advantages "as a lodestone to draw from the farm the labor needed for tilling the soil." 47 Farmers, on the other hand, depended "for their wage bills on the price they realized for their products which were sold in competition with like products from all over the world," 48 and had to make up a deficit between their expenses and their sales. 49 Unpatriotically and artificially, city life was stimulated to "offer more alluring inducements to the young man throughout the country...." Manufacturers could pay the wages which robbed the country of its population. 50 The population decline in rural areas provided the manufacturer with a market for exorbitantly-priced labour-saving machinery. The tariff managed to take the profit out of farming and

draw capital as well as labour from the rural areas,⁵¹ and attracted the cleverest of the young rural men to the manufacturing centres. The artificial conditions aided manufacturing so that "a few brains can make a competence" or even a fortune with much less hard work than agriculture demanded.⁵² The Canadian Council of Agriculture in the march on Ottawa in 1910, told Premier Laurier they believed "the greatest misfortune which can befall any country" was to "have its people huddled together in great centres of population." They resolved that since the customs tariff had the tendency to encourage depopulation and "in view of the constant movement of our people away from the farm, the great problem which presents itself to Canadian people today is the problem of retaining our people on the soil."⁵³

The moderate section of the agricultural opinion-makers publicized another side of the tariff story. As James Duff, Ontario Minister of Agriculture, told a farm audience, "we would not desire this to be an agricultural country alone. We are proud of our farms, but we are proud too, of the cities and towns in which men of our flesh have their abode."⁵⁴ Canadian cities were necessary to round out "the commercial, social and national life, partly for the sake of their reflex influence on the agricultural communities." Whatever their drawbacks cities were "galvanic batteries of progress in thought as well as in material things."⁵⁵ Despite some manufacturers' selfish attempts to have customs taxation raised, tariffs, still a feasible means of collecting necessary revenue, provided some needed protection for Canadian manufacturing. The defenders of a tariff system had to admit that they fostered a concomitant farm labour shortage, but they pointed out that the conservatism of the farmer in adopting labour-saving methods prevented him from overcoming this handicap as fully as he could.

Frequently, they criticized what they termed "inflammatory and misleading" pro-reciprocity articles. They did not like assertions to the effect that all economic inequities would be forever eradicated if the tariffs were removed from certain articles. The removal of tariffs would not prepare "for the consumer a mansion in his Utopia." To argue that tariffs were the sole advantage of the manufacturers and were "the reason [*sic*] d'etre of their affluence in the community, is carrying the author away from cold logic and leading him into the channel made use of by so many, namely that of prejudice and sentiment and swaying feelings." The reformer often had to be misunderstood to arouse the passions of the people. The moderates condemned those who claimed that "the tariff is the sole cause of their troubles and who seek to set class against class to aid the desired consummation." ⁵⁶ The farmer who sought to corner all the benefits of the industrial world without paying for them was as guilty as the monopolist who sought to accumulate at others' expense. Farmers, at heart, were not free trader opportunists. Their radical leaders, believed the moderates, ^{were} ^{who} only prejudiced men/claimed to speak for the farmers. They succeeded in reiterating old absurdities against the Canadian manufacturers. ⁵⁷

In decrying extremism, the Minister of Agriculture had the support of The Canadian Countryman, The Farmer's Magazine, and The Farmer's Advocate. A split developed, however, in the pro-tariff forces of the rural opinion-makers. After 1911, the Department of Agriculture took practical steps to stop the pro-reciprocity group from using the Government-sponsored Farmers' Clubs to vent their opinion on the issue of customs taxation. ⁵⁸ The Farmer's Advocate changed its stand and became much more of an anti-tariff journal. By the middle of 1912, this paper pointed out that poor rural economic conditions caused by the "tariffs and other discriminatory uneconomic legislation" multiplied farmers' problems and curtailed

agricultural production." ⁵⁹ Members of this anti-reciprocity group had been placed in the embarrassing position of having to put forth elaborate justifications to prove a true interest in the farm. ⁶⁰

The most important conflict between the pro and anti-reciprocity groups took place during the election of 1911. The defeat of the pro-reciprocity Liberals showed that the journals which had supported this policy did not represent the true opinion of the vast majority of agriculturists, proclaimed the anti-reciprocity opinion-leaders. For them, the results showed agriculturists' doubt of securing any new national markets and also their desire to maintain Canada's economic independence from the United States. ⁶¹ The pro-reciprocity advocates put forth a different explanation. The cities and towns, they believed, were responsible for the defeat of reciprocity. Toronto, Hamilton, Forest, Cayuga, Kingston, Dundas, Guelph, Woodstock, Oshawa, Wingham and Collingwood, a few of the urban centres, dragged pro-reciprocity candidates down to defeat. The farmers had voted in a substantial majority for the Liberals but the vast anti-reciprocity vote of the towns masked the agricultural intentions. ⁶² The farmer's independent nature made it difficult to organize him at the polls. These sentiments did not make for congenial rural attitudes towards Ontario cities and towns.

Leading proponents of the economic interpretation of depopulation, particularly H. B. Cowan of Farm and Dairy, criticized the unjust tax system for its effect on depopulation. Every issue of this paper stressed the need for increased taxes on land values. The farmer buying from the cities increased the urban land values but received none of the money his business created. Anti-urbanism and anti-business feeling came to the fore. Since they realized land values were directly proportional to the size of the community, keen metropolitan businessmen gained control of the urban land

so that they could appropriate for themselves the values which the community at large had created.⁶³ While urban values increased, the price of farm lands remained stationary. As city rents increased, both producers and consumers were victimized⁶⁴ by rising prices for manufactured goods, clothing, and implements. Rural employers were deprived of the increased profits which their business created.⁶⁵ N. W. Rowell, provincial Liberal leader, told an audience at Princeton, Oxford County, that the provincial government should not tax improvements on buildings but should tax land values. Land taxation contributed to the reduction of the rural population.⁶⁶ "Why do the Boys Leave the Farm?" asked one article on this theme, then answered its own question by pointing to the land tax system. H. B. Cowan, taking his crusade to the provincial government, pointed out the detrimental effects of the land taxation system to the select committee of the Ontario Legislature.⁶⁷

For the reformers, taxing land values was a simple solution to the problem. Since land gained its price only from the presence of population, those who added to its value ought to gain some benefit from it. If occupied or unoccupied land were taxed according to its market price, the higher taxes paid by speculators would carry more of the tax burden of the whole province. The benefits to the burdened countryman were obvious. The only group which would be hit by this measure would be the land speculators and those who extorted high rents from the working people and businessman.⁶⁸ The supply of land would increase, for speculators would be forced to rid themselves of their vast holdings in order to pay their taxes.⁶⁹ If the speculative value of the land was destroyed, the rent that came from the land would flow back in the form of taxes to those who created it--the farmers. Then would farming "become profitable and the farmers come into their own. Then and then only will rural depopulation

cease and country life become attractive." ⁷⁰

These measures gained support from some county councils who petitioned the government to exempt farm buildings from taxation and create an incentive for the agriculturists to improve their facilities. ⁷¹ W. C. Good remarked that "the simplicity of this system of taxation is one of its strong features. What can be simpler...." ⁷² Interestingly, some reformers would extend the tax measures to include the introduction of direct income taxes. Those who could pay the most were those who ought to be charged. ⁷³ The widespread nature of support for these proposals was commended by the more conservative Farmer's Magazine which did not support such measures itself. ⁷⁴

Tax advantages were only one of the benefits which railroads received at the hands of the government. Undertaxation of railroad lands was rampant. Agitation for increased levies on the railroad companies continued throughout the years under study. ⁷⁵ American states collected astronomically higher rates of taxes from the Canadian railroads which passed through them. The Canadian provinces with many times the mileage collected little or nothing. ⁷⁶ The Weekly Sun, The Grange, The Farmers' Association, and numerous correspondents in the rural press pronounced that they thought this situation ought to be remedied. ⁷⁷ The County Council of Grey urged all other counties to send deputations to Toronto to push for higher rates for railroads. ⁷⁸ Unexpected allies joined this rural crusade. The president of the Ontario Municipal Association urged higher taxation of railroads at the annual meeting of that body in 1908. The Sun remarked that while previously discussions had been confined to farmers' organizations, and although "farmers fighting single-handed have accomplished a great deal; united with their brethren of the towns and cities, they can accomplish vastly more." ⁷⁹

Complaints about the railroads' position stemmed from the roads' monopoly of transportation. The managers seemed to have little regard for others' rights. Although the level crossing claimed many lives, warning signals were seldom installed voluntarily. Railroads did not compensate the agriculturists for damages⁸⁰ until a bill the railroads opposed forced them both to pay damages and to erect cattleguards along their tracks.⁸¹ The Government's refusal to ensure adoption of the legislation by making it a party measure irritated militants who were provoked into asking "Why does the Government trifle with the farmers in this fashion? Why does it refuse them justice year after year?" They concluded that while the Government was afraid to offend either the railroads or the farmers, the farmers could be fooled, but the railroads could never be tricked into acquiescing in the diminution of their powers.⁸²

Apportioning the costs of proper drainage across railroad tracks provided another contentious issue pitting farm against rail, but this was a minor battle compared to the acrimonious debate over the justice of rail charges.⁸³ The Farmer's Association demanded a government investigation of rates charged Canadian farmers because these were much higher than comparable shipping charges in the United States. Cattle from Chicago could be sent to the seaboard along the Canadian route more cheaply than the shorter distance from Guelph along the same tracks.⁸⁴ Not only did the companies charge excessively, but they were responsible for delays in reaching market which resulted in much spoiled Canadian farm produce.⁸⁵ Because of this economic discrimination, farming in the United States had distinct advantages in capturing the export markets in Europe.⁸⁶ Farmers joined manufacturing interests which also presented a strong case to prove Canadian railways discriminated in freight rates.⁸⁷

The Sun questioned whether Canada's economic expansion had to be accomplished by private companies. Private ownership was not necessarily progressive, "nor are the terms of a bargain between the state and a private company progressive if they are disadvantageous to the State." ⁸⁸ If the Canadian Pacific had been built "as it should have been" by the Canadian Government, no public money would have been lost. The road would have paid for itself and produced revenue for the people. "The princely coalfields and oil lands would have been saved.... But all this is gone, and there is nothing whatever to show for it." ⁸⁹ The railroads were not ordinary private companies. Because of their monopolistic position, they could fix the prices on the goods they carried. They had been created by Canadian law and their powers under the law including the power of expropriation were extensive. Since Canadian taxpayers had largely borne the rail cost, the roads ought to be more closely controlled.

Most of the agricultural press approved of regulating the roads. Farmers ought to get paid for the lowered value of a farm sliced through the middle by the roads. ⁹⁰ Farmers demanded that the government regulate the rates charged by the different railroads. Canadian farmers wanted, they believed, no more than their rights. "This appears to be the only satisfactory solution to this problem," commented The Farming World, "given fair play in the carrying of his produce to the consumer, we think that the Canadian farmer can hold his own with any producer the world over. But these shackles must be removed and it is the duty of the government of the day to step in and adjust rates on a fair and equitable basis...." ⁹¹ Efforts of the rural agitators focussed on demands that the Government appoint a railway commission to regulate and control rates. The Fruit Growers of the Province joined the Grange, Farmer's Association, Cattle Dealers, Dairymen's Association, Canadian Manufacturers' Association and

Toronto Board of Trade in this request.⁹²

In this campaign for control of the railway rates the farm could claim some success. The outside support of the manufacturers may explain the results. Hon. Mr. Blair, Minister of Railways, announced in 1902 the formation of the Railway Commission.⁹³ Hailed in the agricultural press, this action was "a recognition on the part of the government that the people have a right to control their own highways." They believed that "when this commission is in full working order, freight rates of all kinds will be placed upon a fairer and more equitable basis than they are at the present time."⁹⁴ Agriculture was given recognition with the appointment of James Mills to the Commission. Mills had been, until he moved to Ottawa, the president of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph, a true son of the soil, publicly identified with Ontario agriculture for over twenty-five years.⁹⁵

The agriculturists' struggle with the railroads provides an example of a story with many repetitions. The economic disadvantages inducing the young to depart from rural areas involved other industries as well as the labour unions who took advantage of the countrymen. Rural employers were forced to retain their labour by preventing the passage of measures restricting urban working hours. The first of these, a bill introduced in the House of Commons by Alphonse Verville, limited working time on federal contracts to eight hours. Each time the bill was introduced the agriculturists opposed it. Farmers suspected that the effect of this measure on the farm would be to accentuate the farm shortage of labour for "the farmer's work cannot stop on the blow of a whistle nor can it be held down to an eight hour basis."⁹⁶ Attempts to regulate hours were "a menace to the agricultural interest," and would "demoralize the agricultural industry of this essentially farming country."⁹⁷ Restriction on labouring hours

would spread from the federal to the provincial to the municipal government and then to all private industry. Eventually farmers would be forced to comply against their will.⁹⁸ The farmer generally felt little sympathy for urban labour unions. The union centralized control over labour and provided a means of forcing the farmer to pay money in wages and higher prices for consumer goods. The rural press opposed union-sponsored, 'class' legislation such as workman's compensation because, they argued, "everybody in the state is not ensured...it confers on one class a great benefit which is withheld from all other classes one of which, the farmer class, bears mainly, in the end, the expense."⁹⁹ Agricultural journals did not support strikes for higher wages and shorter hours. Farmers, stuck in the middle of the industrial strife, showed little sympathy for either labour or management.¹⁰⁰

(ii)

Solutions to specific economic disadvantages came easily to mind in the publicists' search for remedies. Yet specific suggestions to limit railroads or other industry and to reduce agriculture's economic disadvantage could accomplish nothing unless stronger enforcement measures were taken. Farmers' limited success with the railroads and the example of urban economic organizations provided a solution. The agricultural journals pointed out that "artisans form powerful unions. Capitalists form trusts. Manufacturers have their aggressive associations. In fact, intelligent organization for the sake of economy and profit is characteristic of every industry except the greatest--agriculture."¹⁰¹ The farmer had to deal with these urban organizations on all levels--buying, selling, and credit. He learned the advantages strong organizations could pry from the government. When manufacturers or men of business in other callings desired to achieve an end, the countryman perceived that

no matter what it may be, they get together and providing the sinews of war, map out a campaign. They growl not, neither do they grumble. They go to work, possibly with gumshoes on, but anyway they go to work.

Agriculturists, on the other hand, provided a great contrast. The farmer who had a complaint "nurtures his grouch assiduously. He deals out diatribes volubly, so does his neighbour, but there the matter ends. They never think of getting together and perfecting an organization to go after what they need or want." ¹⁰²

Rural opinion-leaders were awakening to the need to bring together those who were fully alive to the injustice of the burdens placed upon agriculture. In one issue, The Weekly Sun published seventeen letters from Canadian farmers urging their peers to organize. ¹⁰² J. Lockie Wilson, the President of the Farmers' Association, wrote that "in union of our forces alone can the farmers of Canada hope for redress." ¹⁰³ In a call to battle, The Weekly Sun told its readers that,

manufacturers boast that their organization is the greatest interest in Canada today, that their output exceeds the output of all the farms of the Dominion and that they should not go hat in hand to any Minister.... Henceforth it must be a war that will not end until Customs taxation is reduced to a level merely sufficient to provide Government with the necessary revenue to meet the demands of a public service honestly administered. In order to attain this end, farmers must organize their strength. It is no struggling infant, but a giant made strong at their expense that has thrown down the gage of battle. ¹⁰⁴

The Farmer's Advocate, a moderate journal, joined the radicals in demanding farm unity to combat the organized high-tariff agitation. Agriculture must demand that "the day has more than come when the pursuit of agriculture shall no longer be the milch cow over which manufacturers shall continue to dance." ¹⁰⁵ Industry would stop at nothing to prevent the agricultural groups from unifying and farmers had to be extremely careful not to compromise their unity by accepting clever device put forth by Boards of Trade

such as an import tariff on wool which would alienate the wool-producers from the rest of the farmers.¹⁰⁶

While they all agreed on the need for greater unity among the farmers, the 'radicals' debated the degree to which class interests ought to prevail in their movements. W. L. Smith, the editor of The Weekly Sun, told a meeting of agriculturists that "it is true that we are all citizens of one common country and so have general interests in common; but it is equally true that each class has special interests of its own apart from those of other classes." Agriculturists, therefore, were justified in organizing to protect their legitimate class interests.¹⁰⁷ Farm and Dairy agreed that farmers' organizations had too long given the impression that they needed outside financial support to survive. The financial support of the urban community was not desirable in any organized rural group.¹⁰⁸

While W. C. Good promoted the agricultural unity, he warned farmers to

organize not only in our own interests, but in the interests of all other classes as well, because it is detrimental to the interests of the whole country that injustice now prevailing should continue to prevail.... I would not like to see this organization take an exclusively class form.... There is always danger of the people of one class becoming too oblivious of the rights and interest of people of other classes. We must keep carefully in view the fact that our organization should be not aggressive but defensive.¹⁰⁹

Remembering the Patrons' downfall, The Farming World blamed it on a too narrow appeal. "There can," warned the editor, "be no objection to farmers organizing for their mutual benefit and interest. In doing so, however, they should not place themselves in antagonistic relations to the other interests in the country.... There should be more co-operation between the farmers as a class and the other sections of the community.... More, we think, will be gained by working along this line than by any organization conceived in an antagonistic spirit to other classes."¹¹⁰

Despite their divergence about class restrictions on the farm movement, all agreed on the remarkable growth of farm militancy in the period from 1900 to 1914. The accomplishments of the aroused farmers from 1900 to 1907 included the ability to drain freely across railroad lands, and a farmer was compensated for any of his animals killed on the railroad tracks. The government had set up the railroad commission, and railroads in Ontario were now subject to some degree of taxation. These, including the most important, the arrest of manufacturers' efforts to raise customs taxation, could be attributed to the increased militancy and organization of the rural population. Organizations put pressure more on their representatives in the House of Commons.¹¹¹ To the militants the expansion of these rural 'combines' was "one of the most hopeful signs that has occurred in connection with the public affairs of Canada in a generation."¹¹²

Despite some successes, they believed, agriculturists should not rest on their laurels. If they did not organize further and gain other reforms, their achievements would be jeopardized. They would have little hope of gaining access to foreign markets under conditions of equality.¹¹³ No one could obtain a square deal economically unless he agitated. Only through organization, farmers were told, could they obtain an economically just settlement of their disputes with industry over the tariff; only such a settlement could increase returns from agriculture enough to induce the young people to remain on their parents' farms.¹¹⁴ Increased agitation provided the sole means of forcing the transport companies to lower their charges. One M. P. told rural inhabitants that his post-election mail included few letters from farmers. Therefore, they had only themselves to blame if he ignored their interests.¹¹⁵ Disillusioned farmers still felt that "no matter how they protest against an increase in the tariff, their opinions will not be respected."¹¹⁶

The rural population needed organizations at all levels. The larger organization, Dominion or Provincial in scope, had its place but "it does not get down to the ordinary farmer and reach him as he ought to be reached." The small organization, local in its nature, though allied with some larger movement, accomplished most.¹¹⁷ While the agricultural population of each province faced some different problems, the similarities outweighed the differences. A national organization was necessary to balance the national association of manufacturers. "In union there is strength,"¹¹⁸ was the motto. Nothing short of a national organization of farmers "truly representative in its character as well as wide in its membership" would be effective. Not until the farmers of the East and West united would agriculture "have the weight and influence in the councils of the nation that our numbers and importance deserve."¹¹⁹

Expanding the independent agricultural structures, believed the newspapers, was the best means of agitation available to the rural classes. The oldest of these associations still in operation at the end of the nineteenth century was the Dominion Grange or Patrons of Husbandry.¹²⁰ The journals, accordingly, supported the organization of more branch Granges.¹²¹ Another association of agriculturists, The Farmers' Association, formed under the aegis of Goldwin Smith and The Weekly Sun in 1902. Its handicap stemmed from its lack of appeal for the less militant members of the farm community, for although it was supposed to be non-political, much of the Patron of Industry 'element' backed it. Many farmers questioned whether its fate would differ from the old organization.¹²² The Patrons, after their auspicious beginning, suffered a complete and demoralizing loss of influence by 1900. Despite declarations of their abstention from active politics, the men involved in the Patron movement, including C. A. Mallory, former leader of the Patrons in the Ontario Legislature, played a large

role in founding the new organization.¹²³ The inaugural meeting reminded the community that agriculturists were "by far the most important element of the community [and] should have a voice in saying how legislation affecting their interests should be directed."¹²⁴ E. C. Drury remarked that "though never more than three or four hundred, its members were prominent farmers and it had an influence much greater than mere membership would indicate."¹²⁵

The Farmers' Association immediately began an active programme of agitation by sending a delegation to Ottawa as early as 1903 to present their views to the Government.¹²⁶ According to The Weekly Sun, the aims of this movement attracted many rural people and it spread rapidly across the province.¹²⁷ Many prominent political figures attended its meetings.¹²⁸ Its programme included issues which economically most concerned the farmers (cessation of bonuses, equalization of taxation, fair freight rates and no increase in the tariff).

Organizational expansion would be useless unless farmers presented a united front to the 'Interests'. Union of the farm groups, accordingly, became a further ideal of the rural press.¹²⁹ Slowly until 1914 the farm organizations of Ontario united as the internal squabbling of the preceding years ceased and "young men with education and breadth of mind...allied themselves with men of wider experience in order that Canada's rural population may receive greater consideration at the hands of those in power."¹³⁰ 'A community of interest' was developing.¹³¹ The rural community ought, believed the leaders of The Grange, to free itself from the clutches of the government-sponsored institutions, the Farmers' Institutes and Farmers' Clubs, which stifled freedom of action.¹³² As for the various professional organizations, E. C. Drury remarked that

true we have breeders organizations of various sorts, fruit growers organizations and various other bodies more or less closely identified with agriculture, but these do not in any sense represent the great agricultural interests of the province. Indeed sometimes their interests may be at variance with those of the general farming community.

At their best they were only partially representative.¹³³

This state of affairs could not be satisfactory to the more militant group. To them, "it was unfortunate that so many various local farmers' organizations had no bond of union. The plan naturally suggested itself, therefore, of consolidating all the various local associations by forming a new central organization."¹³⁴ The Dominion Grange took the lead in forming this new association. The United Farmers of Ontario. The founding convention included representatives from the Farmers' Clubs, Fruit Growers' Associations, Poultry Circles, Seed-Growers' Associations, Dairy Companies, Farmers' Marketing Companies, Vegetable Growers, Breeders' Clubs and Branch Granges.¹³⁵ The prospects, according to an optimistic editorial in Farm and Dairy were that "within two to three years, 15,000 to 20,000 farmers in Ontario will be united...."¹³⁶ E. C. Drury pointed out that the United Farmers of Ontario which federated all the local farmers' organizations into a really effective body, had a greater influence than the Grain Growers' Associations in the West.¹³⁷ U. F. O. affiliation with western groups united all Canadian farmers in the Canadian Council of Agriculture, which was set up in 1910.¹³⁸ The 1910 march on Ottawa signalled to the Canadian agriculturist that "the farmers of Canada are uniting. We are entering upon a new era. At last we have come together."¹³⁹

Many believed that truly effective reform action would have to be taken directly in the political arena. They advocated participation to increase electoral representation of the farming class at the provincial and federal levels of government. As for depopulation, one militant wrote that

I cannot help thinking that the best remedy and the greatest help to the farmer can come through the farmers themselves in electing more farmers to parliament, and by the farmers who are already there taking a stand less for party and more for the country's good. It does seem as if there is too much bolstering up, and not enough manliness working out our parts in the nation's growth. 140

Many believed depopulation resulted from financial institutions' control over the whole population through the political system. Some farmers' organizations aimed at creating an "informed and enlightened public opinion among the farmers which would make itself felt through the existing political parties...."¹⁴¹ Once this opinion had been created, agriculturists would see that the Members were sent to Parliament to do what 'the people' wanted, instead of lending their services to the corporations and to private interests for profit.¹⁴² The movement for farm organization, therefore, aimed at achieving its ends by lobbying and by attempting to wrest control of the political system from the present bosses.¹⁴³

Statistics told the newspaper readers that, although countrymen made up over sixty per cent of the population of Canada, the representatives of the farming profession formed less than fifteen per cent of the Members of Parliament.¹⁴⁴ The farmers had only themselves to blame for the existence of this state of affairs. Few rural ridings did not produce local men qualified to take on the job of an M.P. They were "unschooled in pleasing rhetoric and fawning metaphor," and "their daily association with nature and their first hand information with all the divisions of labour crowded into one have not made them good wire-pullers." On the other hand, "they are more ready to grant the same charity of views to all men which they possess and perhaps trust too much to others." This tolerance resulted in city lawyers carrying agriculturists' views to the centres of legislation. This was a

disappointment to those "who look for the upholding of the farm interests in Parliament for no man can represent farmers like one of themselves."¹⁴⁵ Because the proportion of farmers in the Senate was even lower than in the Commons, (2 out of 90 members), rural journals advocated either the abolition of the Senate or appointment of men other than party stalwarts.¹⁴⁶ The Senate's capability would be vastly increased by the presence of men of judgement and experience who, actively identified with agriculture, were qualified to shape legislation affecting its interests.¹⁴⁷ Farmer M.P.'s and Senators were not members of the group of politicians, Cabinet members and judges who had "little hesitation in accepting positions of emolument on the board of management of corporations...."¹⁴⁸ Despite proof that farmers possessed "greater capacity for honest and economical government than men of other classes," they did not achieve high political positions if they were directly associated with agriculture.¹⁴⁹

To change this situation, Parliamentary practice ought to be taught at the agricultural colleges, and farmers should be "drilled in conducting meetings and acting as chairmen and thus posted in the rules of order." The young farmer thus educated "is enabled to preside with dignity and does not have to step aside for members of the learned professions on the ground of their being better qualified for such work."¹⁵⁰ Journal articles with such titles as "The Farmer on the Platform" briefed countrymen on public speaking and encouraged them to express their views on the platform.¹⁵¹ The Farmer's Advocate remarked that "if farmers desire more Members, they must prepare them and elect them.... It is the business of the farmer to get into this political game and to play it fair, and see that the other fellow does not win with a cold deck of cards."¹⁵²

The rural opinion-makers agreed on the desirability of a greater degree of rural participation in politics but they reached no accord in

deciding whether this extension of action should be independent or within existing political parties. One group unhesitatingly recommended that farmers liberate themselves from the political system which stifled efforts to give them justice. Complaints that farmers, tied to the Liberals and Conservatives, would never obtain favourable legislation filled The Weekly Sun. Some party politicians, such as H. J. Pettypiece, a Liberal M.L.A., told farmers they would not achieve their economic reforms if they continued to divide along party lines.¹⁵³ Tariff reform, numerous articles emphasized, would not be gained while farmers "allowed ourselves to be led around through our slavery to party politics."¹⁵⁴ There was no essential difference between the parties on basic reform measures. Declaring its political neutrality, The Sun explained that "we can hardly see anything to choose between the two shibboleths. We look in vain in the speeches and manifestoes for any real difference of principle."¹⁵⁵

Instead of looking to the established political parties for redress, farmers had to learn to depend on their own efforts.¹⁵⁶ For the militants, a beneficial result of the tariff dispute in 1911 was its disruption of the established system. They hoped that it would cause "electors, for once to cease adherence to certain groups merely because they were born into them..."¹⁵⁷ Some of this group hoped to establish an independent agricultural party to force the Liberals and Conservatives to end their double talk. A reader urged The Sun to consider "whether if it is not the most prudent course to declare itself in favor of a New People's Party to save the producers and workers from being further plunged into misery, poverty and crime."¹⁵⁸ The 1911 election dashed the hopes of The Farmer's Advocate for it seemed to prove agriculturists possessed a "blind unreasoning loyalty" which followed the lead of their party newspapers instead of heeding the sound advice of independent publications. Voters were at sea

about issues "until their favourite newspaper has declared its stand.... Meanwhile, hope of better government lies in more true independence of thought and action.... Partisans neutralize each others' votes. The genuine incorruptible and independent element is the one that statesmen have to cater to..."¹⁵⁹ The papers used the results of the 1911 election as an object lesson to prove that the manufacturers and other combines were not allowing partyism to have any effect on their ballots. "These men are voting as their pocket interests dictate," the journals believed, "Do farmers propose to farm the only class that can be moved by appeals to party prejudice? Do farmers propose to allow themselves to be hoodwinked by partizan appeals into voting against something that will be in their own interest?"¹⁶⁰

The pro-reciprocity group generally supported extending independent agricultural political action; those with reservations about tariff reform did not fully endorse the politicization of agriculture. One letter noted that the Grange "had been allowed to go down" and blamed the organization's political stands.¹⁶¹ The second group believed farmers' organizations ought to help the agriculturist progress politically but should stay away from direct political action themselves. If farmers stopped allowing the old parties to use them and forgot the impractical schemes to set up a new party, they could organize within the existing political framework and take over control of the older parties.¹⁶² Another rationale for agriculturists abstaining from political action held that "rightly or wrongly, there has grown up under British institutions a system of parliamentary government which involves the establishment of two great political parties The success...has depended almost absolutely upon the organization and establishment of two great political parties.... The principle is there and the constitution is based on that principle."¹⁶³

(iii)

The radicals' push into politics showed how dangerous to established parties agitation over depopulation could become if this group became the major influence on rural opinion. Concern over discrimination by the system of distribution accompanied their resentment of urban economic dominance as the economic dislocation provided the impetus for the rural population's investigation of their economic relations with urban industry in efforts to discover the roots of 'The Problem.' This questioning led to discoveries of the extent to which the concentration of urban economic power allowed trusts unrestrainedly to siphon off the wealth of the agricultural population. Urban control of the legislative system resulted in tariffs and bounties to industry and handicapped the farmers. Lopsided land taxation gave speculators sway over rents and raised consumer prices. Railroad monopolies increased transportation costs at the producers' expense. Unions' labour monopoly increased urban wages and hampered agricultural efficiency. Possessors of all these economic benefits, it was not surprising cities attracted increasing numbers from the farms.

The radicals put forward schemes to redress each of these economic complaints. They demanded that labour and industry cease taking advantage of agriculture. Abolition of tariffs, reformed land taxation, regulation of the railroad monopoly, all received attention in the radical press. Some reforms occurred, but discrimination remained. Rural activists, taking urban industrial organizations as their models, promoted greater consolidation of rural interest groups. Not until farmers organized and consolidated would they have the power to remove economic grievances completely. Direct political participation, either by using existing political parties to elect more farmers or by creating a new farmers' party,

was one facet of the radicals' solution while another was consolidation of the Grange and the other farm organizations. The moderates stressed adapting agriculture politically, economically, and socially in efforts to manipulate the existing structures to their advantage, the Drury-Good faction proposals for reform challenged urban influence directly.

CONCLUSION

Throughout the industrializing areas of the world, concern for the fate of rural civilization grew as the changing urban-rural relationship placed the countryside on the defensive from 1900 to 1914. James Robertson, a Canadian Commissioner of Agriculture, could join with Sir Horace Plunkett, an Anglo-Irish civil servant and Gifford Pinchot, an American conservationist, in drafting a memorandum urging an international study of rural conditions. The first reason for the concern of these men was that "in the recent economic evolution of the English-speaking nations, the interests of the agricultural populations have been subordinated to the manufacturing and commercial interests of the towns; and that, in consequence life and work upon the land have been gravely prejudiced...."¹

In Ontario, domination of agriculture by the towns assumed three guises: concentration of the economic power of industry, homogenization of life-styles by technology, and agglomeration of the population. Although each of these was equally important, the rural reaction to all focussed on the most obvious of the three, depopulation of the countryside. Nurtured in a philosophy predicated on the belief that a nation's true welfare, social or economic, depended upon recognition of the supremacy of agriculture, the farmers were forced to face an eroding rural population.

Even initial dismay about depopulation was not a unanimous sentiment of the rural opinion-makers. Confronting an agricultural labour shortage and a collapse of many old rural institutions, the majority of the agriculturists evinced great concern. The press, church surveys and conferences, books, politicians' and farmers' speeches, all had their lengthy estimates of the number leaving agriculture and expressed general anxiety

over the unconfined social and economic nature of 'The Problem.' A minority of the farm opinion-leaders, however, minimized the need for alarm. Farmers, they believed, had to accept that in the evolution of the country, social and labour conditions changed. The depopulation of the rural areas of the province was only a stage in the country's advancement to which agriculture must adapt.

Proceeding from their general perception of the problem, the agricultural elite examined its specific effects. Both 'alarmists' and 'rationalists' reached the same conclusion from studying depopulation's results on the traditional rural social institutions. Downgrading the agrarian philosophy, threatening Canadian democracy and political morality, sapping the strength of the country school, church and family, depopulation posed an unmistakable challenge to the country life-style. To most, the uncertainty of the labour situation was as acute a problem as the social decline. It resulted in poorer methods, falling production and inefficiency. The rationalists, however, maintained their equanimity on this score. To them, the labour shortage by forcing mechanization, rationalizing production, and raising prices for farm produce, was a beneficial aspect of the falling population.

The search for solutions to depopulation did not breach the split between the agricultural opinion-makers. Farmers left the countryside, believed the 'adaptors,' because their belief in rural life had been undermined by family, press, school, and church. Instruments of their own destruction, these institutions had accepted urban norms and structures which they instilled in the rural population. From his youth, a country boy was indoctrinated with a materialistic point of view, which headed him towards the golden metropolis. Showing city life 'as it really was' and rural life as it could be, the evangelists of agrarianism propagandized to correct this pro-urban outlook. Reformed teacher and preacher

training to give the schools and churches a strong rural outlook would ensure the children's education taught an appreciation of country life. The more radical section of the agricultural elite accepted this analysis of the decline of the agrarian mythology and struggled to reverse the situation. They were not convinced, however, that these reforms would ultimately plug the leak from the countryside.

The reformers believed that hindering a pleasant rural social life need no longer drive countrymen to the towns. Urban technology gave the countryside its telephones, good roads, mail delivery, automobiles, trolleys, all of which brought countrymen the opportunity of increasing social interaction. Technological advances lightened the work load and increased the leisure time of all members of the farm family. Maintaining urban-style relations between the generations patched up many a farm family quarrel so that the sons remained on their father's farm. These solutions all found favour with the rationalists, while the more sceptical members of the rural elite remained unconvinced. The latter group could not accept the integration with, and takeover by urban life styles that these processes implied for the farm. Rural areas, they believed, must retain a rural identity by cultivating the old unique social organizations. Many doubted that any social solution could reverse depopulation.

Social reasons enticed, but economic drawbacks forced, the countrymen to the towns. The moderates thought farmers adapting urban technological advances could sufficiently increase returns to make farming a comparatively profitable 'business' operation. While they supported intensive farming, mechanization and better working conditions for hired help, the reform group would not rely on these reforms to increase profits adequately. For them, ideological reform and social or production adaptation could not correct the fundamental economic and distributional inequities

which herded the thousands cityward. Only urban exploitation of agriculture explained depopulation, believed Good, Drury, Smith and Cowan. Hammering on this theme, they tried to convince agriculturists of the injustices perpetrated, knowingly or not, by the whole urban population. Organized for exploitation, the corporations, land speculators and railroads implacably pressed their monopolistic, tariff and tax advantages to milk the countryman.

Despite the moderates' warning that Canada needed prosperous towns and their industries to advance, the reformers enthusiastically promoted their remedy for depopulation. Specific reforms to correct economic inequities could be most easily achieved if endorsed by the full weight of a universal farmers' organization. Farmers, in 1914, still composed more than sixty per cent of the Canadian and a little below fifty per cent of the Ontario population. Organized politically to elect men pledged to support their causes, they could wrest control of the legislative system from its corporate bosses. Free trade, the single tax and publicly-owned railroads, could be quickly established. Confrontation, not adaptation, was their aim.

The two outlooks, confrontation and adaptation, cropped up whenever countrymen considered the extending power of metropolitan centres. Evolution in either outlook is difficult to trace throughout the period. The radicalization of The Farmer's Advocate hints that a movement in favour of more drastic political action occurred after the 1911 election demonstrated the unanimity of urban hostility to rural aims. The strong case of The Canadian Countryman, set up in 1911, and The Farmer's Magazine in promoting adaptation as the best means of solving the problems of depopulation shows, however, that their point of view retained strong representatives among the rural elite.

Searching for a way to understand and to cope with their changing relationship with industrial urbanism, farm opinion maintained an equilibrium. Both points of view received the adherence of influential members of the agricultural elite and were strongly expounded before the mass of countrymen. The 1911 election demonstrated the strength of the 'adaptors' but the growth of the Grange and gradual unifying of rural organizations had behind it the force of the 'reformers.' Few unusual political, social or economic circumstances seriously threatened this balance from 1900 to 1914.

The latter year, however, witnessed two events of great portent which upset the balance between the two points of view and made depopulation into the prime issue of Ontario politics. The first of these occurrences, the formation of the United Farmers of Ontario, depended upon the second, the stresses of war, to create the situation in which the U.F.O. formed the government of the province. Depopulation and the labour shortage had been the great problems confronting pre-war Ontario rural society, but the vast numbers leaving the farms for the army and the urban munitions factories brought the simmering rural-urban conflict over this question to a crisis. The final direct challenge to Ontario agriculture, the institution of conscription in 1917 and the later cancellation of farmers' exemptions, placed the radical Good-Drury-Morrison group as leaders of the opinions of the vast majority of the province's agriculturists. The election of 1917, fought on the issue of patriotism and the Union Government's promise to exempt farmers from conscription, momentarily blunted farm and U.F.O. protests. Following the election, however, the cancellation of farmers' exemptions from conscription raised rural protest to unheard of heights. A monster delegation visited Ottawa to complain to Prime Minister Borden that agriculture, consistently short-changed, had

lost much population that it could no longer aid the war effort and avert a famine. Rural hostility towards urban critics of agriculture reached unexampled bitterness. The United Farmers of Ontario, propelled into politics by the widespread protest, finally won the 1919 provincial election on a platform stressing the need to stop the continuing decline of the countryside, and set the stage for efforts to gain economic justice for farmers.

NOTES

¹For the results of this seminar see: M. A. Tremblay and Walton J. Anderson, (eds.), Rural Canada in Transition, Ottawa: 1966.

In this book, a series of monographs, Donald R. Whyte's "Rural Canada in Transition," provides a useful foundation for a knowledge of the contemporary effect of urbanization on agriculture. Helen Abell's monograph, "The Social Consequences of the Modernization of Agriculture," discusses the impact of technology on agriculture, 1941-1961.

Another study, by the Saskatchewan Government's Royal Commission on Rural Life, was prepared in 1952 investigating the changing qualities of a country existence in that province. (Saskatchewan, Royal Commission on Agriculture and Country Life, Report, Regina: 1952-1956. See especially "Movement of Farm People.")

²Examples of these studies in Ontario include:

D. A. Bristow, "Agrarian Interest in the Politics of Ontario: A Study with Special Reference to the Period 1919-1949," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1950; J. D. Hoffman, "Farmer-Labour Government in Ontario," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1959; R. A. Farquharson, "The Rise and Fall of the U.F.O.," Saturday Night, (June 21, 1950); H. H. Hannam, Pulling Together for Twenty-five Years: A Brief Story of the Events and People in the United Farmers' Movement in Ontario During the Quarter Century, 1914-1939, Toronto: 1940; Jean Macleod, "The United Farmer Movement in Ontario, 1914-1943," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Queen's University: 1958; R. W. Trowbridge, "War-Time Discontent and the Rise of the United Farmers of Ontario," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Waterloo: 1966; L. A. Wood, A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada, Toronto: 1924; Norman Farrow, "Political Aspects of the United Farmer Movement in Ontario," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Western Ontario: 1938; M. H. Staples, The Challenge of Agriculture, Toronto: See also: V. C. Fowke, "An Introduction to Agricultural History," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, VIII, (1942); L. S. Grossman, "Safe Seats: The Rural-Urban Pattern in Ontario," Ibid., XXIX, (1963); B. D. Tennyson, "The Ontario Election of 1919," Journal of Canadian Studies, (1969); Richard Vanhoon, "The Political Thought of the United Farmers of Ontario," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Carleton University: 1965.

³There is still room for studies of individual leaders.

Autobiographies available include: W. C. Good, Farmer Citizen: My Fifty Years in the Canadian Farmers' Movement, Toronto: 1958; E. C. Drury, Farmer Premier, Toronto: 1968. A Thesis titled "The Philosophy and Ideas of W. C. Good, 1896-1956" is at present in preparation at Carleton University.

⁴See G. Elmore Reaman, A History of Agriculture in Ontario, Toronto: 1970 (2 vols.); Canada, Department of Agriculture, Canada, Agriculture, The First Hundred Years, (Historical Series #1), Ottawa: 1967.

⁵The best analysis of rural Canadian and Ontario social conditions emerged at the time. Written by Rev. John Macdougall, Rural Life in Canada, Toronto: 1913, explores the results, causes and solutions of rural difficulties. In the United States, Richard Hofstadter's The Age of Reform, New York: 1955, provides an overview of many social and philosophic roots of a comparable social movement. Unpublished American works on the same theme include: Betty C. Clutts., "Country Life Aspects of the Progressive Movement," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Ohio State University: 1962; Robert G. Comegys, "The Agrarian and Rural Tradition as Reflected in National Periodical Literature, 1919-1929," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Stanford University, 1958; Orin L. Keener, "The Background of the American Country Life Movement," Unpublished Ph.D. Thesis, Western Reserve University, 1956; William E. Weir, "The Homestead-Redlands Area: A Study of Agricultural-Urban Conflict," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Miami-Ohio University, 1964; Harold F. Wilson, "A Study in the Social History of Rural Northern New England," Ph.D. Thesis, Harvard University, 1933.

⁶Iain C. Taylor, "Components of Population Change, Ontario, 1850-1940," Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1967, p. 138. Urban growth amounted to 41.9% of the 1901 urban population or an increase of 392,511. See also Appendix D. A census monograph prepared for the Dominion Bureau of Statistics confirms this fact, indicating the rate of growth in Ontario cities has been:

1871-1881	40.0%
1881-1891	35.7%
1891-1901	13.3
1901-1911	41.3
1911-1921	30.5
1921-1931	20.8
1931-1941	12.9
1941-1951	17.9
1951-1961	24.6

(These figures are cited in Leroy O. Stone, Urban Development in Canada, Ottawa: 1968, p. 89.)

⁷ John Porter attempts to show the past decade has seen the greatest rural changes in the century, pointing out that the rural population has dropped from 20% to 11% of the population of Canada. Rural inhabitants left the countryside in an average number of 39,000 annually or over 340,000 in the decade of the 1950's. In the decades from 1900 to 1920, Ontario alone lost about 200,000 per decade. (John Porter, "Rural Decline," in W. E. Mann, (ed.), Canada: A Sociological Profile, Toronto: 1968, p. 20.)

⁸ N.S.B. Gras, a pioneer in the study of urbanization, saw the growth of a metropolis primarily as the concentration of economic functions and particularly financial corporations and financial institutions. The metropolis was the centre in which policies were shaped and from which they diffused out to smaller cities and the countryside. (See Donald Kerr, "Metropolitan Dominance in Canada," W. E. Mann, (ed.), Canada: A Sociological Profile, Toronto: 1968, p. 225.

⁹ Hope T. Eldridge argues that urbanization can only be defined as a process of population concentration, "since any other definition leads to ambiguity and other forms of intellectual distress." Her definition, while it satisfies the desire for concreteness and precision in isolating the physical aspects of urbanization, ignores the other half of the process which is concerned with the social changes involved. Despite the complication brought about by their use, both these latter aspects of urbanization are as important in the process as is the concentration of population. (See Hope Tisdale Eldridge, "The Process of Urbanization," in J. J. Spengler and O. D. Duncan, (eds.), Demographic Analysis, Glencoe: 1942.)

¹⁰ Donald R. Whyte, Rural Canada in Transition, in Marc-Adelard Tremblay and Walton J. Anderson, (eds.), Rural Canada in Transition Ottawa: 1966, p. 3.

¹¹ A. L. Bertrand, Rural Sociology: An Analysis of Contemporary Rural Life, Toronto: 1958, p. 415.

¹² Jacob Spelt, The Urban Development of South-Central Ontario, Assen: 1955, p. 142.

¹³ J. W. Watson, "Rural Depopulation in South West Ontario," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, XXXVI, (1947), p. 153.

¹⁴ Jacob Spelt, p. 142-143.

¹⁵ Farm and Dairy, July 10, 1913, p. 3. Letter from Amateur Economist. See also The Farmer's Magazine, April 1911, p. 128.

¹⁶ Iain Taylor, p. 56. This historical-demographic study proved most useful in gaining a reasonably accurate conception of the numbers involved.

¹⁷Ibid., p. 102. See also Appendix D for the figures of out-migration for the period from 1881 to 1921 and Appendix E for figures of absolute population declines or increases. A migrational increase or decline is calculated by subtracting the natural increase from the population change. An absolute population change was calculated by subtracting the deaths from the births and adding the migrational totals to the resulting figures. Taylor notes a distinct correlation between the date of settlement and the beginning of migration. The latter follows twenty years after the former. Sons of the original settlers could not all find farms in their home townships and had to seek their farms away from these.

¹⁸Ibid., p. 102.

¹⁹Ibid., p. 110.

²⁰Ibid., pp. 264-265. Areas showing growth were in Brant, Essex, Lincoln, Waterloo, Welland, Wentworth and York (See Appendix D). For urban increase during this period see Appendix F.

²¹See Appendix E.

²²This total was obtained by adding up the column of figures as it stands. If the northern districts, which were newly formed and whose population is not included in the 1881 or 1891 totals, are subtracted from the calculations, the total decline rises to 178,871. Further, when counties experiencing suburban and not rural growth are omitted from the calculations, the population drop again rises this time to 144,958. When we do not include either the north or the suburban counties, the final figure of 198,088 is obtained. (See Appendix D.)

²³Figures for migration to the West and the United States are as follows:

	<u>Net migration of Ontario born from the Province</u>	<u>Net migration of Ontario born to rest of Canada</u>	<u>Net migration of Ontario born to United States</u>
1881-1891	- 77,000	- 56,300	- 20,700
1891-1901	-105,000	- 54,700	- 50,300
1901-1911	-109,000	-153,300	+ 44,300
1911-1921	-131,000	- 33,600	- 97,400
1921-1931	-130,000	+ 14,500	-148,000
1931-1941	- 4,200	+ 27,600	- 31,800

(Minus signs indicate losses from Ontario)

Source: Iain Taylor, p. 52.

Note: In this chart, the most important figure of -153,300 gives the number of inhabitants leaving the province in the years 1900-1911. Some

of these people must have migrated from rural areas while others left the cities. There is no way of distinguishing the rural from the urban outmigrants. If two-thirds or 100,000 of the outmigrants left the province from rural areas, and since (according to Appendix D) 200,000 moved from rural areas during this decade, we can assume that at least 100,000 moved from rural areas to the cities of Ontario.

²⁴ These were Brant, Carleton, Essex, Lincoln, Ontario, Peel, Welland, Wentworth and York counties, (See Appendix D).

²⁵ If we follow the same procedures as in footnote 17 above, when the North is excluded the total rises to 60,904. When the suburbs are not included the total decline is 149,575 and when both North and suburbs are omitted, it is 154,202, (See Appendix D).

²⁶ Floyd S. Chalmers, A Gentleman of the Press, Toronto: 1969, pp. 180-181. This biography of John B. Maclean gives the story of the founding of The Farmer's Magazine. Colonel Maclean's interest went so far as signing editorials. The journal expanded rapidly for the first few years after its growth but folded up in 1921, perhaps due to its alienation of the farmers by its lack of militancy in the exciting years of the rural unrest, 1917-1919.

²⁷ It would seem that the Deputy Minister of Agriculture expanded his interests beyond his job with the government. He had a vested interest in industrial expansion which could predispose him towards the interests of railroads in particular. (See P.A.C. George P. Graham Papers, C. C. James to George Graham, May 13, 1909.) James urged Graham to allow a private power company use of a falls to supply the Cobourg, Port Hope and Havelock Electric Railroad with power. The expansion of this railroad would, he believed, give business to the Cobourg car shops, of which he was a director. By reason of their training other high civil servants in the Departments of Agriculture in both Toronto and Ottawa had little natural sympathy for agriculture. James' successor as deputy minister in Toronto was W. B. Roadhouse, a journalist, while the Federal deputy was George O'Halloran, a lawyer. Both these appointments had been deplored in the militant rural journals, which wanted real 'sons of the farm' as the chief directors of the departments.

²⁸ See Elizabeth Wallace, Goldwin Smith: Victorian Liberal, Toronto: 1957, pp. 122-126 for Smith's contribution to The Weekly Sun. Smith perhaps supported the farmers in the hope that they would reciprocate by pushing his more purely ideological interest in free trade. His weekly contribution to his paper in "The Bystander" columns made little direct reference to agricultural interests. It was usually devoted to convincing agriculturists of Smith's position on world or Canadian affairs.

29

For various explanations of the contradictions in agrarian mythology see R. H. Abbott, "The Agricultural Press Views The Yeoman," Agricultural History, XL, 1, (January, 1968), p. 36. Abbott argues that "The insistence with which the farm journals in the U. S. A. discussed the myth seemed to be directly proportional to the degree to which it was rejected by those for whom it was intended." Another interpretation of this same attitude (Margaret L. Woodward, "The Northwestern Farmer, 1868-1876: A Tale of Paradox," Agricultural History, XXXVII, 3, (July, 1963), p. 134 ff.) notes the ambivalent position of the farmer as he was pictured in the agricultural journals between "legend and fact," "culture and rusticity," and "pastoral visions and economic realities." These two interpretations can both be explained by the growing place of the metropolis in the rural life. As the cities increased their control over rural life, the farmers asserted the old agrarian mythology in order to preserve a remnant of their old rural identity. The farmer was forced both to adapt (hence the economic realism) and to fight (hence the growing agrarian visions).

CHAPTER II

NOTES

¹George V. Haythorne, "Agricultural Manpower," The Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, IX, 3, (August, 1943), p. 366.

²G. V. Haythorne, Labor in Canadian Agriculture, Cambridge, Mass.: 1960, p. 43. His classification of the factors affecting labor in agriculture are as follows:

Classification	Demand	Supply	Demand & Supply
Economic:			Income Wages
	Land Other Capital Credit		
Social:			Attitude toward farming
		Birth rate Longevity Immigration	
Economic and Social:			Working conditions Housing Social security Education Recreation

³The Weekly Sun, March 29, 1911, p. 1. This figure came from the Ontario Bureau of Industries Report, 1909.

⁴Ibid., August 16, 1911, p. 1.

⁵Ibid., March 27, 1912, p. 1. See also Ibid., October 25, 1911, p. 1. for another statistical comment on the 1911 census.

⁶W. A. Craik, "Industrial Development: How it Helps the Farmer," The Canadian Countryman, III, 15, (April 11, 1914), p. 9. He provides estimates of the various township declines.

⁷The Farmer's Advocate, March 26, 1914, p. 591. The Advocate published a letter using various bureau of Industries statistics.

⁸Farm and Dairy, October 26, 1911, p. 110. This paper cites a decline of from 80,000 to 100,000 in the previous decade.

⁹The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XVI, 1, (October, 1903), p. 23. The editors estimate the decline in population from 1893 to 1903 at 35,538.

¹⁰W. L. Smith, "Overcrowding in the Cities," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1914, p. 44. Using Bureau of Industries' statistics, he estimates the decline at 45,000 from 1900 to 1911 and includes estimates from individual townships such as 638 in Tuckersmith (Huron Co.) and 937 in Innisfil (Simcoe Co.).

¹¹The Weekly Sun, March 20, 1912, p. 1.

¹²Methodist Church, (Canada), Department of Temperance and Moral Reform, Report of a Rural Survey of Agricultural, Educational, Social and Religious Life. Toronto: December-January, 1913-1914, p. 7. See also Rev. S. F. Sharp, "The Church and the Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914, p. 143ff.

¹³John Macdougall, Rural Life in Canada, Toronto: 1913, p. 27. The estimate was computed from a decline of 52,184 shown in the 1911 census. He subtracted the New Ontario (northern) increase thereby increasing the depopulation figure to 97,124 and then the suburban growth (12,545) again increasing the figure to 109,069. To this he added the natural increase of 200,183 and an estimated figure for foreign immigration (121,200) to obtain his final total. A full page story on his findings was published in Farm and Dairy, October 30, 1913, p. 3 and a summary can be found in Rev. John Macdougall, "The Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report, p. 147ff.

¹⁴For examples see: R. A. Finn, "A Township Survey Re: Agricultural Education," unpublished B.S.A. thesis, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph: 1915, p. 9. He gives figures showing a decline in the Township of Percy, Northumberland County, in the years from 1876 to 1912. George Wilson, "An Agricultural Survey of Halton County," unpublished E.S.A. thesis, Guelph: 1913, p. 40. This thesis gives a detailed summary of population figures for Halton County. H. R. Hare, "Agricultural Survey of Mariposa Township in Victoria County," unpublished B.S.A. thesis, Guelph: 1914, p. 12, notes that emigration has been outward so that the 1914 population of this township was 16% lower than that of 43 years previously. C. E. Lindsay, "A Study of Rural Migration in a Typical Ontario Township," unpublished B.S.A. thesis, Guelph: 1914.

¹⁵S. H. Hopkins, "Rural Depopulation in Ontario," unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, Guelph: 1914, cites a rural decline of 52,184 from 1901 to 1911 compared to urban increase of 392,511.
H. A. Cole, "Rural Depopulation in Ontario," unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, Guelph: 1922.

¹⁶The Weekly Sun, November 23, 1910, p. 1. For similar observations on the 1901 census see The Farming World, September 3, 1901, p. 189.

¹⁷P.A.C., W. C. Good Papers, vol. 18, f. 12190, December 20, 1913. This was a MSS copy of Good's Presidential Address. See also W. C. Good, Farmer Citizen, Toronto: 1958, p. 95.

¹⁸Report of E. C. Drury to the Dominion Grange 1908, (The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1841).

¹⁹See Appendix B for the circulation of the various reports.

²⁰The Weekly Sun, February 16, 1910, p. 12; and also C. C. James, "Address," Tenth Annual Report of the Agricultural Societies of Ontario, 1910, p. 51; Farm and Dairy, May 5, 1910, p. 17 where James cites a figure of 63,000.

²¹General Reform Association for Ontario, Address to the Electors Issued by Mr. N. W. Rowell, K. C., Toronto: 1911, pp. 4-5.

²²General Reform Association for Ontario, Liberal Party Handbook, Toronto: 1911, p. 10. This section dealing with agriculture cites a decline of 638 in Tuckersmith Township and 1000 in Innisfil Township in Minister of Agriculture James Duff's county.

²³M. S. Schell, The Farmer's View, n.p: 1911.

²⁴The Toronto Globe, March 23, 1913, cited in B. D. Tennyson, "The Political Career of Sir W. H. Hearst," unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1963, p. 69.

²⁵Farm and Dairy, February 24, 1914, p. 14. E. C. Drury's submission to Borden when the farmers visited Ottawa in December, 1913.

²⁶The Weekly Sun, March 13, 1912, p. 1.

²⁷Ibid.

²⁸The Weekly Sun, January 23, 1903, p. 7. This contains a story reprinted from The World's Work setting out detailed statistics of the rural population decline for two decades in the United States.

²⁹The Farmer's Advocate, May 16, 1912, p. 15. See also Farm and Dairy, August 8, 1912, p. 10, for another story on depopulation in France.

³⁰The Farming World, August 14, 1900, pp. 1184-1185. Report of a speech made by Rider Haggard on the condition of English agriculture.

³¹The Farmer's Advocate, March 26, 1914, p. 591.

³²Farm and Dairy, May 5, 1910, p. 17.

³³The Farmer's Advocate, November 30, 1911, p. 1933.

³⁴E C. Drury, Farmer Premier, p. 24. See also The Farming World, August 27, 1901, p. 189.

³⁵W. J. Black, "The Labor Problem," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XII, 4, (January, 1901), p. 12.

³⁶The Weekly Sun, October 11, 1905, p. 6. See also General Reform Association, New Measures and a New Deal, n.p.: 1911. This pamphlet backed the demand for a Royal Commission.

³⁷The Farmer's Advocate, November 15, 1902, p. 830. This irate comment was made by Mrs. Rodd in a letter she sent to the paper.

³⁸The Weekly Sun, October 8, 1902, p. 4. For similar statements see also Ibid., January 1, 1902, p. 2; The Farming World, December 1, 1903, p. 843.

³⁹The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4, a letter from Andrew Elliot. See also The Farming World, March 18, 1902, p. 255.

⁴⁰Farm and Dairy, October 30, 1913, p. 3.

⁴¹The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4; and also The Farming World, February 2, 1903, p. 4.

⁴²For example, in The Farming World, March 15, 1906, p. 197, the editors remarked that "the situation this season, however, does not appear to be as serious as on some former occasions." This was according to the Ontario Provincial Government. According to the newspaper, the demand by farmers for immigrant labour may have decreased due to the fact that the Dominion Government had set up an agency to supply workers which supplemented the efforts of the Provincial Government and the Salvation Army.

⁴³In 1907, the Ontario Government's Colonization Bureau reported 2,900 applications for labour of which 1,700 were unfilled months later, despite the fact that 22,000 immigrants had arrived. (The Weekly Sun, June 5, 1907, p. 7.)

⁴⁴The Weekly Sun, June 1, 1904, p. 1.

⁴⁵The Canadian Farm, January 5, 1912, p. 1.

⁴⁶The Farmer's Magazine IV, 3, (July, 1912), p. 13. For similar statements see also The Farmer's Advocate, July 25, 1912, p. 1319; and Ibid., April 25, 1912, p. 733, and C.E.M., "The Labor Problem." The O.A.C. Review, XXV, 9, (June, 1913), p. 451.

⁴⁷For examples see The Weekly Sun, May 22, 1912, p. 6, for reports from Oxford, Waterloo, Halton, Simcoe, Elgin, Ontario, Dundas, Wellington and Perth all reporting the same difficulties in obtaining labour. See also Ibid., May 29, 1912, p. 6 and Farm and Dairy, May 29, 1913, p. 7 for comments from Norfolk, Oxford, and York Counties.

⁴⁸The Farmer's Advocate, January 1, 1900, p. 15. James McMillan spoke on the labour shortage to farmers in Carleton County.

⁴⁹The Farming World, February 16, 1903, p. 39.

⁵⁰For example, Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, 1914, Toronto: 1915. For individual convention speeches see The Farmer's Advocate, March 20, 1913, p. 519, for a speech of J. B. Reynolds at the farmer's institute at Glencoe, or Farm and Dairy, August 14, 1913, p. 17 for Reynolds at the Lanark County Cheesemakers' meeting; or Ibid., November 21, 1912, p. 15 for the report of speeches of Superintendent Putnam and the Assistant Deputy Minister of Agriculture, C. F. Bailey at the Farmer's Institutes Convention; or The Weekly Sun, January 7, 1914, p. 5 for E. C. Drury's speech at a meeting with the farmers' representatives of Western Canada at Barrie.

⁵¹The Farmer's Advocate, October 10, 1907, p.

⁵²The Farming World, June 1, 1903, p. 432.

⁵³The Farmer's Advocate, January 10, 1907, p. 69. This contained the Salvation Army Hired Help Application form published by Brigadier Thomas Howell, Secretary for Immigration.

⁵⁴Advertisements were published in the rural weeklies advertising the available help of the Colonization Branch run by Thomas Southworth.

⁵⁵The Agricultural Gazette published as a section in The Farming World, by the Livestock Associations included a Farm Help Exchange column as part of its features. This continued for the five years following 1900. See also, the advertisement for the "Boys Farmer League," (Farmer's Advocate, March 20, 1913, p. 559), and Curard's Immigration Department (Ibid., April 3, 1913, p. 615).

⁵⁶Examples of articles written on this subject include: Edward Drier, "Keeping the Boy on the Farm," The Canadian Countryman, III, 16, (April, 1914), p. 13; J.H.S. Johnstone, "Educating the Farmers' Sons," The Canadian Farm, December 3, 1909; E. C. Drury, "The Social Position of the Farmer," The Ontario Agricultural College XX, 4, (January, 1900); Ronald Macdonald, "Social Life in Rural Districts," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXII, 8, (May, 1910); J. B. Reynolds, "The Rural Problem," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXV, 10, (July, 1913).

⁵⁷Examples of speeches made with variations on this title include: John Campbell, "Why the Young Man Should Stay on the Farm," Report of the Farmer's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1909, Part I, in Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, 1909, Toronto: 1910, vol. I, (This speech also appeared as an article in The Farmer's Advocate, December 9, 1909, p. 1927); Dr. G. C. Creelman, "The Farmer and the Farmer's Son," Third Annual Report of the Ontario Corn Growers' Association, 1910, in Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, 1910, Toronto: 1911, vol. II; Dr. G. C. Creelman, "Some Rural Problems," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1913, in The Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, 1913, Toronto: 1914, vol. I; Hon. J. S. Duff, "Improving Farm Life," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1908; Hon. J. S. Duff, "Necessity of Cultivating the Social Side of Life on a Farm" Report of the Farmer's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1902-1903, Part I; Member, North Grey Women's Institute, "Our Boys, How Shall we Educate and Influence them so as to Keep them on the Farm," Report of the Farmer's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1901, Part II, Women's Institutes.

⁵⁸Farm and Dairy, October 30, 1913, p. 3.

⁵⁹Ibid.

⁶⁰Farm and Dairy ran a heavily enclosed black print insert for several weeks on the front page asking "Why Young People Leave the Farm - Have You a Remedy to Suggest?" For an example see the issue of July 10, 1913, p. 3.

⁶¹Rev. John Macdougall, Rural Life in Canada, Toronto: 1913, see Preface.

⁶²E. C. Drury, "The Problem of the Country," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914. (See also Report in Farm and Dairy, March 12, 1914, p. 3.)

⁶³Rev. John Macdougall, "The Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report.

⁶⁴Rev. S. F. Sharp, "The Church and the Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report.

⁶⁵Rev. Hugh Dobson, "The School and the Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report.

⁶⁶Alphonse Desjardins, "Co-operation Among Farmers," The Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report.

⁶⁷Professor J. B. Reynolds, "The Department of Agriculture," The Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report.

⁶⁸Farm and Dairy, July 23, 1914, p. 3. This contains a full page story by editor, F. E. Ellis, on the subject of the findings of the Huron Survey.

⁶⁹Methodist Church, (Canada), Huron Survey Report, p. 24. The topics included: "What is the Rural Problem," "Where have People Gone, Why Do They Leave," and "How to Keep them on the Farm,"

⁷⁰These stories appeared mainly in The Farmer's Magazine and The Canadian Countryman

⁷¹Tom E. Dobbin, "Finding Their Level," The Farmer's Magazine, June, 1914, p. 8.

⁷²James Mark, "Holding Our Own," The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1913) p. 17; for a non-farm expression of the same attitude see, S. A. Cudmore, "Rural Depopulation in Southern Ontario," Royal Canadian Institute, IX, n.p.

⁷³The Farmer's Advocate, November 2, 1913, p. 982.

⁷⁴The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1912, p. 60. This was James' contribution to a symposium on farm labour comprising short articles from various civil servants and farm leaders.

⁷⁵C. C. James, "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1909, p. 40.

CHAPTER III

NOTES

¹James Mark, "Holding Our Own," The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 17. See also The Farmer's Advocate, July 30, 1914, p. 1381; Ibid., April 9, 1908, p. 653; The Canadian Farm, December 29, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., September 24, 1909, p. 1.

²The Farmer's Advocate, January 22, 1914, p. 129.

³Ibid., February 23, 1911, p. 306.

⁴John Campbell, "Why Young Men Should Stay on the Farm," The Farmer's Advocate, December 9, 1909, p. 1922.

⁵The Farmer's Advocate, September 5, 1907, p. 1405. See also Rev. John Macdougall, p. 42.

⁶W. L. Smith, "Overcrowding in the Cities," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 44.

⁷J. Kerr Abbott, "Will Democracy Dwindle," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXVI, 4, (January, 1914), p. 225.

⁸The Weekly Sun, November 2, 1904, p. 1.

⁹The Farmer's Advocate, June 23, 1910, p. 1018; William Banks Jr., "Millions," The Farmer's Magazine, August, 1911, p. 80ff.

¹⁰The Weekly Sun, May 3, 1911, p. 1.

¹¹The Farmer's Magazine, December 1911, p. 47, See also Abbott, The O.A.C. Review, p. 224.

¹²The Weekly Sun, February 17, 1909, p. 6. See also The Farmer's Advocate, July 30, 1908, p. 1214; The Weekly Sun, October 11, 1905, p. 6. The Farmer's Advocate, February 5, 1914, p. 218, Letter from C. L. Vincent.

¹³Farm and Dairy, March 27, 1913, p. 18. See also Ibid., April 10, 1913, p. 32, letter from Mrs. W. J. Root, Bruce Co.; and P.A.C., Good Papers, vol. 10, f. 12189, December 20, 1913, speech made to Grange.

¹⁴The Weekly Sun, February 17, 1909, p. 6. Resolution introduced by A. J. Russell.

¹⁵Ibid., July 17, 1907, p. 1; Ibid., June 7, 1911; The Canadian Farm, March 1, 1912, p. 1. The Sun reported that Huron would lose one member and Toronto would gain 15.

¹⁶The Weekly Sun, April 22, 1908, p. 1, remarked that Toronto, Stratford, Chatham, Brantford, Galt, were examples of cities that dominated their contiguous rural ridings.

¹⁷Ibid., October 25, 1911, p. 1.

¹⁸Ibid., October 18, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., December 27, 1911, p. 1.

¹⁹Watson, Annals, p. 152.

²⁰John Macdougall, pp. 37-38. He gives figures for various counties; among them Lennox and Addington lost 366 houses (-6.16%); East Huron 310, North Lanark 265, Grenville 352 (-9.17%). Some townships registered larger losses; for example East Zorra, -13.6%; Madoc, -13.7%; Ashfield, -15%; Glenelg, -19.8% and Barrie, -25.4% or Morris, -25.5%. The highest percentage drop was in Sarawak Twp., Grey County, which lost 45.8% of its homes.

²¹Farm and Dairy, May 7, 1914, p. 20. Letter from 'Cousin Frank.' See also E. C. Drury, Farmer Premier, p. 25 for a description of social life around Barrie in the 1880's and 1890's.

²²The Social Service Council of Canada, Report, p. 148.

²³Cumming, B.S.A. Thesis, Ontario Agricultural College, p. 19.

²⁴Farm and Dairy, November 21, 1912, p. 15. Speech of Superintendent Putnam at the Convention of Farmer's Institutes and Farmer's Clubs at Toronto, See also Cumming p. 33.

²⁵P.A.C., Good Papers, vol. 10, f. 12192, December 20, 1913, MSS of Presidential Address to the Grange. See also Farmer Citizen and J. B. Reynolds, "The Rural Problem," The O.A.C. Review, XXV, 10, (July, 1913), p. 526.

²⁶The Weekly Sun, April 3, 1912, p. 1; Ibid., March 1, 1911, p. 1.

²⁷The Farmer's Advocate, March 15, 1906, p. 405. Letter from John Campbell, Victoria Co.

²⁸In Percy Twp., Northumberland County, the average rural attendance was 18 compared to the average school capacity of 30. (Finn, B.S.A. Thesis, p. 15).

²⁹Ibid., See also The Huron Survey, p. 40, which gives figures of rural school attendance of 16,500 in Huron Co. in 1881 and only 6,818 in 1913. This was a 58.7% decline.

³⁰The Farmer's Advocate, April 15, 1903, p. 364.

³¹The Huron Survey (p. 40) reported only 6 teachers had first class certificates while 20 had no qualifications at all, out of a total teaching staff of 196 in Huron County. Finn, B.S.A., p. 15 gives an average salary of \$493 for Percy Township.

³²The Farmer's Magazine, December 1911, p. 15; The Huron Survey, p. 40.

³³The Canadian Countyman, II, 37, (September 13, 1913), p. 14.

³⁴Finn, B.S.A. Thesis, p. 15.

³⁵The Huron Survey, p. 42ff.

³⁶Albert H. Leake, "Consolidation of Rural Schools," The Farming World and Canadian Farm and Home, January 1, 1903, p. 17. He was inspector of technical education for the Province of Ontario.

³⁷J. W. Hotson, "Rural Education," The O.A.C. Review, XVII, 5, (February, 1905), p. 270; Richard Lees, "More Money for Rural Schools," Farm and Dairy, January 22, 1914, p. 3. He quotes figures of \$37.48 spent on each pupil in the city and only \$17.64 spent in the rural areas.

³⁸Rev. J. Macdougall, "Address," Social Service Council of Canada, Report, p. 148. He notes that the cost of educating a child through school was \$2000 per head and since 152,000 moved to the cities in the preceding decade, the cities gained \$500,000,000 worth of education from the rural areas.

³⁹Farm and Dairy, July 4, 1912, p. 19.

⁴⁰Rev. S. F. Sharp, "Address," Social Service Council of Canada, Report, p. 168.

⁴¹Farm and Dairy, January 16, 1913, p. 19. See also The Huron Survey, p. 11.

⁴²Farm and Dairy, January 16, 1913, p. 19, and The Farmer's Magazine, April 1911, p. 11.

⁴³The Huron Survey, p. 11.

⁴⁴Ibid., pp. 8-9. The decline in Huron County was as follows:

	<u>1871</u>	<u>1881</u>	<u>1891</u>
Anglicans	12,369	12,472	7,031
Baptists	1,369	1,954	723
Congregationalists	221	406	52
Lutherans	1,770	1,976	1,853
Methodists	21,810	25,683	18,199
Presbyterians	21,810	25,330	18,373
Roman Catholics	6,302	6,708	4,414

⁴⁵Ibid., p. 32. See also The Farmer's Advocate, November 25, 1909, p. 1850.

⁴⁶John Macdougall, (p. 38) describes how Edwardsburg Township lost one-fifth of its population but only one-eleventh of its families.

⁴⁷Finn, B.S.A. Thesis, p. 11.

⁴⁸Hopkins, B.S.A. Thesis, p. 26.

⁴⁹See John Macdougall, pp. 39-40. See also Finn, for the same situation with regard to Percy Twp. The Farmer's Advocate, May 30, 1912, p. 1003, notes Bruce Co. had 1,875 more men than women; Grey had a surplus of 1,719 and Welland 2,381. Urban North Toronto, on the other hand, could show 7,500 more women than men.

⁵⁰The Farmer's Advocate, October 5, 1905, p. 1396, letter from J. H. Burns, Perth Co. See also Ibid., October 19, 1905, pp. 1468-69 for two more letters.

⁵¹Ibid., November 16, 1905, p. 1614. Letter from "Bachelor."

⁵²The Weekly Sun, April 4, 1906, p. 2. Report by L. E. Annis of East York.

⁵³The Farming World, July 15, 1904, p. 515. See also The Weekly Sun, September 6, 1905, p. 2.

⁵⁴The Farmer's Advocate, August 4, 1910, p. 1255. Letter from the Secretary of the West Durham Farmer's Association.

⁵⁵Ibid., March 15, 1906, p. 405.

⁵⁶The Canadian Farm, June 17, 1910, p. 1; The Weekly Sun, April 12, 1905, p. 1; Ibid., April 4, 1906, p. 1; Ibid., May 11, 1904, p. 1; Ibid., November 8, 1905, p. 2; C. F. Hamilton, "Agriculture in Ontario," The Canadian Countryman, II, 32, p. 8; P.A.C., Good Papers, vol. 10, f. 12193, December 20, 1913.

⁵⁷A. Leitch, "The Farm Labor Problem," The O.A.C. Review, XIX, 1, (October, 1906), p. 47. See also C. F. Hamilton, "Agriculture in Ontario," p. 8; The Canadian Farm, December 1, 1911, p. 1.

⁵⁸The Weekly Sun, March 6, 1912, p. 1.

⁵⁹The Weekly Sun, February 18, 1903, p. 6.

⁶⁰Ibid., May 11, 1904, p. 1.

⁶¹The Canadian Farm, June 17, 1910, p. 1.

⁶²The Farmer's Advocate, March 15, 1906, p. 405.

⁶³The Farming World, July 15, 1904, p. 1. See also P.A.C., Good Papers, vol. 10, f. 12193, December 20, 1913.

⁶⁴Ibid., See also The Farming World, November 15, 1907, p. 1047.

⁶⁵C. Campbell, "Cuts in Crop Production Costs," The Canadian Countryman, II, 22, (May, 1913), p. 12. Quotes Professor Grisdale of O.A.C.

⁶⁶The Farmer's Advocate, August 4, 1910, p. 1255. Letter from the Secretary of the West Durham Farmer's Association.

⁶⁷Ibid., March 15, 1906, p. 405.

⁶⁸The Weekly Sun, November 29, 1905, p. 8. Speech of Thomas Brooks at the Brantford sitting of the Tariff Commission.

⁶⁹C. F. Hamilton, "Agriculture in Ontario," p. 8. Wages rose from \$5.15 per week to \$7.16 (plus \$2.01) in ten years. See also The Farmer's Advocate, July 31, 1913, p. 1326 for a citation of a minimum wage of \$25.00 per month instead of \$12.00. The Weekly Sun, April 25, 1905, p. 3 gives wages of \$100 plus board per year for an inexperienced man and \$200 for experience or \$300 for a married man. The Canadian Farm, February 17, 1911, p. 1 reported wages had risen to \$35.15 per month for a male and \$20.70 for a female from \$33.69 and \$19.08 the year previously.

⁷⁰The Farmer's Advocate, July 31, 1913, p. 1326.

⁷¹Ibid., January 19, 1911, p. 89. Letter from "Humane", Lambton Co.

⁷²Ibid., April 15, 1903, p. 359; or C. Campbell, "Cuts in Crop Production Costs," p. 12.

⁷³The Farmer's Advocate, March 2, 1911, p. 350; Ibid., January 22, 1914, p. 136; Farm and Dairy, had many such contests. In 1910 farm women were asked to send in their best labour-saving techniques and devices were mentioned in almost every 1911 issue.

⁷⁴The Farmer's Advocate, September 19, 1907, p. 1479.

⁷⁵Ibid., March 26, 1914, p. 591; The Weekly Sun, April 4, 1906, p. 1; Ibid., April 12, 1905, p. 1; Farm and Dairy, March 20, 1913, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, September 5, 1907, p. 1405.

⁷⁶Hon. James S. Duff, "Address," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1911-1912 Part I, p. 45 in Ontario, Department of Agriculture, Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario 1912, vol. 2, Toronto: King's Printer, 1913.

⁷⁷Farm and Dairy, May 16, 1912, p. 14.

⁷⁸The Weekly Sun, July 21, 1909, p. 3. The Canadian Farm, December 1, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., November 17, 1911, p. 1; Farm and Dairy, August 14, 1913, p. 17. (Report of a Speech by Professor Reynolds of O.A.C. at the Lanark County Cheesemakers). The Farmer's Advocate, April 28, 1910, p. 713; The Weekly Sun, March 6, 1912, p. 1.

⁷⁹The Weekly Sun, March 6, 1917, p. 1.

⁸⁰The Canadian Farm, December 11, 1911, p. 1. The Farmer's Advocate, August 27, 1914, p. 1525, Letter from 'Alpha.'

⁸¹The Farmer's Advocate, August 27, 1914, p. 1525, Letter from 'Alpha' Middlesex Co. See also Farm and Dairy, May 16, 1912, p. 14.

⁸²Farm and Dairy, June 19, 1913, p. 10.

⁸³The Weekly Sun, February 21, 1912, p. 1.

⁸⁴Farm and Dairy, June 19, 1913, p. 10.

⁸⁵The Weekly Sun, January 21, 1914, p. 1; The Canadian Countryman, II, 9, (March 1, 1913) p. 17 notes a price rise in binders from \$273 to \$300 in 1878. Further increases of \$115-125 in 1898 and \$125-135 in 1903 increased the prices still further.

⁸⁶Ibid.

⁸⁷Sydney Fisher, "Back to the Farm," Annual Reports of the Dairyman's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1907, p. 35.

CHAPTER IV

NOTES

¹Farm and Dairy, April 23, 1914, p. 18. Letter from Nephew Jack."

²The Farmer's Advocate, August 29, 1907, p. 1360. Letter from O. C., Wentworth Co.

³The Farmer's Magazine, December 1911, p. 46; J. Kerr Abbott, "Will Rural Democracy Dwindle," The O.A.C. Review, XXVI, 4, (January, 1914), p. 222; The Weekly Sun, March 24, 1909, p. 1; Ibid., August 8, 1906, p. 1.

⁴Farming, February 29, 1900, p. 676, Letter from "Sigma."

⁵Farm and Dairy, May 25, 1911, p. 18.

⁶The Weekly Sun, June 5, 1907, p. 18.

⁷Farm and Dairy, November 14, 1912, p. 18, Letter from Mrs. W. E. Hopkins, Russel Co.

⁸Jean Blewett, "The Farming Days of Used-to-Be," The Canadian Countryman, March 22, 1913, p.

⁹Ethel M. Chapman, "Be Good to Mary Ann," The Farmer's Magazine, April, 1913, p. 83.

¹⁰The Farmer's Advocate, June 29, 1905, p. 946, Letter from "Nurse."

¹¹Ibid., p. 947. See also Farm and Dairy, September 14, 1913, p. 16, and Ibid., October 9, 1913, p. 15, Letter from L. G. Crummy.

¹²The Farmer's Advocate, February 24, 1910, p. 309.

¹³James Mills, "Address by Dr. James Mills, OAC, Guelph," Annual Reports of the Livestock Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1901, p. 26.

¹⁴The Farming World, January 8, 1901, p. 242. See also The Farmer's Advocate, November 1, 1901, p. 707; The Farming World, October 29, 1901, p. 462.

¹⁵The Farmer's Advocate, April 11, 1907, pp. 633-634.

¹⁶The Canadian Countryman, II, 1913. See various issues.

¹⁷P.A.C., Sir John S. Willison Papers, f. 6863, G. C. Creelman to Willison, July 29, 1904.

¹⁸The Farmer's Advocate, November 14, 1907, p. 1786. (Adam Shortt); Ibid., October 30, 1913, p. 1874, (R. F. Bowles).

¹⁹Farm and Dairy, June 5, 1913, p. 18. Reprinted from The Christian Guardian.

²⁰Farm and Dairy, May 15, 1913, p. 20. Letter from 'Sunbeam.' See also Anonymous, "The Townward Movement," The O.A.C. Review, XI, 7, (April, 1900), p. 9, and Farm and Dairy, September 25, 1913, p. 5. Letter from J. O. Rutherford.

²¹The Farmer's Advocate, April 24, 1913, p. 770.

²²Ibid., July 24, 1913, p. 1306; and also Ibid., February 23, 1911, p. 306.

²³Ibid., October 10, 1912, p. 1749; and Ibid., November 16, 1855.

²⁴Ibid., July 24, 1913, p. 1306.

²⁵Ibid., June 13, 1912, p. 1083.

²⁶William Johnson, "Life on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1907 - Part I, p. 108.

²⁷The Farmer's Advocate, April 24, 1913, p. 770. Letter from J. H. Smith, Kent Co.

²⁸The Weekly Sun, October 17, 1906, p. 1; see also, Member, North Grey Women's Institute, "Our Boys How Shall we Educate and Influence so as to Keep them on the Farm," Report of the Farmer's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1901 Part II, Women's Institutes, p. 42.

²⁹J. T. Metcalfe, "Agriculture as a Science and an Art," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1904, Part I, p. 107.

³⁰Farm and Dairy, May 15, 1913, p. 20.

³¹Anonymous, The O.A.C. Review, XI, 7; (April, 1900), p. 8.

³²The Weekly Sun, June 5, 1907, Letter W. C. Good, see also The Farming World, October 5, 1907, p. 952.

³³The Farmer's Advocate, September 5, 1907, p. 1405.

³⁴Ibid., October 17, 1907, p. 1631; Ibid., November 16, 1911, p. 1855; Ibid., August 15, 1900, p. 461; Ibid., February 20, 1913, p. 316; The Farming World, September 1, 1904, p. 616; The Weekly Sun, June 5, 1907, p. 5; John Dearness, "Education for the Farm," The Farmer's Advocate, December 9, 1909, p. 1916; The Canadian Farm, November 12, 1909, p. 1; J.H.S. Johnstone, "Educating the Farmer's Sons," The Canadian Farm, December 3, 1909, p. 2; The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1911, p. 13.

³⁵E. C. Drury, "\$1000 for Country Teachers," The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1914, p. 15.

³⁶The Farmer's Advocate, July 25, 1907, p. 1189; The Canadian Countryman, July 4, 1914, p. 4.

³⁷University of Guelph Archives, Adelaide Hunter Hoodless Papers, Manuscript of Speech, N.D.

³⁸S. B. Sinclair, "The Rural School as a Factor in the Agricultural Life of the Nation," The Farmer's Advocate, December, 1912, p. 2161; See also Farm and Dairy, May 29, 1913, p. 13, Letter P. A. Moore; The Canadian Farm, November 25, 1910, p. 1.

³⁹The Farmer's Advocate, August 6, 1908, p. 1341; see also The Canadian Farm, November 25, 1910, p. 1.

⁴⁰The Farmer's Advocate, February 20, 1913, p. 316, Letter W. E. Tunnon, Hastings Co.; See also Ibid., October 10, 1912, p. 1749; The Weekly Sun, December 11, 1907, p. 7. Resolution passed at the Dominion Grange Toronto, December 1907 The Canadian Farm, November 18, 1910, p. 1.

⁴¹William Johnson, "Life on the Farm," Annual Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, Part I, p. 107.

⁴²The Farmer's Advocate, October 10, 1912, p. 1749; see also Ibid., October 17, 1907, p. 1631.

⁴³Ibid., July 25, 1907, p. 1189; Ibid., October 10, 1912, p. 1749.

⁴⁴Ibid., April 15, 1903, p. 364; S. B. Sinclair, "The Rural School as a Factor in the Agricultural Life of a Nation," The Farmer's Advocate, December 12, 1912, p. 2161.

⁴⁵Ibid., December 9, 1909, p. 916; Ibid., October 24, 1912, p. 1837.

⁴⁶S. B. Sinclair, "The Rural School as a Factor in the Agricultural Life of a Nation,"; Ibid., December 12, 1912, p. 2161. The Canadian Countryman, III, 24, (June 13, 1914), p. 13.

⁴⁷The Farmer's Advocate, April 15, 1903, p. 364.

⁴⁸Ibid., August 1, 1907, p. 1225.

⁴⁹Ibid., June 25, 1908, p. 1058. Report of Inspector of Continuation Classes, R. H. Cowley.

⁵⁰The Weekly Sun, February 26, 1906, p. 2.

⁵¹The Farmer's Advocate, September 5, 1907, p. 1405.

⁵²Ibid., October 15, 1902, p. 743.

⁵³J. B. Reynolds, "The O.A.C. and Ontario Farming," The O.A.C. Review, XXIV, 7, (April, 1912), p. 389; see also The Weekly Sun, January 14, 1914, p. 12 for a letter from an O.A.C. grad. expressing the same views, or J. B. Reynolds, "The Rural Problem," The O.A.C. Review, XXV, 6, (July, 1913), pp. 526-527.

⁵⁴The Farmer's Advocate, April 16, 1914, p. 749.

⁵⁵Junia, "Education for the Farm Laddie," The Farmer's Advocate, July 24, 1913, p. 1306.

⁵⁶The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1513, Letter from "a Nottawasaga Farmer,"

⁵⁷Rev. S. F. Sharp, "The Church and the Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report, p. 168.

⁵⁸Ibid., p. 170.

⁵⁹M. E. Graham, "Missions," The Farming World, August 13, 1901, p. 140.

⁶⁰The Farmer's Advocate, September 9, 1900, p. 1446.

⁶¹M. E. Graham, August 13, 1901, p. 140.

⁶²The Farmer's Magazine, April 1911, p. 11.

⁶³The Farmer's Advocate, February 13, 1910, p. 232; see also Ibid., November 16, 1903, p. 1033; and Ibid., October 15, 1908, p. 1580.

⁶⁴The Farming World, July 15, 1905, p. 523. See also The Farmer's Advocate, March 10, 1910, p. 409; Ibid., March 12, 1914, p. 472; The Canadian Countryman, March 7, 1914, p. 13.

⁶⁵The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1841. Report of the Annual Parliament of the Dominion Grange.

⁶⁶The Canadian Countryman, March 22, 1913, p. 13; C. C. James, "Address," Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the Fruit-Growers Association of Ontario, 1902, p. 48; Farm and Dairy, May 28, 1914, p. 10.

⁶⁷The Farmer's Advocate, January 20, 1910, p. 12.

⁶⁸Ibid., February 20, 1913, p. 305; The Weekly Sun, June 10, 1903, p. 6.

⁶⁹William Johnson, "Life on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1906, Part I, Farmers' Institutes, p. 98.

⁷⁰W. Wilfred Campbell, "Country Life and Culture: Environment," The Farmer's Advocate, August 29, 1907, p. 1375; see also, The Farmer's Advocate, July 25, 1907, p. 1189.

⁷¹Farm and Dairy, February 26, 1914, p. 16.

⁷²Ibid., April 10, 1913, p. 32. Letter from Mrs. W. J. Root, Bruce Co.

⁷³For examples of articles contrasting these two types of environments see: Rue, "Why I Love the Country," The Farmer's Advocate, December 12, 1912, p. 2170; The Farmer's Advocate, July 25, 1907, p. 1189; The Farming World, February 25, 1902, p. 183; The Farmer's Advocate, January 13, 1910, p. 33; Ibid., January 1, 1900, p. 24.

⁷⁴The Weekly Sun, February 4, 1903, p. 3. Report of a speech by farm leader L. E. Annis.

⁷⁵Farm and Dairy, August 10, 1911, p. 16; The Farmer's Advocate, February 24, 1910, p. 293; Ibid., March 12, 1908, p. 453; Ibid., August 7, 1913, p. 1362; Farm and Dairy, March 17, 1911, p. 2.

⁷⁶William Johnson, "Life on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes, 1906, p. 101.

⁷⁷John Dryden, "Address by Hon. John Dryden," Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario, 1900, p. 52.

⁷⁸The Weekly Sun, May 13, 1903, p. 1.

⁷⁹The Farmer's Advocate, March 27, 1913, p. 567.

⁸⁰Ibid., March 5, 1914, p. 430. Letter from "Suburbanite."

⁸¹Farm and Dairy, October 2, 1913, p. 16.

⁸²Ibid., August 3, 1911, p. 13, Letter from "Nephew Frank," see also Ibid., February 26, 1914, p. 16.

⁸³The Farmer's Advocate, April 23, 1908, p. 746.

⁸⁴Lally Bernard, "The Woman Who Toils," The Weekly Sun, April 8, 1903, p. 4.

⁸⁵For examples of such stories see: Farm and Dairy, November 30, 1911, p. 15; 'The Country Girl,' "A Country Girl in a Big City," The Farmer's Advocate, July 11, 1907, p. 1134; Farm and Dairy, August 12, 1909, p. 14.

⁸⁶Farm and Dairy, August 7, 1911, p. 16; see also The Farmer's Advocate, April 16, 1900, p. 220; Ibid., April 16, 1900, p. 220.

⁸⁷Ibid., April 16, 1900, p. 220.

⁸⁸Ibid., November 24, 1904, p. 1602.

⁸⁹For examples of such statements see: Farm and Dairy, May 15, 1913, p. 20; The Farmer's Advocate, January 15, 1903, p. 63.

⁹⁰Ibid., February 21, 1907, p. 290.

⁹¹The Canadian Farm, January 5, 1912, p. 1.

- ⁹²The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1906, p. 687.
- ⁹³Dr. George A. Dickinson, The Country Boy, Toronto: 1907, (Public Archives of Ontario, Pamphlet Collection).
- ⁹⁴The Farmer's Advocate, November 11, 1902, p. 893.
- ⁹⁵Ibid., May 4, 1905, p. 657.
- ⁹⁶Helen McMurchie, "The Battle with the Slums," The Canadian Countryman, May 10, 1913, p. 13.
- ⁹⁷The Farmer's Advocate, February 13, 1908, p. 253.
- ⁹⁸J. T. Stirrett, "A Tale of Two Families," The Farmer's Magazine, March, 1911, p. 49.
- ⁹⁹The Farmer's Advocate, August 6, 1908, p. 1341.
- ¹⁰⁰Ibid.
- ¹⁰¹Farm and Dairy, October 2, 1913, p. 16.
- ¹⁰²Ibid., March 3, 1910, p. 346, Letter
see also The Canadian Countryman, II, 50, (December 13), 1913, p. 24;
Farm and Dairy, February 26, 1914, p. 16.
- ¹⁰³The Farmer's Advocate, February 5, 1914, p. 219; and Ibid.,
April 27, 1911, p. 749.
- ¹⁰⁴Ibid., November 16, 1911, p. 1855.
- ¹⁰⁵Ibid., June 13, 1912, p. 1083.
- ¹⁰⁶Ibid., April 24, 1913, p. 771, Letter from J. H. Smith,
Kent County.
- ¹⁰⁷G. C. Creelman, "Some Rural Problems," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1913, p. 52.
- ¹⁰⁸The Farmer's Advocate, January 2, 1909, p. 77; see also The Weekly Sun, August 7, 1901 Speech of Manning Doherty at Haldimand Co.
- ¹⁰⁹The Canadian Farm, November 18, 1910, p. 1, and also Ibid.,
October 14, 1910, p. 1.

¹¹⁰Farm and Dairy, March 27, 1913, p. 29. It showed the following results:

	Wanted to Leave	Wanted to Stay
Before - Boys	157	7
Girls	163.	11
After - Boys	12	162
Girls	17	161

¹¹¹See examples: The Weekly Sun, December 11, 1907, p. 7 for the resolution passed by the annual convention of the Dominion Grange at Toronto in December 1907; Farm and Dairy, September 8, 1910, p. 3. Letter from W. C. Good in which he stresses that the purpose of rural education should be to bring children "into closer and more sympathetic relationship with mother earth,"; see also Ibid., March 4, 1909, p. 2, report of the findings of the Country Life commission set up in the United States by President Roosevelt; The Canadian Farm, October 14, 1910, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, January 2, 1909, p. 77.

¹¹²S. B. McCready, An Experiment in Agricultural Education: Being an Attempt to Develop a Proper Method of Instruction in Elementary Agriculture Throughout Ontario, Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, Guelph: Ontario Agricultural College, 1907. Others also were interested in this aspect of education at the O.A.C. See: W. H. Grant, Difficulties in Teaching Agriculture, Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, 1921. W. H. Hill, Agricultural Exhibits, Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, 1916; A.F.S. Gilbert, Training of Teachers for Teaching Agriculture in Canada, B.S.A. Thesis, 1920; F. W. Forman, Physical Education as a Permanent Factor in Rural Social Work, B.S.A. Thesis, 1922-1923; J. E. McLarty, Is the Rural School Being Properly Used to Further the Interests of Rural Ontario B.S.A. Thesis, 1916; E. L. Small, Agricultural Instruction as Found in the Rural Public Schools of Ontario, B. S. A. Thesis, 1916; R. G. Sutton, The Real Value of School Fairs, B.S.A., 1920; A. F. Hansauld, Agricultural Education in the Schools of Ontario, B.S.A. Thesis, 1920; J. Macdonald, Problem of Rural Education in Ontario, B.S.A., 1921.

¹¹³Margaret Moffatt, "Actual Farm Life Teaches School Teachers," The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1912, p. 66ff; The Farmer's Advocate, September 26, 1907, p. 1520-1521. Letter from Director of Massachusetts Agricultural College re: course.

¹¹⁴S. B. Sinclair, "The Rural School as a Factor in the Life of a Nation," The Farmer's Advocate, December 12, 1912, p. 2161. See also The Farmer's Advocate, April 25, 1907, p. 703.

¹¹⁵John Dearnness, "Education for the Farm," The Farmer's Advocate, December 9, 1909, p. 1916; William Rennie, Successful Farming, Toronto: 1908, p. 10.

116 The Farmer's Advocate, October 17, 1907, p. 1631; P.A.O., Pamphlet Collection, C. C. James, The Teaching of Agriculture in Our Public Schools, Address to the Farmer's National Congress, Boston: 1899, p. 9.

117 The Farmer's Advocate, April 25, 1907, p. 703.

118 Ibid., April 15, 1903, p. 364. See also Ibid., April 12, 1912, p. 732; Ibid., June 13, 1912, p. 1083; and C. C. James, The Teaching of Agriculture in Our Public Schools, p. 11.

119 The Farmer's Advocate, February 20, 1913, p. 316. Ibid., August 6, 1908, p. 1341; Junia, "Education for the Farm Laddie," The Farmer's Advocate, July 24, 1913, p. 1307. The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1514.

120 The Farming World, October 5, 1907, p. 952; The Canadian Farm, October 14, 1910, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, January 21, 1909, p. 77.

121 Justus Miller, "The Story of Two Medals," The Canadian Countryman, II, 25, June 21, 1913; Farm and Dairy, October 16, 1913. Ibid., November 21, 1912, p. 15, Speech of C. F. Bailey at the joint Convention of Farmers' Institutes and Farmers' Clubs at Toronto, November 1912.

122 Ibid., January 29, 1914, p. 27, Letter from J. E. Smith, B.S.A., Peterboro County; at Cavan there were over 700 entries and an attendance of 400-500. (Ibid., October 16, 1913, p. 4.)

123 Ibid., October 16, 1913, p. 3.

124 The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1513.

125 Ibid., February 20, 1913, pp. 316-317.

126 Ibid., July 25, 1907, p. 1189.

127 Ibid., September 19, 1907, p. 1481. According to Ibid., June 25, 1908, p. 1057, 5000 were enrolled in 1907.

128 Ibid., February 23, 1911, p. 306.

129 The Farmer's Advocate, July 21, 1910, p. 1169.

130 Ibid., April 16, 1914, p. 748; The Canadian Farm, July 7, 1911, p. 1; The Weekly Sun, January 29, 1908, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, April 30, 1914, p. 859.

¹³¹The Weekly Sun, October 20, 1909, p. 4.

¹³²The Weekly Sun, January 4, 1911, p. 1.

¹³³Farm and Dairy, October 25, 1911, p. 10; The Farmer's Advocate, September 16, 1913, p. 1625. See also a more scholarly approach by S. A. Cudmore, "Rural Depopulation in Southern Ontario," Royal Canadian Institute, IX, 1912, p. 264.

¹³⁴Farm and Dairy, October 21, 1909, p. 10.

¹³⁵The Weekly Sun, December 7, 1910, p. 1.

CHAPTER V

NOTES

¹These expressions found their way into many articles: The Farmer's Advocate, February 5, 1914, p. 219; Ibid., March 3, 1910, p. 346; Farm and Dairy, October 26, 1911, p. 14; Letter from 'Hired Man'; Ibid., April 23, 1914, p. 18; Letter from Nephew Jack; Ibid., August 14, 1913, p. 17, J. B. Reynolds; The Canadian Countryman, II, 2, (August 16, 1913), p. 4; The Weekly Sun, November 26, 1902, p. 6; Hopkins, B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., 1914.

²The Farmer's Advocate, February 24, 1910, p. 309.

³Farm and Dairy, February 1, 1912, p. 23, Letter Mrs. J. S. Wilson; The Farmer's Advocate, May 30, 1912, p. 1003; The Weekly Sun, November 26, 1902, p. 6.

⁴James Grant, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer," The Canadian Countryman, II, 10, (October 4, 1913), p. 15.

⁵G. C. Creelman, "The Farmer and the Farmer's Son," Third Annual Report of the Ontario Corn Growers' Association, 1900, pp. 11-12.

⁶The Farmer's Advocate, April 24, 1913, p. 770; Ibid., November 2, 1903, p. 982; Farm and Dairy, March 26, 1914, pp. 26-27.

⁷Farm and Dairy, April 1, 1909, p. 18; The Weekly Sun, August 23, 1905, p. 1.

⁸Ibid., October 9, 1901, p. 6; The Farmer's Advocate, July 23, 1914. The Weekly Sun, October 14, 1903, p. 9, reprint from the New York Sun telling of the great usefulness of phones on the farm; Ibid., June 1, 1901, p. 8; The Farmer's Advocate, May 30, 1912, p. 1003.

⁹The Canadian Countryman, II, 15, (April 12, 1913), p. 21; see also The Weekly Sun, July 8, 1908, p. 5; W. L. Smith, "Over-Crowding in the Cities," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 47.

¹⁰The Weekly Sun, July 6, 1910, p. 3.

¹¹Ibid., August 7, 1907, p. 6.

¹²The Farming World, May 27, 1902, p. 579; Ibid., July 31, 1901, p. 88; The Farmer's Advocate, August 19, 1909, p. 1327; The Canadian Farm, October 8, 1909, p. 1.

¹³The Canadian Farm, November 25, 1910, p. 1.

¹⁴Ibid., March 3, 1911, p. 1.

¹⁵The Farming World, October 23, 1900, p. 223 described a cheap farm phone system as set up in Indiana. Francis Dagger wrote a series for The Farmer's Magazine "The Farmer and the Phone," in which he described the invention of the telephone, the development of the telephone monopoly and contrasted it with co-operative or government ownership. (The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 59; Ibid., March, 1912, p. 19). The Farmer's Advocate, September 21, 1905, commented on the set up of the phone system. Farm and Dairy, August 7, 1913 gave figures on the expansion of the phone system in Ontario. In 1908 there were less than 2,000 in the province; in 1913, there were 50,000 phones operated by 460 co-operative systems plus the Bell Telephone Co. phones. Ibid., November 4, 1909, p. 6, detailed instructions on the installation of a telephone line for farmers.

¹⁶The Weekly Sun, March 20, 1909, p. 4. Column by W. L. S.

¹⁷Ibid., February 12, 1902, p. 10; Ibid., March 14, 1906, p. 6. The Farming World, October 1, 1901, p. 361; The Farmer's Advocate, May 1, 1902, p. 333.

¹⁸The Farming World, October 1, 1901, p. 361.

¹⁹The Weekly Sun, November 4, 1903, p. 10; Ibid., October 3, 1906, p. 5; Ibid., September 21, 1910, p. 6.

²⁰Ibid., October 6, 1909, p. 6.

²¹Ibid., October 13, 1909, p. 1.

²²The Weekly Sun, March 19, 1902, p. 3. The Good Roads Association had been founded in 1901 and met with Sydney Fisher in 1902 where he made a statement in support of their aims. See also Farm and Dairy, May 8, 1903, p. 6, Letter John McLaren.

²³The Weekly Sun, March 19, 1902, p. 3. See also W. J. Black, The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXII, 6, (March, 1901), p. 9.

24 For examples of this agitation for improved roads see: The Farming World, July 3, 1900, p. 1083; Letter from D. Mackenzie; The Canadian Farm, January 5, 1912, p. 1; editorial urged federal aid for road improvement; Ibid., June 3, 1910, p. 1. This editorial pointed out that statute labour on the roads of Ontario was out of date and not suited to the rural areas. The Farming World, June 10, 1902, p. 631, told of best methods and costs for road maintenance. The Canadian Farm, July 15, 1910, p. 1. This editorial advocated city aid for rural roads to aid both town and country dwellers. The Farmer's Advocate, April 23, 1914, p. 799. This editorial demanded a higher tax on automobiles to pay for road improvements.

25 The propaganda campaign in the rural press reached great heights in the years before 1910 and had not completely subsided by 1914. The farmers hated the automobiles for racing down rural roads and disturbing animals or causing bad accidents. (The Weekly Sun, October 26, 1910, p. 1; The Canadian Countryman, II, 12, (March 22, 1913), p. 25. The Weekly Sun, June 3, 1908, p. 4; Ibid., October 9, 1907, p. 5; The Canadian Farm, October 29, 1909, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, February 20, 1908, p. 289; Farm and Dairy, June 17, 1909, p. 10.

26 The Weekly Sun, July 6, 1910, p. 1, proposed to limit by legislation the number of roads on which autos were able to travel or to limit the hours of public highways available to autos (see also Ibid., June 24, 1908, p. 1; or Ibid., April 1, 1908, p. 6, for support of private members' legislation which would accomplish this aim.)

27 The Weekly Sun, January 7, 1914, p. 1, supports a special tax on automobiles.

28 The Weekly Sun, August 28, 1907, p. 1. This editorial demanded heavy fines for those who owned autos and broke the rules of the road. These people had lots of money and low fines would not provide much deterrence, The Sun argued.

29 Harris L. Adams, "The Farmer and the Auto," The Farmer's Magazine, November, 1912, p. 19; Farm and Dairy, June 5, 1913, p. 5; The Farmer's Advocate, April 16, 1908, p. 698.

30 The Farmer's Advocate, November 10, 1910, p. 1769. See also, J. W. Sangster, "The Motorcycle on the Farm," The Canadian Countryman, III, 3, (March 28, 1914), p. 6. The first automobile ad in any Canadian farm publication read was in The Agricultural Annual of 1904, p. 167; it was an advertisement for the Fungs Finch Auto Car from the Sintz Gas Engine Co. of Detroit. The Farmer's Advocate printed its first automobile advertisement in 1910, (Sept. 8, 1910, p. 1469), for a Kennedy, the "farmer's car," manufactured by the Kennedy Motor Car Co. Preston, Ontario. It cost \$840 with windshield and headlights extra. Automobiles were advertised from the commencement of publication in The Canadian Countryman, (see Feb. 22, 1913, for example). Ford Car ads begin in 1913. A runabout cost \$675. (The Farmer's Advocate, May 1, 1913, p. 807) or The Farm and Dairy, April 3, 1913, p. 9.)

³¹For examples of the agitation created over this issue see: The Farming World, May 1, 1900, p. 896; The Weekly Sun, August 17, 1904, p. 1; Ibid., October 21, 1903, p. 1; Ibid., March 15, 1905, Letter A. G. Kay. (He remarked that this was the "question above all others which should engage the attention of every man in the Dominion...") The Farming World, July 24, 1900, p. 1133; Ibid., January 28, 1900, p. 513. (Resolution of the East Middlesex Farmer's Association); Ibid., April 23, 1901, p. 891. The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1902, p. 707; Ibid., April 5, 1906, p. 545; Ibid., January 1, 1903, p. 7; Farm and Dairy, February 4, 1909, p. 5, (Remarks on the first rural mail delivery in Canada from Hamilton to Ancaster and claims that its campaign resulted in the service being established.) Immediately after the adoption of this system in limited areas, campaigns were begun urging its extension to all rural areas in Ontario and Canada. (Farm and Dairy, July 22, 1909, p. 10.)

³²The Farming World, August 1, 1904, p. 550, Letter from 'Farmer's Son' Peterboro Co. See also Farm and Dairy, September 2, 1909, p. 7.

³³The Farmer's Advocate, July 15, 1909, p. 1135, provides an example of this service with its full page Eaton's ad extolling the bargains available at their fall and winter sale. This was one of the first large scale advertisements by Eaton's in the rural press. It appeared only a few months after the inauguration of rural mail delivery. A similar advertisement on behalf of Simpson's appeared in The Canadian Countryman, April 26, 1913, p. 23. Again, no sooner had the service been set up than rural publicists demanded its extension. (The Weekly Sun, July 20, 1910, p. 1, supported the extension of the parcel post system to allow greater shopping by mail.)

³⁴The Farmer's Advocate, January 16, 1908, p. 76.

³⁵Ibid., January 1, 1903, p. 7.

³⁶The Weekly Sun, October 9, 1901, p. 6.

³⁷T. P. McDonald, "The Social and Intellectual Side of Farm Life," The Farming World, June 18, 1901, p. 1085.

³⁸The Farmer's Advocate, November 2, 1903, p. 982; W. A. Craik, "Industrial Development - How it Helps the Farmer," The Canadian Countryman, III, 15, (April 11, 1914,), p. 14.

³⁹The Farmer's Advocate, February 24, 1910, p. 309.

⁴⁰Anonymous, "The Townward Movement," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XI, 7, (April, 1900), pp. 9-10.

⁴¹William Johnson, "Life on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1907, Part I, p. 106.

⁴²Ibid.

⁴³The Farmer's Advocate, February 24, 1910, p. 309, Letter from Mrs. W. E. Hopkins; Ibid., January 19, 1905, p. 91.

⁴⁴Farm and Dairy, February 22, 1912, p. 17; Ibid., August 7, 1912, p. 7. A story entitled "Why We Left the Farm," appeared in serialized form and described the disadvantages of being a farmer's wife. (It first appeared in The Saturday Evening Post.)

⁴⁵Ibid., May 7, 1914, p. 552. See also W. L. Smith, "Overcrowding in the Cities," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 46; The Farming World, September 15, 1906, p. 653.

⁴⁶J. Kerr Abbott, "Will Rural Democracy Dwindle," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXVI, 4, (January, 1914), p. 27; The Farmer's Magazine, April, 1913, p. 27; Farm and Dairy, October 7, 1909, p. 12.

⁴⁷Margaret Bell, "Revisiting a Village Church," The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 18.

⁴⁸The Canadian Farm, August 11, 1911, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, January 14, 1907, p. 41; Farm and Dairy, October 7, 1909, p. 12; Ibid., April 1, 1909, p. 18; W. Hunt, The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXVI, 6, (March, 1911), p. 300.

⁴⁹The Farmer's Magazine, V, 6, (April, 1913), p. 27.

⁵⁰Farm and Dairy, May 6, 1909, p. 16.

⁵¹Ibid., June 18, 1911, p. 13.

⁵²Ibid., June 12, 1913, p. 15, Letter Mrs. Wm. Kelley.

⁵³The Canadian Farm, July 29, 1910, p. 2; T Deofol, "Greater Comfort in the Farm Home," The Canadian Countryman, III, 10, (March 7, 1914), p. 22; The Farmer's Advocate, January 14, 1907, p. 41; Ibid., April 25, 1907, p. 701; See also almost any issue of The Canadian Countryman.

⁵⁴Ibid., November 11, 1910, p. 1.

⁵⁵The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1912, pp. 9-10; The Farmer's Advocate, March 19, 1914, p. 524; and G. C. Creelman, "The Farmer and the Farmer's Son," Third Annual Report of the Ontario Corn Growers' Association, 1910, p. 10.

⁵⁶The Farming World, March 12, 1901, p. 619; C. C. James, "address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1909, p. 40; The Farmer's Advocate, April 26, 1906, p. 677; The Weekly Sun, August 2, 1905, p. 4.

⁵⁷Farm and Dairy, May 28, 1914, p. 12; The Canadian Countryman, II, 8, (February 22, 1913), p. 22; The Farmer's Advocate, March 26, 1908, p. 557; Cynthia Doering, "A Dainty Room," Farming, March 13, 1900, p. 748.

⁵⁸Ibid.; The Farmer's Advocate, April 18, 1907, p. 659.

⁵⁹Farm and Dairy, July 17, 1913, p. 16, Letter from "the Son," Ibid., January 30, 1913, p. 12; see also Farming, May 29, 1900, p. 985; The Farmer's Advocate, January 19, 1905, p. 75; Farm and Dairy, October 19, 1911, p. 18; John Dryden, The Weekly Sun, July 1, 1903, p. 3; Farm and Dairy, September 4, 1913, p. 14.

⁶⁰G. C. Creelman, "The Farmer and the Farmer's Son," Third Annual Report of the Ontario Corn Growers' Association, 1910, p. 11; The Farmer's Advocate, May 15, 1900, p. 293.

⁶¹Farm and Dairy, May 1, 1913, p. 12.

⁶²Farming, May 29, 1900, p. 985.

⁶³James Mark, "Holding Our Own," The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1911), p. 17; The Farmer's Advocate, April 26, 1906, p. 691; The Weekly Sun, August 19, 1908, p. 6; one advertisement for a gun told the farmer that he ought to "make that Boy Happy with a Stevens" rifle, (Farm and Dairy, April 8, 1909, p. 23).

⁶⁴The Farmer's Advocate, December 1, 1900, p. 688; The Weekly Sun, March 27, 1901, p. 10; Robson Black, "Sentiment or Wages," The Canadian Countryman, III, 10, (March 7, 1914), p. 12.

⁶⁵The Farmer's Advocate, July 14, 1910, p. 1145; Ibid., January 25, 1914, p. 138; Ibid., January 19, 1905, p. 91.

⁶⁶James Mark, "Holding Our Own," The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 17.

⁶⁷The Farmer's Advocate, July 14, 1910, p. 1145, Letter from Sandy Sanderson; Farm and Dairy, October 19, 1911, p. 18, Letter from J. Dickinson; Farming, May 29, 1900, p. 985, Letter from M. Arthur; The Farmer's Advocate, January 19, 1905, p. 75; The Farming World, June 26, 1900, p. 1061, Letter from J. I. Hobson.

⁶⁸Farming, May 29, 1900, p. 985, Letter from M. Arthur; The Farmer's Advocate, January 19, 1905, p. 75; Ibid., April 20, 1911, p. 700; Ibid., April 27, 1911, p. 749, Letter Fred Foyston; The Canadian Countryman, August 22, 1914, p. 4.

⁶⁹The Farmer's Advocate, September 2, 1901, p. 567, Letter, W.G.H.; The Canadian Farm, October 14, 1900, p. 1.

⁷⁰Edward Drier, "Keeping the Boy on the Farm," The Canadian Countryman, III, 16, (April 18, 1914), p. 13; Farming, May, 1900, p. 894; The Canadian Countryman, "The Old Home Farm at Xmas," II, 50, (December 13, 1913), p. 25.

⁷¹Andrew McTaggart, "The Ministry of the Soil," The Farmer's Magazine, June, 1914, pp. 5-6; The Farmer's Advocate, February 5, 1914, p. 219.

⁷²Florence J. Hadley, "Making the Boy a Property Owner," The Canadian Countryman, July 18, 1914, p. 7.

⁷³The Farmer's Advocate, April 27, 1911, p. 749.

⁷⁴Farm and Dairy, March 7, 1912, p. 4. See also The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, p. 318, Letter from Fair Play.

⁷⁵Ibid., February 19, 1914, p. 319; and Farm and Dairy, March 7, 1912, p. 4.

⁷⁶The Farmer's Advocate, January 30, 1913, p. 176, Report of the Dominion Grange and Farmer's Association; see also The Farmer's Advocate, February 23, 1911, p. 306; Ibid., February 13, 1913, p. 253; Farm and Dairy, January 30, 1913, p. 10.

⁷⁷The Farmer's Advocate, October 15, 1908, p. 1580.

⁷⁸Ibid., December 1, 1910, p. 1882.

⁷⁹Ibid., April 24, 1913, p. 770.

⁸⁰Hattie Robinson, "The Influence of One Grange," The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1912, p. 172ff.; The Farmer's Magazine, November, 1912, p. 17.

⁸¹The Farmer's Advocate, February 13, 1913, p. 253.

⁸²The Farmer's Advocate, November 10, 1904, p. 1531; see also Ibid., January 5, 1905, p. 13.

⁸³The Farming World, January 15, 1906, p. 64; see also Farm and Dairy, August 28, 1913, p. 24.

⁸⁴The Farmer's Advocate, July 28, 1910, p. 1204; Ibid., February 13, 1913, p. 260; Ethel M. Chapman, "How Mary Jane Made Good," The Farmer's Magazine, March, 1914, p. 52.

⁸⁵Ibid., December 8, 1910, p. 1925.

⁸⁶The Weekly Sun, January 30, 1901, p. 1, commends the Ontario Government's Proposal to establish travelling libraries. The Farming World, August 12, 1902, p. 139.

⁸⁷The Farmer's Advocate, October 15, 1901, p. 674.

⁸⁸Ibid., December 30, 1909, pp. 2080-2081; The Farming World, November 1, 1907, p. 1027; Farm and Dairy, May 15, 1912, p. 20.

⁸⁹The Farmer's Advocate, January 4, 1906, p. 18.

⁹⁰The Canadian Farm, July 21, 1911, p. 1.

⁹¹E. J. Mountford, "Boys are the Sinews of War," The Farmer's Magazine, May, 1912, p. 61.

⁹²The Farmer's Advocate, February 4, 1909, p. 160.

⁹³The Weekly Sun, July 15, 1903, p. 3; Farm and Dairy, April 8, 1909, p. 23.

⁹⁴The Farmer's Advocate, July 2, 1900, pp. 380-381; Ethel M. Chapman, "How Mary Jane Made Good," The Farmer's Magazine, March, 1914, p. 52.

⁹⁵The Canadian Countryman, II, 52, December 27, 1913, p. 4.

⁹⁶H. M. Culter, "The Rural College," The Farmer's Magazine, March, 1911, p. 23; see also E. C. Drury, "\$1,000 for Country Teachers," The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1914, p. 15ff.

⁹⁷Farm and Dairy, October 25, 1911, p. 10; and The Farmer's Advocate, September 16, 1913, p. 1625.

CHAPTER VI

NOTES

¹Farm and Dairy, October 26, 1911, p. 10. Ibid., November 20, 1913, p. 12; Ibid., October 21, 1909, p. 10; F.A.C., W. C. Good Papers, vol. 10, f. 11192, December 20, 1913, MSS of Grange Address in which he lays the blame for depopulation and rural problems on the doorstep of industrialization. See also Appendix G for presentation of farmers at Ottawa in 1910; The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908; E. C. Drury in The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XIV, 7, (April 1902), p. 4. Rev. J. Macdougall, "The Rural Problem," The Social Service Congress, Report, p. 151. A study conducted by Cornell University discovered that 155 out of 400 boys were planning to leave the farm. Of the 155, 62 cited inadequate financial returns for their decision (The Farmer's Advocate, February 3, 1910, p. 162).

²The Farmer's Advocate, February 27, 1908, p. 337; see also Ibid., February 5, 1914, p. 230; Letter from J. H. Robinson; Farm and Dairy, October 26, 1911, p. 10, remarked that "The true reason is an economic one. Farming is not comparatively profitable."

³Hon. Sydney Fisher, "Back to the Farm," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1907, p. 36.

⁴C. C. James, "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1909, p. 40. For similar comments see also The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, Letter from "Fair Play,"; Ibid., January 22, p. 129; Ibid., February 27, 1908, p. 337; Farm and Dairy, March 7, 1912, p. 4; Ibid., August 6, 1914, p. 11 (F. E. Ellis of this journal told an audience that annual farm income per farmer in the U.S. was only \$318.22).

⁵The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, p. 322.

⁶Ibid., February 5, 1914, p. 230; Letter J. H. Robinson, Peel Co.

⁷Farm and Dairy, November 30, 1911, December 7, 1911, and December 14, 1911 for examples of this series.

⁸See Ibid., August 14, 1913, p. 17, Professor Reynolds of O.A.C. said that this was one "logical conclusion at which we can arrive," H. H. Dean "Dairying Past, Present and Future," Farm and Dairy, April 23, 1914, p. 3, remarked that the dairy farmer has "not received just rewards for capital invested."

⁹The Weekly Sun, October 25, 1911, p. 1.; see also J. Kerr Abbott, "Will Rural Democracy Dwindle," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXVI, 4, (January, 1914), p. 224, "...the chief cause of the movement to the city is economic...."

¹⁰Farm and Dairy, August 14, 1913, p. 10, reprinted from The Weekly Sun; see also The Farmer's Advocate, September 15, 1913, p. 1625, or Ibid., April 18, 1912, p. 732. This journal said that "the real underlying cause is economic" coupled with a "school system that has made a breach with the farm and a bridge to the occupations of the town." W. C. Good occasionally modified his purely economic point of view to recognize the influence of propaganda and education in leading country children away from the farm, but he emphasized that no permanent cure to the problem could be achieved without economic reform. (W. C. Good "Two Reasons Flain," The Farmer's Magazine, January 1912, p. 61.)

¹¹The Farmer's Advocate, January 22, 1914, p. 129.

¹²For examples of this type of sentiment see: Hon. Nelson Monteith, "Address," Thirty-Seventh Annual Report of the Fruit-Growers' Association of Ontario, 1905, p. 19. The tendency of agriculture was to become more and more a manufacturing industry. Farm and Dairy, July 24, 1913, p. 2, Letter from C. Davis urged that farmers like manufacturers should throw away still usable machinery in order to keep up with progress. Ibid., March 27, 1913, p. 4, Letter by G. E. Day of C.A.C. reiterates that farmers are not applying business principles as far as they should. Ibid., November 28, 1912, p. 6, article by J. E. Waggoner of the I.H.C. Service Bureau remarked that farming was more and more a purely business operation. Ibid., August 25, 1910, urges more systematization of the methods used in agriculture on the manufacturer's model. Ibid., September 22, 1910, p. 10, George C. Creelman at the Exhibition remarked that farmers were not "speculative enough." The Farmer's Advocate, remarked the man who makes most was the farmer who saw his cows as machines.

¹³Ibid., March 12, 1914, p. 477. (Though this letter was written by an opponent of the above viewpoint, he puts its arguments cogently.) Ibid., April 26, 1906, p. 691; Ibid., April 26, 1906; The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1911, p. 12.

¹⁴The Farmer's Advocate, February 22, 1912, p. 307.

¹⁵The Canadian Farm, May 13, 1910, p. 2; The Farming World, August 27, 1901, p. 189. (This editorial noted that "...it seems to us that a family is better off when one son has a hundred acre farm, and the other is earning his living in some other occupation...." than when both sons were trying to run uneconomical fifty acre farms.)

¹⁶Cudmore, Royal Canadian Institute, p. 267.

¹⁷Farm and Dairy, November 6, 1913, p. 3. Report on Rev. Macdougall's book.

¹⁸The Farming World, August 27, 1901, p. 190.

¹⁹See C. C. James, The Teaching of Agriculture in Our Public Schools, (Address to Farmer's National Congress, Boston, 1899), Ontario Department of Agriculture, Toronto: 1900 (P.A.O. Pamphlet Collection). This gives a full explanation of the need for agricultural education. Justin Miller, "The Story of Two Medals," The Canadian Countryman, II, 25, (June 21, 1913), p. 15. The Farmer's Advocate, February 20, 1913, p. 316, Letter from W. E. Tummon.

²⁰The Weekly Sun, March 13, 1912, p. 5, promoted a special train with displays and experts to instruct farmers. This was endorsed by The Canadian Countryman, II, 22, (May 31, 1913), p. 4, and Ibid., II, 12, (March 22, 1913), p. 8, see also G. I. Christie, "Equipment and Methods in Agricultural Extension," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXIII, 2, (November, 1910).

²¹Wm. T. Howson, "Agriculture as an Occupation," The Farming World, July 25, 1901, p. 75; The Farmer's Advocate, June 15, 1903, p. 552. (This article remarks that with continuing depletion of the soil scientific agriculture had become very important and the best way to learn better methods was at O.A.C.) E. J. Mountford, "Boys are the Sinews of War," The Farmer's Magazine, May, 1912, p. 59.

²²R. M. Robinson, "Why I Took to It," The Farmer's Magazine, May, 1912, p. 56; J. B. Reynolds, "Reading in the Farm Home," Twenty-Eighth Annual Report of the Ontario Agricultural and Experimental Union, 1906; Farm and Dairy, January 28, 1909, p. 14; points out the role of government publications in promoting improvements; G. LeLecheur, "Reading in the Farm, Home," The O.A.C. Review, XX, 8, (May, 1908), p. 442; The Farmer's Advocate, September 12, 1907, says the average journal "has more or less influence in directing his [the farmer's] choice and course in the operations on the farm in relation to stock raising, cultivation of the soil, crop rotation...."

²³The O.A.C. Review, XIII, 5, February, 1902, p. 11; Wm. T. Howson, "Agriculture as an Occupation," p. 75.

²⁴Florence J. Hadley, "Making the Boy a Property Owner," The Canadian Countryman, III, 29, (July 18, 1914), p. 7. R. M. Robinson, "Why I Took to It," p. 56. C. C. James, The Teaching of Agriculture in Our Public Schools, notes the importance of the agricultural societies, fruit growers, poultry, bee, experimenters, dairymen, and entomologists in educating the mature population.

²⁵The Canadian Farm, April 7, 1911, p. 1, urged model farms scattered over the country to show new techniques to farmers.

²⁶G. I. Christie, "Equipment and Methods in Agricultural Extension," The O.A.C. Review, XXIII, 2, (November, 1910).

²⁷The Canadian Farm, November 5, 1909, p. 1.

²⁸

For full details of this argument see:

The Farmer's Advocate, February 9, 1911, p. 288; Ibid., February 25, 1909, p. 281. Mixed farming means nothing known in depth about anything. It had no system "no head nor tail," The Weekly Sun, December 22, 1909, p. 6. Ibid., June 2, 1909, p. 8, Letter from A. Patterson. He emphasized the complementary nature of fruit growing and dairying. W. J. Brown, "Agricultural Economics," The O.A.C. Review, (March, 1906), XVIII, 6, p. 250. S. E. Todd, "Principles of Co-operation," The O.A.C. Review, XXIV, 9, (October, 1911), p. 1. ("The day of the mixed farmer is passing. The complications arising from the endeavour to successfully conduct many branches of farming forced the farmer to recognize that a mastery of two branches was about the limit of the human mind." Andrew McTaggart, "The Ministry of the Soil," The Farmer's Magazine, June, 1914, p. 5. Nelson Monteith, "Address," Thirty-Eighth Annual Report of the Fruit Growers' Association of Ontario, 1906, p. 42.

²⁹

The Canadian Countryman, III, 1, January, 1914, p. 9; Otto Herold, "The Small Farm and the High Cost of Living," The Canadian Countryman, III, 11, (March 14, 1914), p. 9. "Too many farmers have land hunger and bite off too much land and get work indigestion. Instead of farming intensively and in a business-like manner, they dissipate their energies and often too meagre capital in running large farms of many acres inefficiently and with miserable returns for work and capital put in." S. E. Todd, "Rural Population in Ontario: One Way to Solve the Farm Problem," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 52ff. The Canadian Farm, August 27, 1909, p. 8. H. Harton, "Cultivate the Soil," The O.A.C. Review, XIX, 3, (December, 1906), p. 115; L. A. Moorhouse, "Intensive Farming," The O.A.C. Review, XII, 5, (February, 1900), p. 13; The Canadian Farm, April 8, 1910, p. 1. Ibid., October 21, 1910, p. 1.

³⁰

Barton, The O.A.C. Review, XIX, 3, (December, 1906), p. 115. Moorhouse, Ibid., XII, 5, (February, 1900), p. 13.

³¹

The Canadian Farm, November 18, 1910, p. 1.

³²

Farm and Dairy, May 27, 1909, p. 12 remarked that "probably no one thing tends to discourage boys on the farm more than the quality of the stock that is so largely kept. The average farm boy needs to be interested in something that is worthwhile if he is to be induced to stay on the farm." See also The Canadian Countryman, II, 34, (August 23, 1913), p. 6; Farm and Dairy, January 19, 1911, p. 12.

³³

The Canadian Farm, January 21, 1911, p. 1. Ibid., August 5, 1910, p. 1; Ibid., January 28, 1909, p. 1; Ibid., October 21, 1910, p. 1; Canadian Bee Journal XV, (July, 1903), p. 269, Speech of G. C. Creelman.

³⁴W. A. Craik, "Industrial Development, How it Helps the Farmer," The Canadian Countryman, III, 15, (April 11, 1914), p. 15. See also Ruddick et al. The Dairy Industry in Canada, p. 8, for a description of the impact of urban areas in promoting expansion of agricultural specialties.

³⁵In favour of production records see: Farm and Dairy, January 14, 1909, p. 3, Letter C. F. Whitely; The Farmer's Advocate, March 20, 1913, p. 519. Article on the rural problem describes the importance of keeping track of production from various dairy cattle and therefore knowing exactly how to increase production. The Canadian Countryman, II, 8, (February 22, 1913), p. 11. In favour of bookkeeping systems see: Farm and Dairy, February 11, 1909, p. 16. John J. Bartlett, "The Farmer's Book-Keeping," The Farmer's Magazine, February, 1914, p. 20. "The farmer can't be told too much that he must be as much a businessman as the grocer or hardware dealer. The O.A.C. Review, XXIII, 1, (October, 1910), p. 10 estimated that less than five per cent of the farmers keep accounts. Again city businessmen were cited as the examples for the farmer to follow in keeping accounts. The Weekly Sun, April , 1908, p. 5, remarked that cost accounting was an essential to economical production. The Canadian Farm, January 27, 1911, p. 1, again pointed out to its readers that farming was a business and had to have a system of some sort. The Farmer's Advocate, June 1, 1909, p. 365. Ibid., About once a year the journal ran a series on how to organize and keep an accounting system of the farms. (see August 6, 1914, p. 1421 for example.) J. J. Beaumont, "Business Methods in Farming," The Farming World, June 3, 1902, p. 614.

³⁶The Farmer's Advocate, January 14, 1909, p. 47. Ibid., January 28, 1909, p. 119 and various other issues in 1900 and 1901.

³⁷P.A.C., Department of Agriculture Papers, Dairy Products Division, Vol. 16, file 78064, May 11, 1911, MSS Prepared by J. A. Ruddick, "How the Canadian Governments, Federal and Provincial, Protect and Assist the Dairy Industry."

³⁸The Farmer's Advocate, January 28, 1909, p. 113.

³⁹W. A. Craik, "Guarding the Milk Supply of a Big City," The Canadian Countryman, II, 25, (June 21, 1913, O, p. 8.

⁴⁰The Weekly Sun, September 15, 1909, p. 1; The Canadian Farm, October 15, 1909, p. 1.

⁴¹The Weekly Sun, March 30, 1910, p. 1; The Canadian Farm, October 7, 1910, p. 1, Letter from A. Macmillan; The Farmer's Advocate, December 4, 1913, p. 2093.

⁴²P.A.C., Sir John Willison Papers, C. G. Creelman to J. S. Willison, December 2, 1909, p. 6096; see also The Canadian Countryman, II, 23, (June 7, 1913), p. 5.

⁴³The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 4; The Farmer's Advocate, July 16, 1912, p. 1309.

⁴⁴The Canadian Countryman, II, 1, (January 4, 1913), p. 5.

⁴⁵H. R. Ross, "Co-operation Among Farmers," The O.A.C. Review, XI, 7, (April, 1900), p. 5; P.A.C., Department of Agriculture Papers, Dairy Products Division, MSS., J. A. Ruddick, "History of Dairying in Canada," vol. 15, file 58389; C. C. James, "Agriculture in its Relation to Manufactures," The O.A.C. Review, XX, 8, (May, 1908), p. 416; The Weekly Sun, April 27, 1910, p. 1; Ibid., November 28, 1906, p. 1; Farm and Dairy, July 21, 1910, p. 3, cited the Farmer's Dairy company with George S. Henry as president as an organization which embodied some principles of co-operation.

⁴⁶The Weekly Sun, March 21, 1904, p. 2, describes the meetings which resulted in setting up the co-operatives. Ibid., March 11, 1908, p. 1; Ibid., March 13, 1912, p. 4; The Farmer's Advocate, January 14, 1909, The Canadian Countryman, II, 31, (August 2, 1913), p. 5, said that co-operative packing would cut down on dishonest fruit packers.

⁴⁷P.A.C., Co-operative Union of Canada Papers, copy of letter from Alex McNeill to P. W. Hodgetts, (Sup't. of Fruit Growers' Association), October 24, 1911. McNeill was the Chief of the Fruit Division of the Department of Agriculture and very friendly to the idea of co-ops and helped plan their strategy. (CUC Papers, December 9, 1909, Alex McNeill to George Keen). The District Representatives of Ontario Department of Agriculture appeared to be greatly interested in the establishment of co-operative ventures and sent many letters to the Co-op Union between 1912 and 1914 asking about subscriptions to The Canadian Co-operator for information about co-operatives in agriculture. Peter McArthur also wrote to George Keen and asked about the possibilities of co-ops in agriculture apart from fruit growing aspects (CUC Papers, Peter McArthur to George Keen, August 7, 1913).

⁴⁸The Weekly Sun, July 20, 1902, p. 4, Letter B.B.M.; The Canadian Countryman, May 16, 1914, III, 20, (May 16, 1914), p. 13, points out the advantages of a co-operative commercial laundry in lessening the work of the farm housewife.

⁴⁹The Canadian Farm, January 20, 1911, p. 1.

⁵⁰The Canadian Farm, October 7, 1910, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, April 2, 1914, p. 641; Farm and Dairy, May 14, 1914, p. 12.

⁵¹The Canadian Countryman, II, 20, (May 24, 1913), p. 7.
 Story on Co-op buying organized by the Ontario Vegetable Growers; The Weekly Sun, November 28, 1906, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, December 4, 1913, p. 2093.

⁵²W. J. Black, "The Labor Problem," The O.A.C. Review, XII, 4, (January, 1901), p. 12.

⁵³This question according to The Canadian Farm was one of the "live topics of the day."

⁵⁴The Farming World, July 15, 1902, p. 51; The Weekly Sun, June 4, 1902, p. 4.

⁵⁵The Farming World, May 21, 1901, p. 982; see also The Canadian Countryman, II, 25, (June 21, 1913), p. 5. Farm and Dairy, June 6, 1912, p. 17; Ibid., April 10, 1913, p. 4; Ibid., April 3, 1913, p. 14; The Canadian Farm, March 25, 1910, p. 1.

⁵⁶Farm and Dairy, August 7, 1913, p. 17; Ibid., August 12, 1909, Letter Mrs. W. E. Hopkins, Russell Co.

⁵⁷The Farmer's Advocate, October 12, 1911, p. 1677; see also Farm and Dairy, August 7, 1913, p. 17; Letter S. Monahan

⁵⁸The Farming World, March 18, 1902, p. 255; A. Leitch, "The Farm Labor Problem," The O.A.C. Review, XIX, 1, (October, 1906), p. 49; The Farming World, March 10, 1902, p. 255; The Farmer's Advocate, August 15, 1901, p. 534.

⁵⁹Ibid. See also The Weekly Sun, February 5, 1908, p. 1, E. C. Drury's speech at Whitby.

⁶⁰The Weekly Sun, January 28, 1903, p. 2.

⁶¹The hired man became the scapegoat of the farmer in many situations. On one occasion one man told of how when his employer was caught trying to cheat, the mill blamed him (The Farmer's Advocate, August 15, 1901, p. 534). Living in the farmer's house he was under the eye of the farmer's wife the while time "and she generally manages to make their lives not worth living. They must take off their boots on the doorstep; they must brush all the flies off in the screen door before they enter...they must not expect anything to drink on a broiling summer's day except hot tea.... Then the farmer's wife has a temper like a fiend and vents it all on the hired man when he comes in for his meals. (The Canadian Farm, February 2, 1912, p. 3). See also Ibid., January 12, 1912, p. 3, Letter from "Ardent Reader."

⁶²The Weekly Sun, June 4, 1902, p. 4.

⁶³The Canadian Farm, January 26, 1912, p. 4.

⁶⁴The Weekly Sun, February 25, 1903, p. 3, Letter Robert Hall;
Ibid., February 25, 1903, p. 3; Ibid., February 19, 1908, p. 6;
Ibid., March 11, 1908, p. 9.

⁶⁵W. C. Good, "The Farm Labor Problem," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XVII, 2, (November, 1904), p. 68; The Weekly Sun, February 25, 1903, p. 3.

⁶⁶The Farming World, March 18, 1902, p. 255; Ibid., July 15, 1902, p. 51; The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4; Ibid., January 28, 1903, p. 2; Farm and Dairy, November 28, 1912, p. 4; Ibid., November 18, 1909, p. 10; The Farmer's Advocate, April 18, 1907, p. 675.

⁶⁷Ibid., August 15, 1901, p. 534; Ibid., March 26, 1914, p. 586;
Ibid., January 11, 1912, p. 43.

⁶⁸A. Leitch, "The Farm Labor Problem," The O.A.C. Review, XIX, 1, (October, 1906), p. 49.

⁶⁹The Farmer's Advocate, January 11, 1912, p. 43; The Farming World, June 26, 1900, p. 1061; The Weekly Sun, June 4, 1902, p. 4; Farm and Dairy, October 27, 1910, p. 10; The Canadian Farm, March 25, 1910, p. 1; The Farming World, March 18, 1902, p. 255; Ibid., March 15, 1905, p. 213; A Campbell, "Making the Hired Man a Fixture," The Canadian Countryman, III, 36, (September 5, 1914), p. 6.

⁷⁰The Farmer's Advocate, November 2, 1903, p. 982; The Farming World, July 17, 1900, p. 1117; Farm and Dairy, March 26, 1914, p. 26.

⁷¹The Farming World, April 15, 1905, p. 294; The Weekly Sun, February 25, 1903, p. 3, Letter from Isaac Puston who said that "for myself I cannot see any way to make it [farm labour shortage] any better except by immigration from the older countries. This policy gained the support of the ex-minister of labour W. L. Mackenzie King in 1912 who remarked that immigration was necessary to meet the demand for farm labour (The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1912, p. 59). See also The Weekly Sun, March 4, 1903, Letter from E. H. Standing; The Farming World, April 15, 1903, p. 195 told the farmer that he would not get even inexperienced farm helpers for the prices he was offering.

Some countrymen were even opposed to government-assisted British immigrants who "would be of the lower, drinking class, for surely a sober industrious man could get money enough to leave the homeland if he wished without aid, (The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4).

⁷²The Farming World, October 1, 1907, p. 903; Ibid., March 15, 1906, p. 197; The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4, Letter from Andrew Elliot; Ibid., May 22, 1907, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, April 9, 1914, p. 697; Ibid., March 2, 1903, p. 199; Farm and Dairy, April 21, 1910, p. 12; W. J. Black, "The Farm Labour Problem," The O.A.C. Review,

⁷³The Farmer's Advocate, April 9, 1914, p. 697; The Farming World, July 1, 1907, p. 593.

⁷⁴The Farmer's Advocate, January 25, 1912, p. 139; Letter from "Agricola"; The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4.

⁷⁵The Farmer's Advocate, October 13, 1904, p. 1371; The Weekly Sun, February 11, 1903, p. 4; Letter from A. Elliott. Ibid., September 9, 1903, p. 2; comments by two farmers at the C.N.E.; The Canadian Farm, February 17, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., November 3, 1911, p. 1; The Canadian Countryman, II, 49, (December 6, 1913); p. 5; A. Leitch, "The Farm Labour Problem," The O.A.C. Review, p. 48.

⁷⁶The Farming World, April 1, 1903, p. 156.

⁷⁷Ibid., May 1, 1903, p. 247. At the same time the paper remarked on its neutrality regarding the race issue. The Chinese were to be allowed into Canada as labourers only. "We have no special love for Chinamen, either as a nation or as individuals, but if they can be utilized to solve the farm help problem, we say by all means give them a chance to do so." See also Ibid., September 16, 1907, p. 855, and The Farmer's Advocate, May 11, 1906, p. 698; Max Wexford, "The Duty We Owe the Immigrant," The Canadian Countryman, III, 18, (May 2, 1914), p. 10.

⁷⁸The Canadian Farm, April 14, 1911, p. 1. It assured the rural people that only the best would come because most southern peoples could not stand the Canadian winter. Ibid., January 3, 1912, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate did not support bringing in the various groups as labourers on the farm but did urge a more tolerant attitude towards them and an open door policy on the part of the Canadian government (The Farmer's Advocate, July 23, 1914, p. 1345).

⁷⁹The Weekly Sun, June 22, 1904, p. 1.

⁸⁰Ibid., June 1, 1910, p. 1.

⁸¹Max Wexford, The Canadian Countryman, p. 10. W. J. Elliott, "Our Duty to the Newcomer," The Canadian Countryman, II, 30, (July 26, 1913), p. 10.

⁸²The Farming World, June 1, 1904, p. 419.

⁸³Ibid., December 1, 1902, p. 521; Ibid., February 1, 1904, p. 119; Ibid., February 1, 1907, p. 115; The Weekly Sun, July 13, 1904, p. 3; Ibid., April 26, 1905, p. 3; Farm and Dairy, May 9, 1912, p. 15; The Farmer's Advocate, May 5, 1904. In 1904 they sent in workers at the rate of fifty per day and the Bureau had over 4,000 in the Spring (The Farmer's Advocate, May 5, 1904).

⁸⁴In the years before 1904, the Salvation Army had arranged for 1,000. After this, in the second year of operation, the Army imported 4,000 men; then 13,000 in the third year and in the fourth year they expected to bring from 25,000 to 30,000 to Canada. (J. M. McGillivray, "Farm Labor Problem," Annual Reports of the Livestock Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1906-1907, p. 95). They worked closely with the Ontario Government, taking charge under government supervision of the new provincial immigration shelter, (Farming World, January 15, 1907, p. 47).

⁸⁵The Farmer's Advocate, March 20, 1913, p. 559; Ibid., April 3, 1913, p. 615; The Canadian Countryman, II, 19, (May 17, 1913), p. 22.

⁸⁶A budget of \$1,250,000 aimed at settling 10,000 to 12,000 in Ontario that year. This number would be largely farm labourers to be placed by the Farm Labor Bureau of Ontario (The Farming World, January 15, 1907).

⁸⁷In 1907, for example, 2,900 applications from farmers were in the hands of the Ontario authorities and 1,700 remained unfilled months later, although 22,000 immigrants entered the province in the meantime (The Weekly Sun, June 5, 1907, p. 7).

⁸⁸The Canadian Farm, June 10, 1910, p. 1. Arch. Leitch, The O.A.C. Review, XIX, 1, (October, 1906), p. 47; W. J. Black, The O.A.C. Review, XII, 4, (January, 1904), p. 13. He remarks that while mechanization eased the labour shortage, farmers ought to remember they were "making use of the very weapon which has aided in bringing about the present condition." The Weekly Sun, February 15, 1911, p. 5, announced Sir Wm. Macdonald would give a prize to the man who invented the most efficient milker. The Weekly Sun, January 15, 1908, p. 1, said that machinery bought on the co-op basis was one way to reduce costs and improve efficiency. Ibid., July 18, 1906, Advertisement for the national cream separator company said that the cream separator was the only way in which the farm labour problem could be kept under control. Farm and Dairy, June 1, 1914, p. 3, Prof. John Evans, remarked that inventions would solve the labor problem. Ibid., June 3, 1909, p. 14, remarked that the introduction of labour saving machinery was one way in which young men could be induced to remain on the farm. Ibid., June 2, 1910, p. 12; The Farming World, August 1, 1904, p. 548 remarked that as well as increasing his market the implement manufacturer was increasing the farmer's efficiency. The Canadian Farm, July 14, 1911, p. 1 remarked on the help which the machinery gave the farmer. The Canadian Countryman, II, 44, (November 11, 1913), p. 5.

⁸⁹The Farming World, September 18, 1900, pp. 126-127.

⁹⁰The Weekly Sun, June 8, 1910, p. 5, Letter from James Allen, The Farming World, May 29, 1900, p. 973.

⁹¹Farming, April 7, 1900, p. 851, a special issue on machinery; see also Farm and Dairy, June 1, 1911, for another special issue.

⁹²The Farmer's Advocate, May 23, 1907, p. 864.

⁹³Ibid., February 1, 1906, p. 163. (No really satisfactory device had been developed but various attempts showed promise.) The Canadian Farm, June 2, 1911, p. 1, article by a prof. at Macdonald College explained how milkers reduced work load. Farm and Dairy, January 15, 1914, p. 5.

⁹⁴For example see The Canadian Countryman, II, 8, (February 22, 1913), p. 20.

⁹⁵The Farmer's Advocate published many articles throughout 1900 on the subject of the proper design of barns. Ibid., January 5, 1911, p. 10, Letter John J. Hammond.

⁹⁶The Canadian Countryman, II, 17, (April 26, 1913), p. 22.

⁹⁷The Farming World, December 18, 1900, p. 385.

⁹⁸The Canadian Countryman, See various issues for ads promoting this device.

⁹⁹The Farmer's Advocate, April, 1900, p. 2111, Advertisements for steam tractors urged farmers to be "up-to-date" in this age of progress. The Canadian Farm, January 12, 1912, p. 2, Correspondence course conducted by Dr. J. C. Lynde of Macdonald College explained the principles of operation and repair of steam machinery.

¹⁰⁰The Canadian Farm, February 4, 1910, p. 3; The Canadian Countryman, II, 1, (January 4, 1913), p. 4.

¹⁰¹Ibid., III, 9, (February 28, 1914), p. 3. This explained the basic operation and maintenance of such a motor. Ibid., II, 28, (July 12, 1913), p. 32, advertisements for a Massey-Harris engine. Ibid., August 9, 1913, p. 3, advertisement explained how Massey-Harris valves worked on their engines. The Weekly Sun, April 14, 1909, p. 6. The earliest example of a description of new power was in The Farmer's Advocate, March 1, 1900, p. 127, in a letter describing how A. W. Lecain used a 2 h.p. gas engine to run a cream separator. The Farmer's Advocate, September 1, 1900, p. 521 (an advertisement for a gas engine to help pumping water). Ibid., February 22, 1906, advertisement of International Harvester engine. Ibid., March 15, 1906, p. 402, Letter from E.G.H. The Farmer's Advocate, August 29, 1907, p. 1359.

¹⁰²Ibid., August 8, 1912, p. 1404, tractor ads reported that the Case tractor broke records at Winnipeg and offered 40 and 60 h.p. tractors for sale. The Farm and Dairy, June 4, 1914, p. 5, the "Hay driven motor delivered only two pounds of energy for every 100 lbs. consumed. It was the most wasteful of all power.

¹⁰³The Farmer's Advocate, March 21, 1912, p. 528.

¹⁰⁴Wilson B.S.A. Thesis, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph: 1913, p. 37. He gives a report on the uses of hydro electric power for running various pumps, crushers, lighting, churning; Farm and Dairy, June 4, 1914, p. 7; The Farmer's Magazine, November, 1912, p. 68ff.; The Weekly Sun, January 17, 1903, p. 1; Ibid., August 10, 1910, p. 5; Ibid., February 15, 1911, p. 6; The Canadian Farm, October 21, 1910, p. 1.

¹⁰⁵Farm and Dairy, March 13, 1913, p. 16; The Canadian Farm, March 10, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., July 15, 1910, p. 1; Ibid., January 14, 1910, p. 1; The Farming World, November 13, 1900, p. 276; The Canadian Countryman, II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 4; The O.A.C. Review, XII, 6, (March, 1901), p. 10; The Farmer's Advocate, November 27, 1913, p. 2049; Ibid., March 15, 1900, p. 147; Ibid., January 16, 1913, p. 77; A. W. Campbell, "Highway Economics," The O.A.C. Review, XX, 9, (June, 1908), p. 477ff.

¹⁰⁶Farm and Dairy, March 14, 1912, p. 10; The Weekly Sun, July 30, 1902, p. 1; Ibid., January 1, 1902, p. 2.

¹⁰⁷The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1902, p. 707; The Weekly Sun, January 14, 1902, p. 1; Ibid., November 12, 1902, p. 3; The Farming World, May 1, 1907, p. 403.

¹⁰⁸The Canadian Farm, November 25, 1910, p. 1; The Farming World, January 1, 1904, p. 23; W. A. Craik, "The Farmer and the Phone," The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1912, p. 82ff.; The Weekly Sun, August 21, 1907, p. 4; Ibid., July 6, 1910, p. 3; The Canadian Countryman, II, 37, (September, 13, 1913), p. 5; Ibid., III, 25, (June 20, 1914), p. 5.

109

The Farmer's Advocate, April 16, 1908, p. 698, letter; Farm and Dairy, June 5, 1913, p. 5; The Weekly Sun, November 18, 1903, p. 4; Ibid., October 7, 1903, p. 3; The Canadian Farm, February 10, 1911, p. 1.

110

For an example of this viewpoint see Farm and Dairy's criticism of Rev. J. Macdougall's book, (November 6, 1913, p. 4), for not putting enough emphasis on distributional causes of depopulation.

CHAPTER VII

NOTES

¹Farm and Dairy, November 20, 1913, p. 12; The Weekly Sun, September 15, 1909, p. 1; W. C. Good, Farmer Citizen, p. 98; Farm and Dairy, November 30, 1913, p. 12; The estimated price of farm land in Ontario had increased 15% in the previous ten years (1903-1913) while everything else rose in value by 30%. (The Farmer's Advocate, February 26, 1913, p. 369; The Weekly Sun, September 15, 1909, p. 1.

²Jean McLeod, "The United Farmer Movement in Ontario, 1914-1943," unpublished M.A. Thesis, Queen's University, 1958, p. 5.

³Ibid., November 20, 1913, p. 12; Ibid., October 21, 1909, p. 10; W. C. Good Papers, vol. 10, f. 19192, December 20, 1913, MSS of Grange Address in which he lays the blame for depopulation and rural problems on the doorstep of industrialization. See also Appendix F for presentation of farmers at Ottawa in 1910; The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1841 for E. C. Drury's address to the Grange in 1908; E. C. Drury, The O.A.C. Review, XIV, 7, (April, 1902), p. 4. Rev. J. Macdougall, "The Rural Problem," Social Service Congress Report, p. 151.

⁴Farm and Dairy, May 8, 1913, p. 3.

⁵The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1841, Report of E. C. Drury to the Grange; see also "Drury, "The Farmers on the Question of the Tariff," Farm and Dairy, December 29, 1910, p. 3; The Weekly Sun, October 12, 1904, p. 10, Letter from a "Canadian."

⁶Good, Farmer Citizen, p. 96.

⁷The Farmer's Advocate, September 4, 1913, p. 1537.

⁸Farm and Dairy, November 20, 1913, p. 12.

⁹The Weekly Sun, September 14, 1910, p. 1; Ibid., September 28, 1908, p. 6.

¹⁰Ibid., September 5, 1906, p. 2; Ibid., August 22, 1906, p. 7, (Speech of A. F. Wilson to Union of Municipalities).

¹¹Farm and Dairy, July 21, 1900, p. 3.

¹²The Farmer's Advocate, July 24, 1913, p. 1289.

¹³The Weekly Sun, May 31, 1911, p. 3; Ibid., January 3 or 10, 1906, for a series of letters circularizing pork packers; Farm and Dairy, July 21, 1910, p. 10.

¹⁴Peter Ryan, "The Canadian Bank Combine and Untaxed Currency," (Submission to the Senate, in the Laurier Papers, vol. 759 f. 216659); The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1912, p. 13. ("So little sympathy exists with the big institutions for the farmer and his work that unless the farmer himself goes after what he wants...he gets little shift in the play of commercial forces.") The Weekly Sun, December 21, 1910, p. 1, (branch banks tended to centralize the wealth of the people and make it a tool of the head office.); Ibid., October 26, 1910, p. 6; The Farmer's Advocate, April 2, 1914, p. 637 (remarked on the fact that due to McArthur's campaign against the banks which the journal supported, display advertising by chartered banks had been withdrawn from this magazine). For details of the farmers' case against the banks see Farm and Dairy, April 10, 1913, p. 8, for Peter McArthur's presentation to the banking commission.

¹⁵Farm and Dairy, January 4, 1912, p. 4; Ibid., May 8, 1913, p. 3, article by H. B. Cowan. The feeling in rural areas can be measured by the number of letters published on this issue. One edition of The Farmer's Advocate contained six letters (May 22, 1913). One of them declared that "the sooner a Moses arises to lead us out of our present bondage, the better. I am no leader of men, but I am ready to 'fall in' and follow."

¹⁶The Weekly Sun, March 30, 1910, p. 1. This editorial attacked the retailers for blocking the legislation to set up co-op stores and for their incorporation of the Retail Merchants' Association of Canada. See also The Farmer's Advocate, February 9, 1912, p. 3.

¹⁷The Weekly Sun, August 25, 1909, p. 1; The Canadian Farm, June 9, 1911, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, May 14, 1914, p. 949.

¹⁸The Canadian Farm, May 26, 1911, p. 1, Letter J. W. Dow, Springfield, Ontario; The Weekly Sun, August 16, 1911, p. 1.

¹⁹The Weekly Sun, October 12, 1904, p. 10.

²⁰Ibid., March 7, 1909, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1841. E. C. Drury at the annual Grange meeting remarked that the lawyers of Simcoe County were drawing \$80,000 per year from the productive classes when one quarter of the men making the same money or more would be better for all concerned. See also Farm and Dairy, August 11, 1910, p. 10, or Good, Farmer Citizen, p. 98, or E. C. Drury, The O.A.C. Review, XIV, 7, April, 1902, p. 5.

²¹E. C. Drury, "Canada's Parasites," The O.A.C. Review, XIV, 8, 1911, p. 13. See also The Canadian Farm, February 23, 1912, p. 1, which noted that "there is, in this country two general classes, so to speak, one class whose sympathies are entirely urban and another class who live on the land, whose sympathies are anti-urban. Although these classes may not be necessarily antagonistic to each other, yet their sympathies tend to opposite directions."

²²W. C. Good, "Two Reasons Plain," The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1912, p. 61. See also W. C. Good, Farmer Citizen, p. 98. A representative of the Toronto Board of Trade remarked that "to me, his [E. C. Drury's] language at times seems to betray the sympathetic position in which he poses towards his fellowman, by betraying feelings of apparent hatred and envy towards the reputed prosperity of others of his countrymen engaged in other industrial pursuits. I submit, Mr. Editor, that the creating of the feelings of irritability in the minds of one industrial class towards those of their fellow laborers in the other branches of industry is vicious and unpatriotic." (Wm. Ellis in Farm and Dairy, March 16, 1911, p. 2).

²³J. Kerr Abbott, "Will Rural Democracy Dwindle," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXVI, 4, (January, 1914), p. 224. For an excellent presentation of this point of view see W. C. Good's speech to the Dominion Grange 1913, (Farmer Citizen, p. 98) of The Weekly Sun, October 25, 1911, p. 1.

²⁴Peter McArthur wrote an excellent series in The Farmer's Advocate, which summarize the major arguments. See Peter McArthur, "Our Real Rulers," The Farmer's Advocate, April 24, 1914, p. 649. Peter McArthur, "The Toothpick Trust," Ibid., February 26, 1914, p. 375; _____, "The Innocent Investor," Ibid., April 18, 1912, p. 733; _____, "On the Side," Ibid., April 11, 1912, p. 680; _____, "The Cheerful Gover," Ibid., April 4, 1912, p. 628. H. B. Cowan wrote a similar series in Farm and Dairy, for example, see H. B. Cowan, "The Farmer's Interest in Combines and Mergers," Farm and Dairy, March 28, 1913, p. 4; The Weekly Sun, April 13, 1910, p. 1, urged an honest anti-combine measure honestly enforced; Ibid., April 13, 1910, p. 1, W. L. Smith condemns the formation of a furniture combine; W. L. Smith, The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXI, 6, (March, p. 321, describes the type of price-fixing arrangements; The Canadian Farm, October 28, 1910, p. 1, remarked how the combine should receive no consideration in the tariff negotiation; The Weekly Sun, July 19, 1911, p. 1, deplores the formation of a varnish combine; The Canadian Farm, January 21, 1909, p. 1. This editorial remarked on the spread of trusts which ought to be controlled immediately; The Weekly Sun, July 5, 1911, p. 1, remarks that the bread monopoly ought not to be allowed to control prices..

²⁵The Weekly Sun, May 1, 1912, p. 1.

²⁶Ibid., May 3, 1911, p. 1.

- ²⁷Ibid., March 15, 1911, p. 1; see also Ibid., March 30, 1910, p.1.
- ²⁸Ibid., September 28, 1910, p. 5, Letter from E. C. Drury.
- ²⁹Ibid.; The Weekly Sun, May 4, 1910, p. 5, Letter from Francis Dagger.
- ³⁰W. C. Good Papers, f. 12194, MSS. of Speech to Grange, 1913.
- ³¹Whether the proposed trade pact was good or bad, remarked The Canadian Farm, (June 9, 1911, p. 1), it had focussed attention to the needs of rural areas as no previous political question had done. (See also E. C. Drury, "Tariff Reduction in Canada is a Necessity," The Farmer's Magazine, November, 1910, p. 59.)
- ³²The Weekly Sun, October 3, 1906, p. 1; see also series of columns by Adam Russel (example: Ibid., October 13, 1909, p. 7) and M. S. Schell, The Farmer's View, n.p. 1911, for the standard argument against the tariff. For a good summary of rural complaints against the tariff see E. C. Drury, "Tariff Reduction is a Necessity," The Farmer's Magazine, November, 1910, p. 59ff.
- ³³The Weekly Sun, October 19, 1910, p. 8, Letter from Drury; see also The Farmer's Advocate, November 23, 1905, p. 1646, and the W. C. Good Papers, vol. 14, submission to the tariff commission in 1905, copied from an article in The University Magazine, "Tariffs, Bounties and the Farmer." For Drury's method of calculation of the cost of the tariff see E. C. Drury, "What Protection Costs Canada," The Farmer's Magazine, May, 1911, p. 19. Manufacturers increased their output from \$481,000,000 to \$715,000,000 in the years from 1901 to 1905 ("Tariffs Bounties and the Farmers," Good Papers.
- ³⁴The Weekly Sun, September 23, 1908, p. 6; see also Ibid., October 3, 1906, p. 1; Farm and Dairy, November 10, 1910, p. 10; and The Farmer's Advocate, July 14, 1910, p. 1138.
- ³⁵Canadians exported over 85 million dollars worth of certain agricultural products in 1904 and imported just \$2,000,000. Imports to Canada would not increase because the prices for agricultural products were higher in the United States.
- ³⁶P.A.C., Good Papers, "Tariffs, Bounties and the Farmer," (He noted an increase in agricultural exports from \$10,000,000 in 1879 to \$120,000,000 in 1904.) See also The Weekly Sun, November 29, 1905, speech of David Wilson, Secretary of the Morpeth Farmer's Association to the Tariff Commission at Chatham; Farm and Dairy, October 6, 1910, p. 10. See also speech of W. C. Good to the Tariff Commission at Brantford, 1905 in The Weekly Sun, November 29, 1905, p. 8.

³⁷Farm and Dairy, November 10, 1910, p. 10, Letter from L. , Shaw.

³⁸One submission to the tariff Commission noted that in Canada agricultural capital invested totalled \$1,787,000,000 and manufacturing only \$447,000,000 while the number employed was 344,000 in industry and 1,000,000 in farming. Agriculture therefore was "the pioneering industry and all others depended upon it." (Thomas McMillan, The Farmer's Advocate, November 30, 1905, p. 1686.) See The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1507; Ibid., November 23, 1905, p. 1645; Ibid., December 19, 1907, p. 2003; The Weekly Sun, January 21, 1914, p. 3; E. C. Drury, "Tariff Reduction is a Necessity," The Farmer's Magazine, November, 1910, p. 59; The Farmer's Advocate, July 14, 1910, p. 1138; Ibid., October 6, 1910, p. 1590; The Weekly Sun, April 1, 1903, (Thos. Brooks and Farmer's Association at Ottawa); The Farmer's Advocate, July 28, 1910, p. 1203; The Farming World, November 15, 1905, p. 1906; E. C. Drury, "Canada's Parasites," Ontario Agricultural College Review, XIV, 8, 1911, p. 15.

³⁹The Weekly Sun, October 16, 1907, p. 1.

⁴⁰Ibid., November 14, 1906, p. 1. The total in 1912 was \$20,519,000 for iron, oil, binder twine, railroads, etc. In ten years before 1909, \$13,000,000 was paid out in bounties to the iron and steel industry.

⁴¹Ibid., February 13, 1909, p. 1; Ibid., January 30, 1907, p. 7. Eight petitions were presented on the 21st of January and more later that week.

⁴²Ibid., October 17, 1906, p. 5; see also Peter McArthur, The Farmer's Advocate, May 12, 1914, p. 951.

⁴³The Weekly Sun, November 3, 1909, p. 1; see also Ibid., May 1, 1907, p. 3, protest at the House of Commons' approval of increasing and extending bounties on iron and steel; see W. L. Smith, "Overcrowding in the Cities," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 44ff.; The Weekly Sun, January 21, 1914, p. 3, reported that even the municipalities were trying to get into the act and promised to grant tax exemptions to industry as incentives.

⁴⁴The Weekly Sun, May 4, 1910, p. 1.

⁴⁵The Canadian Farm, March 18, 1910, p. 1. Farmers appeared to be consistent in their opposition to bonuses for they even opposed the subsidization of other agriculturists. The Sun opposed the use of public money to aid in the establishment of the beet sugar industry in Ontario (January 30, 1901, p. 1). A livestock farmer complained that the dairy-men of the province had received special treatment. This treatment was as unjustified as the bonus paid the iron manufacturers, (John Campbell, Woodville, The Weekly Sun, February 19, 1908, p. 5).

⁴⁶The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1513, Letter from a Nottawasaga Farmer; see also Peter McArthur, "The Question of Hired Help," The Farmer's Advocate, August 8, 1912, p. 1394.

⁴⁷The Weekly Sun, May 11, 1904, p. 1; Ibid., March 24, 1909, p. 1; Ibid., May 29, 1907, p. 1; W. L. Smith, "Overcrowding in the Cities," The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 46; The Weekly Sun, November 29, 1905, p. 8 (Speech of Thomas Brooks at Brantford); Farm and Dairy, November 17, 1910, p. 10; E. C. Drury, "The Farmers on the Question of the Tariff," Farm and Dairy, December 29, 1910, p. 3; W. C. Good, "The Farm Labor Problem," The Ontario Agricultural College Review, XXVII, 2, November, 1904, p. 69; The Weekly Sun, October 5, 1910, p. 1, letter "Retired Farmer."

⁴⁸The Weekly Sun, November 14, 1906, p. 1; Ibid., November 9, 1910, p. 7.

⁴⁹W. C. Good told the Tariff Commission that the deficit amounted to \$112,000,000, (The Weekly Sun, November 29, 1905, p. 8).

⁵⁰Ibid.; see also The Canadian Farm, Letter W.E.P., Bowmanville, October 14, 1910, p. 1, and E. C. Drury, "The Farmers on the Question of the Tariff," Farm and Dairy, December 29, 1910, p. 3.

⁵¹The Canadian Farm, February 9, 1911, p. 3, Letter J. R. Philip, Maple Lane; The Farmer's Advocate, August 4, 1910, p. 1255; The Weekly Sun, November 1, 1905, p. 1; Ibid., November 29, 1905, p. 6, (David Wilson of Morpeth Farmer's Association at the Tariff Commission); Ibid., December 6, 1905; Farm and Dairy, November 17, 1910, p. 10; The Weekly Sun, June 1, 1904, p. 1.

⁵²The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1513; see also Peter McArthur, "The Question of Hired Help;" Ibid., August 8, 1912, p. 1394.

⁵³E. C. Drury, "Reciprocity," The Farmer's Magazine, August, 1911, p. 20ff.; see also The Farmer's Advocate, December 22, 1910, p. 2048. These sentiments were similar to those voiced in the Toronto Meetings of the Dominion Grange for several years, (The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1841ff.).

⁵⁴The Weekly Sun, February 6, 1911, p. 4, Speech of Hon. J. S. Duff at the Nelson and Burlington Agricultural Societies.

⁵⁵The Farmer's Magazine, December, 1911, p. 16; see also Ibid., September, 1911, pp. 5-6. One farmer titled his letter "The Sinister Scream of Annexation" which heatedly remarked that reciprocity would ruin both Canadian industry and agriculture; (The Farmer's Advocate, April 13, 1911, p. 651).

⁵⁶Lewis Austin, "The People Should Speak," The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1911, p. 32.

⁵⁷The Farmer's Advocate, April 9, 1908.

⁵⁸The Weekly Sun, February 22, 1911, p. 1.

⁵⁹The Farmer's Advocate, April 18, 1912, p. 732. At the same time, however, the journal included education away from the farm as the other major cause of depopulation.

⁶⁰Archie L. McCredie, "The Real Reciprocity," The Farmer's Magazine, September, 1911, p. 29. "My people are farmers. My life work is farm journalism. My father was one of the leaders in the Patrons of Industry. I am a Member of the Grange. My education has been at the Ontario Agricultural College...."

⁶¹The Farmer's Magazine, October, 1911, p. 8. For another comment see the George F. Graham Papers, Thomas Southworth to G. Graham, September 22, 1911, f. 33388. "For once Sir Wilfrid and his Cabinet misjudged public sentiment. You naturally thought when the farmers of the country made their demand for reciprocity so insistently that they really wanted it, but they did not want it so badly as to be exempt from being stampeded by the usual appeal to sentiment...it does not pay from a party point of view to pay much attention to the requests of the people, but to succeed the party needs to stand by the protected interests of the men with special privileges who have the long green."

⁶²The Weekly Sun, September 27, 1911, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, October 26, 1911, p. 1746. (The farmers split and enabled the manufacturers, trusts and railroads to swing the election.); Farm and Dairy, September 28, 1911, p. 12 (noted that educational work had made a good start and ought to continue.

⁶³Farm and Dairy, February 15, 1912, p. 4, Series on Land Taxation article number 10.

⁶⁴Farm and Dairy, November 30, 1911, p. 4; see also "Fair Play," in The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, pp. 318-319.

⁶⁵Ibid., October 21, 1909, p. 10; Ibid., August 21, 1913, p. 10; Ibid., November 14, 1912, p. 3.

⁶⁶Ibid., November 11, 1909, p. 10; Ibid., November 14, 1912, p. 3. Major article by H. B. Cowan laying responsibility for depopulation at the door of exploitation of land values in the cities; Ibid., October 21, 1909, p. 10; Ibid., March 7, 1912, p. 4; Ibid., November 30, 1911, p. 4; The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, p. 318, (Letter "Fair Play"); Ibid., January 23, 1910, p. 10, Report of N. W. Rowell's address at Princeton, Oxford Co.

⁶⁷Farm and Dairy, December 12, 1912, p. 3.

⁶⁸Ibid., November 30, 1911, p. 4; Ibid., March 2, 1911, p. 3; Ibid., November 11, 1909, p. 10; The Farmer's Advocate, September 9, 1909, p. 1441; The Canadian Farm, April 8, 1910, p. 1.

⁶⁹Farm and Dairy, August 21, 1913, p. 10.

⁷⁰The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, p. 319.

⁷¹The Weekly Sun, June 30, 1909, p. 1. Over 500 provincial municipalities petitioned the government for a change (Farm and Dairy, February 16, 1911, p. 3).

⁷²The Farmer's Advocate, September 9, 1909, p. 1441.

⁷³The Farmer's Advocate, January 19, 1911, p. 86; The Weekly Sun, July 9, 1902, p. 8.

⁷⁴The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1911, p. 10.

⁷⁵The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 1842, "The Township of Oro in the county of Simcoe, has 13 miles of railway. This includes 127 acres of land, and buildings assessed at \$1750. The total assessment is \$17367 on which the rate of taxation is the same as on farm property for county, township and general land and special school rates. That a railway, running through good country and worth in actual costs probably \$20,000 per mile, a total of \$390,000 should pay no more in taxation than an average 200 acre farm is absurd." See also The Weekly Sun, March 13, 1901, p. 1; Ibid., April 23, 1902, p. 1.

⁷⁶Ibid., February 12, 1902, p. 6. A whole page is given to Pettypiece's arguments for higher taxation. The Weekly Sun, January 15, 1902, p. 1; Ibid., February 11, 1903, p. 6, for reprint of Pettypiece's argument; Ibid., October 15, 1902, for speech of L. E. Annis; Ibid., September 21, 1910, p. 1. See also report of the meeting of the Dominion Grange, 1908, in which lines operating in Ontario and also the U. S. were compared. The G.T.R. and the C.P.R. and the Michigan Central in the six states bordering Ontario had 5120 miles of track. In 1907 the taxes on these lines mounted to \$2,444,000 or \$471 per mile. In Ontario the railways had 5320 miles and paid only \$85 per mile.

⁷⁷The Weekly Sun, February 10, 1904, p. 2; Ibid., September 6, 1903, p. 6. See also report on speech by James McEwing, President of the Farmer's Association (The Weekly Sun, September 5, 1906, p. 6.).

⁷⁸Farm and Dairy, May 15, 1913, p. 14.

⁷⁹The Weekly Sun, September 9, 1908, p. 1.

⁸⁰Ibid., May 27, 1903, p. 1. The Ontario Association of Fairs and Exhibitions sent a resolution to the Minister of Railways on the subject of stopping the accidents at level crossings. (P.A.C. Graham Papers, J. Lockie Wilson to G. P. Graham, February 19, 1909).

⁸¹The Weekly Sun, April 2, 1902, p. 13. The bill was introduced by E. A. Lancaster, M.P. for Lincoln and Niagara.

⁸²The Weekly Sun, April 1, 1903, p. 1. See also L. A. Wood, A History of Farmer's Movements in Canada, p. 150.

⁸³The Weekly Sun, October 15, 1902, p. 4, Speech of L. E. Annis of the East York Farmer's Association. Another article claimed that farmers paid up to \$30 to \$25 million more than they should in excess rates (Ibid., December 7, 1910, p. 9).

⁸⁴W. L. Smith, The O.A.C. Review, XIV, 4, January, 1904, p. 9.

⁸⁵Farm and Dairy, January 28, 1909, p. 14. The C.P.R. express company earned \$19,185 per year per car, (The Weekly Sun, June 9, 1909, p. 1); The Farmer's Advocate, January 28, 1904, p. 120; The Farming World, January 8, 1901, p. 441; Ibid., December 10, 1901, p. 631.

⁸⁶The Weekly Sun, January 28, 1904, p. 8, W. D. Gregory's submission to the Railway Commission for a reduction in rates.

⁸⁷The Farming World, March 1, 1904, p. 174.

⁸⁸The Weekly Sun, May 4, 1904, p. 1.

⁸⁹Ibid., W. L. Smith, The O.A.C. Review, XIV, 4, January, 1904, p. 11.

⁹⁰The Farmer's Magazine, May, 1911, p. 7.

⁹¹The Farming World, January 8, 1901, p. 441; see also The Weekly Sun, January 29, 1902, p. 6.

⁹²Ibid., February 11, 1903, p. 2.

⁹³The new railroad act introduced into Parliament in 1902 provided for the appointment of an independent railroad commission to take the place of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council. Its powers, according to the original proposal, would cover railway rates, and the supervision of all dealings and adjustment of all disputes between the railways and their patrons.

⁹⁴The Farming World, April 15, 1902, p. 377; The Weekly Sun, April 16, 1902, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, January 28, 1904, p. 120. The bill became law on October 24, 1903 and came into force in February, 1904. This bill also incorporated the principle that the animals killed by trains on railroad property were the responsibility of the roads. The farmer could be held responsible, however, if the roads could prove his negligence. It also gave the farmers right to drain their lands across railroad tracks.

⁹⁵The Farmer's Advocate, January 28, 1904, p. 120. Mills believed that the aim of the commission was to make sure that "ordinary people, rich or poor, having dealings with the railway companies could have their disputes settled and get substantive justice without the expense of litigation." This, Mills believed, was thwarted by the "do-nothing" attitude of procedure and the encouragement of the commission of people to "go to law even in the most petty matters." He also urged that another farmer be appointed because of the importance of agriculture in Canada, (George P. Graham Papers, James Mills to Graham, March 9, 1908, f. 22467).

⁹⁶Farm and Dairy, March 25, 1910, p. 14; see also The Weekly Sun, December 21, 1910, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, March 21, 1907, p. 295; The Weekly Sun, January 25, 1911, p. 1.

⁹⁷Ibid., March 13, 1907, p. 61, Letter Charles C. Ford.

⁹⁸The Farming World, February 15, 1907, p. 148.

⁹⁹The Weekly Sun, January 10, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., October 15, 1902, 'The Bystander'; Ibid., May 13, 1903, p. 1, 'The Bystander'.

¹⁰⁰The Farmer's Advocate, January 28, 1910, p. 203; Ibid., February 21, 1907, p. 395.

¹⁰¹The Farmer's Advocate, March 16, 1905, p. 374, Letter from Austin L. McCredie; see also speech of J. Lockie Wilson; (The Weekly Sun, November 5, 1902, p. 3).

¹⁰²The Weekly Sun, July 23, 1902, p. 6; The Canadian Farm, April 28, 1911, p. 1; Ibid., September 24, 1909, p. 1; Ibid., October 7, 1910, p. 1.

¹⁰³The Weekly Sun, May 4, 1904, p. 6. See same page for statement to the same effect by C. A. Mallory, and Ibid. for letter from J. J. Morrison.

¹⁰⁴Ibid., October 2, 1907, p. 1.

¹⁰⁵Ibid., July 14, 1910, p. 1137.

¹⁰⁶The Farmer's Advocate, July 21, 1910, p. 1173, Letter from E. C. Drury.

¹⁰⁷The Weekly Sun, November 26, 1902, p. 7; see also Farm and Dairy, November 18, 1909, p. 10.

¹⁰⁸This organization ought to have as few ties outside the agricultural community as possible. This contrasted to the former attitude towards agricultural organizations which had looked outside the farming classes for financial support as the farmers went around "with their hats in their hands to the merchants and others of the nearby towns and villages asking for contributions..."it often happened that the farmers who did this left the impression that they were too poor to contribute to their own causes and that they expected others to help them out. This placed all farm organizations in a humiliating position. (Farm and Dairy, April 8, 1909, p. 16).

¹⁰⁹The Weekly Sun, September 9, 1903, p. 8. Report of a speech made by Good at the organizational meeting of the South Brant Farmers' Association. See also The Farming World, September 16, 1902, p. 265 for similar sentiments re: the need for farm organizations and avoiding class politics.

¹¹⁰The Farming World, September 16, 1902, p. 265.

¹¹¹The Weekly Sun, September 11, 1907, p. 1.

¹¹²Ibid., January 9, 1907, p. 1.

¹¹³Farm and Dairy, January 14, 1909, p. 12.

¹¹⁴The Weekly Sun, January 14, 1904, p. 7. Report of a speech by W. L. Smith at a farmers' meeting at Stayner. See also a letter by W. F. Maclean, M.P. in Farm and Dairy, September 2, 1909, p. 2.

¹¹⁵The Weekly Sun, June 16, 1909, p. 1. Statement from Nesbitt, M.P. for Oxford.

¹¹⁶Ibid., November 28, 1906, p. 5, Letter H. J. Potts, Bruce Co.

¹¹⁷The Canadian Farm, April 28, 1911, p. 1.

¹¹⁸Ibid., February 25, 1910, p. 1.

¹¹⁹The Weekly Sun, February 17, 1909, p. 6; The Farming World, September 16, 1902, p. 265.

¹²⁰ See L. A. Wood for the full story of the expansion and the decline of the Grange in Canada or Jean McLeod for a summary and interpretation of the significance of the earlier farm organizations.

¹²¹ The Weekly Sun, February 6, 1911, p. 41; Ibid., February 22, 1911, for similar optimistic stories of the expansion of the organization in Drayton, Erin, Innerkip, Dufferin, Grey, Oxford, and Ibid., March 1, 1911, p. 1; The Farm and Dairy, February 9, 1911; The Weekly Sun, March 20, 1912, p. 1, (The Grange is a power for good).

¹²² The Farming World, September 16, 1902, p. 265 for story of founding of the Farmers' Association.

¹²³ C. A. Mallory chaired the founding meeting of the new group.

¹²⁴ The Farming World, September 16, 1902, p. 265.

¹²⁵ E. C. Drury, Farmer Premier, p. 52.

¹²⁶ The Weekly Sun, April 1, 1903, p. 2.

¹²⁷ See stories regarding the organization of various branches in The Sun, November 26, 1903, p. 1. (It was organized in Frontenac by the former M.P., D. D. Rogers); Ibid., January 7, 1903, p. 10; Ibid., January 21, 1903, p. 4.

¹²⁸ Ibid., November 5, 1902, p. 3. The Glengary Co. Association formed in the presence of Senator McMullen, J. T. Schell M.P., and G. D. Macleod, M.P.P.

¹²⁹ Farm and Dairy, March 19, 1911, p. 14.

¹³⁰ The Farmer's Advocate, December 17, 1908, p. 1949.

¹³¹ The Weekly Sun, February 19, 1908, p. 1.

¹³² Ibid., March 20, 1912, p. 1; Ibid., January 11, 1911, p. 1 ; Ibid., September 15, 1909, p. 1.

¹³³ The Weekly Sun, April 2, 1909, p. 6.

¹³⁴ P.A.C., W. C. Good Papers, vol. 10, Story written for the Canadian Countryman, Christmas, 1919.

¹³⁵ See stories in The Farmer's Advocate, March 26, 1914, p. 596, and The Canadian Countryman, III, 23, (March 28, 1914), p. 5.

¹³⁶Farm and Dairy, March 26, 1914, p. 3.

¹³⁷The Farmer's Advocate, April 16, 1914, p. 757; see also Farm and Dairy, March 23, 1914, p. 3.

¹³⁸For a brief account of the formation of the Canadian Council of Agriculture see E. C. Drury, Farmer Premier, p. 64ff. and The Weekly Sun, December 1, 1909, p. 1.

¹³⁹Farm and Dairy, December 22, 1910, p. 10.

¹⁴⁰The Canadian Farm, October 14, 1910, p. 1.

¹⁴¹E. C. Drury, Farmer Premier, p. 56; see also The Weekly Sun, July 1, 1903, p. 1.

¹⁴²The Farmer's Magazine, July, 1912, p. 9.

¹⁴³Farm and Dairy, February 1, 1912, p. 8; The Canadian Farm, October 29, 1909, p. 1; The Weekly Sun, January 10, 1906, p. 7; W. W. Emmerson, "The Farmer in Politics," The O.A.C. Review, XXII, 1, (October, 1909), p. 3.

¹⁴⁴Farm and Dairy, January 4, 1912, p. 12.

The figures were:	1911	1908
Merchants	27	31
Capitalists	2	7
Lawyers	75	75
Farmers	32	31
Doctors	18	22
Journalists	10	10
Manufacturers	13	12
Agents	8	8
	5	2
Students	1	--
Druggists	1	--
Surveyors	1	--
Labor employees	1	--
Contractors	9	7
Notaries	7	4
Lumbermen	11	7

¹⁴⁵The Farmer's Magazine, September, 1911, p. 8.

¹⁴⁶Ibid., May, 1912, p. 9.

¹⁴⁷Ibid., December, 1911, p. 10; see also F.A.C., George P. Graham Papers, G. C. Creelman to Graham, October 17, 1907, urging a Senate seat for John Dryden, the Provincial Minister of Agriculture, defeated by the Conservatives; see also The Farmer's Advocate, February 2, 1903, p. 101.

¹⁴⁸The Weekly Sun, September 5, 1906, p. 6, Speech of James McEwing, a Liberal M.L.A. and agricultural activist at the Farmers' Association convention in Toronto.

¹⁴⁹Ibid., March 18, 1903, p. 3.

¹⁵⁰The Farmer's Advocate, November 15, 1901, p. 733; Ibid., November 21, 1907, p. 1824.

¹⁵¹George E. Clough, "The Farmer on the Platform," The Farmer's Magazine, June, 1914, p. 32; W. W. Emmerson, "The Farmer in Politics," The O.A.C. Review.

¹⁵²The Farmer's Advocate, June 11, 1914, p. 1122.

¹⁵³The Farmer's Magazine, January, 1911, p. 19, Statement by H. J. Pettypiece.

¹⁵⁴Farm and Dairy, September 29, 1910, p. 10.

¹⁵⁵The Weekly Sun, April 30, 1902, p. 2.

¹⁵⁶Farm and Dairy, May 8, 1913, p. 3.

¹⁵⁷The Farmer's Advocate, February 23, 1911, p. 305.

¹⁵⁸Ibid., October 26, 1911, p. 1746; The Weekly Sun, May 13, 1908, p. 6, Letter J. T. Holmes.

¹⁵⁹The Farmer's Advocate, June 5, 1912, p. 1022.

¹⁶⁰The Weekly Sun, September 20, 1911, p. 1; see also Farm and Dairy, September 28, 1911, p. 12. This points out the difficulty involved in getting agriculturists to act as a class after only a few months of educational work. They ought not to be discouraged by the election.

¹⁶¹The Farmer's Advocate, January 14, 1909, p. 42, Letter A. H. Cutten.

¹⁶²The Weekly Sun, May 27, 1908, p. 7; The Canadian Countryman, III, 2, (March 21, 1914), p. 5.

¹⁶³J. G. Mitchell, "Keep Politics out of the Farmers' Clubs," The O.A.C. Review, XXIV, 9, (June, 1912).

CONCLUSION

NOTES

¹The University of British Columbia, Special Collections,
James W. Robertson Collection, box 1, Memorandum enclosed with letter,
Sir Horace Plunkett to James Robertson, May 21, 1910.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. PRIMARY MATERIALS

I. Manuscripts, Personal Papers.

a) Public Archives of Canada

Department of Agriculture Records
 Production and Marketing Branch
 Dairy Products Division
 Deputy-Ministers' Letterbooks
 Secretary and Assistant Deputy Ministers' Letterbooks
 Commissioner of Agriculture and Chief of the
 Publications Branch Letterbooks
 Replies to Questions in the House of Commons
 Co-operative Union of Canada Papers
 Sir George E. Foster Papers
 W. C. Good Papers
 Hon. George P. Graham Papers
 George Johnson Papers
 Sir Wilfrid Laurier Papers, (selections)
 John Lowe Papers
 J. J. Morrison Papers
 C. B. Sissons Papers
 N. W. Rowell Papers
 Sir J. S. Willison Papers

b) University of Guelph, Archives

Adelaide Hunter Hoodless Papers

c) The University of British Columbia, Special Collections

James W. Robertson Papers

II. Periodicals and Newspapers.

The Canadian Countryman, (1912-1914)
The Canadian Farm, (1909-1912)
Farm and Dairy and Rural Home, (1909-1914)
The Farmer's Advocate and Home Magazine, (1900-1914)
The Farmer's Magazine, (1910-1914)
Farming, (1900)
The Farming World and Canadian Farm and Home, (1902-1908)
The Ontario Agricultural College Review, (1900-1914)
The Weekly Sun, (1900-1914)

III. Periodical and Newspaper Articles.

a) The Canadian Countryman

- Abraham, Roy H., "Agriculture in the Schools,"
III, 28, (July 11, 1914), p. 9.
- Bell, Margaret, "Revisiting a Village Church,"
II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 18.
- Bell, H. Y., "One Man's Success: Making Farming a
Certainty," II, 12, (March 22, 1913), p.
- Blair, A. C., "Crows and Scarecrows," II, 13, (March 29,
1913), p. 12.
- Black, Robson, "Sentiment or Wages," III, 10,
(March 7, 1914), p. 12.
- Blewett, Jean, "The Farming Days of Used to Be," II,
12, (March 22, 1913), p. 14.
- Brown, Walter J., "Enriching Rural Life," III, 2,
(January, 1914), p. 9.
- Campbell, A., "Making the Hired Man a Fixture," III,
36, (September 5, 1914), p. 6.
- Campbell, N. C., "Cuts in Crop Production Costs," II,
22, (May 31, 1913), p. 12.
- Craik, W. A., "The Value of Insurance," II, 31,
(August 2, 1913), p.
- Craik, W. A., "Industrial Development: How it Helps
the Farmer," III, 15, (April 11, 1914), p. 9.
- _____, "Guarding the Milk Supply of a Big City,"
II, 25, (June 21, 1913), p. 8.
- Deofol, T., "Greater Comfort in the Farm Home," III,
10, (March 7, 1914), p. 22.
- Depiew, B. F., "Converting Native Furs into Cash,"
II, 14, (April 5, 1913), p. 8.
- Drier, Edward, "Opportunities Slipping Away," II, 13,
(March 29, 1913), p. 30.
- _____, "Keeping the Boy on the Farm," III, 16,
(April 18, 1914), p. 13.
- _____, "The Farmer's Selling Methods," II, 1,
(January 4, 1913), p. 29.
- Dunstan, Kenneth J., "Taking Care of Our Cities," II,
35, (August 31, 1913), p. 9.
- Elliot, W. J., "Our Duty to the Newcomer," II, 30,
(July 26, 1913), p. 10.
- Good, W. C., "The Dominion Grange," II, 27, (July 5,
1913), p. 9.
- Grant, James, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer, I,"
II, 40, (October 4, 1913), p. 14.
- _____, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer, II,"
II, 41, (October 11, 1913), p. 14.
- _____, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer, III,"
II, 42, (October 18, 1913)
- _____, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer, IV,"
II, 43, (October 25, 1913), p. 10.
- _____, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer, V,"
II, 44, (November 1, 1913), p. 9.

- Grant, James, "Private Papers of a Canadian Farmer, VI," II, 45, (November 8, 1913), p. 14.
- Hadley, Florence J., "Making the Boy a Property Owner," III, 29, (July 18, 1914), p. 7.
- Hamilton, C. F., "Agriculture in Ontario," II, 32, (August 9, 1913), p. 8.
- Herold, Otto, "The Small Farm and the High Cost of Living," III, 11, (March 14, 1914), p. 9.
- Inman, J. C., "Farm Machinery Over-Equipment and Care," II, 33, (August 16, 1913), p. 16.
- _____, "When the Farmer Gets a Run for His Money," III, 6, (February 7, 1914), p. 11.
- _____, "Coining Dollars from Milk," II, 35, (August 31, 1913), p. 10.
- Kirchner, W. H., "The Application of Science to Agriculture," II, 29, (July 19, 1913), p. 12.
- Ladd, Mariella, "What the Parcel Post Does for the American," III, 9, (February 28, 1914), p. 7.
- Livestock Editor, "A Matter of Speed," III, 24, (June 13, 1914), p. 6.
- Ladd, Mariella, "The Farmer's Wife as a Partner," III, 33, (August 15, 1914), p. 6.
- McCredie, A. L., "The Farmer's Little Engine," III, 9, (February 28, 1914), p. 5.
- _____, "Pouring Power from a Gasoline Can," III, 7, (February 14, 1914), p. 5.
- McLean, W. A., "The Value of Good Roads," II, 19, (May 10, 1913), p. 15.
- McMurchie, Helen, "The Battle With the Slums," II, 19, (May 10, 1913).
- _____, "The Women's Institute," II, 42, (October 18, 1913), p.
- _____, "Patriots and their Duty," II, 33, (August 16, 1913), p. 8.
- Mark, James, "Holding Our Own," II, 18, (May 3, 1913), p. 17.
- Miller, Justus, "The Story of Two Medals," II, 25, (June 21, 1913), p. 15.
- _____, "Does Farming Pay in Older Canada?" II, 30, (July 26, 1913), p. 7.
- Morrisson, Stanley, "The Grain Grower and the Farmer," II, 13, (March 29, 1913), p. 13.
- _____, "The Grain Grower and the Farmer," II, 17, (April 26, 1913), p. 10.
- Park, W. E., "Bringing Canada to Our Door - The Part the Rural Telephone is Playing," II, 11, (March 15, 1913), p. 8.
- _____, "The Country School Garden," II, 11, (March 21, 1914), p. 9.
- Sangster, J. W., "The Motorcycle on the Farm," III, 13, (March 28, 1914), p. 6.
- Tefft, T. A., "Co-operation in Farm Life," III, 26, (June 27, 1914), p. 5.
- Wexford, Max, "The Duty We Owe to the Immigrant," III, 18, (May 2, 1914), p. 10.

- Wexford, Max, "Asiatic Immigration," III, 19,
(May 9, 1914), p. 10.
- Wylie, Newton, "His Ennobling Work," II, 24,
(August 23, 1913), p. 10.
- Lash, Z. A., "The Banking System of Canada, Part I,"
II, 10, (March 8, 1913).
- _____, "The Banking System of Canada, Part II,"
II, 11, (March 15, 1913).

b) Canadian Bee Journal.

Ontario Bee Keepers Association, "Annual Meeting, The Canadian Bee Journal, New Series, X, 12, (July, 1903),
p. 267.

c) The Canadian Farm

Johnstone, J.H.S., "Educating the Farmer's Sons,"
December 3, 1909, p. 2.

d) Farm and Dairy

Cowan, H. B., "Some Fundamental Reasons for the Depopulation of our Country Districts," November 14, 1912, p. 3.

Dean, H. H., "Dairying Past, Present, Future," April 23, 1914, p. 3.

Evans, Prof. John, "The Farmers' Interest in Labor-Saving Machinery," June 3, 1909, p. 3.

Gillman, Nellie, "The Homecoming of Melinda," March 18, 1909, p. 16.

Good, W. C., "Education and Its Application to Agriculture," September 8, 1910, p. 3.

Hardy, C. F., "Organizing and Installing a Rural Telephone System," March 11, 1909, p. 3.

Lees, Richard, "Rural Schools Need Reorganizing," December 18, 1913, p. 3.

_____, "Are Our Rural Schools Unprogressive?"
November 20, 1913, p. 3.

_____, "More Money for Rural Schools," January 22, 1914, p. 3.

McClung, Nellie, "Sowing Seeds in Danny," April 8, 1909, p. 22. (First Installment of Serial).

Drury, E. C., "The Farmers on the Question of the Tariff," December 29, 1910, p. 3.

e) The Farmer's Advocate.

Campbell, John, "Why Young Men Should Stay on the Farm,"
December 9, 1909, p. 1922.

Campbell, W. W., "Country Life and Culture - Environ-
ment," August 29, 1907, p. 1375.

_____, "Canadian Country Life, The Home,"
August 8, 1907, p. 1274.

Country Girl, The, "A Country Girl in a Big City,"
July 11, 1907, p. 1134.

Coureur-Du-Bois, "Retiring From the Farm," September,
1907, p. 1419.

Dearness, John, "Education for the Farm," December 9,
1909, p. 1915.

DeWeese, Trumen A., "A Boy and His Father," September
21, 1911, p. 1582.

J.E.L. "The Reason Why," February 27, 1913, pp. 369-70.

Junia, "Education for the Farm Laddie," July 24, 1913,
p. 1306.

Lawson, Frank, "A Glimpse of New Ontario," September 1,
1903, p. 773.

McArthur, Peter, "The Joys of Farming," June 20, 1911,
p. 1131.

_____, "Our Real Rulers," April 2, 1914,
p. 649.

_____, "An Impression of Ottawa," April 17,
1913, p. 717.

_____, "The Election," October 5, 1911,
p. 1644.

_____, "The Toothpick Trust," February 26,
1914, p. 375.

_____, "Wealth and Brains," August 1, 1912,
p. 1353.

_____, "The Innocent Investor," April 18,
1912, p. 732.

_____, "The Question of Hired Help,"
August 8, 1912, p. 1394.

_____, "On the Side," April 11, 1912, p. 680.

_____, "The Cheerful Giver," April 4, 1912,
p. 628.

Ogilvie, Will H., "Contentment at the Plow," December 8,
1910, p. 1932.

Simpson, Walter, "Why Are We Farmers?" December 16,
1901, p. 818.

Rue, "Why I Love the Country," December 12, 1912,
p. 2170.

Rutherford, T. J., "The Highest Type of Farmer and How
he is Evolved," April 28, 1910, p. 733.

Sinclair, S. B., "The Rural School as a Factor in the Agricultural Life of the Nation," December 12, 1912, p. 2161.

Van Nest, A. T., "Why I am Proud to be a Farmer," August 15, 1903, p. 744.

Yeigh, Frank, "The Foreign Inflow to the Canadian West," September 1, 1904, p. 1177.

f) The Farmer's Magazine

Abbott, J. Kerr, "Giving the Farmer his Own," January, 1914, p. 15ff.

Adams, Harris L., "The Farmer and the Auto," November, 1912, p. 91.

Austin, Lewis, "The People Should Speak," July, 1911, p. 32ff.

Banks, William, Jr., "Millions!" August, 1911, p. 80ff.

Bilkey, Paul E., "Diary of a Backbencher," March, 1911, p. 82ff.

_____, "Diary of a Backbencher," April, 1911, p. 89ff.

Boyden, J. C., "Lighting Rural Ontario," November, 1912, p. 68ff.

Chapman, Ethel M., "Be Good to Mary Ann," April, 1913, p. 83ff.

_____, "How Mary Jane Made Good," March, 1914, p. 50ff.

Cherry, P. C., "Sir William Mackenzie," June, 1911, p. 33.

Clough, George E., "The Farmer on the Platform," June, 1914, p. 32ff.

Cooke, B. B., "The Annual Tide in Canada," September, 1911, p. 52ff.

Craik, W. A., "A Plea for a Fuller and Broader Farm Life," March, 1911, p. 112.

Crothers, Hon. T. W., "A Difficult Question," January, 1912, p. 59.

Culter, H. M., "The Rural College," March, 1911, p. 22ff.

Cummings, M., "A Deeper Cure," January, 1912, p. 60.

Dagger, Francis, "The Farmer and the Phone," March, 1912, p. 19ff.

Dobbin, Tom E., "Finding Their Level," June, 1914, p. 8.

Drury, E. C., "\$1000 for Country Teachers," January, 1914, p. 15.

_____, "The National Aspect of the Rural Life Problem," June, 1911, p. 122.

_____, "Reciprocity," August, 1911, p. 20ff.

_____, "Revenue and Protection," April, 1911, p. 25ff.

- Drury, E. C., "Tariff Reduction in Canada is a Necessity," November, 1910, p. 59ff.
- _____, "What Protection Costs Canada," May, 1911, p. 19ff.
- Genevieve, "The Bent Twig," April, 1914, p. 33.
- Good, W. C., "Two Reasons Plain," January, 1912, p. 61.
- Grant, James, "Sir Maxwell Aiken," May, 1911, p. 58ff.
- Greyson, Frederick, "The Men We Need," March, 1912, p. 88ff.
- Hall, Mackenzie, "A 50 Acre Mistake," May, 1914, p. 27.
- _____, "Electricity on the Farm," December, 1911, p. 18ff.
- Hitchcock, A. P., "The Joys of Being a Farmer," August, 1911, p. 97ff.
- James, C. C., "Depends on the Farm," January, 1912, p. 60.
- _____, "It is not Charity to Develop Agriculture," November, 1910, p. 114ff.
- Kester, Eluid, "Farm Outlook and Output," February, 1914, p. 37ff.
- King, W.L.M., "Vigorous Immigration Policy," January, 1912, p. 59.
- McCredie, A. L., "The Farm Labor Problem," May, 1911, p. 29.
- _____, "The Real Reciprocity," September, 1911, p. 29ff.
- Mackenzie, F. C., "The Economy of the large Farm," June, 1911, p. 14ff.
- MacNeill, A. L., "Rural Leaders," March, 1912, p. 19.
- _____, "Shall It be Large or Small Farms," January, 1912, p. 43ff.
- _____, "Cheaper Money for Farmers," May, 1912, p. 17.
- McTaggart, Andrew, "The Ministry of the Soil," June, 1914, p. 5.
- Merriday, Mae, "The Call of Youth to the Farm - After All She Marries a Farmer," May, 1912, p. 57ff.
- Miller, Justus, "Land O' Gold," May, 1914.
- Moffatt, Margaret, "Actual Farm Life Teaches School Teachers," July, 1912, p. 66ff.
- Mountford, E. J., "The Call of Youth to the Farm, III - Boys are the Sinews of War," May, 1912, p. 60ff.
- Munroe, Ethel, "A Hostel for Girl Berry Pickers," April, 1914, p. 25.
- Robinson, Hattie, "The Influence of One Grange," July, 1912, p. 72ff.
- Robinson, R. M., "The Call of Youth to the Farm, I, Why I took to It.," May, 1912, p. 55.
- Russell, T. A., "Scarcity of Farm Labor," January, 1912, p. 62.
- Smith, W. L., "Overcrowding in the Cities," December, 1911, p. 44.

- Stirrett, J. T., "A Tale of Two Families," March, 1911, p. 49ff.
- The Hired Man, "Farmin' and Other Things," September, 1912, p. 49ff.
- Todd, S. E., "Rural Population in Ontario: One Way to Solve the Farm Labor Problem," December, 1911, p. 52ff.
- Tybout, Ella M., "One of Many," July, 1911, p. 43.
- Wetherald, Ethelwyn, "The Canadian Farmer's Daughter," March, 1911, p. 24ff.
- _____, "The Canadian Farmer's Daughter: Her Social Life," October, 1911, p. 116.

g) Farming.

- Doering, Cynthia, "A Dainty Room," March 19, 1900, p. 748.
- McCrimmon, I. R., "The Need of an Agricultural Education," April 17, 1900, p. 848.
- Sears, "How Can We Interest the Boys in Farm Work," May 1, 1900, p. 894.

h) The Farming World.

- Beaumont, J. J., "Business Methods in Farming," June 3, 1902, p. 615.
- Carrothers, G. E., "Transformation by Education," March 18, 1902, p. 258.
- Graham, M. E., "Missions," August 13, 1901, p. 140.
- _____, "The New Girl," October 8, 1901, p. 403.
- Howson, W. T., "Agriculture as an Occupation," July 25, 1901, p. 75.
- Leake, Albert H., "Consolidation of Rural Schools," January 1, 1903, p. 17.
- Lochhead, Prof. Wm., "Rural Education in Canada," September 1, 1905, p. 651.
- McDonald, Thomas P., "The Social and Intellectual Side of Farm Life," June 18, 1901, p. 1085.
- Mills, G. K., "Agriculture in Public Schools," June 17, 1900, p. 662.
- Robertson, Jas. W., "Manual Training in the Public Schools," September 4, 1900, p. 25.

i) The Ontario Agricultural College Review.

- Abbott, J. Kerr, "Will Rural Democracy Dwindle," XXVI, 4, (January, 1914).
- Anonymous, "The Townward Movement," XI, 7, (April, 1900).
- Barton, H., "Cultivate the Soil," XIX, 3, (December, 1906).
- Black, W. J., "The Labor Problem," XII, 4, (January, 1901).

- Breese, Mrs. M. W., "The Woman Upon the Farm,"
XXIV, 9, (June, 1912).
- Brown, Walter James, "Should a Farmer Study Economics,"
XVII, 3, (December, 1904).
- _____, "Agricultural Economics," XVIII,
6, (March, 1906).
- _____, "Travelling Library System of
Ontario," XV, 6, (March, 1903).
- _____, "The Claims of Citizenship,"
XIX, 4, (January, 1907).
- Campbell, A. W., "Highway Economics," XX, 9, (June, 1908).
- C.E.M., "The Labor Problem," XXV, 9, (June, 1913).
- Chisholm, W. J., "Suggestions for the Improvement of
Rural Schools," XX, 7, (April, 1908).
- Christie, G. I., "Equipment and Methods in Agricultural
Extension," XXIII, 2, (November, 1910).
- Cowan, H. B., "The Future of Ontario's Agricultural
Societies," XX, 1, (October, 1907).
- Dawson, Mrs. M. C., "The Woman on the Farm," XXIV, 8,
(May, 1912).
- Day, W. H., "Electric Power and the Ontario Farmer,"
XX, 9, (June, 1908).
- Drury, E. C., "The Social Position of the Farmer," XI, 4,
(January, 1900).
- _____, "Canada's Parasites," XIV, 8, (May, 1911).
- Emmerson, W. W., "The Farmer in Politics," XXII, 1,
(October, 1909).
- Good, W. C., "The Farm Labor Problem," XVII, 2,
(November, 1904).
- _____, "Farmers' Organizations and Politics, No. 3"
XXIV, 8, (May, 1912).
- Gresnide, F. C., "Harness Horses and Motor Cars," XXI,
6, (March, 1909).
- Hotson, J. W., "Rural Education," XVII, 5, (February, 1905).
- James, C. C., "Agriculture in Its Relation to
Manufactures," XX, 8, (May, 1908).
- Leitch, A., "The Farm Labor Problem," XIX, 1,
(October, 1906).
- Le Lecheur, G., "Reading in the Farm Home," XX, 8,
(May, 1908).
- Macdonald, Ronald, "Social Life in Rural Districts,"
XXII, 8, (May, 1910).
- Mills, James, "Notes on the Recent Progress of Agriculture
in the Dominion of Canada," XVI, 3, (December, 1903).
- Mitchell, J. G., "Keep Politics Out of the Farmer's
Clubs," XXIV, 9, (June, 1912).
- Moorhouse, L. A., "Intensive Farming," XII, 5,
(February, 1900).
- Newman, L. H., "The Canadian Seed Growers Association,"
XXII, 2, (November, 1909).
- Pettypiece, H. J., "The Farmer and the Railway," XVII, 6,
(March, 1905).
- Putnam, George A., "Farmer's Institutes in Ontario,"
XX, 4, (January, 1908).

- Reynolds, J. B., "The O.A.C. and Ontario Farming," XXIV, 7, (April, 1912).
- Reynolds, J. B., "The Rural Problem," XXV, 10, (July, 1913).
- Roadhouse, W. B., "The New Agriculture," XXV, 9, (June, 1913).
- Ross, H. R., "Co-operation Among Farmers," XI, 7, (April, 1900).
- Smith, W. L., "The Farmers' Transportation Problem," XVI, 4, (January, 1904).
- _____, "The Farmer and the Combines," XXI, 6, (March, 1909).
- Todd, S. E., "Principles of Co-operation," XXIV, 1, (October, 1911).
- Williamson, J., "The Automobile on the Farm," XXIII, 1, (October, 1910).

IV. Government Documents.

a) Canada

Canada. Department of Agriculture. Canada, Agriculture: The First Hundred Years. (Historical Series #1). Ottawa: 1967.

Canada. Department of Trade and Commerce. Fifth Census of Canada, Agriculture, Vol. IV. Ottawa: 1914.

Canada. Dominion Bureau of Statistics, Seventh Census of Canada, 1931, Agriculture, Vol. VIII, Ottawa: 1933.

_____. Sixth Census of Canada, 1921, Agriculture, Vol. V. Ottawa: 1925.

Canada. House of Commons. The Improvement of Rural Conditions, Evidence of Jas. W. Robertson before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture and Colonization. Ottawa: 1909.

Canada. House of Commons. Evidence of James W. Robertson, Chairman, Committee on Lands, Commission on Conservation, before the Select Committee on Agriculture and Colonization, 1911-1912. Ottawa: 1912.

b) Ontario

Ontario. Department of Agriculture. "Report of the Minister of Agriculture," The Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, Vol. I, Toronto: 1900-1914, (2 Vols.).

(The Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture for the Province of Ontario, is hereafter cited as D. of A.)

Campbell, John, "Why the Young Man Should Stay on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1909, Part I, D. of A., Vol. I. Toronto: 1910.

Cleland, Mrs. Wm., "Advantages of the Country Home," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1902-1903, Part II, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1903.

Creelman, Dr. G. C., "Some Rural Problems," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1913, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1914.

_____, "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1905, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1906.

_____, "The Farmer and the Farmer's Son," Third Annual Report of the Ontario Corn Growers Association, 1910, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1911.

_____, "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Association of the Province of Ontario, 1901, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1902.

Dryden, Hon. John, "Address by Hon. John Dryden," Thirty-Second Annual Report of the Fruit Growers Association of Ontario, 1900, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1901.

Duff, Hon. J. S., "Improving Farm Life," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1908, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1909.

_____, "Address," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1911 & 1912, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1913.

_____, "Necessity of Cultivating the Social Side of Life on a Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario - 1902 & 1903, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto:

Fisher, Hon. Sydney, "Back to the Farm," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1907, D. of A., Vol. I Toronto: 1908.

James, C. C., "Address," Tenth Annual Report of the Agricultural Societies of Ontario, 1910, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1910.

James, C. C., "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Association of the Province of Ontario, 1909, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1910.

_____, "Address," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1910, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1911.

_____, "Address," Thirty-Fourth Annual Report of the Fruit-Growers' Association of Ontario, 1902, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1903.

_____, "Agriculture - Past and Present," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1900, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1901.

_____, "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1909, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1910.

_____, "Looking Forward," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1903, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1904.

Johnson, William, "Life on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1907, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1908.

Kitchen, Mrs., (Dr.), "Co-operation of Town and Country Ladies in Institute Work," Report of the Women's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1906, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1907.

McClure, Mrs. George, "How the Town Woman Can Adapt to the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1902 & 1903, Part II, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1903.

McGillivray, J. A., "Farm Labor Problem," Annual Reports of the Livestock Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1906-1907, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1907.

Member, North Grey Women's Institute, "Our Boys - How Shall We Educate and Influence so as to Keep them on the Farm," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1900, Part II, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1902.

Metcalf, J. S., "Agriculture as a Science and an Art," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1904, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1905.

Mills, James, "Address by Dr. James Mills, C.A.C. Guelph," Annual Reports of the Livestock Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1901, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1902.

Mills, G. K., "Agriculture in Public Schools," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1901, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1901.

Monteith, Hon. Nelson, "Address," Annual Reports of the Livestock Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1906-1907, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1907.

_____, "Address," Thirty-Seventh Annual Report of the Fruit-Growers' Association of Ontario, 1905, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1906.

_____, "Address," Thirty-Eighth Annual Report of the Fruit-Growers' Association of Ontario, 1906, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1907.

Preston, T. H., M.P.P., "Address of Welcome," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1902, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1903.

Reynolds, J. B., "Standards of Country Life," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1908, Part I, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1908.

_____, "Reading in the Farm Home," Thirty-Eighth Annual Report of the Ontario Agricultural and Experimental Union, 1906, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1907.

Rose, Laura, "One Eye in the Field the Other in the Town," Report of the Farmers' Institutes of the Province of Ontario, 1905, Part II, Women's Institutes, D. of A., Vol. II, Toronto: 1906.

Rowell, N. W., "Address," Annual Reports of the Dairymen's Associations of the Province of Ontario, 1912, D. of A., Vol. I, Toronto: 1913.

V. Pamphlets.

Biggar, E. B., The Canadian Farmer, The General Consumer, and the Wool Tariff, n.p.: 1910.

Dickinson, Dr. George A., The Country Boy, Toronto: 1907.

Field, F. W., Protection the Proven Policy for the Farmer, n.p.: 1911.

General Reform Association of Ontario, Liberal Party Handbook, Toronto: 1911.

_____, Address to the Electors Issued by Mr. N. W. Rowell, Q. C., Toronto: 1911.

Iles, George, Dr. Robertson's Work for the Training of Canadian Farmers, n.p. : 1907.

James, C. C., The Problem of the Indifferent Farmer: Address by C. C. James before the International Association of Farmers' Institute Workers at Washington, D. C., n.p.: 1910.

_____, The Teaching of Agriculture in Our Public Schools, Toronto: 1900.

n.a., From A Farmer's Standpoint: Correspondence Between R. J. Vair and C. A. Mallory, n.p. : 1904.

Schell, M. S., The Farmer's View, n.p. : 1911.

VI. Primary Articles.

Cudmore, S. A., "Rural Depopulation in Southern Ontario," Royal Canadian Institute Transactions, IV Series, IX, (1912).

Desjardins, Alphonse, "Co-operation Among Farmers," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

Dobson, Rev. Hugh, "The School and the Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

Drury, E. C., "The Problem of the Country," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

Macdougall, Rev. John, "The Rural Problem," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

Reynolds, Prof. J. B., "The Department of Agriculture," Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

Sharp, Rev. S. F., "The Church and the Rural Problem," The Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

VII. Books.

Adams, Thomas, Rural Planning and Development, Ottawa: 1917.

Dean, H. H., Canadian Dairying, Toronto: 1903.

Drury, E. C., Farmer Premier: Memoirs of the Honourable E. C. Drury, Toronto: 1966.

Good, W. C., Farmer Citizen: My Fifty Years in the Canadian Farmers' Movement, Toronto: 1958.

Macdougall, Rev. John, Rural Life in Canada: Its Trend and Tasks, Toronto: 1913.

Methodist Church, (Canada), Department of Temperance and Moral Reform, Report of a Rural Survey of Agricultural, Educational, Social and Religious Life, Toronto: December-January, 1913-1914.

Sissons, C. B., Nil Alienum: The Memoirs of C. B. Sissons, Toronto: 1964.

Rennie, William, Successful Farming, Toronto: 1908.

Social Service Council of Canada, Social Service Congress, Ottawa, 1914, Report of Addresses and Proceedings, Toronto: 1914.

Thomas, Arnold W., The Canadian Almanac, Toronto: 1900-1915.

VIII. Theses.

Bratt, C. H., "Farmer Movements in Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph: 1923.

Cole, H. A., "Rural Depopulation in Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1922.

Finn, R. A., "Township Survey Re: Agricultural Education," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph: 1915.

Forman, K. W., "Physical Education as a Permanent Factor in Rural Social Work," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1922-23.

Gilbert, A.F.S., "Training of Teachers for Teaching Agriculture in Canada," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1920.

Grant, W. H., "Difficulties in Teaching Agriculture," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1921.

Hansauld, A. F., "Agricultural Education in the Schools of Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1920.

Hare, H. R., "Agricultural Survey of Mariposa Township in Victoria County," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1914.

Hill, W. H., "Agricultural Exhibits," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1916.

- Hopkins, S. H., "Rural Depopulation in Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1914.
- Jacobs, W. S., "A Physical Analysis of the Soils of Vespra Township," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1907.
- Linsay, C. E., "A Study of Migration in a Typical Ontario Township," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1914.
- McCready, S. B., "An Experiment in Agricultural Education: Being an Attempt to Develop a Proper Method of Instruction in Elementary Agriculture Throughout Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1917.
- Macdonald, J., "Problems of Rural Education in Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1921.
- McLarty, J. E., "Is the Rural School Being Properly Used to Further the Interests of Rural Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1916.
- Small, E. L., "Agricultural Instruction as Found in the Rural Public Schools of Ontario," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1916.
- Sutton, R. G., "The Real Value of School Fairs," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1920.
- Vining, R.L., "Some Phases of Ontario's Rural Problems," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1914.
- Wilson, George, "An Agricultural Survey of Halton County," Unpublished B.S.A. Thesis, O.A.C., Guelph: 1913.

B. SECONDARY MATERIALS

1. Articles.

- Abbott, R. H., "The Agricultural Press Views the Yeoman," Agricultural History, XLII, 1, (January, 1968).
- Abell, Helen C., "The Adaptation of the Way of Life of the Rural Family in Canada to Technological, Economic, and Social Changes." Vanier Institute of the Family, The Family in the Evolution of Agriculture, Ottawa: 1968.
- Ashby, Arthur W., "The Effects of Urban Growth on the Countryside," Sociological Review, XXXI, 3, (October, 1939).

- Atherton, Lewis, "The Farm Novel and Agricultural History: A Review," Agricultural History, XL, 2, (April, 1966).
- Baker, O.E., "Rural-Urban Migration and the National Welfare," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, XXIII, (1933).
- Barton, G.S.H., "Historical Background of Canadian Agriculture," Canada Year Book, 1939.
- Bassett, T. D. Seymour, "A Case Study of Urban Impact on A Rural Society, Vermont, 1840-1880," Agricultural History, XXX, 1, (January, 1956).
- Bealer, Robert C., Fern K. Wilts and W. P. Krwlesky, "The Meaning of Rurality in American Society: Some Implications of Alternative Definitions," Rural Sociology, XXX, 1956.
- Bogue, Allan, "The Progress of the Cattle Industry in Ontario During the 1880's," Agricultural History, XXI, 3, (July, 1947).
- Burnet, Jean, "Town-Country Relations and the Problem of Rural Leadership," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XIII, 3, (August, 1947).
- Colman, Gould P., "Innovation and Diffusion in Agriculture," Agricultural History, XL, 3, (July, 1968).
- Demaree, A. L., "Farm Journals: Their Editors and Their Public, 1830-1860," Agricultural History, XV, 4, (November, 1941).
- Eldridge, Hope T., "The Process of Urbanization," J. J. Spenger and O. D. Duncan, (eds.), Demographic Analysis, Glencoe: 1942.
- Ellsworth, Clayton S., "Theodore Roosevelt's Country Life Commission," Agricultural History XXIV, 4, (October, 1960).
- Erdman, H. E., "The Development and Significance of California Co-operatives 1900-1915," Agricultural History XXXII, (July, 1958).
- Fowke, V. C., "An Introduction to Canadian Agricultural History," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, VIII, 1, (February, 1942).
- Fuguitt, Glen, "The City and Countryside," Rural Sociology, XXVIII, 2, (April, 1962).

- Fuller, Wayne, "The Rural Roots of Progressive Leaders," Agricultural History, XLII, 2, (January, 1968).
- Galpin, C. J., "The Development of the Science and Philosophy of American Rural Society," Agricultural History, XII, XII, 3, (July, 1938).
- Gleason, John P., "The Attitude of the Business Community Towards Agriculture During the McNary-Haugen Period," Agricultural History, XXXII, 2, (January, 1958).
- Goldsmith, Harald, and James J. Cops, "Metropolitan Dominance and Agriculture," Rural Sociology, XXIX, (1964).
- Haythorne, G. V., "Agricultural Manpower," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, IX, 3, (August, 1943).
- Hicks, John D., "The Western Middle West, 1900-1914," Agricultural History, XX, 2, (April, 1946).
- Hiller, E. T., "Extension of Urban Characteristics into Rural Areas," Rural Sociology, VI, (1941).
- Hoffman, David, "Intra-Party Democracy: A Case Study," Canadian Journal of Economics and Political Science, XXVII, 2, (May, 1961).
- Johnstone, Paul H., "In Praise of Husbandry," Agricultural History, XI, 2, (April, 1937).
- _____, "Turnips and Romanticism," Agricultural History, XII, 3, (July, 1938).
- Kerr, Donald, "Metropolitan Dominance in Canada," W. E. Mann, (ed.), Canada: A Sociological Profile, Toronto: 1968.
- Nordin, Dennis S., "Graduate Studies in American Agricultural History," Agricultural History, XLI, 3, (July, 1967).
- Porter, John, "Rural Decline," W. E. Mann, (ed.), Canada: A Sociological Profile, Toronto: 1968.
- Salutos, Theodore, "The Agricultural Problem and Nineteenth Century Industrialism," Agricultural History, XX, 3,
- Taeber, Conrad, "Rural-Urban Migration," Agricultural History, XV, 3, (July, 1941).
- Taylor, Iain, "Population Migration to and from Ontario, 1870-1940," Ontario Economic Review, V, 7-8, (July-August, 1967).

Watson, J. W., "Rural Depopulation in South-West Ontario," Annals of the Association of American Geographers, XXXVII, (1947).

Woodward, Margaret, "The Northwestern Farmer 1868-1876: A Tale of Paradox," Agricultural History, XXVII, 3, (July, 1963).

Yuan, Y. D., "The Rural-Urban Continuum: A Case Study of Taiwan," Rural Sociology, XXIX, (1964).

II. Books.

Bertrand, Alvin L., Rural Sociology: An Analysis of Contemporary Rural Life, Toronto: 1958.

Britnell, G. E., and V. W. Fowke, Canadian Agriculture in War and Peace, Stanford: 1962.

Canada Packers, The Story of Our Products, Kingston: 1943.

Chalmers, Floyd S., A Gentleman of the Press, Toronto: 1969.

Clark, S. D., The Social Development of Canada, Toronto: 1942.

_____, Urbanism and the Canadian Society, Toronto: 1961.

Drummond, W. M., and W. J. Anderson, (eds.), A Review of Agricultural Policy in Canada, Ottawa: n.d.

Fowke, Vernon, Canadian Agricultural Policy, Toronto: 1946.

Hayter, Earl, The Troubled Farmer, Dekalb, III.: 1967.

Hofstadter, Richard, The Age of Reform, New York: 1955.

Jones, R. L., History of Agriculture in Ontario, 1613-1880, Toronto: 1946.

Katz, Elihu, and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence, New York: 1955.

Lazarsfeld, Paul and Bernard Berelson, and Helen Gaudet, The People's Choice, New York: 1944.

Phillips, W. G., The Agricultural Implement Industry in Canada, Canadian Studies in Economics No. 7., Toronto: 1956.

Reaman, G. Elmore, A History of Agriculture in Ontario,
2 volumes, Toronto: 1970.

Rosenau, James W., Public Opinion and Foreign Policy,
New York: 1961.

Ruddick, J. A., et al., The Dairy Industry in Canada, Toronto:
1937.

Spelt, Jacob, The Urban Development of South-Central Ontario,
Assen: 1955.

Stone, Leroy O., Urban Development in Canada, Ottawa: 1961.

Watson, W. P., The Royal: A History of the Royal Winter
Fair, Toronto: 1968.

Wood, Louis A., A History of Farmers' Movements in Canada,
Toronto: 1924.

III. Theses.

Evans, A. M., "Oliver Mowat and Ontario, 1872-1896: A
Study in Political Success," Unpublished Ph.D.
Dissertation, University of Toronto: 1967.

Harris, James G., "The News and Canadian Politics 1903-1914:
A Study of The News Under the Editorship of Sir John
Willison," Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of
Toronto: 1952.

Hoffman, J. D., "Farmer-Labour Government in Ontario,"
Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1959.

Humphries, C. W., "The Political Career of Sir James P.
Whitney," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University
of Toronto: 1966.

Macleod, Jean, "The United Farmer Movement in Ontario, 1914-
1943," Unpublished M. A. Thesis, Queen's University:
1958.

Oliver, Peter N., "The Making of a Provincial Premier: Howard
Ferguson, And Ontario Politics," Unpublished Ph.D.
Dissertation, University of Toronto: 1969.

Osborn, Elizabeth, "The Ontario Farmers' Union as a Movement
of Farm Protest," Unpublished M.S.A. Thesis, University
of Toronto: 1964.

- Patterson, William, "The Progressive Political Movement 1919-1930," Unpublished M. A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1940.
- Prang, Margaret E., "The Political Career of Newton W. Rowell," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto: 1959.
- Stevens, Paul D., "Laurier and the Liberal Party in Ontario," Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Toronto: 1966.
- Stone, Alfred Russell, "The Causes of Rural Depopulation," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1932.
- Taylor, Iain C., "Components of Population Change, Ontario 1850-1940," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1967.
- Tennyson, B. D., "The Political Career of Sir William H. Hearst," Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1963.
- Warner, Catherine L., "Sir James W. Whitney and Sir Robert L. Borden: Relations Between a Conservative Premier and his Federal Party Leader," Unpublished M. Phil. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1967.

APPENDIX A

CIRCULATION OF AGRICULTURAL JOURNALS

General Reviews	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
1. <u>O.A.C. Review</u> (Guelph)	n.a.m.	1,200m	1,200m	1,200m	1,000m	900m	900m	900m	900m	900m	900m
2. <u>The Weekly Sun</u> (Toronto)	n.a.w.	16,077w	16,214w	16,235w	16,051w	16,124w	16,124w	15,000w	16,988w	16,988w	16,000w
3. <u>The Farmer's Advocate</u> (London)	n.a.w.	30,016w	30,016w	30,016w	27,500w	27,500w	n.a.w.	n.a.w.	32,500w	32,000w	32,000w
4. <u>Farm and Dairy</u> ¹ (Toronto & Peterboro)	n.a.f.	40,000f	40,000f	10,400f	5,000w	10,000w	10,000w	10,000w	13,400w	13,000w	16,807w
5. <u>Canadian Countryman</u> (Toronto)	-----	n o t	p u b l i s h e d -----						n.a.w.	30,000w	32,500w
6. <u>The Canadian Farm</u> ² (Ottawa & Toronto)	n.a.w.	n.a.w.	--- not published-----			n.a.w.	n.a.w.	19,697w	19,078w	19,106w	19,106w
7. <u>The Farmer's Magazine</u> (Toronto)	-----	n o t	p u b l i s h e d -----				n.a.w.	20,000m	20,000m	20,000m	20,000m
TOTAL CIRCULATION	N.a.	87,291	87,430	87,441	59,951	54,524	27,014	73,697	102,866	140,094	137,313

APPENDIX A - (continued)

Special Interest Magazines	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
1. <u>Canadian Bee Journal</u> (Brantford)	n.a.m	925m	925m	925m	1500m	1400m	1400m	1500m	1500m	1500m	1500m
2. <u>Canadian Sportsman & Livestock Jour.</u> ³ (Grimsby & Toronto)	n.a.w	4000w	4000w	4000w	3000w	3100w	3100w	5000w	5000w	5000w	5000w
3. <u>Fruit Grower Mkt. Gardener & Poultry- man</u> (Grimsby)	not published	-----	-----	n.a.w	n.a.w	2300w	2300w	3400w	3400w	3400w	3200w
4. <u>Cdn. Poultry News</u> ⁴ (Grimsby & Owen Snd)	n.a.m	1000m	1000m	900m	1200m	1325m	2000m	2000m	2000m	2000m	2000m
5. <u>Cdn. Horticultur- ist</u> ⁵	n.a.m	5500m	5000m	6000m	8198m	8198m	9238m	9587m	10523m	11170m	13257m
6. <u>Cdn. Poultry Rev.</u> (Toronto)	n.a.m	7500m	7750m	7750m	6000m	5000m	12500m	13500m	13000m	15000m	15000m
7. <u>Poultry Advocate</u> ⁶ (London, Toronto, Petrolia)	not pub.	3200m	3200m	4500m	2500m	2500m	3000m	4000m	4000m	5000m	5000m
8. <u>Thresherman's Rev.</u> (Toronto)	-----	-----	-----	n o t	p u b l i s h e d	-----	-----	n.a.m	7800m	8400m	-----
9. <u>Breeder's Advocate</u> (London)	n.a.m.	-----	-----	n o t	p u b l i s h e d	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
10. <u>Cdn. Dairyman</u> (Toronto)	not published	n.a.f	5000w	-----	Amalgamated with The Farming World	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----
TOTAL CIRCULATION	N.A.	22125	21875	29075	22398	23823	33538	38987	39423	50870	53357

APPENDIX A - (continued)

Journal Published by a Daily Newspaper	1904	1905	1906	1907	1908	1909	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
1. Free Press ⁷ & Farm & Home (London)	not a farm weekly till 1907			2000w	2000w	1375w	n.a.w	n.a.w	n.a.w	n.a.w	n.a.w
2. Globe & Can. ⁸ Farmer (Toronto)	not a farm weekly till 1907			20,604w	20,604w	30,287w	25,104w	22,088w	20,620w	15,609w	not farm
3. Mail & Empire ⁹ (Toronto)	not a farm weekly till 1910			-----			15,167w	14,576w	14,576w	14,000w	14,000w
TOTAL CIRCULATION				22,604	22,604	31,662	40,271	36,664	35,196	29,609	14,000

Key to Chart:

m = Monthly; w = Weekly; f = Fortnightly; n.a. figures not available but periodical in publication

1. In 1904 The Farming World amalgamated with The Canadian Farm and Home and from 1904 to 1907 this was known as The Farming World and Canadian Farm and Home. In 1908 it amalgamated with the Canadian Dairyman and was known as Farm and Dairy and was published in Peterboro rather than Toronto.
2. A publication called Canadian Farmer appeared in Ottawa in 1904 and 1905, Canadian Farm was published in Toronto from 1909 to 1914.
3. Canadian Sportsman and Livestock Journal is listed as a sportsman's magazine. It was published in Toronto from 1904 to 1911 when it moved its location to Grimsby.
4. Canadian Poultry News published in Owen Sound from 1904 to 1913 moved to Grimsby in 1913.
5. The Canadian Horticulturist was published in Toronto from 1904 to 1908 when it moved to Peterboro.
6. The Poultry Advocate in 1905 was published in London; from 1906 to 1907 in Petrolia and from 1907 to 1914 in Toronto.
7. This was published Weekly by the London Free Press. It began as an agricultural weekly in 1907, and listed its political affiliation as Conservative.
8. The Globe published The Globe and Canadian Farmer as an agricultural weekly from 1907 to 1913 when it became The Weekly Globe.
9. The Weekly edition of The Mail and Empire became an agricultural supplement from 1910 to 1914.

Source: Thomas, Arnold W., The Canadian Almanac, Toronto: 1900-1915.

APPENDIX B

CIRCULATION OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Type of Report	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Minister's Report	-----	25,000	25,000	25,000	25,000
The Ontario Agricultural College	30,000	30,000	30,000	28,000	28,000
The Experimental Union	30,000	27,000	28,000	28,000	25,000
Ontario Veterinary College	2,500	2,500	4,000	4,000	4,000
Ag. Soc. & Field Crop Competition	14,500	20,000	20,000	20,000	20,000
Horticultural Soc.	10,000	10,000	15,000	15,000	15,000
Vegetable Growers	6,000	6,000	8,000	8,000	8,000
Livestock Ass'ns.	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000	30,000
Poultry Institute	6,000	-----	-----	-----	-----
Farmer's Clubs	-----	-----	5,000	-----	-----
Stallion Enrollment	-----	-----	-----	8,000	8,000
Farmer's Institutes	34,000	34,000	4,000	4,000	4,000
Women's Institutes	20,000	25,300	32,000	33,000	33,000
Dairymen's Assn's.	30,000	30,000	28,000	28,000	26,000
Entomological Soc.	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,000	3,500
Fruit Growers	3,000	4,000	4,000	5,000	4,000
Fruit Branch	6,500	6,500	8,000	-----	10,000

continued...

APPENDIX B - continued

CIRCULATION OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

Report	1910	1911	1912	1913	1914
Ontario Corn Growers	2,500	5,000	6,000	6,000	6,000
Beekeepers' Assn.	2,000	3,000	3,000	3,500	4,500
Bureau of Industries					
1. Agric. Stats.	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000	7,000
2. Municipal Stats.	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500	6,500
TOTAL	243,500	274,800	266,500	290,000	261,000
Dept. of Agric. ¹ Bulletins	135,600	210,000	227,000	216,000	282,000
Crop & Statistical Bulletins	-----	35,000	39,000	39,000	41,500
GRAND TOTAL	379,100	519,800	532,500	545,000	584,500

¹ Examples of the type of Bulletins Issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1911.

184. Uses of Vegetables Fruits and Honey	25,000	158. Disease Affecting Fruit Trees	15,000*
185. Little Peach Disease	4,000	171. Diseases Affecting Vegetables	10,000*
186. Children: Care and Training	27,000	174. Farm Underdrainage	6,000*
187. The Codling Moth	32,000	175. Farm Drainage Operations	6,000*
188. Weeds of Ontario	20,000		
189. Farm Poultry	40,000		
190. Bee Diseases	10,000		
191. Beekeeping in Ontario	10,000		
192. Agricultural Co-operation	5,000		
		TOTAL	210,000

SOURCE: "Report of the Minister of Agriculture," Ontario, Department of Agriculture, in The Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario. vol. I Toronto: 1900 to 1915.

* Re-issues
NOTE: The publication of the figures was begun by the Minister of Agriculture, James Duff in the Annual Report of 1910. Figures for the earlier years are unavailable.

APPENDIX C

ATTENDANCE AT FARMERS' INSTITUTES AND RELATED ORGANIZATIONS

Institute	1900 1901	1901 1902	1902 1903	1903 1904	1904 1905	1905 1906	1906 1907	1907 1908	1908 1909	1909 1910	1910 1911	1911 1912	1912 1913	1913 1914
Farmers' Institute	131,653	147,642	126,459	106,719	102,008	126,084	110,765	110,415	108,020	105,576	86,000	94,266	92,660	--
Women's Institute	3,500	16,440	22,013	44,698	54,329	51,892	71,154	93,951	119,364	140,300	151,654	177,42	178,858	202,504
Better Farming Special (train visiting rural areas)										8,500	18,500	11,000	--	
Fruit Institutes (not available before 1910).....										10,121	5,350			
Factory and Creamery Meetings (not available before 1910).....										38,850	40,500	33,500	24,552	
Farmers' and Women's Institute Conventions (not available before 1910).....										13,606	13,761	12,931	12,446	
Women's Institute Demonstration Lectures (not available before 1912).....												22,504	15,500	
TOTAL	135,153	164,052	148,472	151,417	156,337	177,976	181,919	204,366	240,687	248,320	328,307	357,563	367,759	361,237

Source: From 1900 to 1910, Report of the Farmer's Institutes of the Province of Ontario, Parts I and II. (Women's Institutes); from 1910 to 1914, Report of the Minister of Agriculture, both published in The Annual Report of the Department of Agriculture of the Province of Ontario, vols. I and II, Toronto: 1900-1915.

APPENDIX D

MIGRATION FROM RURAL AREAS OF ONTARIO COUNTIES

County	1881-1891 Total %	1891-1901 Total %	1901-1911 Total %	1911-1921 Total %
Algoma	-----	-----	30,467(66.2) ²	7656(8.1) ² ₁
Brant	-2762(-11.1)	-3576(-15.1)	4929(15.2) ¹	3225(7.0)*
Bruce	-9415(-15.1)	-12,473(-20.3)	-14106(23.9)*	-9447(-18.9)*
Carleton	-8603(-23.4)	-3(-)	-4443(-12.0)	5733(17.7) ¹
Dufferin	-2852(-12.9)	-3184(-16.4)	-5036(-23.9)*	-3730(-21.0)*
Dundas Stormont & Glengarry	-3592(-5.8)	-5085(-8.1)	-10479(-16.8)	-6260(-10.9)
Elgin	-4155(-12.2)	-3361(-10.2)	-3789(11.8)	-1064(-3.5)
Essex	-2016(-5.0)	-6055(-13.4)	-3667(-7.8)	4035(8.7) ¹
Frontenac	-3021(-10.7)	-3575(-12.9)	-4920(-18.5)	-2674(-11.3)
Grey	-10457(-15.8)	-10039(-15.7)	-12949(-21.3)	-10715(-20.1)
Haldimand	-4460(-17.8)	-3803(-16.8)	-1351(-6.4)*	-2007(-9.3)*
Haliburton	-141(-2.4)	-----	-1566(-23.0)	-1178(-18.6)
Halton	-2326(-10.6)	-4035(-19.6)	1151(5.8)* ¹	591(2.6)* ¹
Hastings	-944(-2.1)	-4443(-9.0)	-8822(-17.6)	-5185(-11.3)
Huron	-17878(-26.8)	-11359(-18.0)	-13257(-23.0)	-9119(-17.2)*
Kenora/ Rainy River	-----	-----	12206(113.2) ²	-4294(-30.4) ²
Kent	-3254(-7.0)	-6471(-13.3)	-7375(-15.3)	-5634(-12.4)
Lambton	-2041(-4.2)	-9070(-17.4)	-10489(-22.5)	-6249(-15.1)
Lanark	-75(-0.2)	-3885(-11.2)	-5837(-18.2)	-3378(-12.1)
Leeds and Grenville	-4971(-9.3)	-4445(-8.5)	-7251(-14.5)	-4550(-10.1)
Lennox and Addington	-3156(-13.8)	-2606(-12.2)	-3760(-18.6)	-2652(-13.0)*
Lincoln	-3278(-14.9)	-1656(-7.9)	+1665(+12.4) ¹	3877(16.9) ¹

continued...

APPENDIX D - (continued)

County	1881-1891 Total %	1891-1901 Total %	1901-1911 Total %	1911-1921 Total %
Manitoulin -----				-2366(-20.9) [*]
Middlesex -13541(-19.5)		-9566(-15.8)	-5105(-9.3)	-7462(-14.7)
Muskoka 2835(10.4)		-327(-1.0)	-3214(-15.3) [*]	-4119(-19.4) [*]
Nipissing -----			3124(18.0) ^{2*}	-823(-2.9) ^{*2}
Norfolk -6249(-18.6)		-4479(-15.8)	-3913(-13.4) [*]	-2518(-9.3) [*]
Northumber- land, Durham 12215(-16.9)		-11517(-17.5)	-5622(-9.7)	-7090(-14.2)
Ontario -8792(-19.2)		-8026(-18.8)	-2516(-6.2) [*]	1713(3.4) ¹
Oxford -8334(-18.6)		-5553(-13.5)	-4650(-11.7)	-3356(-10.1)
Parry Snd. -----			-2843(-11.4) [*]	-4290(-16.2) [*]
Peel -4430(-19.0)		-4516(-20.9)	-558(-2.6) [*]	83(0.4) ^{*1}
Perth -8740(-19.1)		-6563(-15.5)	-6977(-17.5)	-4602(-12.7)
Peterboro -2340(-9.9)		-2874(-11.5)	-3028(-13.1)	-3473(-15.5)
Prescott, Russel -1190(-3.3)		-3323(-8.0)	-9306(-19.7) [*]	-10819(-22.2) [*]
Prince Edward -3358(-18.6)		-2191(-14.0)	-1127(-6.3)	-1004(-5.8) [*]
Rainy River -----				1138(10.9) ^{*2}
Renfrew 6023(14.1) ^o		-2351(-5.5)	-8561(-18.0)	-8541(-18.5)
Simcoe 1619(2.3) ^o		-8963(-11.6)	-7315(-10.2)	-8332(-12.4)
Thunder Bay -----			7333(167.7) ²	950(2.3) ^{*2}
Victoria -5647(-19.8)		-4760(-17.7)	-4306(-17.2)	-4829(-20.8)
Waterloo -2595(-6.7)		-5437(-12.6)	-2226(-6.4)	-2090(-8.2)
Welland -4605(-14.5)		-2151(-8.5)	5140(19.8) ¹	13,121(47.5) ¹
Wellington -11942(-21.8)		-9201(-18.8)	-7724(-17.5)	-5469(-13.9)

continued...

APPENDIX D - (continued)

<u>County</u>	1881-1891 Total %	1891-1901 Total %	1901-1911 Total %	1911-1921 Total %
Wentworth	-5796(-18.7)	-3622(-12.9)	1156(4.3) ¹	7808(26.2) ¹
York	-4731(-7.9)	-6772(-11.4)	5176(9.1) ¹	53112(85.1) ¹
TOTAL	-183,425	-201,316	-125,741	-56,277
Total Minus North (marked 2)	Not available	Not available	-178,871 (53,130)	-60,904 (4627)
Total Minus Suburbs (Marked 1)	Not available	Not available	-144,958 (19,217)	-149,575 (93,298)
Total Minus North and Suburbs	Not available	Not available	-198,088	-154,202

For counties marked * figures for the rural areas only are unavailable. The total, therefore, includes the incorporated towns and villages. This results in an underestimation of the number leaving the rural areas. In the period from 1901 to 1911 these counties were: Bruce, Dufferin, Haldimand, Halton, Muskoka, Nipissing, Norfolk, Ontario, Parry Sound, Peel, Prescott/Russell, Prince Edward, Thunder Bay, Rainy River.

Source: This chart has been compiled from various appendices to the Iain Taylor, Components of Population Change, Ontario, 1850-1940. Unpublished M.A. Thesis, Toronto,

Counties marked ° indicate corrections made to Taylor's figures.

APPENDIX E

POPULATION CHANGE IN RURAL AREAS OF ONTARIO COUNTIES

COUNTY	1881-1891 Total %	1891-1901 Total %	1901-1911 Total %	1911-1921 Total %
Algoma	-----	-----	37281(81.0) ²	23934(25.3) ²
Brant	-561(-2.3)	-2171(-9.2)	6287(19.4) ¹	7501(16.3) ^{*1}
Bruce	-370(-0.6)	-5493(-8.9)	-8988(-15.2) [*]	-5747(-11.5) [*]
Carleton	-3215(-8.8)	3500(10.4)	-4104(-11.1)	8540(26.4) ¹
Dufferin	-248(-1.1)	-845(-4.4)	-3296(-15.7) [*]	-2325(-13.1) [*]
Dundas/Stor- mont & Glen- garry	1381(2.2)	-704(-1.1)	-4625(-7.4)	-2059(-3.6)
Elgin	-983(-2.9)	-910(-2.7)	-1843(-5.7)	532(1.7)
Essex	4822(11.9)	1368(3.0)	3127(6.7)	10509(22.6) ¹
Frontenac	-547(-1.9)	-1173(-4.2)	-2843(-10.7)	-989(-4.2)
Grey	-2396(-3.6)	-2903(-4.5)	-7481(-12.3)	-6472(-12.1)
Haldimand	-1540(-6.2)	-2156(-9.5)	329(1.5) [*]	-275(-1.3) [*]
Halton	63(0.3)	-2359(-11.5)	2663(13.6) ^{*1}	2691(12.1) ^{*1}
Haliburton	439(7.4)	-----	-237(-3.6) [*]	-111(-1.7) [*]
Hastings	3623(7.9)	1006(2.0)	-4247(-8.5)	-610(-1.3)
Huron	-9020(-12.5)	-5280(-8.4)	-9201(-15.9)	-5975(-11.2) [*]
Kent	2325(5.0)	-636(-1.3)	-2901(-6.0)	-532(-1.2)
Lambton	3958(8.2)	-3652(-7.0)	-7081(-15.2)	-3383(-8.2)
Lanark	3081(9.8)	-945(-2.7)	-4072(-12.7)	-1802(-6.4)
Leeds/ Grenville	-1461(-2.7)	-2041(-3.9)	-5132(-10.2)	-3420(-7.6)
Lennox & Addington	-1487(-6.5)	-1114(-5.2)	-2624(-13.0)	-1392(-6.8) [*]
Lincoln	-1033(-4.7)	-303(-1.4)	2339(17.4) ¹	5799(25.3) ¹
Manitoulin	-----	-----	-----	-856(-7.5) [*]
Middlesex	-7163(-10.3)	-5641(-9.3)	-2334(-4.3)	-4859(-9.6)
Muskoka	9614(35.3)	6947(20.7)	262(1.2) [*]	-1632(-7.7) [*]
Nipissing	-----	-----	10760(46.9) ^{*2}	6475(23.1) ^{*2}
Norfolk	-2535(-7.6)	-1792(-6.3)	-2031(-7.0) [*]	-744(-2.7) [*]
Northumber- land, Durham	-6406(-8.8)	-7823(-11.9)	-2714(-4.7)	-3873(-7.7)

APPENDIX E - (continued)

COUNTY	1881-1891 Total %	1891-1901 Total %	1901-1911 Total %	1911-1921 Total %
Ontario	-3103(-6.8)	-4271(-10.0)	598(.15) [*]	3984(8.0) ¹
Oxford	-3549(-7.9)	-1666(-4.0)	-1520(-3.8)	-1060(-3.2)
Parry Sound	-----	-----	1611(6.5) [*]	313(1.2) [*]
Peel	-1936(-8.3)	-2892(-13.4)	627(2.9) [*]	1794(8.1) [*] ¹
Perth	-3238(-7.1)	-2304(-5.4)	-3676(-9.2)	-1487(-4.1)
Peterboro	1220(5.1)	- 53(-0.2)	-757(-3.3)	-1156(-5.1)
Prescott/ Russel	6525(18.1)	4831(-9.2)	-714(-4.0) [*]	-344(-2.0) [*]
Prince Edward	-2467(-13.6)	-1436(-9.2)	-714(-4.0) [*]	-344(-2.0) [*]
Renfrew	6914(19.4)	4983(11.7)	-1329(-2.3)	-2600(-5.6)
Simcoe	7228(10.3)	-811(-1.0)	346(0.5)	-2682(-4.0)
Victoria	-1665(-5.3)	-1961(-7.3)	-1734(-6.9)	-3049(-13.1)
Waterloo	4353(11.2)	-192(-0.4)	2131(16.1)	3175(12.4)
Welland	-1140(-3.6)	-110(-0.4)	7029(27.1) ¹	15653(56.7) ¹
Wellington	-5938(-10.8)	-4663(-9.5)	-4833(-10.9)	-3285(-8.3)
Wentworth	-2836(-9.1)	-1337(-4.6)	2919(10.9) ¹	9679(32.5) ¹
York	3696(6.6)	-836(-1.4)	10795(18.9) ¹	63371(101.5) ¹
Kenora	-----	-----	13750(27.6) ²	-1727(-12.2) ²
Rainy River	-----	-----	-----	3089(29.6) [*] ²
Thunder Bay	-----	-----	7405(169.4) ²	10064(25.5) [*] ²
TOTAL	-5695	-47,838	20,552	111,639
Minus North (Marked ¹)	--	--	(69,196) -48,644	(41,835) 69,804
Minus Suburbs (Marked ²)	--	--	(32,032) -11,480	(129,521) -17,842
Minus Both	--	--	(101,228) -80,676	(171,356) -59,677

NOTE: For explanation of * see APPENDIX D.

ONTARIO CITIES - MIGRATION AND POPULATION CHANGE,
1900 - 1921

City	1901 - 1911		1911 - 1921	
	Change (total) %	Migration (total) %	Change (total) %	Migration (total) %
Barrie	471 (7.9)	91 (1.5)	516 (8.0)	-3 (----)
Belleville	759 (8.3)	835 (7.0)	2330 (23.6)	1585 (16.0)
Brockville	434 (4.8)	9 (0.1)	669 (7.1)	257 (2.7)
Chatham	1702 (18.8)	1726 (19.0)	2486 (23.1)	2256 (20.9)
Cobourg	835 (19.7)	801 (18.9)	253 (5.0)	302 (5.9)
Cornwall	-106 (-1.6)	-156 (-2.3)	821 (12.4)	481 (7.3)
Cobalt	-----	-----	-1189 (-21.1)	-2590 (-45.9)
Collingwood	-----	-----	-1208 (-17.0)	-1866 (-26.3)
Fort William	12886 (354.1)	11288 (310.7)	4042 (24.5)	- 857 (-5.2)
Galt	2433 (30.9)	1961 (24.9)	2917 (28.3)	1705 (16.5)
Guelph	3679 (32.0)	2693 (23.4)	2953 (19.4)	1642 (10.8)
Hamilton	29335 (55.7)	24513 (46.6)	32182 (39.3)	18104 (22.1)
Ingersoll	-----	-----	387 (8.1)	-164 (-3.4)
Kenora	-751 (-12.2)	-746 (12.1)	6766 (25.1)	609 (11.3)
Kingston	913 (5.1)	740 (4.0)	2879 (15.2)	1914 (10.1)
Kitchener	5449 (55.9)	3974 (40.8)	6567 (43.2)	3759 (24.7)
Lindsay	- 39 (-0.5)	-533 (-7.6)	656 (9.4)	-27 (-0.4)
London	8324 (21.9)	5990 (15.8)	14659 (31.7)	11672 (25.3)
Midland	-----	-----	2523 (50.4)	1285 (27.5)
Niagara Falls	3546 (62.1)	2926 (51.3)	5516 (59.6)	4160 (45.0)
North Bay	-----	-----	2955 (38.2)	783 (10.1)
Orillia	1921 (39.1)	1581 (32.2)	803 (11.8)	-579 (-8.5)
Oshawa	-----	-----	4504 (60.6)	3174 (42.7)
Ottawa	27134 (45.3)	22742 (37.9)	20781 (23.9)	11968 (13.7)
Owen Sound	3782 (43.1)	2894 (33.0)	-368 (-2.9)	-2000 (-15.9)
Parry Sound	-----	-----	117 (3.4)	-795 (-23.2)
Pembroke	470 (9.1)	- 8 (-0.1)	2249 (40.0)	1863 (33.1)
Port Arthur	8006 (249.1)	7259 (225.8)	3666 (32.7)	441 (3.9)
Port Hope	-----	-----	-636 (-12.5)	-969 (-19.0)
Peterborough	5474 (42.5)	4390 (43.1)	2364 (14.3)	909 (4.9)
St. Catharines	2538 (25.5)	2018 (20.3)	7397 (59.2)	4962 (39.7)
St. Thomas	2569 (22.4)	1533 (13.3)	1972 (14.0)	607 (4.3)
Sarnia	1771 (21.7)	1164 (14.2)	4930 (49.6)	4054 (40.7)
Sault Ste. Marie	3815 (53.2)	2886 (40.2)	6172 (41.3)	4818 (32.3)
Smith's Falls	1215 (23.6)	675 (13.1)	420 (6.6)	-367 (-5.8)
Stratford	2987 (30.0)	1838 (18.4)	3148 (24.3)	1553 (11.9)
Sudbury	-----	-----	4471 (107.7)	3301 (79.5)
Toronto	160776 (74.5)	138260 (64.1)	140060 (36.7)	78178 (20.5)
Trenton	-----	-----	1144 (26.0)	398 (9.0)
Walkerville	-----	-----	3757 (113.8)	2939 (89.0)
Welland	-----	-----	3336 (62.7)	2380 (44.7)
Windsor	5679 (46.7)	4752 (39.1)	20768 (116.4)	17599 (98.7)
Woodstock	487 (5.5)	249 (2.8)	615 (6.6)	-46 (-0.5)
Urban Ontario	298494 (40.1)	246177 (33.1)	287047 (30.1)	150601 (15.8)
Brantford	1449 (25.2)	-730 (-12.7)		
(Unreliable)				

SOURCE: Iain Taylor, "Components of Population Change, Ontario 1850-1940,"
Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Toronto: 1967. Various Appendices.

APPENDIX G

FARMERS' SUBMISSION TO THE GOVERNMENT
ON THE TARIFF - 1910

Presented to The House of Commons, Ottawa, December 16, 1910.

The Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the Members of the Cabinet:

Gentlemen,- This delegation, representative of the agricultural interests of Canada, desire to approach you upon the question of the bearing of the Canadian customs tariff.

We come asking no favors at your hands. We bear with us no feeling of antipathy towards any other line of industrial life. We welcome within the limits of Canada's broad domain, every legitimate form of industrial enterprise, but, in view of the fact that the further progress and development of the agricultural industry is of such vital importance to the general welfare of the state, that all other Canadian industries are so dependent upon its success, that its constant condition forms the great barometer of trade, we consider its operations should be no longer hampered by tariff restrictions.

And in view of the favorable approaches already made through President Taft and the American Government looking towards more friendly trade relations between Canada and the United States this memorial takes form as follows:-

1. That we strongly favor reciprocal free trade between Canada and the United States in all horticultural, agricultural and animal products, spraying materials, fertilizers, illuminating, fuel and lubricating oils, cement fish and lumber.
2. Reciprocal free trade between the two countries in all agricultural implements, machinery, vehicles and parts of each of these; and, in the event of a favorable arrangement being reached, it be carried into effect through the independent action of the respective governments, rather than by hard and fast requirements of a treaty.
3. We also favor the principle of the British preferential tariff, and urge an immediate lowering of the duties on all British goods to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff schedule, whatever they may be; and whatever trade advantages given the United States in reciprocal trade relations be extended to Great Britain.
4. For such further gradual reduction of the remaining preferential tariff as will ensure the establishment of complete free trade between Canada and the Motherland within ten years.
5. That the farmers of this country are willing to face direct taxation in such form as may be advisable to make up the revenue required under new tariff conditions.

Believing that the greatest misfortune which can befall any country is to have its people huddled together in great centres of population,

and that the bearing of the present customs tariff has the tendency to encourage that condition, and realizing also, that in view of the constant movement of our people away from the farms, the greatest problem which presents itself to Canadian people today, is the problem of retaining our people on the soil, we come doubly assured of the justice of our petition.

Trusting this memorial may meet your favorable consideration, and that the substance of its prayer be granted with all reasonable despatch.

D. W. McCuaig, President
E. C. Drury, Secretary

CANADIAN COUNCIL OF AGRICULTURE

Source: E. C. Drury, "Reciprocity," The Farmer's Magazine,
August , 1911, p. 24.

APPENDIX H

A NOTE ON METHODS AND USE OF SOURCES

Accurate statistical analysis of the opinions of Ontario's rural inhabitants seventy years ago is impossible, and, therefore, present day assessments of this group's attitudes can only be approximations. Mass opinion, even when approached by survey research specialists in a carefully prepared quantitative study presents difficult problems. Historians are often guilty of discussing public opinion about an issue without examining the relationship of the primary materials they use to the opinion extrapolated from them. Social scientists readily admit the problems of grasping the processes involved in the formation and diffusion of contemporary opinion.¹ The difficulties involved in a modern analysis of the outlook of the million-and-a-half inhabitants in the Ontario countryside seventy years ago are even greater. It is impossible to apply modern questionnaire methods retrospectively. Usable quantitative data of the survey-research variety are almost totally unavailable for that time. To speak accurately of the body of 'opinion' in that period on any subject is statistically impossible.

Combined with the primary sources available, the models developed by opinion theorists yield hope of constructing a reasonable assessment of rural attitudes six decades ago. Elihu Katz and Paul Lazarsfeld developed a two-step flow hypothesis of communications.² This theory establishes a relationship between two groups, the elite opinion-makers and the mass of opinion-holders. The mass media and the opinion leaders form the channels of communication.³ All opinions pass through these channels, before they become the commonplaces of the masses.⁴ In other words, "the opinions which

circulate [among the mass public] are given form, are 'made', by those who introduce them into the impersonal channels." ⁵ Convincing someone in a discussion "does not constitute opinion-making because ordinarily, the disputed alternatives have been previously formulated and have reached disputants through prior throbs of the circulatory system." ⁶ Opinions are, therefore, formed by opinion-makers before they circulate widely and change little once they are common knowledge.

This theory indicates that if it were possible to determine the thought of opinion-makers on the subject of urbanization, the ideas of the mass population could be approximated. The considerable volume of published primary material contributed by six different groups of agricultural opinion-makers allows this thesis to make such a reconstruction. Five of these groups made up the agricultural elite of the age: the editors and feature writers of the agricultural press, the officials of the Ontario and Canadian Departments of Agriculture, the teachers and students of the Ontario Agricultural College at Guelph, the leaders of the professional agricultural associations, (the Dairymen, for example) and the leaders of the general farm organizations (the Grange). Although these groups have not been studied in detail, it is evident that membership and leadership belonged to several of the organizations at the same time and constituted a core of the agricultural interest. ⁷ The sixth group of opinion-makers were the attentive public of the agricultural population, the farmers aroused about an issue who sent in their ideas to the press.

The agricultural journals, the reports of the government-sponsored agricultural societies, as well as the actual programmes and speeches at conventions (reported in both the press and in sessional papers) enabled the opinion-makers to propagate their views to an audience numbering in the hundreds of thousands (See Appendices A, B, & C for the circulation of

newspapers and reports). Investigations of some social scientists indicate that the masses not only listened to the opinion-leaders but tended to believe them rather than the urban press.⁸

In the body of this thesis, therefore, terms implying mass beliefs must be interpreted in the context of both the two-step flow hypothesis, and the extrapolation of these expressions from the available primary sources.

¹James N. Rosenau, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy, New York: 1961, pp. 4-5.

²Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence, New York: 1955, p. 31ff. (See Chapter II of Section I). Rosenau gives a summary of the development of public opinion and communications theory, going into its evolution and exposing the more obvious confusions of its proponents. In his revisionist approach, Rosenau proceeds to define his terms precisely and to rectify what he considers the major fault of the original theory.

³Rosenau concentrates on the relationship between the opinion-holders (the entire citizenry) and the opinion-makers (those who introduce opinions into impersonal channels of the media.) Katz and Lazarsfeld do not dispute this relationship but concentrate upon relationships among the opinion-holders, emphasizing the role of certain designated individuals, the opinion-leaders, who are concerned and exercise great influence over the adoption of opinions by the mass. Rosenau concedes this is the most effective method of transmitting influence but downgrades its importance since it is not where opinions are originally formulated.

⁴Rosenau, p. 30. Katz and Lazarsfeld report that the empirical evidence available from their study of a midwestern city bears out this hypothesis in that opinion-leaders had a greater exposure to the mass media (Katz, Part II, Chapter XIV, p. 309ff.)

⁵Rosenau, p. 30.

⁶Ibid., p. 31.

⁷This overlapping seemed to centre greatly around the Ontario Agricultural College. A proper study of the connections would be very worthwhile. A cursory look provides many obvious examples, such as the editors of the farm journals and the district representatives of the Department of Agriculture both consisting largely of graduates of O.A.C. A few examples are: John Dryden, Liberal Minister of Agriculture in Toronto to 1904, formerly taught at O.A.C. and after his defeat went to the editorial staff of The Farming World as well as taking an active part in the Livestock Associations. Other Ministers of Agriculture, Manning Doherty of the U.F.O. and Nelson Monteith both served the elite outside elected office. Doherty taught at the O.A.C.; while Monteith served on the Board of Directors of The Canadian Countryman when he was not elected in 1907. C. C. James, Ontario's Deputy Minister of Agriculture until 1913, left to serve on special commissions in Ottawa. Before his government position, he had taught at O.A.C. as did W. C. Good, Master of the Dominion Grange and a founder of the United Farmers' Movement. E. C. Drury, the Provincial Premier after 1919 had been a student at O.A.C. and an editor of the O.A.C. Review before accepting a teaching position at Macdonald College;

when he left he served as an Executive of the Ontario Farmers' Association, Master of the Grange, Secretary of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, and a lecturer in the Farmers' Institute system of Ontario. Dr. James Robertson, Dominion Dairy Commissioner and Commissioner of Agriculture, founded Macdonald College after serving the Government in Ottawa and teaching with C. C. James at O.A.C. His international connections are interesting for he was in correspondence with Sir Horace Plunkett, a British Civil Servant, and Gifford Pinchot, American conservationist Civil Servant and protege of Teddy Roosevelt, and suggest that ruralists may have possessed the beginnings of an impetus to form an international movement.

⁸ According to some social scientists, the particular channels of communication directed at a specialized public, i.e. farm journals, are more effective in converting them to the journal's views than is the general magazine or newspaper. "The specialized magazine already has a foot in the door, so to speak, because it is accepted by the reader as a reliable spokesman for some cause or group in which he is greatly interested and with which he identifies himself." Empirical evidence showed The Farm Journal of Erie County, Pennsylvania to be more convincing to farmers in that area than national publications such as Life, when discussing similar topics. (Paul Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson, Helen Gaudet, The People's Choice, New York: 1944, pp. 135-136.)