ONTARIO PROVINCIAL ELEC-TIONS, RURAL DEPOPULA-TION AND PROVINCIAL EXPENDITURE

WHY THE U.F.O. IS IN POLITICS

- To establish personal responsibility of electors.
- To promote honest debate of public questions.
- To establish honesty and economy in public business.
- To establish a fair representation for agriculture.
- To secure fair treatment for farmers as producers.
- To insist on the fulfillment of pledges by Governments.
- To secure real responsible Government, not Government by Orders - in -Council.

The facts given relative to the depopulation of rural Ontario are from the Ontario Bureau of Industries Report for 1884 and 1918, issued by the Ontario Department of Agriculture. The facts relative to the Provincial expenditure are from the Annual Year Book of 1904 and 1918, and the Public Accounts of Ontario for the latter year.

Issued by the United Farmers of Ontario.

A 0901

DECLINE OF RURAL ONTARIO

DXXX

The population of rural Ontario increased, practically without a break, year by year, from 1872 to 1881, inclusive.

The rural population of the Province in 1872 was 1,049,931, and in 1881 it was 1,134,192.

This was an increase of eight per cent. in the ten year period.

From 1881 to 1918 the rural population of the Province showed a steady decrease from 1.134,192 in 1881 to 995,228 in 1918, or a decline of 12% in that period.

Now how about the urban population -the people living in cities, towns and villages?

From 1872 to 1884 urban population increased from 374,854 to 636,178. This was an increase of 49% in the urban as compared with 8% in the case of the rural population.

From 1884 to 1918 the urban population of the Province increased from 636,178 to 1,582,949, or an increase



of Canada

National Library Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

183% ias com the toy

It i incide INCR popul vear i tion, tive. too, 1 urbai

> Wh shows worth centre crease

time.

Th Onta now t

Pic 1872

Na 1881

W in 18

Or in 1 IO

ineak,

ince 1 it

ent.

oulaeady to % in

and

This an as i the

from rease 183% in the urban population of Ontario as compared with a **decrease** of 14% in the township population in the same time.

It is something more than a coincidence that the change from INCREASE to DECREASE in rural population began with the first year in which the policy of protection, adopted in 1880, became effective. It is more than a coincidence too, that the abnormal increase in urban population began at the same time.

While urban population as a whole shows such a phenomenal increase it is worth nothing that it is the large centres which have absorbed this increase.

There are many towns and villages in Ontario that have a smaller population now than they had in 1881, 38 years ago.

Picton, for example, had 2,391 people in 1872; 2,833 in 1881, and 2,682 in 1918.

Napanee had 2,757 in 1872; 3,313 in 1881; 3,014 in 1918.

Walkerton had 1,070 in 1872; 2,612 in 1881; 2,205 in 1918.

Orangeville had 1,487 in 1872; 2,523 in 1881; 2,259 in 1918.

All these towns are what might be called "farm towns." They depend for their prosperity on the country surrounding them. From 1872 to 1884 while rural population was increasing their population also increased. When rural population began to decline in 1881 the population of these towns also started on the down grade.

Still more significant are the figures for urban centres, taken as a whole, and more particularly the figures for the last

few years.

The population of all the villages and towns in Ontario was 5,371 less in 1918 than for two years before. The population of cities increased by 35,288 in the same time.

The smaller urban centres and the townships are in the same boat. Their interests are identical. Why then should they not act together in changing conditions from which they both suffer?

A table given on page 15 shows the population of representative townships east, west and north of Toronto in 1872, 1881 and 1918. The townships named are not the poorest in the Province; they might rather be described as

among been se are peo that is sobriety every of was in is less if not a those to in 1875

It is of impr the ne This s great a tion of farm b the are have b Moreo implen largely increas crop, expend known

of the

man r

ht be id for sur-1884 easing When ne in s also

igures , and le last

s and 1918 pula-88 in

d the Their hould g coner?

rs the iships 1872, amed ince; d as among the best. Most of them have been settled for a century; all of them are peopled by representatives of all that is best in rural Ontario—thrift, sobriety, industry, intelligence. In every case the population is less than it was in 1881; in every case population is less than in 1872, although in many, if not all cases, the work of "clearing" those townships had not been completed in 1872.

It is sometimes asserted that the use of improved farm machinery has reduced the need of population on the land. This statement is not true. No very great addition was made to the application of labor-saving machinery on the farm between 1881 and 1918. In 1918 the area under cultivation was, or should have been, much greater than in 1872. Moreover, the improvement in farm implements between 1872 and 1918 is largely, if not wholly, offset by the vast increase in intensive farming. The corn crop, for example, that calls for large expenditure in labor, was almost unknown even in 1881. To-day it is one of the main crops on which the dairyman relies for feed.

Going beyond Ontario, and taking Canada as a whole, we find it stated by the Dominion Department of Labor, that the urban population of all Canada, which was only 14% of the total population of the Dominion in 1881, was $45\frac{1}{2}\%$ in 1911.

PROVINCIAL EXPENDITURE

Some 20 years ago a huge map hanging in the Provincial Parliament Buildings carried the legend: "Ontario has no Public Debt." To-day the Provincial debt is at least \$100,000,000.

A quarter of a century ago Ontario boasted of economy in the spending of Provincial revenue and pointed the finger of scorn at extravagant Quebec. In 1917, the last year for which figures are available for the two Provinces, the Provincial expenditure of Ontario was given in the Canada Year Book, issued by the Dominion Government, at \$16,518,223. The Provincial expenditure of Quebec is given by the same authority at \$9,907,673.

From 1904 to 1917, the Canada Year Book again being the authority, the Provincial expenditure of Ontario in-

creased by 213%.

0

In exper

Government The Government The Publisher The Publisher The Publisher The Publisher The Publisher The Government The Government

This eith part influction pop

F

still Mo a libui latu par Joh of spe

res

ena

taking ted by Labor, anada, popul, was

RE

anging ildings has no vincial

Ontario ding of ed the Quebec. figures ces, the rio was , issued nt, at xpendie same

da Year ty, the ario inIn the same period the Provincial expenditure of Quebec increased by only 107%

The total expenditure of the Ontario Government in 1918, as shown by the Public Accounts, aside from advances to the Hydro Electric Commission, to be repaid by the municipalities, was well over \$23,000,000.

What is the cause of the present financial position of the Province? This position is not wholly chargeable either to one or other of the old political parties. It is due to the fact that "farm influence" in the Legislature has declined even more rapidly than has farm population in the townships.

For years, while farm influence was still strong in the Legislature, the Mowat Government hesitated to spend a little over a million dollars to provide a building for the housing of the Legislature, and the several Provincial Departments. At an earlier date, when John Sandfield Macdonald was Premier of Ontario, there was equal hesitation in spending less than \$50,000 on the official residence then occupied by the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. A few

years ago a million dollars was spent in providing a new and palatial residence for that same official.

it

ti

n

n

tl

e

il

b

The salary of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario, payable by the Dominion Government, is \$10,000 a year. In addition to this the Governor has an "allowance" from the Ontario Government of \$2,050 a year. His official secretary, Alex. Fraser, receives \$1,400 a year (in addition to \$2,500 as Provincial Archivist). An Assistant Secretary to the Governor gets \$600, and a messenger \$800. Assistant gardeners, firemen and repairs to grounds about Government House cost \$12,764.74. Water, fuel, light and power for the official residence cost \$5,951.27, and repairs and contingencies over \$5,000 more. The fuel bill alone for Government House was \$4,760.84 in 1918. In addition to this annual interest and depreciation will easily total \$100,000. And all for the most useless public official in the Province.

During the war, when the effects of rural depopulation, with a resultant insufficient supply of food stuffs became glaringly apparent, some effort was made to meet the situation. With this end in was

rnor nion ddilownt of tary, r (in rchithe nger and nent fuel,

ence confuel was this will the

s of tant ame ade d in

Pro-

view, the Ontario Government spent in 1918:

\$3,747.59 on its hog campaign.

\$6,218,79 on its farm help campaign.

\$16,650.21 in advertising appeals urging farmers to "produce even at a loss."

\$18,875.35 on the purchase and distribution of calendars with the object of securing the production of the maximum in foodstuffs.

\$71,520.72 in encouraging agriculture in the schools.

\$260,000 on its "organization of resources" campaign, with the significant notation by the Provincial Auditor that there was no audit of this particular expenditure.

\$316,140.54 on the purchase and operation of tractors, etc.

And then, as if to rub it in, \$31,937.50 (two items) was spent on the purchase of films and operation of moving pictures intended to show the wonderful work being done by the Department of Agriculture for the boosting of Agriculture.

OFFICIAL SALARIES.

The official salaries of members of the Provincial Government, as Cabinet Ministers, aggregated \$50,612.02 last year. Of this the Premier received \$12,000, and the other ministers at the rate of \$6,000 a year each. In addition each Minister receives his sessional allowance of \$1,500.

Deputy Ministers, for the most part, received \$4,200 to \$4,500 each.

Some of the so-called minor officials received even more than most of the Deputy Ministers.

Dr. John Waugh, for "allowances," extra services inspecting seven schools, as Chief Inspector of Schools, for services and expenses at Departmental examinations, and for extra services in connection with professional and supervising boards of examiners, received \$4,329.50 in all.

Dr. J. W. S. McCullough as Deputy Registrar-General and Secretary of the Provincial Board of Health, and for allowances as member of the Provincial Board of Health, was paid \$4,800.

The late Dr. John Seath, as Superintendent of Education, for extra services

and in connection with the work of supervising boards of examiners received \$5,250.

le

t

st

d

le

n

11

t.

Is

le

in

d

Cy

1e

or

al

11-

es

T. E. Godson, as Mining Commissoner and for special services, drew \$5,775.00.

A. M. Dymond, as Law Clerk of Public Bills, for legal services in connection with Teachers' and Inspectors' Superannuation Commission, and for travelling expenses in connection with Privy Council Appeal, got \$5,912.00.

Dr. G. C. Creelman, as Commissioner of Agriculture received \$1,700, as President of the Agricultural College, \$3,000 and \$1,081.38 for a trip to Britain and France in connection with the Khaki University, and "with a view of studying food conditions and other matters of interest to the work in this Province." Since free residence, etc., are provided for the President of the Agricultural College as well, the total emoluments in this case come near rivalling those of the Premier of the Province.

OTHER PROVINCIAL OUTLAYS

Legal expenses come high. One firm of Toronto lawyers received \$18,500

for legal expenses connected with Ottawa Separate School case; another firm \$7,000, and two other legal firms divided \$1,575.61 between them on the same account.

The Treasurer of the Great War Veterans of Ontario received \$37,500 of Provincial funds last year, and the Secretary-Treasurer of the Ontario Branch of the Navy League \$50,000, without there being anything to show in the Public Accounts how the money was spent.

Two really curious items there are in the Public Accounts of the Province for 1918. R. Home Smith was paid \$10,000 for travelling and other expenses in connection with the Provincial fuel problem, while R. C. Harris and his assistant, H. G. Rupert, divided \$2,000 between them on the same account. And this expenditure was made in the same year that \$4,760.84 was spent for fuel for heating the official residence of the Lieutenant-Governor of Ontario. That, again, was rubbing it in.

TABLE SHOWING INCREASE IN POPULATION OF TOWNSHIPS OF ONTARIO, 1872-1881

	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881
Popu- lation.	1,049,931	1,049,931 1,047,812 1,064,040 1,071,757 1,088,753 1,108,671 1,117,580 1,128,889 1,131,288 1,134,192	1,064,040	1,071,757	1,088,753	1,108,671	1,117,580	1,128,889	1,131,288	1,134,192
No. of Town-	406	407 411 414 Township Increase -8%.	411 Increase	414	416	418	424	427	430	433

TABLE SHOWING DECREASE OF POPULATION IN TOWNSHIPS, 1881-1884.

1884	1,117,880	445
1883	1,115,841	442
1882	1,120,574	* 438
1881	1,134,192	433
,	Population	No. of Townships

TABLE SHOWING DECREASE IN POPULATION OF TOWNSHIPS, 1916-1918.

TABLE SHOWING INCREASE IN URBAN POPULATION, 1872-1884, AND 1916 TO 1918.

	1872	1873	1874	1875	1876	1877	1878	1879	1880	1881	1882	1883	1884
Populat'n 374,854 406,422 441,582 468,990 498,766 511,872 528,455 544,678 552,595 559,306 574,792 594,164 636,178	374,854	406,422	441,582	468,990	498,766	511,872	528,455	544,678	552,595	559,306	574,792	594,164	636,178
No Cities Towns, Villages		122 131	142	159	166	174	182	189	193	198	201	200	205

	9161	1917	1918
	1,553,032	1,556,789	1,582,949
An Increase of 183% for 1918 as comparedwith 1884	as comparedwith	1884.	

1

TABLE SHOWING CHANGE IN POPULA-TION OF INDIVIDUAL REPRESEN TATIVE TOWNSHIPS

	1872	1881	1918
HALTON Esquesing	5,668	4,585	2,915
Peet, Caledon	3,687	3,568	3,071
York King	5,614	5,655	4,230
Ontario Whitby	2,950	2,852	1,691
Brant S. Dumfries	2,859	3,448	2,404
Oxford Dereham	3,785	3,976	3,264
MIDDLESEX Ekfrid	2,800	2,721	1,950
Bruce. Brant	4,255	4,687	2,939
Kent Camden	2,762	2,616	2,102
LAMBTON Bosanquet	3,420	2,863	2,170
Elgin Bayham	4,350	3,830	3,010
HALDIMAND Cayuga N	1,855	1,838	1,392
WELLAND Willoughby	1,033	1,024	753
Durham Darlington	5,536	5,044	3,426

An Increase of 183% for 1918

as comparedwith 1884.

COMPOSITION OF LEGISLATURE. July 31, 1919.

Professions .		
Bankers. Lawyers. Doctors. Teachers. Preachers.	21 11 1	37
TRADERS .		01
Merchants		29
MANUFACTURERS:		49
Manufacturers	. 2	
		19
DROVERS		2
AUCTIONEER		1
GENTLEMAN		1
FARMERS including ("joy farmers")		17
VACANT (Hanna's, Studholme's and Johnson's Ridings)		3
UNACCOUNTED (Duff's successor and Sharpe of Welland)		2
		111