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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.
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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. Historians are still catching up. The political manifestations of the agrarian revolt engendered by growing urban dominance have been exhaustively analyzed, and some biographies of agricultural leaders and histories of the Ontario and Canadian Departments of Agriculture are available. 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.

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." 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. 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, consolidation of metropolitan control over diffusion of information, and the concentration of population.

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." 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." 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....

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. 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. 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."
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. 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.  

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. 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. 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. 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. The total migration from the southern rural areas amounted to a minimum of 125,741 or a more accurate maximum of 198,088. 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.

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. 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.

(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. 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. 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. 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. 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. Obscurred 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, combined with an urban increase of 176,000 from 1898 to 1907. Another story declared that an estimated 20,000 per year left rural areas following 1890. Articles advertising the same dismal tale appeared in the various rural journals. The Canadian Countryman, The Farmer's Advocate, Farm and Dairy, The Ontario Agricultural College Review, and The Farmer's Magazine 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.

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

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. 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. 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. The Deputy Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, C. C. James, told various bodies such as the Dairymen of Ontario 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.

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. Party campaign literature pointed out to provincial voters that rural population had dropped by 50,000 in the preceding decade. 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.
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.  

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. The Weekly Sun remarked on the widespread nature and unconfined extent of 'the Problem.' 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."  

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. 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 Paris rated a comment in the Ontario press, as did the "grave trouble ahead" foreseen in England if depopulation were not checked. Similar accounts related to comparable situations in Germany, Belgium and Australia.

(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. 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." 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. 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. 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." 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."

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." The situation appeared unparallelled 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." Publicity given by the press included inch-high headlines such as "Rural Depopulation Creates a Crisis in Ontario." Many farmers were driven to advocate reconciliation with the condition since the problem continued for such a long time and never seemed to improve. Despite occasional lapses into optimism at minor relief, the demand for farm help continued to outstrip the supply. 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."

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." 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." Reports of newspaper correspondents scattered throughout the province invariably mentioned the labour shortage in their stories.

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, and at the larger meeting of the Dominion Grange in Toronto in 1903, 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. 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?" 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. Agencies were set up to deal with the rural employers' demands for farm labour and to supply workers for rural areas. The Salvation Army, the Ontario Provincial Government, and several smaller private operations 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 journals and at agricultural meetings. The articles often emphasized that the long duration of the migration from rural areas had meant that the problem was becoming a crisis. 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.

Weekly editorials in most of the agricultural journals served to bring the worsening social situation to the notice of the general farm populace. 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. 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. Drury and W. C. Good, officials of the farm organizations, rubbed shoulders with Rev. John Macdougall, Rev. W. F. Sharp (Organizer of the Huron Survey), along
with others such as Rev. Hugh Dobson, Alphonse Desjardins (Organizer of the Caisses Populaires), and Professor Reynolds of O.A.C. 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 findings 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.

(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. "A great deal of bother," 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." 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."
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 by individual or even combined effort on the part of the farmer." 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. 

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." 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 Ontarió'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 de­
voted 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 popula-
tion 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... 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.... 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*. 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.

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." 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." 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. 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.

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. 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. One estimate placed the number of ridings under urban control in federal contests in the 1911 election at one-half the total. 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.
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. Abandoned homes sprinkling the countryside provided testimony to the breakdown in rural social institutions. 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." 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. 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." 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.
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 \( \sqrt{1873} \) now shiver with a beggarly half-dozen," reported W. C. Good to the Dominion Grange in 1913. 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. 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, while most reported minimal attendance. Rural students were also represented in low proportion in the high schools compared to the number of urban students.

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. Full blame could hardly be laid on the teachers' shoulders, however, for the majority were underprivileged and underpaid. The trustees, skimping on funds, hired cheaper, underqualified teachers when these were available. 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.

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.
Sanitation, lighting, heating, medical inspection, all left much to be desired in most rural schools. These conditions, one rural school inspector believed, existed mainly because of the paucity of both pupils and taxpayers. 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. Of the money devoted to rural education, much indirectly subsidized the cities as rural sections bore the cost of educating many a prospective townsman.

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." 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...." 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. 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 congregation and in the upkeep of "poor shabby buildings displeasing to the eye in architectural design,... unattractive within and without." Ministers also had to cope with a chronic, disheartening decrease in numbers; a continuing loss of workers
and young people affected all denominations. Attendance showed a particular decline among the men.

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. The average family-size shrank considerably, 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. A female majority in a rural area prevailed only in one county (Grenville). The problem of farmer-bachelors became a bandied-about topic of discussion in the rural press, as rural bachelors had difficulty in ferreting out suitable mates.

(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." 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." Agricultrists 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. 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. 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. 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." Orchard men had to reconsider their type of farming as their trees were attacked by diseases they could not control.

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. According to one estimate, because of the increased grazing, the value of possible output from the land declined by seventy-five per cent. 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. Cattle 'finished' on grass alone also had not the quality to command top prices on the world's leading markets.

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. 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. 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. 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."

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. 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 jeremiashs 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. 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. 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. This equipment, while expensive, still cost less than inefficient hired help, or so believed many advocates of mechanization. Labour-saving competitions were held by the farm newspapers to popularize new methods of alleviating the shortage in all lines of farm work. "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."
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. Urban dwellers, under the impression that "farmers are rolling in wealth," 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. 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. 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. 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."  

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...." 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. 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. 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. 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." 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." 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. 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.\ldots 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."\footnote{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.\footnote{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.\footnote{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.\footnote{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."

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." 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?" 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. J. J. Hill, the U. S. railroad magnate was also known to be the son of an Ontario farm. 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.
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. F. 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." 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. They thought of agriculture only as drudgery while the travail of the cityman was easy in comparison. "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...."

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." 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."

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." 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. 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...." 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." 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."

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." 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. 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.
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. 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." 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.

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. "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.

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. 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, as well as better buildings and larger specialized classes.

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. Very few returned to the farm, reported the Department of Education. Anti-high school feeling, very pronounced in some articles, led to at least one recommendation that the number of high schools be reduced. 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 criticized 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." 

"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.

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.

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. 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." 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." 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.

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. 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.

(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. 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..."  

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..."  

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. 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..." 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. 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." 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." Unconsciously, city dwellers showed in their desire to move to the land
that they realized their lives were distorted. 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...." The contrast with the city
forced itself into each scene.

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." Rural areas maintained a constant standard of
living more easily than the cities with their boom and bust atmosphere.
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' 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. 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."

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. 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." 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. 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." 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. 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." 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 city 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.

The 'fanfare of commerce' and 'dollars and mammon' held no attraction for the true son of the soil. 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. 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." 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.

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." Like packing boxes, dwellings seemed "tumbled without calculation or order...with their thin walls and chimneyless roofs, through which crooked pipe ends protruded...." Numberless families inhabited 'rears', squalid houses on back alleys, for which landlords could collect double rent like a "hole shelters rats." 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 habituees 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." 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. 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.

Reassertions of the tradition beliefs in the inferiority of urban life reaffirmed the counymen'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. When journals were writing about the farm they should "speak well of it," wrote another correspondent. "It is worthy so to be talked about." 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." 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." 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."

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." 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. 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. 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.

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."

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. McCready, had written his B.S.A. thesis 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. 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.

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. 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. 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.

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." By teaching him to appreciate his surroundings more, this course in school could recompense the farmer for his lack of urban excitement. 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." 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. 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. 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." 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.

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. 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. 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. 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."  

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."  

President Creelman of C.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. 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.
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. "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...." 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.\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{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."\textsuperscript{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. 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. 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." 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. Medical care was close at hand. 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. 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. 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.
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.  

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, 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. The rural housewife could go to the city and browse through the more attractive products sold in town shops. 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. 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. 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.

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. Sydney Fisher remarked to the Goods 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." 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. 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. The countrymen fought to have the hours during which cars were allowed on their roads strictly limited; they urged high taxation of motor vehicles; 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. 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." 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 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." 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. 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. 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. By forcing the governments to take measures to keep the roads open in winter it removed another cause of complaint. 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....

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." 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.

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."

(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 in vast numbers.
Farmers laughed at refinement and had "no time for the little things that make life pleasant."

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. 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-locking businessmen passed to and fro from splendid banks.

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.

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. 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. 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. 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!" 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. The population could live in as "elaborately-furnished and beautifully-arranged" rooms as their city relatives. 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. 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." 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. 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." Under the prevailing conditions, boys, deprived of their needed fun and recreation, lost their spirit. Little wonder, many became moody and dissatisfied.

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...." 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. Taking their children into partnership, farmers could give them some stock of their own, and go to the market together to interview the produce dealers, wholesalers, retailers, fruit dealers and horse dealers. Following the businessman's example of paying a salary to the son who remained with his father to work the land would keep the boy on the farm. "James Smith and Son, Farmers," would be just as common as "William Jones and Son, Drygoods Merchants." 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. By giving the boys more interesting labour, a farmer could maintain youthful enthusiasm for the farm and its work.

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." 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."
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.

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, 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.

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 agricultural 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..." Rural libraries also filled the void in rural social life by encouraging reading and providing relief from winter-time monotony. 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.

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. 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." In addition to a good library, every farmer's parlour should possess a musical instrument: piano, organ, violin, mouth organ, accordion, zither or mandolin. Boys should be allowed to buy sports equipment and play with their friends at home. 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.

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." 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. Farmers who organized a local winter fair relieved the monotony of the cold season and provided themselves with an opportunity to socialize. 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 meeting place 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.

(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. 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

(ii)

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." 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." 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. Series of articles emphasized the theme that the decrease in agricultural population had resulted from inadequate profits. Professors from the Ontario Agricultural College agreed with this assessment. Editorial 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.

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." The vaunted advantages of rural life, however, could not compensate for the profits of the city. "People," the realists believed,

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

\[(i)\]

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.
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. 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, practical travelling demonstrations, the Ontario Agricultural College, farm journals and magazines, a home agricultural library, professional organizations, experimental farms, and other extension facilities 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."
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...
Copyation 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.\textsuperscript{36} Measures
promoting quality control pointed to an urban systematizing and rational-
izing 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.\textsuperscript{37} Ontario had been divided
into various districts for inspection of cheese factories,\textsuperscript{38} and the
farmers wanted to have cheese and butter factories licensed to promote
better quality.\textsuperscript{39} If milk were more closely inspected in the cities,
agriculturists would be forced to pay more attention to the improvement
of their herds.\textsuperscript{40} Other agitation to regulate poor methods included efforts
to have more stringent weed inspection schemes established.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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-operation 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. The farmer's unbusinesslike attitude towards his hired man showed in the poor working conditions.

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. 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. 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 gyped 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. 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...." 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.

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. 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...." 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. 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. 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. 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.

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. 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. The agriculturist would profit by having a man available the whole time even if he were idle occasionally. 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. 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."
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. Urban immigrants refused the farmers' offers of work and would take any kind of job just to remain in the cities. 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.

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. 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." This cold-bloodedly economic suggestion was extended to the
Negroes and the Hindus. Occasionally, charitable statements remarked that immigrants could make Ontario "what it should be" if they could be assimilated quickly.

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. The Ontario Bureau of Colonization published advertisements in the farm journals offering for hire the English labourers it assisted. 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. The Central Emigration Board of Great Britain announced in 1907 that it would bring British unemployed to work as Canadian farm helpers. However, the labour shortage, however, outstripped all the efforts to relieve it.

(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. 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 machines 98 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. 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.

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. The radial railways, mail delivery systems, telephones, and the automobile were among the other technological devices which saved time, money and labour, thereby increasing the profitability of agriculture.

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 townward 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
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. 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.

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. W. C. Good pointed out that farm improvements had not resulted in higher production and lower costs.

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. Middlemen took unjustified profits and left the producer a minimal return for his labour.\textsuperscript{17}

The country did not get a square deal; it was "bled white in nearly every way by the greedy cities."\textsuperscript{18} Everyone was "down on the poor farmer"; everyone tried to "do him in every way."\textsuperscript{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 over-supply of urban professionals supplied with an adequate income.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 competition 27 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.  

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. 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. 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.

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." 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. 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. 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.

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. 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." 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. Petitions flooded into the House of Commons protesting the amounts. 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.

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." 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..." 50 Manufacturers could pay the wages which robbed the country of its population. 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, 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. 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."

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." 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." 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 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." 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, only prejudiced men claimed to speak for the farmers. They succeeded in reiterating old absurdities against the Canadian manufacturers.

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. 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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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.\textsuperscript{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 \textit{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.  

While urban values increased, the price of farm lands remained stationary. As city rents increased, both producers and consumers were victimized by rising prices for manufactured goods, clothing, and implements. Rural employers were deprived of the increased profits which their business created.  

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. "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.  

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. The supply of land would increase, for speculators would be forced to rid themselves of their vast holdings in order to pay their taxes.  

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
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. W. C. Good remarked that "the simplicity of this system of taxation is one of its strong features. What can be simpler..." 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. The widespread nature of support for these proposals was commended by the more conservative Farmer's Magazine which did not support such measures itself.

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. 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. 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. The County Council of Grey urged all other counties to send deputations to Toronto to push for higher rates for railroads. 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."
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 damages until a bill the railroads opposed forced them both to pay damages and to erect cattleguards along their tracks. 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.

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. 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 seaborad along the Canadian route more cheaply than the shorter distance from Guelph along the same tracks. Not only did the companies charge excessively, but they were responsible for delays in reaching market which resulted in much spoiled Canadian farm produce. Because of this economic discrimination, farming in the United States had distinct advantages in capturing the export markets in Europe. Farmers joined manufacturing interests which also presented a strong case to prove Canadian railways discriminated in freight rates.
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." 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." 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. 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...."

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. 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. 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." 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.

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." Attempts to regulate hours were "a menace to the agricultural interest," and would "demoralize the agricultural industry of this essentially farming country." 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. 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." 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.

(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." 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 "nurture 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 com- promise 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.  

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. *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.  

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.  

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."
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. 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."

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. 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. 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. Disillusioned farmers still felt that "no matter how they protest against an increase in the tariff, their opinions will not be respected."
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. 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," 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."

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. The journals, accordingly, supported the organization of more branch Granges. 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. 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. The inaugural meeting reminded the community that agriculturists were "by far the most important element of the community should have a voice in saying how legislation affecting their interests should be directed." 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."

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. According to The Weekly Sun, the aims of this movement attracted many rural people and it spread rapidly across the province. Many prominent political figures attended its meetings. 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. 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." 'A community of interest' was developing. 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. 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.  

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." 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. 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...." 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. U. F. O. affiliation with western groups united all Canadian farmers in the Canadian Council of Agriculture, which was set up in 1910. 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."

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
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." 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. 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.

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. 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." 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. 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. 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...." 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.

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." 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. 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."

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 K. J. Fettypiece, a Liberal M.L.A., told farmers they would not achieve their economic reforms if they continued to divide along party lines. Tariff reform, numerous articles emphasized, would not be gained while farmers "allowed ourselves to be led around through our slavery to party politics." 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." Instead of looking to the established political parties for redress, farmers had to learn to depend on their own efforts. 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..." 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." 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
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

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


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.")

2 Examples of these studies in Ontario include:

There is still room for studies of individual leaders.


Iain 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1871-1881</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1881-1891</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891-1901</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1901-1911</td>
<td>41.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1911-1921</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1921-1931</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931-1941</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1941-1951</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951-1961</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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

W. E. 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.

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.)


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


Jacob Spelt, p. 142-143.

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

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

Ibid., p. 102.

Ibid., p. 110.

Ibid., 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.

See Appendix E.

This 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.)

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

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

(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 F.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.
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


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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification</th>
<th>Demand</th>
<th>Supply</th>
<th>Demand &amp; Supply</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Economic:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Income</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Credit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Attitude toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>farming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Birth rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Longevity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Immigration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic and Social:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Social security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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


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


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


10. W. 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.).


13. John 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.

15 S. 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.


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

17 P.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.


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

20 The 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.

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

22 General 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.


27 Ibid.

29. The 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.


32. Farm and Dairy, May 5, 1910, p. 17.

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


36. The 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.

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

38. The 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.

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

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

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

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

44. The Weekly Sun, June 1, 1904, p. 1.

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


47. For 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.

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

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

50. For 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.
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28. In 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).

29. Ibid., 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.

30. The Farmer's Advocate, April 15, 1903, p. 364.
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34. Finn, B.S.A. Thesis, p. 15.
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Finn, B.S.A. Thesis, p. 11.
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C. 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.
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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...."
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12For examples of this type of sentiment see:
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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.


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.
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25. The Canadian Farm, April 7, 1911, p. 1, urged model farms scattered over the country to show new techniques to farmers.
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all the flies off in the screen door before they enter...they must not ex­
pect anything to drink on a broiling summer's day except hot tea....
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Ibid., 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. 695; Max Wexford, "The Duty We Owe the Immigrant," The Canadian Countryman, III, 18, (May 2, 1914), p. 10.

The 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).

The Weekly Sun, June 22, 1904, p. 1.

Ibid., June 1, 1910, p. 1.
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The 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, Advertiser 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. 518 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.
89 The Farming World, September 18, 1900, pp. 126-127.


91 Farming, April 7, 1900, p. 851, a special issue on machinery; see also Farm and Dairy, June 1, 1911, for another special issue.

92 The Farmer's Advocate, May 23, 1907, p. 864.

93 Ibid., 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.

94 For example see The Canadian Countryman, II, 8, (February 22, 1913), p. 20.

95 The 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.
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99 The 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.

100 The Canadian Farm, February 4, 1910, p. 3; The Canadian Countryman, II, 1, (January 4, 1913), p. 4.

*Ibid.*, 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.


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.
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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.


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."


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.
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13. The 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.

14. Peter 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.

15. Farm 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."

16. The 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.


20. Ibid., March 7, 1909, p. 1; The Farmer's Advocate, December 3, 1908, p. 10. 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.
21 E. C. Drury, "Canada's Parasites," The C.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."

22 W. 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).


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.


Whether the proposed trade pact was good or bad, remarked The Canadian Farmer, (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.)

The 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.


The 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.

Canadians 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.

P.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 Norpeth 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.
One 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.

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.

Eight petitions were presented on the 21st of January and more later that week.

The 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).
The 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.


W. C. Good told the Tariff Commission that the deficit amounted to $112,000,000, (The Weekly Sun, November 29, 1905, p. 8).


The 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.

The Farmer's Advocate, October 1, 1908, p. 1513; see also Peter McArthur, "The Question of Hired Help," Ibid., August 8, 1912, p. 1394.

E. 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.).

The Weekly Sun, February 6, 1911, p. 4, Speech of Hon. J. S. Duff at the Nelson and Burlington Agricultural Societies.

The 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).

57 The Farmer's Advocate, April 9, 1908.


59 The 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.

60 Archie 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 Orange. My education has been at the Ontario Agricultural College...."

61 The 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."

62 The 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.

63 Farm and Dairy, February 15, 1912, p. 4, Series on Land Taxation article number 10.

64 Farm and Dairy, November 30, 1911, p. 4; see also "Fair Play," in The Farmer's Advocate, February 19, 1914, pp. 318-319.

65 Ibid., October 21, 1909, p. 10; Ibid., August 21, 1913, p. 10; Ibid., November 14, 1912, p. 3.

The 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).


The Farmer's Advocate, January 19, 1911, p. 86; The Weekly Sun, July 9, 1902, p. 8.


The 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.

Ibid., 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.

The 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.).


The Weekly Sun, September 9, 1908, p. 1.
80. Ibid., 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. (F.A.C. Graham Papers, J. Lockie Wilson to G. F. Graham, February 19, 1909).

81. The Weekly Sun, April 2, 1902, p. 13. The bill was introduced by E. A. Lancaster, M.P. for Lincoln and Niagara.


83. The 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).


91. The Farming World, January 8, 1901, p. 441; see also The Weekly Sun, January 29, 1902, p. 6.

92. Ibid., February 11, 1903, p. 2.

93. The 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.
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.

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 F. Graham Papers, James Mills to Graham, March 9, 1908, f. 22467).

Farm 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.
This 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).

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.

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.

Statement from Nesbitt, M.P. for Oxford.
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.

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 ).


G. A. Mallory chaired the founding meeting of the new group.

The Farming World, September 16, 1902, p. 265.

E. C. Drury, Farmer Premier, p. 52.

The Weekly Sun, April 1, 1903, p. 2.

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.


The Farmer's Advocate, December 17, 1908, p. 1949.

The Weekly Sun, February 19, 1908, p. 1.


The Weekly Sun, April 2, 1909, p. 6.

P.A.C., W. C. Good Papers, vol. 10, Story written for the Canadian Countryman, Christmas, 1919.

136 *Farm and Dairy*, March 26, 1914, p. 3.

137 *The Farmer's Advocate*, April 16, 1914, p. 757; see also *Farm and Dairy*, March 23, 1914, p. 3.


139 *Farm and Dairy*, December 22, 1910, p. 10.

140 *The Canadian Farm*, October 14, 1910, p. 1.

141 E. C. Drury, *Farmer Premier*, p. 56; see also *The Weekly Sun*, July 1, 1903, p. 1.


144 *Farm and Dairy*, January 4, 1912, p. 12.

The figures were:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1908</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merchants</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capitalists</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawyers</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journalists</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturers</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agents</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Druggists</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor employees</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractors</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notaries</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lumbermen</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


147. Ibid., 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.


149. Ibid., March 18, 1903, p. 3.

150. The Farmer's Advocate, November 15, 1901, p. 733; Ibid., November 21, 1907, p. 1824.


152. The Farmer's Advocate, June 11, 1914, p. 1122.


154. Farm and Dairy, September 29, 1910, p. 10.

155. The Weekly Sun, April 30, 1902, p. 2.

156. Farm and Dairy, May 8, 1913, p. 3.


158. Ibid., October 26, 1911, p. 1746; The Weekly Sun, May 13, 1908, p. 6, Letter J. T. Holmes.

159. The Farmer's Advocate, June 5, 1912, p. 1022.

160. The 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.


CONCLUSION

NOTES

1 The University of British Columbia, Special Collections, James W. Robertson Collection, box 1, Memorandum enclosed with letter, Sir Horace Flunkett to James Robertson, May 21, 1910.
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# APPENDIX A

## CIRCULATION OF AGRICULTURAL JOURNALS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Reviews</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. O.A.C. Review (Guelph)</td>
<td>n.a.m.</td>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>1,000m</td>
<td>900m</td>
<td>900m</td>
<td>900m</td>
<td>900m</td>
<td>900m</td>
<td>900m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The Weekly Sun (Toronto)</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>16,077w</td>
<td>16,214w</td>
<td>16,235w</td>
<td>16,051w</td>
<td>16,124w</td>
<td>15,000w</td>
<td>16,988w</td>
<td>16,988w</td>
<td>16,000w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The Farmer's Advocate (London)</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>30,016w</td>
<td>30,016w</td>
<td>30,016w</td>
<td>27,500w</td>
<td>27,500w</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>32,500w</td>
<td>32,000w</td>
<td>32,000w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Farm and Dairy 1 (Toronto &amp; Peterboro)</td>
<td>n.a.f.</td>
<td>40,000f</td>
<td>40,000f</td>
<td>10,400f</td>
<td>5,000w</td>
<td>10,000w</td>
<td>10,000w</td>
<td>10,000w</td>
<td>13,400w</td>
<td>13,000w</td>
<td>16,807w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Canadian Countryman (Toronto)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The Canadian Farm 2 (Ottawa &amp; Toronto)</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>--- not published</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>n.a.w.</td>
<td>19,697w</td>
<td>19,078w</td>
<td>19,106w</td>
<td>19,106w</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. The Farmer's Magazine (Toronto)</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special Interest Magazines</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Canadian Bee Journal (Brantford)</td>
<td>n.a.m</td>
<td>925m</td>
<td>925m</td>
<td>925m</td>
<td>1500m</td>
<td>1400m</td>
<td>1500m</td>
<td>1500m</td>
<td>1500m</td>
<td>1500m</td>
<td>1500m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Canadian Sportsman &amp; Livestock Jour. (Grimsby &amp; Toronto)</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>4000w</td>
<td>4000w</td>
<td>4000w</td>
<td>3000w</td>
<td>3100w</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>5000w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Fruit Grower Mkt. Gardener &amp; Poultryman (Grimsby)</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>2300w</td>
<td>2300w</td>
<td>3400w</td>
<td>3400w</td>
<td>3400w</td>
<td>3200w</td>
<td>3200w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cdn. Poultry News (Grimsby &amp; Owen Snd)</td>
<td>n.a.m</td>
<td>1000m</td>
<td>1000m</td>
<td>900m</td>
<td>1200m</td>
<td>1325m</td>
<td>2000m</td>
<td>2000m</td>
<td>2000m</td>
<td>2000m</td>
<td>2000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cdn. Horticulturist</td>
<td>n.a.m</td>
<td>5500m</td>
<td>5000m</td>
<td>6000m</td>
<td>8198m</td>
<td>8198m</td>
<td>9238m</td>
<td>9587m</td>
<td>10523m</td>
<td>11170m</td>
<td>13257m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Cdn. Poultry Rev. (Toronto)</td>
<td>n.a.m</td>
<td>7500m</td>
<td>7750m</td>
<td>7750m</td>
<td>6000m</td>
<td>5000m</td>
<td>12500m</td>
<td>13500m</td>
<td>13000m</td>
<td>15000m</td>
<td>15000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Poultry Advocate (London, Toronto, Petrolia)</td>
<td>not pub.</td>
<td>3200m</td>
<td>3200m</td>
<td>4500m</td>
<td>2500m</td>
<td>2500m</td>
<td>3000m</td>
<td>4000m</td>
<td>4000m</td>
<td>5000m</td>
<td>5000m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Thresherman's Rev. (Toronto)</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>n.a.m</td>
<td>7800m</td>
<td>8400m</td>
<td>8400m</td>
<td>8400m</td>
<td>8400m</td>
<td>8400m</td>
<td>8400m</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Breeder's Advocate (London)</td>
<td>n.a.m.</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>n.a.m.</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>n.a.m.</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>n.a.m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Cdn. Dairyman (Toronto)</td>
<td>not published</td>
<td>n.a.f</td>
<td>5000w</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>Amalgamated with The Farming World</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL CIRCULATION: N.A. 22125 21875 29075 22398 23523 33538 38987 39423 50870 53357
APPENDIX A - (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Journal Published by a Daily</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free Press &amp; Farm &amp; Home (London)</td>
<td>2000w</td>
<td>2000w</td>
<td>1375w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Globe &amp; Can. Farmer (Toronto)</td>
<td>20,604w</td>
<td>20,604w</td>
<td>30,287w</td>
<td>25,104w</td>
<td>22,088w</td>
<td>20,620w</td>
<td>15,609w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
<td>n.a.w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail &amp; Empire (Toronto)</td>
<td>15,167w</td>
<td>14,576w</td>
<td>14,576w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
<td>14,000w</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL CIRCULATION</td>
<td>22,604</td>
<td>22,604</td>
<td>31,662</td>
<td>40,271</td>
<td>36,664</td>
<td>35,196</td>
<td>29,609</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

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.


## APPENDIX B

### CIRCULATION OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Report</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minister's Report</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ontario Agricultural College</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Experimental Union</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>27,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Veterinary College</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ag. Soc. &amp; Field Crop Competition</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horticultural Soc.</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vegetable Growers</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Ass'ns.</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poultry Institute</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer's Clubs</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stallion Enrollment</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmer's Institutes</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>34,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Institutes</td>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>25,300</td>
<td>32,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
<td>33,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairymen's Assn's.</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>28,000</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entomological Soc.</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Growers</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Branch</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

continued...
APPENDIX B - continued

CIRCULATION OF GOVERNMENT REPORTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Report</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Corn Growers</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
<td>6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beekeepers' Assn.</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Industries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Agric. Stats.</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Municipal Stats.</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
<td>6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>243,500</td>
<td>274,800</td>
<td>266,500</td>
<td>290,000</td>
<td>261,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept. of Agric.¹ Bulletins</td>
<td>135,600</td>
<td>210,000</td>
<td>227,000</td>
<td>216,000</td>
<td>282,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crop &amp; Statistical Bulletins</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>35,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>41,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRAND TOTAL</td>
<td>379,100</td>
<td>519,800</td>
<td>532,500</td>
<td>545,000</td>
<td>584,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ Examples of the type of Bulletins Issued by the Department of Agriculture in 1911.

184. Uses of Vegetables, Fruits and Honey 25,000
185. Little Peach Disease 4,000
186. Children: Care and Training 27,000
187. The Codling Moth 32,000
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
158. Disease Affecting Fruit Trees 15,000
171. Diseases Affecting Vegetables 10,000
174. Farm Underdrainage 6,000
175. Farm Drainage Operations 6,000

TOTAL 210,000


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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institute</th>
<th>1900</th>
<th>1901</th>
<th>1902</th>
<th>1903</th>
<th>1904</th>
<th>1905</th>
<th>1906</th>
<th>1907</th>
<th>1908</th>
<th>1909</th>
<th>1910</th>
<th>1911</th>
<th>1912</th>
<th>1913</th>
<th>1914</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Farmers'</td>
<td>131,653</td>
<td>147,642</td>
<td>126,459</td>
<td>106,719</td>
<td>102,008</td>
<td>126,084</td>
<td>110,765</td>
<td>110,415</td>
<td>108,020</td>
<td>105,576</td>
<td>86,000</td>
<td>94,266</td>
<td>92,660</td>
<td>--</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's</td>
<td>3,500</td>
<td>16,440</td>
<td>22,013</td>
<td>44,698</td>
<td>54,329</td>
<td>51,892</td>
<td>71,154</td>
<td>93,951</td>
<td>119,364</td>
<td>140,300</td>
<td>151,654</td>
<td>177,42</td>
<td>178,858</td>
<td>202,504</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Institute</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better Farming Special (train visiting rural areas)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fruit Institutes (not available before 1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Factory and Creamery Meetings (not available before 1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmers' and Women's Institute Conventions (not available before 1910)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women's Institute Demonstration Lectures (not available before 1912)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**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 | 367,759 | 361,237 |

## APPENDIX D

### MIGRATION FROM RURAL AREAS OF ONTARIO COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1881-1891 Total %</th>
<th>1891-1901 Total %</th>
<th>1901-1911 Total %</th>
<th>1911-1921 Total %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>30,467 (66.2)²</td>
<td>7656 (8.1)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant</td>
<td>-2762 (-11.1)</td>
<td>-3576 (-15.1)</td>
<td>4929 (15.2)</td>
<td>3225 (7.0)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>-9415 (-15.1)</td>
<td>-12,473 (-20.3)</td>
<td>-14106 (-23.9)*</td>
<td>-9447 (-18.9)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>-8603 (-23.4)</td>
<td>-3 (-)</td>
<td>-4443 (-12.0)</td>
<td>5733 (17.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufferin</td>
<td>-2852 (-12.9)</td>
<td>-3184 (-16.4)</td>
<td>-5036 (-23.9)*</td>
<td>-3730 (-21.0)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas</td>
<td>-3592 (-5.8)</td>
<td>-5085 (-8.1)</td>
<td>-10479 (-16.8)</td>
<td>-6260 (-10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stormont &amp; Glengarry</td>
<td>-4155 (-12.2)</td>
<td>-3361 (-10.2)</td>
<td>-3789 (11.8)</td>
<td>-1064 (-3.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>-2016 (-5.0)</td>
<td>-6055 (-13.4)</td>
<td>-3667 (-7.8)</td>
<td>4035 (8.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>-3021 (-10.7)</td>
<td>-3575 (-12.9)</td>
<td>-4920 (-18.5)</td>
<td>-2674 (-11.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>-10457 (-15.8)</td>
<td>-10039 (-15.7)</td>
<td>-12949 (-21.3)</td>
<td>-10715 (-20.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>-141 (-2.4)</td>
<td>-1566 (-23.0)</td>
<td>-1178 (-18.6)</td>
<td>-2007 (-9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haldimand</td>
<td>-4460 (-17.8)</td>
<td>-3803 (-16.8)</td>
<td>-1351 (-6.4)*</td>
<td>-2007 (-9.3)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliburton</td>
<td>-2326 (-10.6)</td>
<td>-4035 (-19.6)</td>
<td>-1566 (-23.0)</td>
<td>-1178 (-18.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>-4971 (-9.3)</td>
<td>-4445 (-8.5)</td>
<td>-7251 (-14.5)</td>
<td>-4550 (-10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>-3156 (-13.8)</td>
<td>-2606 (-12.2)</td>
<td>-3760 (-18.6)</td>
<td>-2652 (-13.0)*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>-3877 (16.9)²</td>
<td>-1656 (-7.9)</td>
<td>+1665 (+12.4)¹</td>
<td>-3737 (17.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued...*
### APPENDIX D - (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1881–1891 Total</th>
<th>1891–1901 Total</th>
<th>1901–1911 Total</th>
<th>1911–1921 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manitoulin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>-13541(-19.5)</td>
<td>-9566(-15.8)</td>
<td>-5105(-9.3)</td>
<td>-7462(-14.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskoka</td>
<td>2835(10.4)</td>
<td>-327(-1.0)</td>
<td>-3214(-15.3)</td>
<td>-4119(-19.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3124(18.0)</td>
<td>-823(-2.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>-6249(-18.6)</td>
<td>-4479(-15.8)</td>
<td>-3913(-13.4)</td>
<td>-2518(-9.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland, Durham</td>
<td>12215(-16.9)</td>
<td>-11517(-17.5)</td>
<td>-5622(-9.7)</td>
<td>-7090(-14.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>-8792(-19.2)</td>
<td>-8026(-18.8)</td>
<td>-2516(-6.2)</td>
<td>1713(3.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>-8334(-12.6)</td>
<td>-5553(-13.5)</td>
<td>-4650(-11.7)</td>
<td>-3356(-10.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry Snd.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2843(-11.4)</td>
<td>-4290(-16.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>-4430(-19.0)</td>
<td>-4516(-20.9)</td>
<td>-558(-2.6)</td>
<td>83(0.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>-8740(-19.1)</td>
<td>-6563(-15.5)</td>
<td>-6977(-17.5)</td>
<td>-4602(-12.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterboro</td>
<td>-2340(-9.9)</td>
<td>-2874(-11.5)</td>
<td>-3028(-13.1)</td>
<td>-3473(-15.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott, Russell</td>
<td>-1190(-3.3)</td>
<td>-3323(-8.0)</td>
<td>-9306(-19.7)</td>
<td>-10819(-22.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince Edward</td>
<td>-3358(-18.6)</td>
<td>-2191(-14.0)</td>
<td>-1127(-6.3)</td>
<td>-1004(-5.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy River</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1138(10.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrew</td>
<td>6023(14.1)</td>
<td>-2351(-5.5)</td>
<td>-8561(-18.0)</td>
<td>-8541(-18.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simcoe</td>
<td>1619(2.3)</td>
<td>-8963(-11.6)</td>
<td>-7315(-10.2)</td>
<td>-8332(-12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7333(167.7)</td>
<td>950(2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>-5647(-19.8)</td>
<td>-4760(-17.7)</td>
<td>-4306(-17.2)</td>
<td>-4829(-20.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>-2595(-6.7)</td>
<td>-5437(-12.6)</td>
<td>-2226(-6.4)</td>
<td>-2090(-8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>-4605(-14.5)</td>
<td>-2151(-8.5)</td>
<td>5140(19.8)</td>
<td>13,121(47.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>-11942(-21.8)</td>
<td>-9201(-18.8)</td>
<td>-7224(-17.5)</td>
<td>-5469(-13.9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*continued...*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>1881-1891 Total</th>
<th>1891-1901 Total</th>
<th>1901-1911 Total</th>
<th>1911-1921 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>-5796(-18.7)</td>
<td>-3622(-12.9)</td>
<td>1156(4.3)$^1$</td>
<td>7808(26.2)$^1$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>-4731(-7.9)</td>
<td>-6772(-11.4)</td>
<td>5176(9.1)$^1$</td>
<td>53112(85.1)$^1$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTAL      | -183,425       | -201,316       | -125,741       | -56,277        |
| Total      | Not available  | Not available  | -178,871       | -60,904        |
| Minus North available (marked 2) | (53,130) | (4627) |

| TOTAL      | Not available  | Not available  | -144,958       | -149,575       |
| Minus Suburbs (Marked 1) | (19,217) | (93,298) |

| TOTAL Minus North and Suburbs 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 0 indicate corrections made to Taylor’s figures.
## APPENDIX E

### POPULATION CHANGE IN RURAL AREAS OF ONTARIO COUNTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>1881-1891 Total</th>
<th>1891-1901 Total</th>
<th>1901-1911 Total</th>
<th>1911-1921 Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algoma</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>37281 (81.0)²</td>
<td>23934 (25.3)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brant</td>
<td>-561 (-2.3)</td>
<td>-2171 (-9.2)</td>
<td>6287 (19.4)¹</td>
<td>7501 (16.3)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>-370 (-0.6)</td>
<td>-5493 (-3.9)</td>
<td>-8983 (-15.2)²</td>
<td>-5747 (-11.5)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>-3215 (-8.8)</td>
<td>3500 (10.4)</td>
<td>-4104 (-11.1)</td>
<td>8540 (26.4)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dufferin</td>
<td>-248 (-1.1)</td>
<td>-845 (-4.4)</td>
<td>-3296 (-15.7)²</td>
<td>-2325 (-13.1)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dundas/Stormont &amp; Glen­</td>
<td>1381 (2.2)</td>
<td>-704 (-1.1)</td>
<td>-4625 (-7.4)</td>
<td>-2059 (-3.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gary</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elgin</td>
<td>-3923 (-2.9)</td>
<td>-1090 (-2.7)</td>
<td>-1843 (-5.7)</td>
<td>532 (1.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essex</td>
<td>4822 (11.9)</td>
<td>1368 (3.0)</td>
<td>3127 (6.7)</td>
<td>10509 (22.6)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontenac</td>
<td>-547 (-1.9)</td>
<td>-1173 (-4.2)</td>
<td>-2843 (-10.7)</td>
<td>-959 (-4.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grey</td>
<td>-2396 (-3.6)</td>
<td>-2903 (-4.5)</td>
<td>-7481 (-12.3)</td>
<td>-6472 (-12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haldimand</td>
<td>-1540 (-6.2)</td>
<td>-2156 (-9.5)</td>
<td>329 (1.5)³</td>
<td>-275 (-1.3)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halton</td>
<td>60 (0.3)</td>
<td>-2359 (-11.5)</td>
<td>2663 (13.6)¹</td>
<td>2691 (12.1)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haliburton</td>
<td>439 (7.4)</td>
<td>-237 (-3.6)³</td>
<td>-111 (-1.7)³</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hastings</td>
<td>3623 (7.9)</td>
<td>1006 (2.0)</td>
<td>-4247 (-8.5)</td>
<td>-610 (-1.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>-9020 (-12.5)</td>
<td>-5280 (-8.4)</td>
<td>-9201 (-15.9)</td>
<td>-5975 (-11.2)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent</td>
<td>2325 (5.0)</td>
<td>-636 (-1.3)</td>
<td>-2901 (-6.0)</td>
<td>-532 (-1.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lambton</td>
<td>3958 (8.2)</td>
<td>-3652 (-7.0)</td>
<td>-7081 (-15.2)</td>
<td>-3383 (-8.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lanark</td>
<td>3081 (9.8)</td>
<td>-945 (-2.7)</td>
<td>-4072 (-12.7)</td>
<td>-1802 (-6.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds/Grenville</td>
<td>-1461 (-2.7)</td>
<td>-2041 (-3.9)</td>
<td>-5132 (-10.2)</td>
<td>-3420 (-7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lennox &amp; Addington</td>
<td>-1487 (-6.5)</td>
<td>-1114 (-5.2)</td>
<td>-2624 (-13.0)</td>
<td>-1392 (-6.8)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln</td>
<td>-1033 (-4.7)</td>
<td>-303 (-1.4)</td>
<td>2339 (17.4)¹</td>
<td>5799 (25.3)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manitoulin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-856 (-7.5)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>-7163 (-10.3)</td>
<td>-5641 (-9.3)</td>
<td>-2334 (-4.3)</td>
<td>-4859 (-9.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskoka</td>
<td>9614 (35.3)</td>
<td>6947 (20.7)</td>
<td>262 (1.2)³</td>
<td>-1632 (-7.7)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nipissing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10760 (46.9)²</td>
<td>6475 (23.1)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk</td>
<td>-2535 (-7.6)</td>
<td>-1792 (-6.3)</td>
<td>-2031 (-7.0)³</td>
<td>-744 (-2.7)³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northumberland, Durham</td>
<td>-6406 (-8.8)</td>
<td>-7823 (-11.9)</td>
<td>-2714 (-4.7)</td>
<td>-3873 (-7.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX E - (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>COUNTY</th>
<th>1881-1891</th>
<th>1891-1901</th>
<th>1901-1911</th>
<th>1911-1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Total %</td>
<td>Total %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>-3103(-6.8)</td>
<td>-4271(-10.0)</td>
<td>598(15)‡</td>
<td>3984(8.0)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford</td>
<td>-3549(-7.9)</td>
<td>-1666(-4.0)</td>
<td>-1520(-3.8)</td>
<td>-1060(-3.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry Sound</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>1611(6.5)‡</td>
<td>313(1.2)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peel</td>
<td>-1936(-8.3)</td>
<td>-2892(-13.4)</td>
<td>627(2.9)‡</td>
<td>1794(8.1)‡¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perth</td>
<td>-3238(-7.1)</td>
<td>-2304(-5.4)</td>
<td>-3676(-9.2)</td>
<td>-1487(-4.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterboro</td>
<td>1220(5.1)</td>
<td>-53(-0.2)</td>
<td>-757(-3.3)</td>
<td>-1156(-5.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prescott/</td>
<td>6525(18.1)</td>
<td>4831(-9.2)</td>
<td>-714(-4.0)‡</td>
<td>-344(-2.0)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russell</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prince</td>
<td>-2467(-13.6)</td>
<td>-1436(-9.2)</td>
<td>-714(-4.0)‡</td>
<td>-344(-2.0)‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renfrew</td>
<td>6914(19.4)</td>
<td>4983(11.7)</td>
<td>-1329(-2.3)</td>
<td>-2600(-5.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simcoe</td>
<td>7228(10.3)</td>
<td>-811(-1.0)</td>
<td>346(0.5)</td>
<td>-2682(-4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victoria</td>
<td>-1665(-5.3)</td>
<td>-1961(-7.3)</td>
<td>-1734(-6.9)</td>
<td>-3049(-13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterloo</td>
<td>4353(11.2)</td>
<td>-192(-0.4)</td>
<td>2131(16.1)</td>
<td>3175(12.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland</td>
<td>-1140(-3.6)</td>
<td>-110(-0.4)</td>
<td>7029(27.1)¹</td>
<td>15653(56.7)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellington</td>
<td>-5938(-10.8)</td>
<td>-4663(-9.5)</td>
<td>-4833(-10.9)</td>
<td>-3285(-8.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wentworth</td>
<td>-2836(-9.1)</td>
<td>-1337(-4.6)</td>
<td>2919(10.9)¹</td>
<td>9679(32.5)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York</td>
<td>3696(6.6)</td>
<td>-836(-1.4)</td>
<td>10795(18.9)¹</td>
<td>63371(101.5)¹</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenora</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>13750(27.6)²</td>
<td>-1727(-12.2)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rainy River</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>3089(29.6)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thunder Bay</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>7405(169.4)²</td>
<td>10064(25.5)²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>-5695</td>
<td>-47,838</td>
<td>20,552</td>
<td>111,639</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Minus North    | (Marked ¹) | -- | -- | (69,196) | (41,835) |
| Minus Suburbs  | -- | -- | -- | (32,032) | (129,521) |
| Minus Both     | -- | -- | -- | (101,228) | (171,356) |

NOTE: For explanation of ‡ see APPENDIX D.
### APPENDIX F

**ONTARIO CITIES - MIGRATION AND POPULATION CHANGE, 1900 - 1921**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>1901 - 1911</th>
<th>1911 - 1921</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Change (total) %</td>
<td>Migration (total %)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barrie</td>
<td>4.71 (7.9)</td>
<td>91 (1.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belleville</td>
<td>759 (8.3)</td>
<td>835 (7.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brockville</td>
<td>434 (4.8)</td>
<td>9 (0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chatham</td>
<td>1702 (18.8)</td>
<td>1726 (19.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobourg</td>
<td>835 (19.7)</td>
<td>801 (18.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornwall</td>
<td>-106 (-1.6)</td>
<td>-156 (-2.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cobalt</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collingwood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port William</td>
<td>12886 (354.1)</td>
<td>11288 (310.7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galt</td>
<td>2433 (30.9)</td>
<td>1961 (24.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guelph</td>
<td>3679 (32.0)</td>
<td>2693 (23.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>29335 (55.7)</td>
<td>24513 (46.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ingersoll</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenora</td>
<td>-751 (-12.2)</td>
<td>-746 (12.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kingston</td>
<td>913 (5.1)</td>
<td>740 (4.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kitchener</td>
<td>5449 (55.9)</td>
<td>3974 (40.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lindsay</td>
<td>-39 (-0.5)</td>
<td>-533 (-7.6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>8324 (21.9)</td>
<td>5990 (15.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Midland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niagara Falls</td>
<td>3546 (62.1)</td>
<td>2926 (51.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bay</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orillia</td>
<td>1921 (39.1)</td>
<td>1581 (32.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oshawa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>27134 (45.3)</td>
<td>22742 (37.9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owen Sound</td>
<td>3782 (43.1)</td>
<td>2894 (33.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parry Sound</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pembroke</td>
<td>470 (9.1)</td>
<td>-8 (-0.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Arthur</td>
<td>8006 (249.1)</td>
<td>7259 (225.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Port Hope</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peterborough</td>
<td>5474 (42.5)</td>
<td>4390 (43.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Catharines</td>
<td>2538 (25.5)</td>
<td>2018 (20.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Thomas</td>
<td>2569 (22.4)</td>
<td>1533 (13.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarnia</td>
<td>1771 (21.7)</td>
<td>1167 (14.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sault Ste. Marie</td>
<td>3815 (53.2)</td>
<td>2886 (40.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith's Falls</td>
<td>1215 (23.6)</td>
<td>675 (13.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratford</td>
<td>2987 (30.0)</td>
<td>1838 (18.4)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudbury</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>160776 (74.5)</td>
<td>138260 (64.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trenton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walkerville</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Windsor</td>
<td>5679 (46.7)</td>
<td>4752 (39.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woodstock</td>
<td>487 (5.5)</td>
<td>249 (2.8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban Ontario</td>
<td>2984.94 (40.1)</td>
<td>246177 (33.1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brantford</td>
<td>1449 (25.2)</td>
<td>-730 (-12.7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Unreliable)

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

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. 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. 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. All opinions pass through these channels, before they become the commonplaces of the masses. 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.' 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." 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. 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.
1 James N. Rosenau, Public Opinion and Foreign Policy, New York: 1961, pp. 4-5.

2 Elihu 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.

3 Rosenau 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.

4 Rosenau, 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.)

5 Rosenau, p. 30.

6 Ibid., p. 31.

7 This 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.

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.)