

“Patronage, like Hamlet’s ghost will not down!” Ontario’s Farmer-Labour Government and Political Patronage, 1919-1923

Mark Sholdice

Volume 106, Number 2, Fall 2014

URI: <https://id.erudit.org/iderudit/1050693ar>

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7202/1050693ar>

[See table of contents](#)

Publisher(s)

The Ontario Historical Society

ISSN

0030-2953 (print)

2371-4654 (digital)

[Explore this journal](#)

Cite this article

Sholdice, M. (2014). “Patronage, like Hamlet’s ghost will not down!”: Ontario’s Farmer-Labour Government and Political Patronage, 1919-1923. *Ontario History*, 106(2), 191–213. <https://doi.org/10.7202/1050693ar>

Article abstract

This article examines the issue of political patronage during the tenure of the United Farmers of Ontario (UFO)-Independent Labor Party (ILP) coalition government in Ontario, which held office between 1919 and 1923. The reform of political patronage became the focus of profound controversy during the UFO-ILP government because of an unresolved contradiction between the inequality inherent in the practice, and the importance of patronage to the agrarian community. Politically motivated appointments were not just result of simple hypocrisy but came about because of the government’s desire to include greater numbers of farmers and workers in the province’s political system.

“Patronage, like Hamlet’s ghost will not down!”

Ontario’s Farmer-Labour Government and Political Patronage, 1919-1923

By Mark Sholdice

“Patronage, like Hamlet’s ghost will not down! The Drury Government is probably having more trouble over the patronage question than all the other problems combined.”¹

The United Farmers of Ontario (UFO) (1914-1943) was an important outgrowth of the unsettled economic, political, and social conditions of late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century Canada. Faced with a sense of great change wrought by increased industrialization and urbanization, Ontario farmers created a new organization to achieve their economic and political goals. The UFO’s heritage spanned back to agrarian organizations in the late-nineteenth-century, such as the Patrons of Industry and the Grange; following the tentative steps taken by these groups, the UFO and its

Abstract

This article examines the issue of political patronage during the tenure of the United Farmers of Ontario (UFO)-Independent Labor Party (ILP) coalition government in Ontario, which held office between 1919 and 1923. The reform of political patronage became the focus of profound controversy during the UFO-ILP government because of an unresolved contradiction between the inequality inherent in the practice, and the importance of patronage to the agrarian community. Politically motivated appointments were not just result of simple hypocrisy but came about because of the government’s desire to include greater numbers of farmers and workers in the province’s political system.

Résumé: *Dans cet article nous examinons le patronage politique sous la coalition entre les United Farmers of Ontario (UFO) et le parti travailliste indépendant (Independent Labor Party -- ILP), qui a gouverné l’Ontario de 1919 à 1923. La réforme du patronage politique a provoqué une controverse profonde sous le gouvernement UFO-ILP qui résultait de la contradiction entre l’inégalité inhérente à cette pratique et l’importance de ce patronage pour la communauté agricole. Ce n’est pas le seul désir de procurer un avantage à ces partis qui a motivé les nominations politiques à des postes publics, mais le désir du gouvernement de faire participer un plus grand nombre de cultivateurs et de travailleurs au système politique de la provinces.*

The author would like to thank the Rural History Roundtable at the University of Guelph and the Tri-University History Conference for hearing earlier versions of this paper. Additionally, David Murray, and most especially Alan Gordon, of the University of Guelph are especially thanked for their advice and guidance for the master’s research paper on which this article is based

¹ *Farmers’ Sun*, 7 Feb. 1920, 7.

members sought to address the perceived neglect shown to the province's agricultural community by the traditional brokerage parties, the Liberals and the Conservatives. The farmers' grievances included high tariffs on manufactured goods, corporate influence over the federal and provincial governments, and a perceived decline in political morality. One of their solutions was the elimination of patronage, which was seen as both an impediment to a true democracy and a barrier to morality in public affairs.

The immediate cause of the UFO's 1918 entrance into political activity was anger at the federal Union government for reversing its promise not to conscript farmers. Autonomous local units decided to display their fury at the urban political class by running candidates in two provincial by-elections occurring in the following months. Meeting success, enthusiasm spread throughout the movement in anticipation for the next general contest. When the UFO unexpectedly won a plurality of seats in the October 1919 provincial election and formed a coalition government with the Independent Labor Party (ILP) under the leadership of E.C. Drury, many of the agrarians believed their aspirations were close to realization. They further carried this optimism into the 1921 federal election, for which UFO members helped create a national Progressive Party. Investigations were promised into the inner-workings of the defeated Conservative government of Sir William Howard Hearst, which they believed to be corrupt in its provision of patronage.

Despite earnest hopes and sincere

promises, the UFO-ILP provincial government of 1919-1923 failed to eliminate political patronage from official appointments. Broadly, this can be attributed to three reasons: firstly, the decision to leave many of the Heart regime's appointees in office (and indeed, in promoting many); secondly, the appointment of UFO and ILP supporters due to the influence of political exigencies; and lastly, the government's failure to replace the old patronage system with a new, reformed method of making appointments. Yet members of the Drury government believed that they had abolished patronage and subtly shifted their interpretation of the term. Patronage, to them, came to mean the appointment of government supporters *lacking the proper qualifications* to conduct their official duties. This change in meaning led to bewilderment within the ranks of the UFO and sharp (and exaggerated) attacks from the opposition Liberals and Tories.

However this is not merely a story of political hypocrisy and the compromise of ideals. It is an attempt to clarify the position of political patronage during a time of flux. Like reformers in other times and places, the members of the UFO-ILP government failed to completely excise politics, understood as the antinomianism of private or individual interests, from public governance. In their practice of patronage, the government tried to resolve this tension by promoting the inclusion of groups such as farmers and workers into the administration of power. This helps to underline the dual nature of political patronage,

as both a mechanism for the promotion of social cohesion, and a prime target of those wishing to transform society. These groups initially saw patronage as a practice that disempowered their collective political efforts, but upon taking office the UFO-ILP government used appointments as a constructive way to bring their supporters into public administration.

The overriding focus of the literature on the UFO has been to explain the sudden political rise and decline of the movement between 1914 and 1923. The rise of the UFO is mainly seen as accidental: as a reaction to conscription, rural depopulation, the collapse of the Ontario Conservatives, and a general breakdown of the

two-party system. The 1919 provincial election victory is thus viewed as unintentional.² Explanations of the UFO's demise are likewise varied, but they mostly stress internal discord within the organization. The "Broadening Out" controversy, a feud between Drury and UFO Secretary-Treasurer J.J. Morrison over the make-up of the movement, is central to the body of literature. An ex-Liberal, Drury wished to create a "People's Party" of farmers, organized labour, middle-class reformers, and others; Morrison opposed a return to the two-party system and instead advocated "group government," an idea which originated from the Western agrarians.³ Individual economic groups

² Peter Oliver, *Public & Private Persons: The Ontario Political Culture, 1914-1934* (Toronto and Vancouver: Clarke, Irwin & Company, 1975); F.J.K. Griezic, "Power to the People: The Beginning of Agrarian Revolt in Ontario, the Manitoulin By-Election, October 24, 1918," *Ontario History* 69:1 (March 1977), 33-54; Brian D. Tennyson, "The Ontario General Election of 1919: The Beginnings of Agrarian Revolt," *Journal of Canadian Studies* 4:1 (February 1969), 26-36; Norman Douglas Farrow, "Political Aspects of the United Farmers Movement in Ontario" (MA thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1938); Robert W. Trowbridge, "War Time Rural Discontent and the United Farmers of Ontario, 1914-1919" (MA thesis, University of Waterloo, 1966); Richard J. Van Loon, "The Political Thought of the United Farmers of Ontario" (MA thesis, Carleton University, 1965); W.R. Young, "Conscription, Rural Depopulation and the Farmers of Ontario," *Canadian Historical Review* 53:3 (September 1972), 289-320. On the plurality of ideas about farming and rural life in Ontario during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, see Adam Crerar, "'Ties that Bind': Farming, Agrarian Ideals, and Life in Ontario, 1890-1930" (PhD dissertation, University of Toronto, 1999).

³ On the development of the United Farmers' movement in the western provinces, see: Margaret Ormsby, "The United Farmers of British Columbia: An Abortive Third Party Movement," *British Columbia Historical Quarterly* 17:1 and 17:2 (January-April 1953), 53-73; Bradford James Rennie, *The Rise and Fall of Agrarian Democracy: The United Farmers and Farm Women of Alberta, 1909-1921* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2000); Jeffrey Taylor, *Fashioning Farmers: Ideology, Agricultural Knowledge and the Manitoba Farm Movement, 1890-1925* (Regina: Canadian Plains Research Center, 1994). On the populist milieu in which the United Farmers' movement grew in the West, see David Laycock, *Populism and Democratic Thought in the Canadian Prairies, 1910 to 1945* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990). On the United Farmers and agrarian politics in the Maritimes, see Timothy D. Lewis, "Defeating the Farmers' Efforts to Help Themselves: The Role of the State in the Collapse of the United Farmers Co-operative Company of New Brunswick, 1918-1922," *Acadiensis* 35:1 (Autumn 2005), 50-73; and George A. Rawlyk, "The Farmer-Labour Movement and the Failure of Socialism in Nova Scotia," in *Essays in Honour of T.C. Douglas*, eds. Laurier LaPierre et al (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1971), 31-41. The only nation-wide study of the United Farmers and the related Progressive Party is W.L. Morton, *The Progressive Party in Canada* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1967). (second edition).

were to represent themselves in the Legislature, thereby preventing a return to traditional brokerage politics.⁴ The most recent work on the movement is rooted in an anarchist framework, but it too underlines structural reasons for the UFO's decline. Kerry Badgley sees the UFO as an organization with a conservative leadership but a *potentially* radical rank-and-file. His emphasis is on the failure of the movement to break out of a hegemonic liberal capitalist order.⁵ Other studies have focused on the role of women, youth, and individual leaders in the movement, along with the UFO's precursors, the Patrons of

Industry and Grange.⁶

Scholars in their studies of the subject have defined patronage in various ways. Most problematic is the view of patronage as the "pornography of politics," loading the term with negative assumptions.⁷ In 1976 Kenneth M. Gibbons defined political corruption (ranging in "scope of social involvement" from bribery to patronage) as "the use of a public office in a way that forsakes the public interest, measured in terms of mass opinion, elite opinion or both, in order that some form of personal advantage may be achieved at the expense of that public interest."⁸ The

⁴ See Wayne C. Brown, "The Broadening Out Controversy: E.C. Drury, J.J. Morrison and the United Farmers of Ontario" (MA thesis, University of Guelph, 1979), and Terry Crowley, "J.J. Morrison and the Transition in Canadian Farm Movements During the Early Twentieth Century," *Agricultural History* 71:3 (Summer 1987), 330-56; for a study that connects the "Broadening Out" issue with the sometimes divisive nature of the Social Gospel in the UFO, see Mark Sholdice, "'Brotherhood Extended to all Practical Affairs': The Social Gospel as the Religion of the Agrarian Revolt in Ontario?" *Journal of Religion and Popular Culture*, 25:3 (December 2013), 358-71; the exception to this emphasis on internal discord is R.D. Pennefather's work on the opposition to the UFO from the Orange Order: see "The Orange Order and the United Farmers of Ontario 1919-1923," *Ontario History* 69:3 (September 1977), 169-84.

⁵ Kerry Badgley, *Ringing in the Common Love of Good: The United Farmers of Ontario, 1914-1926* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2000).

⁶ Margaret Kechnie, "The United Farm Women of Ontario," *Ontario History* 77:4 (December 1985), 267-80; Pauline Rankin, "The Politicization of Ontario Farm Women," in *Beyond the Vote: Canadian Women and Politics*, ed. Linda Kealey and Joan Sangster (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1989), 309-32; Terry Crowley, "The New Canada Movement: Agrarian Youth Protest in the 1930s," *Ontario History* 80:4 (December 1988), 311-25; Charles M. Johnston, *E.C. Drury: Agrarian Idealist*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1986, does not significantly discuss Drury's views on patronage. On the nineteenth-century roots of the UFO, see Ramsay Cook, "Tillers and Toilers: The Rise and Fall of Populism in Canada in the 1890s," *Historical Papers/Communications Historiques* (Ottawa: Canadian Historical Association, 1984), 1-20; Darren Ferry, *Uniting in Measures of Common Good: The Construction of Liberal Identities in Central Canada, 1830-1900* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 2008); Russell Hann, *Farmers Confront Industrialism: Some Historical Perspectives on Ontario Agrarian Movements* (Toronto: New Hogtown Press, 1975) (third edition); and S.E.D. Shortt, "Social Change and Political Crisis in Rural Ontario: The Patrons of Industry, 1889-1896" in *Oliver Mowat's Ontario*, ed. Donald Swainson (Toronto: Macmillan of Canada, 1972).

⁷ See Jeffrey Simpson, *Spoils of Power: The Politics of Patronage* (Don Mills, ON: Collins Toronto, 1988), 6, for the term.

⁸ Kenneth M. Gibbons and Donald C. Rowat, eds., *Political Corruption in Canada: Cases, Causes and Cures* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1976), 5-6.

subjective nature of patronage thus creates a paradox: opposition to the practice depends to great measure on public attitudes, but these attitudes are themselves shaped by the political process, of which patronage is a part. For the purposes of this study, patronage will be used to describe the conferment of a benefit by the government (specifically the appointment of an individual to office) where the desire for political advantage *can be inferred to have been significant* to the government's motivations.

Canadian historians and political scientists have usually seen patronage as vital, if not pivotal, to the development

of the nation's political culture and institutions. The *Journal of Canadian Studies* produced a major issue devoted to dozens of studies by political scientists and others on patronage in 1987; many of these approached the topic historically.⁹ Sid Noel's influential study of patronage in Ontario places the practice at the heart of nineteenth-century political life in the province.¹⁰ Other work tends to point towards a change in the practice of, and thinking about, patronage in the late-nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century, a period when traditional notions started to break down.¹¹ Alan Gordon's work on the patronage activities among To-

⁹ This issue included: Ralph Heintzman and David R. Cameron, "Of Patrons and Patronage," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 3, 212-214; Vincent Lemieux, "Le sens du patronage politique," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 5-18; David E. Smith, "Patronage in Britain and Canada: An Historical Perspective," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 34-54; Reg Whitaker, "Between Patronage and Bureaucracy: Democratic Politics in Transition," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 55-71; S. J. R. Noel, "Dividing the Spoils: The Old and New Rules of Patronage in Canadian Politics," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 72-95; Raymond Hudon, "Le patronage politique: rationalités et moralité," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 111-34; Norman Ward, "Patronage: Gentle Reflections," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 177-83; Reeves Haggan, "Patronage Observed," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 184-90; Jean-Luc Pepin et al, "Panel on Patronage," *Journal of Canadian Studies*, 22:2 (Summer 1987), 191-97

¹⁰ S.J.R. Noel, *Patrons, Clients, Brokers: Ontario Society and Politics, 1791-1896* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990).

¹¹ See John English, *The Decline of Politics: The Conservatives and the Party System, 1901-1920* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1993), and Allan Bartley, "Colonel Belcher's Quest: The Changing Nature of Political Patronage, 1890-1920," *Ontario History* 79:1 (March 1987), 19-30; for a discussion of the professionalization of the civil service in Ontario, see J.E. Hodgetts, *From Arm's Length to Hands-On: The Formative Years of Ontario's Public Service, 1867-1940* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1995); for the changing influence of patronage in the press in Canada, see Brian P.N. Beaven, "Partisanship, Patronage, and the Press in Ontario, 1880-1914: Myths and Realities," *Canadian Historical Review*, 64:3 (September 1983), 317-51, and Minko Sotiron, *From Politics to Profit: The Commercialization of Canadian Daily Newspapers, 1890-1920* (Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press, 1997). Patronage and clientelist relationships have also been placed at the centre of political culture in Nova Scotia and Quebec; see Ralph Heintzman, "The Political Culture of Quebec, 1840-1960," *Canadian Journal of Political Science*, 16:1 (March 1983), 3-59; T. Stephen Henderson, "Nova Scotia's Liberal Patronage System in the 1930s," *Journal of the Royal Nova Scotia Historical Society*, 11 (2008), 89-109; Vincent Lemieux, *Le patronage politique: Une étude comparative* (Quebec: Les Presses de l'Université Laval, 1977); Vincent Lemieux and Raymond Hudon, *Patronage et politique au Québec: 1944-1972* (Sillery: Les Éditions du Boreale Express, 1975).

ronto Tories is a particularly important effort to revise earlier, one-dimensional, views of clientelism and patronage.¹² In this sense, I will argue that patronage in the early-twentieth-century was part of a larger system of political behavior, and not merely a spoils system. The UFO as a movement, however, was divided between an urge to destroy this system, and a desire to integrate itself and its members into it.

Scholarly work on the UFO and the Drury government does not significantly analyze the role of political patronage. Research on the ILP does not pay significant attention to the labour party's opinions on patronage, but fragmentary evidence (explored below) shows official condemnation of the practice, along with examples of politically-motivated appointments.¹³ From Peter Oliver we know a remarkable amount about a case of outright corruption of the UFO-ILP government's provincial treasurer, the Jarvis-Smith Affair.¹⁴ Yet we should separate such an instance of direct and illicit personal profit from the overall experience of the UFO-ILP government with patronage. How then, did this government move from an explicitly anti-patronage stance towards a moderate ac-

ceptance of the practice?

At least from its entrance into active politics, the UFO stood solidly against political patronage. In doing so it carried-on the tradition of its agrarian populist predecessors like the Grange and the Patrons of Industry, which emphasized a fundamental division between the interests of the people and an economic and political elite. Patronage was seen as the glue that bound-up political and economic "Big Interests" in a compact against the people. After entering the legislature upon victory in a 1918 by-election, Beniah Bowman, the first UFO MPP, ended his maiden speech on the topic:

What is this evil thing in partyism which makes it a curse to the nation? Is it not the spoils of office, the possibility which people see through a political party of getting out of the community more than they give to it? This may take the form of some public office in which they do not earn their pay and which comes as a reward for service to their party, or as a bribe by which to detach them and their influence from an opposing party; or it may appear in the guise of contracts, or franchises, or legislation favorable to certain monied interests, which may be had as a reward of contributions to the party election campaign funds, the value of which is so well recognized that it is said some large corpora-

¹² Alan Gordon, "Taking Root in the Patronage Garden: Jewish Businessmen in Toronto's Conservative Party, 1891-1921," *Ontario History* 88:1 (March 1996), 31-46 and "Patronage, Etiquette and the Science of Connection: Edmund Bristol and Political Management, 1911-1921," *Canadian Historical Review* 80:1 (March 1999), 1-31.

¹³ The most definitive work on the Ontario labour movement's political activities in this era is James Naylor, *The New Democracy: Challenging the Social Order in Industrial Ontario, 1924-1925*. (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1991).

¹⁴ See Peter Oliver, "Scandal in Ontario Politics: The Jarvis-Smith Affair, an Ontario Dreyfus Case?," in *Public and Private Persons The Ontario Political Culture, 1914-1934* (Toronto: Clarke, Irwin & Co.1975), 180-261.

tions make it a custom to contribute to the campaign funds of both political parties.¹⁵

Patronage was thus seen not only as an evil unto itself (by rewarding unproductive individuals for their political labours), but also for the way it enabled ward-heeling politicians and tariff-promoting corporations to cement their control over the political process. By 1918 the Hearst government bowed to popular pressure, and like the federal government, created a Civil Service Commission to regulate public appointments. Yet there was a significant difference between the two commissions. Ottawa's Civil Service Amendment Act of 1908 provided for a two-member commission; in the provincial case, a sole commissioner, J.M. McCutcheon, was appointed. Many, especially in the UFO, did not think that the appointment of McCutcheon was enough. In early 1919 J.W. Widdifield, another by-election victor from the farmers' movement, promised to the Ontario North electors that he would work to abolish patronage, and declared: "Everyone, except those who profit by it, deplores the evils of the patronage system. It creates and maintains useless offices, and it unnecessarily subdivides necessary offices. The public foots the bill."¹⁶ Not only immoral but inefficient, political patronage was targeted by the UFO as an area of government activity sorely needing reform.

By the summer of 1919 local UFO

groups across the province were nominating candidates for the expected provincial election, their hopes fueled by the two earlier by-election victories. At the same time, governmental inefficiency and patronage had become closely cemented in the minds of the movements' supporters. On 9 July, alongside announcements of the feverish organizing taking place in the counties, an editorial in the *Farmers' Sun* further developed a populist critique of politically-induced extravagance: "...economy is never attractive to a party Government that depends for its existence upon a 'machine' which must be plentifully oiled, and which carries an army of 'supporters' who expect to receive more support than they give." The UFO's platform for the 1919 provincial election went so far as to include the abolition of "the system of party patronage" as the second plank, right after a promise to eliminate government waste.¹⁷ At campaign rallies at Woodbridge and Welland in September, A.A. Powers (a director of the Farmers' Publishing Company, the UFO-aligned entity that controlled the *Sun*) averred that "[p]olitical patronage was one of the greatest curses of the country, and he believed that the people were in such a temper today that they would not stand for it much longer."¹⁸ Although certainly not the only theme of the UFO campaign, the abolition of patronage was a central item among their election promises.

¹⁵ *Farmers' Sun*, 16 Apr. 1919, 11.

¹⁶ *Farmers' Sun*, 12 Feb. 1919, 10.

¹⁷ *Farmers' Sun*, 13 Aug. 1919, 1.

¹⁸ *Farmers' Sun*, 10 Sept. 1919, 4; *Globe*, 12 Sept. 1919, 4.

**AND WE ARE GOING TO CLEAR
UP ALL FESTERING SORES
OF PARTY PATRONAGE -**



Unexpectedly, the UFO carried forty-five seats on election day, 20 October. With the eleven-member ILP caucus, the farmers' group formed a coalition government which was later sworn-in by mid-November. Drury accepted the premiership after it was refused both by Morrison and (allegedly) by defeated Tory MPP and Hydro Electric Power Commission (HEPC) chairman Sir Adam Beck. The cabinet included UFO MPPs Beniah Bowman (Minister of Lands, Forests, and Mines), Lt-Col.

Caricature of Drury speaking at the December 1919 UFO Convention (Farmers' Sun, 24 Dec. 1919, 18)

Dougall Carmichael (Minister responsible for the HEPC and the Soldiers' Aid Commission), R.H. Grant (Minister of Education) and Harry Nixon (Provincial Secretary), with ILP representation in the person of Walter Rollo (Minister of Labour). Drury added prohibition activist and lawyer William Edgar Raney as Attorney General and Manning Doherty, unsuccessful UFO candidate in Peel, as Minister of Agriculture. Drury, Raney and Doherty were faced with the immediate prospect of finding seats. Yet optimism ran high about the anticipated reforms to be instated by the UFO-ILP government; on 19 November, the *Farmers' Sun* editorialized: "So far as the civil service is concerned officials of proved capacity and industry, and needed in the service, have nothing to fear. Mere 'Job holders,' men who fail to measure up to the new standard of public service, whose places are not requisite to the proper carrying on of the work of the Department, are in a different category..." At a December meeting of the Canadian Council of Agriculture (a national federation of farmers' organizations), delegates revised a "Farmers' Platform," that included as a sixth plank, "[t]he complete abolition of the patronage system."¹⁹

Due to their opposition to the Hearst regime (and perhaps envious of the Tories' fourteen-year control of provincial appointments), the Ontario Liberal Party kept-up a strong public campaign against

¹⁹ *Farmers' Sun*, 10 Dec. 1919, 10.

political patronage before, during, and after the 1919 election. In the legislature, Chief Whip C.M. Bowman accused the Hearst government of loading the civil service with patronage appointees “who are not efficient or capable of giving value to the Province.”²⁰ In comparing the Liberal and UFO platforms, the *Globe* optimistically pointed out that the two groups agreed on the abolition of patronage.²¹ After election day this enthusiasm continued; the Drury government’s publication of civil service vacancies was hailed as proof of the end of political favoritism in public appointments.²² The *Star* noted: “The members of the Drury Cabinet have been presented with Bibles. This indicates the immense change that has taken place. Heretofore new Cabinet Members were usually presented with patronage lists.”²³

The Conservatives wavered on the issue, both before and after the 1919 election. Party leaders were divided between those who agreed with the reformist public sentiment, and moderates who defended the old ways. Officially running as an independent, Adam Beck asked a Toronto Methodist men’s association “[w]hy should a man not get a job and be paid a decent wage because of his ability to fill the job, and not because he is a hanger-on of any political party

or the relative of a hanger-on?”²⁴ Other Tories held their ground. During a spring 1919 legislative debate, Thomas Hook defended the practice of patronage, and warned the Liberals that they would feel differently about reform should they take office.²⁵ Howard Ferguson repeatedly declared that moderate political patronage was the foundation of ministerial responsibility.²⁶ Ferguson stuck to this position throughout the Drury government’s tenure, despite an official inquiry (the so-called “Timber Commission”) into his activities as a minister under Hearst. Over time, members and supporters of the UFO-ILP government came to similar conclusions; in some cases, sympathy to reformist politics was seen to be a necessity for official appointment.

In filling a county legal office the new Attorney General set-off a minor political scandal that divided the UFO and began a debate over the government’s policy on patronage. Raney announced the appointment of Miss Minnie Walker as registrar of deeds for East and North Middlesex on 18 December, at the same time promoting Major E.A. Reid from military secretary of the Soldiers Aid Commission to accountant of the Office of the Public Trustee. Walker had served as deputy registrar for seven years, and so now was being promoted on the

²⁰ *Globe*, 12 Mar. 1919, 8.

²¹ *Globe*, 25 Oct. 1919, 6.

²² *Daily Star*, 19 Dec. 1919, 13; *Globe*, 19 Dec. 1919, 8.

²³ *Daily Star*, 21 Nov. 1919, 6.

²⁴ *Globe*, 15 Oct. 1919, 8.

²⁵ *Globe*, 19 Mar. 1919, 8.

²⁶ *Daily Star*, 3 Feb. 1920, 9; *Globe*, 12 Mar. 1920, 7.

death of the office's previous occupant.²⁷ Walker's appointment drew criticism from within the UFO (especially from the movement's supporters in Middlesex County), which quickly began to surface in the press. Around the same time a joint UFO-ILP caucus was held in Toronto in an effort to create a new, completely non-partisan system of public appointments, but the members were unable to agree on anything definite.²⁸ On the 26th, the *Star* published a purported interview with J.J. Morrison in which he criticized the government's course in the appointment as overly bureaucratic.²⁹ Morrison quickly denied the article's veracity.³⁰

The decision to promote Walker was said to have caused a major rift within the UFO, especially among the organization's members in Middlesex. In remarks to the press, UFO county director Harold Currie expressed great anger at the appointment and yet denied he was at all interested in the position.³¹ Currie, Doherty, Drury, Morrison, and Raney met at Queen's Park on 29 December to settle the feud. After meeting for a few hours, they emerged to tell the press that the affair had been a simple misunderstanding

on Currie's part.³² On 31 December, the *Globe* facetiously asked, "The Middlesex patronage squall has blown over, or was it a squeal?"

Drury's stand in the face of criticism during the Middlesex Registrarship affair drew approbation from many observers. Both the *Globe* and the *Star* endorsed the Walker appointment in glowing editorials.³³ On 14 January at Montreal, the president of the Social Service Council of Canada, Dean L. Norman Tucker, told the Social Welfare Congress that Drury deserved congratulation for his stance against patronage.³⁴ The Ministerial Alliance of London passed a resolution commending Drury for abolishing patronage.³⁵ The appointment of Walker was seen as a precedent and an encouraging portent for the future of the farmers' administration. Yet forebodingly, at Calgary a decision was made by the United Farmers of Alberta convention that it was too early to congratulate Drury for abolishing patronage.³⁶

At the same time as the Middlesex Registrarship affair drew attention in the press, Doherty, Drury and Raney sought-out ridings so that they could secure their

²⁷ *Globe*, 19 Dec. 1919, 8.

²⁸ *Daily Star*, 20 Dec. 1919, 2; *Globe*, 20 Dec. 1919, 1-2; see *Daily Star*, 24 Dec. 1919, 5, for Drury's insistence that patronage had ended.

²⁹ *Daily Star*, 26 Dec. 1919, 1-2.

³⁰ *Daily Star*, 27 Dec. 1919, 1, and 29 Dec. 1919, 1.

³¹ *Daily Star*, 26 Dec. 1919, 1, 27 Dec. 1919, 2, and 29 Dec. 1919, 4; *Globe*, 27 Dec. 1919, 1, 5.

³² *Daily Star*, 30 Dec. 1919, 5; *Globe*, 30 Dec. 1919, 1, 7.

³³ *Globe*, 27 Dec. 1919; *Daily Star*, 30 Dec. 1919, 6, and 3 Jan. 1920, 6.

³⁴ *Globe*, 15 Jan. 1920, 11.

³⁵ *Globe*, 20 Jan. 1920, 3.

³⁶ *Globe*, 16 Jan. 1920, 17; importantly, the United Farmers of Alberta did not have any experience of the exercise the functions of government until it won a provincial election the next year.

place as ministers of the Crown. Doherty failed to win in Peel during the 1919 election, while Drury and Raney did not stand as candidates. Two members were said to have offered their ridings to Drury in early November 1919.³⁷ Yet a long delay ensued between the formation of the cabinet and the necessary by-elections to confirm the new ministers. On New Year's Day 1920, the *Globe* reported that UFO MPPs were unenthusiastic about giving up their seats for Raney, the Toronto lawyer, and that Drury threatened to resign to force the issue. The Halton and Kent East by-elections did not take place until late January 1920, while the Wellington East contest was delayed until early February.

The farmers' government was evidently entering dangerous waters. The difficulty in finding seats for Doherty, Raney, and Drury has been explained by Drury's reluctance to use patronage to induce UFO MPPs to resign their seats.³⁸ Morrison found the search to be a frustrating task, as he did not share Drury's compunctions about the use of official preferment.³⁹ The Conservative member for Wellington South, the Rev. Caleb Henry Buckland, is said to have offered his riding in return for the position of chaplain to returned soldiers, but was refused by the new premier.⁴⁰

On 3 December 1919, the *Farmers' Sun* warned the Drury government to be careful as to how it secured seats for the three ministers: "To pay party debts with public office would be to renew one of the worst evils of the old regime." But in the aftermath of the Middlesex Registrarship affair, a subtle change in the definition of patronage arose, one which differentiated between partisan preferment and due consideration for government supporters should they apply for position: "In all fairness to them and to the people who elected them to power, the Drury Government or any other Government must give at least equal consideration to the claim of their friends and supporters."⁴¹ UFO membership was not to disbar an individual to a public appointment. The problem in the past had been that Opposition supporters and non-partisans were excluded from public appointments. This new argument was simply the reverse; support for the government should not exclude an individual from an official position.

Seats were eventually found for the ministers after three government MPPs stepped-aside in the ridings of East Kent, East Wellington, and Halton. Kent County voters were reported to have demanded an experimental farm and winter fair in exchange for their support of Doherty in the

³⁷ *Farmers' Sun*, 6 Nov. 1919, 11.

³⁸ Jean MacLeod, "The United Farmer Movement in Ontario, 1914-1943" (MA thesis, Queen's University, 1958), 82.

³⁹ Brown, "The Broadening Out Controversy," 79-80.

⁴⁰ William Bruce Hillman, "J.J. Morrison: A Farmer Politician in an Era of Social Change" (MA thesis, University of Western Ontario, 1974), 73-74.

⁴¹ *Farmers' Sun*, 14 Jan. 1920, 12.

by-election.⁴² (A research farm was later built at Ridgetown in 1922). Yet no plums had been publicly offered to the three resigning MPPs, who were said to have stepped-aside out of loyalty to the farmers' cause. In a speech during his Halton by-election, Drury said, "I believe we can carry on without resorting to the rewards of party patronage."⁴³ The UFO-ILP government seemed to have discovered a new way to conduct politics, one without immoral and inefficient patronage.

But the story of the three disinterested former members evaporated in the ensuing months. In June 1920, Albert Hellyer (the former MPP for East Wellington and Morrison's brother-in-law) was appointed to a government commission of inquiry into patronage reform. The man who stood aside for Raney, James B. Clark, was named the registrar of deeds for Kent County in late November. This latter action especially provoked public criticism because Deputy Registrar Miss Carrie C. Burton was not promoted, as had been the case in Middlesex. Raney was quoted as saying, "We are showing the people we are human."⁴⁴ Veterans were also reported to be angry over the appointment because Great War Veterans Association representatives in Brantford had earlier been told that the government was maintaining a

system of promotion when they sought the appointment of a comrade to a local position there. At the same time as he defended the appointment of Clark, J.J. Morrison attacked the promotion policy of Drury and his ministers in comments to the Toronto press:

We talk glibly about doing away with patronage, yet patronage has never been defined... If we said we going to do away with the abuses of patronage it would be more intelligible... No business firm would follow a system of promotion regardless of qualification. Were this plan followed we would be victims of routine, and qualification would receive scant recognition. Why should not ability and consideration by the representatives of the people be a medium of appointment?⁴⁵

Opinions within the farmers' movement about the appointment were divided between those who believed it to be legitimate and others who saw the Drury government revert back to the old ways of politics. Of the latter group, John Smith of Lambton County told the editor of the *Farmers' Sun*: "[Clark] did not have long to wait for his reward. I thought we farmers were not going to do these things. We kicked like steers because the Grits and the Tories did it, but it looks like our U.F.O. Government was not going to be any better."⁴⁶

But many did not see the appoint-

⁴² *Farmers' Sun*, 21 Jan. 1920, 2; Doherty certainly inferred, in at least one of his campaign speeches, that a farm would be built, see *Daily Star*, 15 Jan. 1920, 6.

⁴³ *Globe*, 30 Jan. 1920, 2; for another account of the speech, see *Daily Star*, 30 Jan. 1920, 5.

⁴⁴ *Globe*, 1 Dec. 1920, 1, 3; Hellyer's appointment contradicted an earlier pledge that he would not be rewarded for resigning his seat, see *Daily Star*, 4 Feb. 1920, 1.

⁴⁵ *Farmers' Sun*, 4 Dec. 1920, 1; *Globe*, 4 Dec. 1920, 1.

⁴⁶ *Farmers' Sun*, 4 Dec. 1920, 4.

ment as pure patronage. Like Morrison, some UFO supporters believed that a strict promotion policy inherently favoured the Tories who held government appointments before the 1919 election. These individuals were seen as products of the old patronage system, achieving their posts according to partisan loyalty, not efficiency or qualification. In solidarity with the government, a resolution was passed at the mid-December UFO convention denouncing patronage but adding “that individuals should not be denied because of their membership in the U.F.O., from receiving consideration from the U.F.O. Government, when appointments for public service are being necessarily made.”⁴⁷ If farmers entered electoral politics in order to battle their exclusion from power, their new-found success should not bar them from the administration of this power. Likewise, the *Sun* told its readership that “[t]he party organs would force Premier Drury to appoint none but enemies of the Government to office.”⁴⁸ United Farm Women of Ontario organizer Meta S. Laws summed-up the new definition of appropriate patronage: “...the servants of the Government, whose business it is to further the Government’s aims in the various departments of the service, must have two qualifications. First, the techni-

cal knowledge which fits them for the position to be filled. Second, absolute sympathy with the aims of the Government. How else can they SERVE?”⁴⁹ Although subtle, this shift in thinking brought the UFO unwittingly closer to the position of Ferguson. The government was faced with a choice: either fully replace the system of appointments, or face accusations of hypocrisy for maintaining the status quo. Eventually it opted for the latter course.

Outside of a promotion policy for the civil service, another option towards reforming or abolishing patronage existed in a fundamental reform to the parliamentary system itself. This should be seen in context of the idea of “group government” advocated by many in the Canadian agrarian movement, including Morrison. Some within the UFO suggested a radical change in the formation of government as a solution to the patronage evil. In a letter to the *Sun* during the 1919 election, F.E. Titus suggested a cabinet proportionally made-up of all parties represented in the legislature. Partisanship would not disappear, but efficiency would increase: “The true function of a minister as the manager of a department of the public business would be more fully recognized and acted upon.”⁵⁰ Ironically, Titus was later appointed a

⁴⁷ See “By-laws and resolutions for UFO 1919-1930,” XA1 MS A126, File #16, Leonard Harman/United Co-operatives of Ontario Collection, University of Guelph Archives; resolution referred to in *Globe*, 17 Dec., 1920, 2, and *Daily Star*, 17 Dec. 1920, 3.

⁴⁸ *Farmers’ Sun*, 4 Dec. 1920, 10; there is a similar editorial sentiment in the *Daily Star*, 2 Dec. 1920, 6.

⁴⁹ *Farmers’ Sun*, 11 Feb. 1920, 6; Laws contributed a column in the *Sun* under the pseudonym “Margery Mills” (see Margaret Kechnie, “The United Farm Women of Ontario,” 278 n14; I would like to thank an anonymous reviewer for highlighting this fact).

⁵⁰ *Farmers’ Sun*, 3 Sept. 1919, 12.

law clerk to the Minister of Lands and Forests by Beniah Bowman, a neighbour from Manitoulin Island.⁵¹ John Egerton Wright wrote in support of Titus' proposal: "The use of departmental power for private ends would be discouraged, yet the healthy rivalry between the parties would be retained."⁵²

The UFO-ILP government does not seem to have seriously considered this option for patronage reform, but it did adopt a cross-partisan model for some of its public appointments. Upon creating a Civil Service Superannuation Board in the summer of 1920, Drury requested that the all four parliamentary parties recommend representatives to the body. Liberal leader Hartley Dewart nominated L. Homfray Irving of Toronto. In response Drury asked for several names to choose from, which elicited a stern refusal from the Grit leader.⁵³ Dewart mused, "I do not suppose that you desire to make these appointments as a matter of party patronage," and added that Drury had earlier promised to allow the opposition parties to nominate candidates to the civil service before full-scale reform was implemented. Irving was subsequently confirmed to the board.

Ultimately the implementation of some kind of multi-party system of appointments never occurred. It would have

been a radical modification to the system of responsible government. At most the Drury government attempted to name at least some Grits and Tories to various positions, which was never entirely satisfactory to either opposition party. In one memorable debate in the legislature, one of the Toronto Conservatives attacked the appointment of a supposed Liberal, but upon being informed that the man was a Tory, the MPP allegedly remarked, "I thought he was a school teacher."⁵⁴

A more lasting commitment on the part of the UFO-ILP government was an effort to take veterans into the civil service. This was seen as both as a deserved recognition of the men's service in the Great War and a non-partisan way to recruit new government employees. Patriotism and the war effort had been catalysts for much of the public's anti-patronage mood. Near the end of the Hearst regime, G.D. Wylie of Grenville County opined in the *Farmers' Sun* that the Government's outside service "should be cleared of its present party appointed incumbents, who have not done any service for King or country, and give these appointments to the returned soldiers who have done and sacrificed much and to whom much more is due than cheer them back with bands playing and fine words."⁵⁵ Such sentiments were shared

⁵¹ Ontario, *Journals and Sessional Papers of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario*, 22 Mar. 1920, 64.

⁵² *Farmers' Sun*, 10 Sept. 1919, 4; Wright was defeated as a candidate for the UFO in the provincial election of 1919 and for the Progressives in the federal election of 1921.

⁵³ See Hartley Dewart to E.C. Drury, 7 July 1920; Drury to Dewart, 14 July 1920; and Dewart to Drury, 15 July 1920; Series RG 3-4: E.C. Drury General Correspondence; File #61, "Civil Service Superannuation Board" (1920), Archives of Ontario (AO).

⁵⁴ *Farmers' Sun*, 19 May 1920, 3

⁵⁵ *Farmers' Sun*, 2 Apr. 1919, 8.

widely within the UFO. The main veterans' organization, the Great War Veterans' Association (GWVA), advocated both for an end to patronage and the appointment of its members to positions in the civil service. One GWVA policy resolution asked that war veteran lawyers be appointed judges upon the occurrence of vacancies.⁵⁶ In July 1922 the Wallaceburg Branch of the GWVA protested the appointment of an unsuccessful UFO candidate as Sheriff of Kent County, declaring that Captain J. Sheff deserved the position instead.⁵⁷ As will be shown in the case of the Ministry of the Attorney General, the UFO-ILP government did appoint a significant number of veterans to the civil service. And yet it does not seem to have garnered public congratulation for such patriotic actions. As with many of its policies, the Drury government was never able to sufficiently please any particular group.

With public outcry over systems of promotion and appointment, the Drury government hoped to find a new system that balanced non-partisanship with efficiency and egalitarianism. The desire was to separate politics from the appointment of individuals to positions within the public administration. Efficiency was emphasized over individual morality; patronage reformers sought system-

atic change, not the selection of specific people, as the answer to the patronage problem. Soon after the December 1919 Middlesex Registrarship scandal, the government announced that four plans were under consideration for the abolition of patronage.⁵⁸ Later, at their first caucus meeting in February 1920, the new UFO members attacked the Civil Service Commissioner's powers as too centralized and bureaucratic.⁵⁹ The movement's executive officers and county directors planned to discuss the problem and design a new system of appointments at their upcoming annual gathering.⁶⁰ Drury publicly promised such a new and reformed process by the end of the year.⁶¹

Yet a new system was never implemented. The UFO-ILP government did not manage to resolve an eternal political problem: how to balance competing private interests with the common weal. This was partly due to the many pressures and urgent issues the new government faced; ultimately a lack of time forced the cabinet to follow old methods. Fragmentary evidence suggests that local patronage remained in the hands of MPPs, a traditional method of operating the appointments system. Yet this government largesse may have been delegated to members regardless of their party. Speaking in the legislature in March 1920, Drury said: "You

⁵⁶ See GWVA Ontario Provincial Command to Drury, 24 April 1920, Series RG 3-4: E.C. Drury General Correspondence; File #102: "Great War Veterans Association" (1920), OA.

⁵⁷ *Globe*, 11 July 1922, 13.

⁵⁸ *Globe*, 30 Dec. 1919, 7.

⁵⁹ *Daily Star*, 4 Feb. 1920, 3; *Globe*, 4 Feb. 1920, 11

⁶⁰ *Farmers' Sun*, 7 Feb. 1920, 1, 12.

⁶¹ *Globe*, 4 Feb. 1920, 3.

cannot get rid of the evils of patronage while you leave the recommendation in the hands of the member for the appointees' constituency. If the Angel Gabriel represented the purest constituency in Ontario he could not recommend in a manner disinterested a man for the public appointment."⁶² Evidence of patronage remaining in the hands of local MPPs also comes from complaints expressed by UFO supporters. A 27 January 1923 letter to the editor of the *Farmers' Sun* by Alfred Limoges of Sturgeon Falls suggested that control over some patronage in his riding had been given to Zotique Mageau, the Liberal MPP: "Had the patronage been given to our defeated UFO candidate, he would have used it to make friends while acting fairly and honestly, and he would be a strong candidate in the next election. Do you think if the Liberals or the Conservatives were in power, they would give the patronage to the U.F.O. members? Not that I know. In politics it is tit for tat." This letter could be taken as an opposition subterfuge, if it was not for the fact that Limoges later ran in the 1926 provincial election as a Progressive. Similarly, John Houldershaw of Simcoe County believed his Conservative representative was doling out patronage:

Under the Hearst Administration, the patronage of West Simcoe was in the hands of the local Tory member [William Torrance Allen]. Under the Drury administration, the patronage is in the same hands... Is it because Tories are better men or had they experi-

ence? If so, we should have left experienced Tories in our legislative halls.⁶³

With incomplete evidence it is difficult to determine the veracity of such claims. If true, this would represent a radical departure from traditional patronage practices, linked to cross-partisan ideals. At the very least these statements confirm that many supporters believed there was much to be desired from the UFO-ILP government's handling of public appointments.

The desire of Drury and his government to abolish patronage permanently led to the creation of the so-called "Civil Service Commission" in June 1920 (officially it was the "Royal Commission to Inquire into, Consider and Report upon the Best Mode of Selecting, Appointing and Remunerating Sheriffs, etc."). The Hearst government's creation of a single-member commission in 1918 left much to be desired by patronage reformers and others. Some of the populist-minded agrarians viewed the office suspiciously, believing it could become an elitist source of unaccountable bureaucracy. Drury's Civil Service Commission was not meant to supplant the role of McCutcheon immediately, but was rather an inquiry into a better system of public appointments. The five members appointed to the commission included: Walter Dymond Gregory, Toronto lawyer, UFO sympathizer and former editor of the *Weekly Sun* (which became the *Farmers' Sun* in 1919); Albert Hellyer,

⁶² *Globe*, 17 Mar. 1920, 7.

⁶³ *Farmers' Sun*, 8 Dec. 1920, 3.

who resigned his Wellington East seat in favour of Raney; Edward A. Pocock, ILP member and veteran⁶⁴; Norman Sommerville, lawyer; and Dr. Horace Leslie Brittain, government reformer and managing director of the Citizens Research Institute of Canada. Ironically, three of the five commissioners were linked to the ILP and UFO movement, and thus provoked criticism that the government had made these appointments as a reward for partisan loyalty. The commission sat for the length of the government's term, and although it collected testimony in public hearings across the province, it never completed a final report. When the Conservatives regained power in 1923, it was quietly dissolved.

Renegade ILP MPP Malcolm MacBride attacked the government in February 1921 after learning that a circular letter had been sent by the commission's secretary, J.W. Mallon, on the subject of "naming a committee of ten or twelve citizens in each constituency for the purpose of advising the Government in connection with appointments to the Civil Service."⁶⁵ Such local committees strangely resembled the riding committees that a Conservative or Liberal government traditionally relied upon for patronage recommendations. Drury and Raney protested that such committees

were only to advise the government on improvements to the administration of the civil service. The Civil Service Commission was designed as an official inquiry, not a tool for the management of patronage.

The Ministry of Agriculture under Doherty is an area of interest in examining provincial patronage in the period from 1919-1923. The perceived lack of affordable financial credit for farmers was a concern of the UFO movement, and after the Drury government took power it moved to address the problem. In 1920 Doherty created a three-man Special Committee on Rural Credits to investigate, to which he named M.H. Staples, a well-educated Durham County farmer and the UFO's educational director. The efforts of this committee led to the creation of the Agricultural Development Board (ADB) in 1921, a provincial agency designed to make loans to deserving farmers; easing agricultural credit was one of the UFO's major planks. A.G. Farrow, UFO director for Halton and organizer of the county's Peoples' Political Association, was appointed chairman and manager of the ADB in August 1921. Of the thirty-two temporary valuers appointed by the board, at least three were UFO supporters, but one was a former federal Conservative candidate.⁶⁶ The first Farm

⁶⁴ See the 28 June 1920 letter of gratitude from the GVWA London Command to Drury, for the appointment of their member Pocock to the Commission; Series RG 3-4: E.C. Drury General Correspondence File #102: "Great War Veterans Association" (1920), OA; interestingly Pocock took part in the socialist slate which won the election for the executive of the Ontario Section of the Canadian Labour Party in 1921 (see Naylor, *The New Democracy*, 235).

⁶⁵ *Globe*, 5 Feb. 1921, 1-2; *Daily Star*, 5 Feb. 1921, 9.

⁶⁶ Ontario, *Journals and Sessional Papers of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario*, 27 Mar. 1922, 131-32, and 2 Mar. 1923, 148.

Loan Association was formed by thirty-one farmers in Nassagewaya Township, Halton County (Drury's riding). Among the eight founding directors were R.J. Anderson (appointed by the provincial government), L.W. Chisholm (appointed by the township council), and William W. Dredge (appointed by the members), all office-holders of the Halton Peoples' Political Association.⁶⁷ The close relationship between the ADB and the farmers' movement led to charges of politically-motivated lending decisions by the provincial agency. In a 10 March 1923 letter to the *Farmers' Sun*, Fred A. Newman, UFO director for Algoma West, denied allegations made by Tory MPP J.A. Currie about specific loans in Northern Ontario. Farrow's connection to the department was alleged to have been based on political patronage. Toronto Mayor C. Alfred Maguire publicly accused Drury of appointing Farrow to a series of positions on the Veterinary Practice Board, the "scrub bull" campaign, and the Agricultural Development Board in exchange for his earlier assistance in arranging for the premier to take the seat for Halton.⁶⁸

A number of ILP activists and sympathizers received appointments with provincial commissions and agencies under the direction of the Minister of Labour, fellow party stalwart Walter Rollo. Supporters of the other coalition member were thus integrated into the functioning of the provincial government, just as members of the UFO. Ex-

cept for a few appointments as returning officers, the only ILPers named to government offices that could be found in the 1919-1923 period were discovered in connection with the Department of Labour, a finding which results from a lack of comprehensive information on provincial appointments, but that may also indicate patterns throughout the government. Harry Halford, Hamilton labour activist, organizer for the Journeymen Barbers' International Union, and ILP activist, was appointed Vice-Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board in October 1921.⁶⁹ Another Hamiltonian ILPer, Henry George Fester, a conservative labourist, single taxer, and cigarmaker, was appointed to the new Minimum Wage Board in November 1920, along with Margaret Stephens of the Garment Workers' Union. Minnie Singer, vice-president of the Grand Lodge of the International Association of Machinists Auxiliary League and ILP speaker, was appointed to the Mothers' Allowance Commission in 1920. Among the first inspectors appointed under the provisions of the commission was the Rev. Albert Edward Smith, a radical Social Gospeller who left for Manitoba in 1920 and was elected to that province's legislature as a candidate for a Dominion Labour Party affiliate. James Higgins, defeated ILP candidate in the November 1920 Toronto Northeast by-election, received a position as an employment scout in the Soldiers' Department of the pro-

⁶⁷ See *Farmers' Sun*, 11 Jan. 1922, 4, and 4 July 1922, 5.

⁶⁸ See *Globe*, 11 Jan. 1922, 10, and 16 Jan. 1922, 10, and *Daily Star*, 10 Jan. 1922, 1.

⁶⁹ Ontario, *Journals and Sessional Papers of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario*, 6 Mar. 1922, 50.

vincial Employment Bureau.⁷⁰

Interestingly, the executive of the ILP passed an anti-patronage resolution at a March 1921 meeting at the Toronto Labour Temple: “That any member of the provincial executive of the Independent Labor Party who attempts to secure a government job shall automatically be compelled to resign from his position on the executive.”⁷¹ This is perhaps related to factionalism between labourists and socialists within Ontario’s labour movement. The ILP supporters listed above as recipients of official positions were relatively moderate; patronage thus may have become a crucial issue in the ILP during a time of factional struggle, but the issue requires further research.

In the Ministry of the Attorney General, appointments to the local divisional courts seem to have been exceptionally non-partisan, despite the seemingly high turnover that occurred in the 1919-1923 period. The only case of a potentially politically-motivated appointment that can be confirmed was a Delbert Franklin Rogers, a Minden farmer named bailiff who was the next-door neighbour of Fred Rogers, a director of the Victoria

and Haliburton United Farmers’ Association.⁷² A Simcoe County farmer complained (perhaps in frustration at not receiving the job): “Last September, the bailiff of the Fourth Division Court [of Simcoe County] resigned. A green man had to succeed. A U.F.O. man applied but was turned down. If Drury gives all the patronage to the enemy, his best friends will turn enemy.”⁷³ After Dr. H.A. Stevenson (MPP – London) announced his support of fellow ILP member John M. Thompson for the position of bailiff of the Ninth Division Court of Middlesex County, the latter publicly declared that he opposed patronage and would only seek the position through legitimate avenues.⁷⁴

More than reward to partisanship, bailiff and clerk appointments served another function of patronage—social welfare.⁷⁵ In the pre-welfare state era, government positions were coveted for the financial security they represented. At a time when the Drury government was designing a scheme for the superannuation of civil servants, it named at least thirty men over the age of sixty as divisional court officers. For example, sixty-

⁷⁰ Ontario, *Journals and Sessional Papers of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario*, 14 Mar. 1921, 174.

⁷¹ *Toronto World*, 11 Mar. 1921, 8.

⁷² See 1911 Census of Canada, Ontario, Victoria-Haliburton, #37 Minden Township, p. 17, line 46; for Fred Rogers see *Farmers’ Sun*, 1 Mar. 1924, 4.

⁷³ *Farmers’ Sun*, 8 Dec. 1920, 3.

⁷⁴ *Globe*, 21 Apr. 1920, 4; the appointment of an individual to the position was not included in the *Ontario Gazette*, and so it was not possible to confirm whether Thompson succeeded or not. In September 1921, Stevenson attacked the government for the appointment of Cambridge C. Hawkshaw as magistrate in Middlesex County, which he characterized as patronage; Raney responded by pointing out that Hawkshaw had originally been appointed in 1910, and had merely been given a wider jurisdiction; see *Daily Star*, 24 Sept. 1921, 1.

⁷⁵ For more on this function, see Gordon, “Patronage, Etiquette and the Science of Connection,” 25.

six year-old auctioneer W.D. Weir was named bailiff of the Fifth Division Court of Perth County in June 1920.⁷⁶ Likewise, in February 1921, sixty-five year-old farmer Samuel Truman was appointed clerk of the Seventh Division Court of Victoria.⁷⁷ Former salesmen and other white-collar workers were more likely to receive clerk positions, whilst farmers and workers seem to have mainly been named bailiffs. Veterans also received positions. John Wynn Payne, the president of the Woodstock branch of the GWVA, was named a bailiff in an Oxford County court.⁷⁸ Women were confined to the office of clerk. It appears that unmarried daughters of former or deceased clerks were given the office to support their families. (During the press debate over the Kent Registrarship, this had in one instance been given as the only justification for giving a local office to a woman instead of a man.⁷⁹) For example, Margaret A. Day of Guelph was appointed clerk of the First Division Court of Wellington County after the resignation of her father.⁸⁰

Major Thomas J. Rutherford, a war hero and defeated Progressive candidate

in Grey North during the 1921 federal election, was later appointed to the combined triple office of local registrar of the Supreme Court of Ontario, county court registrar, and clerk. The Grey County Bar Association protested, demanding that a person with a formal legal education be named. When asked about Rutherford's qualification for the position in the legislature, Raney argued that the veteran had been appointed due to his wartime service, along with his "business ability" and "undoubted integrity."⁸¹ When Ferguson later asked to see correspondence recommending Rutherford's appointment, the Attorney General refused, before adding that the Hearst government had always burned letters regarding patronage.⁸² A policy of promotion was also sometimes followed, as in the case of Wallace Lakeman MacWhinnie, who succeeded to the Registrarship of Oxford County after thirteen years of service as deputy to a Tory appointee.⁸³ A Great War veteran became the new deputy.

In these departments, we see a mixture of bureaucratization, partisanship, and social welfare behind the decisions to appoint particular persons to govern-

⁷⁶ *Ontario Gazette*, 53.25 (19 June 1920), p. 1161; 1911 Census of Canada, Ontario, Perth North #57, Milverton, p. 9, line 18.

⁷⁷ *Ontario Gazette*, 54.6 (5 February 1921), p. 197; 1901 Census of Canada, Ontario, Victoria North, #119, Eldon, F-3, p. 6, line 2.

⁷⁸ *Ontario Gazette*, 53.27 (3 July 1920), p. 1247.

⁷⁹ *Farmers' Sun*, 15 Dec. 1920, 3.

⁸⁰ See *Ontario Gazette*, 53.40 (2 Oct. 1920), p. 1955; 1901 Census of Canada, Ontario, Wellington South #126, Guelph E-7, p. 10, line 23; 1911 Census of Canada, Ontario, Wellington South, #35 Guelph, p. 6, line 38.

⁸¹ Ontario, *Journals and Sessional Papers of the Legislative Assembly of Ontario*, 6 Apr. 1923, 268-69.

⁸² *Farmers' Sun*, 10 Apr. 1923, 1-2.

⁸³ *Farmers' Sun*, 26 Aug. 1922, 4.

Caricature of Drury; the note on the step says "Kent Registrarship" (The Globe, 29 Dec. 1920, 1)

ment offices. At its best, the Drury government's policy towards patronage could be called pluralistic; at worst, this was the type of equivocation that drew strong denunciation from contemporary critics of the farmer-labour cabinet.

A surprising amount of such criticism came from the farming community, and even from within the ranks of the UFO itself, in regard to the Drury government's perceived failure to abolish political patronage. In a letter to the *Globe*, William H. Sainsbury of Bright mentioned the abolition of patronage among a litany of unimplemented UFO election planks.⁸⁴ Lamenting the government's failure to change the patronage status quo, the executive of the West Lambton UFO went so far as to pass a resolution asking Raney to promote the deputy to the county registrarship should the position fall empty.⁸⁵ In contrast, a lonely voice in defence of the government's patronage record meekly stated to the *Farmer's Sun*: "This, we think, needs little or no comment, as there has been no complaint from any source whatsoever."⁸⁶

Ferguson never let up with his criticism of the UFO-ILP government's patronage policies, even while he was



MR. DRURY—I WAS DETERMINED TO HAVE THAT PATRONAGE TOOTH OUT, BUT IT WAS ACHING WHEN I GOT HERE.

being investigated by the Timber Commission for alleged wrongdoing whilst Minister of Lands, Forests, and Mines under Hearst. Speaking at a 1921 Conservative nomination meeting, he listed a series of controversial appointments and hyperbolically asked, "Is that not patronage? I have been 17 years in public life, but have never seen anything equal to the sweets of office as they are being given to friends of the Farmers' party."⁸⁷ Underlying the Drury government's approach to patronage and appointments was a foul hypocrisy, as he said in Trenton: "Now they claim... that they stand for abolition of the evils of patronage, but the kind

⁸⁴ *Globe*, 16 Feb. 1923, 4.

⁸⁵ *Globe*, 24 Apr. 1923, 20.

⁸⁶ *Farmer's Sun*, 28 Apr. 1923, 5.

⁸⁷ *Globe*, 20 May 1921, 3.

they practiced was, of course, not evil.”⁸⁸ Ferguson worried aloud in the legislature about a “last minute orgy of appointments” before the 1923 election.⁸⁹

The Liberals also flayed Drury for his failure to abolish patronage. At a December 1921 party meeting in Woodstock, R.L. Brackin warned that Drury was “in danger of losing his political soul” over the issue.⁹⁰ A year later, at a speech during the Toronto Southeast – Seat A by-election, he characterized the government as hypocritical, citing the official appointments of the Progressive and UFO candidates Kent County as an example.⁹¹ During the 1923 election he suggested that along with his victory in eliminating a British ban on Canadian cattle, Doherty had similarly succeeded in removing an embargo on patronage.⁹² Brackin’s attacks are especially notable when compared to his early sympathy with the UFO-ILP government.⁹³ During the 1923 campaign, the *Globe* editorially sermonized that “[t]he condemnation of party patronage by the U.F.O. convention, which was morally binding on the Drury Administration, has been treated with cynical contempt at Queen’s Park from first to last.”⁹⁴

Drury remained unrepentant in the face of such attacks. After a denuncia-

tion from Hay in the legislature near the end of the 1923 session, Drury said “if we have been guilty of patronage it has been in being too generous to our opponents.”⁹⁵ Later in June during a campaign speech at Guelph, he denied his government even practiced political patronage.⁹⁶ Yet he also trimmed his sails on the issue, adding later at an Essex rally that while patronage was abolished, “But we are not going to adopt the principle... that because a man is a supporter of the Government he is to be penalized and shall not hold a good position.”⁹⁷ Part of the problem was the very definition of the term patronage, and the negative connotations held by the word itself.

The June election itself was anti-climactic. Ferguson gained a commanding 19-member majority in the legislature. The new government did not excessively purge the civil service of UFO-ILP appointees, but it was widely understood that old-style political patronage had returned to Ontario. Alleging that Ferguson would break his campaign promise to legalize beer, the *Farmers’ Sun* commented that he would otherwise keep his word in the area of patronage: “Mr. Ferguson was always entirely frank about his belief in patronage, and already he had shown us that honors have not changed him.”⁹⁸ Yet

⁸⁸ *Globe*, 15 Sept. 1921, 15.

⁸⁹ *Farmers’ Sun*, 26 Apr. 1923, 2.

⁹⁰ *Globe*, 14 Dec. 1921, 14.

⁹¹ *Globe*, 12 Oct. 1922, 15.

⁹² *Globe*, 22 May 1923, 2.

⁹³ See Oliver, *Public & Private Persons*, 130.

⁹⁴ *Globe*, 1 June 1923, 4.

⁹⁵ *Globe*, 28 May 1921, 3; *Farmers’ Sun*, 29 May 1923, 1.

⁹⁶ *Globe*, 18 June 1923, 7.

⁹⁷ *Globe*, 20 June 1923, 3.

Ferguson's practice of patronage seems to have been relatively moderate. By April 1924, 227 permanent and temporary civil servants had resigned since the Conservative victory.⁹⁹ The number of appointments during the same period amounted to 153; 23 out of 39 permanent appointees were temporary government employees during the Drury regime. Questioned about some of the former administration's appointments, Doherty admitted in the legislature in early 1924 that the UFO-ILP government gave preference to qualified partisan supporters when filling positions.¹⁰⁰

After the brief leadership of Doherty, Raney served as the chief of the small UFO/Progressive caucus until he was named Puisne Justice of the Supreme Court of Ontario. Relating the 1927 federal appointment to Raney's long-alleged sympathies to the Grits, the *Farmers' Sun* cynically suspected that it was a reward "[f]or his part in this service to the Liberal Party..."¹⁰¹ In his memoirs, Drury described his quest for an official position from the new Liberal government under Mitch Hepburn in 1934. He sought a seat on the HEPC, seeing himself well-qualified through his knowledge of hydroelectric power issues, and in need of compensation for financial losses incurred while

farming.¹⁰² Unfortunately he was overlooked for the position, and had to make do with a "lesser appointment," the combined offices of Sheriff, County Court Clerk, and Local Registrar of the Supreme Court for the County of Simcoe, which he held until retirement in 1959 at the age of eighty. Interestingly, Drury's father was a previous occupant of the office of Sheriff of Simcoe County, having been appointed by the Mowat government in 1896 after tenure as Minister of Agriculture.

The UFO-led government of 1919-1923 failed in its initial efforts to abolish patronage from Ontario's political system. But this was not merely a tale of corrupted ideals. These agrarian activists discovered, upon taking power, that the issue of political preferment was not a simple problem to be solved by higher morality. The antagonism of interests and values turned-out to be deeply complicated. They came to discover that patronage was both a means of maintaining the hegemony of the political system of the "Big Interests" and the means by which farmers, workers, and reformers could be integrated into the state structure. That they tried and failed to solve the patronage issue should not affect our assessment of their efforts, but rather stand as evidence of the UFO's deep roots in Ontario's political culture.

⁹⁸ *Farmers' Sun*, 10 Oct. 1923, 6.

⁹⁹ G.M. McCutcheon to G. Howard Ferguson, 11 April 1924, RG 3-7-1: Premier Howard Ferguson Office Records – Miscellaneous Records, File #4, "Civil Service Commissioner's Office" (1928), AO; for more on Ferguson's career, see Peter Oliver, *G. Howard Ferguson: Ontario Tory* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1977).

¹⁰⁰ *Farmers' Sun*, 16 Feb. 1924, 2.

¹⁰¹ *Farmers' Sun*, 22 Sept. 1927.

¹⁰² E.C. Drury, *Farmer Premier: The Memoirs of E.C. Drury* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart, 1966), 187.