By Way of Introduction

This is the first issue of PAST AND PRESENT, which will be sent, free, to all interested in receiving it, four times a year: October, December, February, and April. It is produced as a joint effort by members of the Departments of Anthropology, History, Political Science and Sociology at the University of Waterloo.

It is designed as a medium of communication between High School teachers in these and related subjects, and the Universities. This first issue is, obviously, an entirely University production, but the editors are anxious to hear directly from the teachers, and to publish material from them which might be of wider interest to their colleagues.

We have a very broad view of what might be included in PAST AND PRESENT. We will regularly publish brief reports of current research in the fields of our concern, reports which will illustrate the present concerns of University faculty. We will review books which might be particularly useful in High School libraries. We will from time to time publish factual data not readily available elsewhere - official election results, or government reports, for example. But in particular we would like to develop a two-way communication with the High Schools on school projects. First of all, we would like to hear from teachers about projects they have undertaken, and with what success, and then we would be very glad to provide any support material for proposed projects.

The whole philosophy behind this journal is based on the feeling that High School and University teachers are working in isolation. This is especially true of the Social Sciences, Political Science, Sociology, and Anthropology which are only occasionally an integral part of a regular High School curriculum.

Most University professors have only a vague, and probably inaccurate, idea of what is being done in the schools. The teachers know something more about the Universities, for a great many will have been students more or less recently, but even here fashions and areas of interest and methodologies change quite rapidly. PAST AND PRESENT is an attempt to bring the two levels of education closer together in their concern for History and the Social Sciences.

We are sending several copies of this first issue to each High School in Ontario. If you would like to make sure of receiving your own personal copy in future, please complete and mail the form on the inside back page. Let us know what you think of us.
An important part of any field of knowledge is putting facts and interpretations into some order and system. Studying the history of a country, people, or civilization involves a classifying activity. Historians divide the history of Western civilization into categories such as ancient, medieval, and modern. The choice of topical and chronological divisions is usually based on social, political, economic, religious, and other characteristics. These units change or are modified from time to time as new information and new interpretations arise and older points of view pass away.

In the case of Canadian Indian history, a field which is being increasingly studied, the eras and epochs have been defined by scholars only in recent years. Four major phases have been distinguished to describe the course of Canadian and American Indian history. The dates applied to the phases vary from East to West.

The first period begins with the earliest contact between Indians and newcomers. Europeans (and the beginning of written accounts) arrived on the East coast of the North American continent. It was a period in which mutual borrowing of culture elements, tools, weapons, foods, geographical knowledge took place. Birch bark canoes, potatoes, squash are Indian contributions. Native societies changed but were not destroyed. They retain their political and cultural autonomy.

The second phase saw a shift in the Indian-white relationship. Competition and conflict developed as land pressures increased. Economic pressures also developed as the natives became more deeply involved in the fur trade. Wars, population dislocation, and epidemic diseases occurred. Indians acted as separate groups, thereby contributing to their disadvantage. Some "tribes" were destroyed (Beothuk), others were decimated (Hurons). Inter-tribal wars also increased. Game was greatly reduced or virtually destroyed (moose, caribou, buffalo).

The third period was that in which Indians were brought under the direct control of the newcomers. Indian administration aimed to change forcibly the entire lifestyle of the natives. Earlier change had been voluntary or non-directed. In the third phase involuntary or directed change was imposed. Reserves were created. Indian agents, teachers, clergy, police and farm instructors became the agents of the forcing apparatus. Indians resisted as well as they could by passive, silent and covert means for the most part. Occasionally violence occurred as when some Plains Cree (Big Bear,
Poundmaker) joined in the second Riel rising (1885).

The fourth phase began after World War II. It saw a "resurgence" of Indians. A sense of common Indian identity (Pan-Indianism) developed over and above ancient, local and "tribal" divisions. Indian leaders and organizations are asserting their right to a larger voice in their own affairs. They are studying traditional values, languages and customs and seeking to adapt them to urban and rural Canada (and the United States). The fourth or "recent" phase in Indian history, the last two or three decades, coincides with North American interest in multi-culturism. It challenges the flexibility and creative adaptability of everyone in our society.

The Black Loyalists

by James Walker
Department of History

Most Canadians know about the Underground Railroad and the arrival of fugitive American slaves in nineteenth-century southwestern Ontario, but few of us are aware that an equally significant black migration occurred into the Maritime provinces during and after the American Revolution. The black Loyalist story is particularly interesting this year, when the Americans are celebrating their Bicentennial, for it provides an unusual perspective on the Revolution and the settlement of the Loyalists in Canada.

At the outbreak of the American Revolution British commanders, strapped for manpower, were prepared to offer freedom to any rebel-owned slave who would come and fight for the royal cause. As the war progressed this offer was extended to include slave women and children and others who could not actively participate in the fighting. The British objective, obviously, was to deprive the rebels of slave labour and to cause the economic collapse of the southern colonies. But to the slaves themselves the British proclamations implied that Britain was an enemy to slavery, and since the rebels represented the racial status quo, the most revolutionary and freedom-minded blacks threw in their lot with the Loyalists. For black independence, it seemed, a British victory was necessary. Estimates of the number of slaves who became black Loyalists range up to 100,000, in stark contrast to the 5,000 who sided with the American rebels.

Unfortunately the runaway slaves were mistaken in their impression of British motives. Many of them were kept as slaves by white Loyalists or were sold in the West Indies. But some did manage to retain their freedom and about 3,500 were carried to Nova Scotia in 1782-83. They were joined by about 1,500 slaves who, being owned by white Loyalists, were not eligible to claim freedom under proclamations intended to attract only those slaves who belonged to the rebels. These 5,000 blacks constituted over ten percent of the total Loyalist influx into British North America.

In Nova Scotia (and New Brunswick, which was made a separate province in 1784), the freed blacks were settled in small segregated communities on the outskirts of the white Loyalist towns. Despite promises made to them during the war, the vast majority of the
The black Loyalists were betrayed and exploited, sharing a fate closer to that of the slaves than to that of the Loyalists whose status they had earned in the War. And yet it was upon the blacks that Loyalist society relied for the bulk of its labour supply. Their economic necessity caused them, in a very real sense, to become the builders of the British provinces in North America. Their contribution was essential to the foundation of the land we now know as Canada.

Reading Percentaged Tables

By John C. Goyder
Dept. of Sociology

Sociology and related disciplines in the social sciences have increasingly come to rely on numerical evidence in the last few decades. Part of the justification for the existence of social scientists is that they test public understandings of reality (or "conventional wisdoms") by gathering objective evidence that can be expressed in quantitative form. The presentation of such evidence can itself give rise to problems because of the familiar cliché that "statistics can lie." There are certain rules that help ensure that statistical results are not misinterpreted. The most basic of these is the conventional form of "running percentages."

The rule for percentaged tables is that the percentages should run in the direction of the causal variable. That is, percentages should sum to 100% under the headings for categories of the causal variable. The "causal variable" is the thing one suspects is the cause of the phenomenon under investigation. Often the causal variable is termed the "independent variable" while the thing to be explained is called the "dependent variable." The rule for running percentages can most easily be explained by looking at an example. Table 1 shows data collected in a survey of people living in London, Ontario, in 1970. The results were reported by James Rinehart and Ishmael Okraku in an article entitled "A Study of Class Consciousness," and printed in the August 1974 edition of The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology. Respondents were asked to give their agreement or disagreement to the statement: "I feel my political leaders hardly care what people like myself think or want." The numbers agreeing and disagreeing to this statement are classified according to whether the respondent had a white collar (nonmanual) or a blue collar (manual) occupation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Blue Collar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>357</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>286</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


In this example we would say that occupational class is the independent variable. Theories of social class lead us to predict that people in different occupational levels will hold differing attitudes about the social structure. Thus attitude towards political leaders forms here the dependent variable—the thing to be explained. The conventional rule for running percentages in the direction of the independent variable is followed in Table 2. This is how Rinehart and Okraku presented their results. The correct interpretation of the data is that both white and blue collar respondents are more likely than not to disagree with the statement that leaders do not care about them, but disagreement is more frequent among the white collar group. In other words, white collar people are proportionately the most satisfied with the political leadership.

black Loyalists were not provided with free land and provisions. They thus remained a landless and impoverished group, forced to work for whatever wages they could obtain from their wealthier white neighbours. Since almost all the white Loyalists were engaged in establishing businesses or commencing farms on their free land grants, it was the black Loyalists who laboured to clear roads, construct government buildings and harbours, and even to develop the lands of those white Loyalists whose tracts were too large for them to work by themselves.
Table 2: Running percentages in the direction of the independent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Blue Collar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>18.5%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>81.5%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>74.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Table 3 the same raw data are percentaged in the wrong direction. It can be seen that a majority of those disagreeing with the statement (65.3%) are white collar and a majority of those agreeing (57.3%) are blue collar. There is a danger here of drawing the false conclusion that a majority of blue collar respondents agree with the statement (are critical of leaders). It is true that among those agreeing with the statement, over 50% are blue collar. But this does not mean that over 50% of blue collar people support the statement. As we see from Table 2 (and from Table 1), both groups are more likely to disagree than to agree with the statement, although a greater proportion of blue collar than white collar people do agree.

In this way, the percentages in Table 3 may lead to a misinterpretation that greatly overstates the degree of class polarization in London, Ontario. This is just one of the elementary misinterpretations that can happen when examining empirical data. A good source of other problems and examples is the book How to Lie with Statistics, by Darrell Huff.

Table 3: Running percentages in the direction of the dependent variable.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>White Collar</th>
<th>Blue Collar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
<td>57.3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
<td>34.7%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.5%</td>
<td>40.5%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Caucus

A number of words in the vocabulary of politics can cause a good deal of confusion and difficulty because the meaning changes from time to time, and place to place. This is especially true when one starts reading about politics from Canadian, British, and American sources. We use the same words, but we do not always mean the same things by them. From time to time we shall present illustrations of this problem. Here, for example, is the word CAUCUS.

In CANADA, caucus is generally used to describe a meeting of the elected members of a political party. We talk of the Liberal caucus in Ottawa, meaning all the Liberal members of the House of Commons, or the NDP caucus at Queen's Park, meaning the NDP members of the Ontario Legislature. And we talk about matters being discussed in caucus, or differences between opinions of caucus and opinions of the top leadership of a party.

BRITISH usage is quite different. The British use the term caucus to label any permanent, or semi-permanent group within a party, either at the parliamentary or the constituency level. It is used particularly in a critical sense for a group that seems to be trying to exert too much influence, or which represents an extreme view.

AMERICAN usage is closer to the British, but without the critical implication. It is used more to describe a group within a party charged with some special function like nominating a candidate. Its decisions are usually binding on the whole party. It is in effect a kind of committee with broad powers.
ELORA

by Kenneth Westhues
Chairman, Department of Sociology

About twenty miles north of Kitchener-Waterloo, the village of Elora is spread on the banks of the Grand and Irvine Rivers. To the traveler out for a Sunday drive, Elora appears as a peaceful, quaint and quiet cluster of old stone homes. It is a relaxing place to visit. The Elora Gorge Park offers swimming, trails, and campgrounds. Many of the old storefronts on Mill Street have been restored as outlets for the antiques and handiwork of village craftsmen. The rapids and islet rock just above the gorge offer unique natural beauty on the Southern Ontario landscape.

What drew me to Elora in 1972, however, was not its superficial peacefulness. It was news of intense conflict in the village concerning its future. One faction of its residents, led by the village reeve, was in favour of urban development, new apartment buildings, a new bridge across the gorge, and new industry to provide employment. The other, organized in a citizens' action group, wanted to limit new housing, resist industrial expansion, and preserve Elora as a quaint country village reminiscent of the turn of the century.

The conflict in Elora was interesting to me as one battleground in the war all across Canada between those who want economic and urban growth and those who want to preserve the environment and the traditions of the past. A colleague of mine, Dr. Peter Sinclair, was equally interested. We decided to undertake a thorough study of the village, in order to understand what was going on there and why. What especially fascinated us was that it seemed to be long-term residents, country people, who were most in favour of making Elora a small-scale Toronto. The people resisting change were highly-educated newcomers who might be expected to favour change.

The first question was how to begin our research. Sociologists use many methods, from questionnaires and surveys to participant observation and historical analysis. We decided to draw upon a variety of methods in order to get a firm grasp on the social location of Elora in the structure of modern Canada. First there were long, informal interviews with those who were active on both sides of the conflict. Then there were days of poring over old newspapers and historical documents preserved by the Elora Women's Institute, documents going back to the early nineteenth century. We searched through census statistics for the last hundred years. In the final phase of the research, we did a survey of a random sample of 215 village residents. The survey obtained information on the age, education, and other background characteristics of people on both sides of the conflict, and their attitudes on subjects ranging from religion to apartment houses.

It was two years before we decided that we had answered the questions we had asked at the outset. At that point we communicated the results to village residents, gave lectures in universities on our findings, and eventually published a little book. There is not room here to discuss everything we learned, but two points in particular are worth mentioning.

First is that the history of Elora—and presumably other Ontario villages as well—is one of steadily decreasing power of village residents over their own affairs. The furniture factories, stores, and small industries which used to be owned and controlled by local residents are now owned by large corporations with headquarters in Toronto or American cities. The schools have been consolidated with others in Wellington County. The village council, which was not very powerful even in pre-Confederation days, has grown steadily weaker. Elora is no longer isolated by poor roads and its own erratic telephone system. Instead it has been integrated as one physical setting for the smooth-functioning machinery of urban Ontario life.

From this perspective, the deluge of newcomers to the village since the late 1960's is just one more step in breaking down the boundaries which made Elora a separate entity. The new residents moved there from Guelph, Toronto, Kitchener, and Montreal to find solid, low-priced old houses away from urban congestion. Though they lacked roots in the community, they felt free to demand a voice in village affairs. They proclaimed that Elora's quaintness, its gorge and the picturesque old
homes belong to all Ontario. They denied that the future of a beautiful village should be left up to the wishes of those who had lived and worked there all their lives. To village oldtimers, it looked as if the strangers who had come to control Elora from the outside had now moved directly into the village and were trying to take over completely.

A second important conclusion of our work was that although the conflict was portrayed in the newspapers simply as one between newcomers and oldtimers, the conflict also had an economic basis. Those who favoured apartment buildings did not do so simply on principle, but because they were less well off and saw the need for inexpensive housing. The newcomers resisted industry not simply because they thought it would be ugly but because they had jobs in nearby cities and did not need the jobs new industry would create. Our study showed that in spite of their readiness to take part in village politics, the newcomers were less ready to do their shopping in village stores or join local organizations. Only in part, therefore, was the conflict between opposing principles; it was more basically a conflict between opposing economic interests.

Our study is now completed, but the conflict in Elora continues. There is still no bridge over the gorge but apartment houses have been built. Each new development is accompanied by a repetition of the basic conflict we studied four years ago. As political beings, both Dr. Sinclair and I have our opinions about what the future should hold. As sociologists, however, our task was only to understand why and how the current state of affairs had come about.

Political Parties in Local Government?

Civic elections in Ontario reveal a long-standing malaise permeating the structure of municipal politics in Canada. In nearly every civic election two things stand out clearly: the low rate of voter participation (even in areas where weather conditions cannot be said to be a factor) and the high rate of re-election of incumbents.

Moreover, the electoral process is dominated by campaigns which do not focus upon issues or offer clear alternatives but instead are composed of personality differences and the espousal of generalities in favor of motherhood and better government.

Democratic government is not well served when less than 40 percent of the electorate determines who will hold office, when the competition for political power does not raise fundamental questions about how that power will be used, and when the victors are apparently elected more on name recognition than on their records or platforms about what is to be done.

These characteristics of the municipal political process indicate an underlying sickness as there is considerable reason to believe that they reflect not so much the electorate's satisfaction with the status quo but, instead, the failure of our society to develop a local political system which effectively provides representation and accountability.

by Peter Woolstencroft,
Department of Political Science

What happens in local politics is reasonably well known. The usual laments, however, about this sorry state of affairs miss the point, for they are based on hoary myths about the nature of municipal politics, which in the end aggravate— if not intensify—the sickness.

The problem of municipal politics is best exemplified by the election of councils and school boards where the voters are faced with selecting candidates from a long list of names.

How can a reasonable choice be made?

Advertisements in the media are not particularly revealing: there are too many which say too little. Incumbents stress their experience and membership on innumerable committees. Challengers promise vigor, imagination, action and whatever else seems attractive.

Voters are given very little idea about what will happen if one candidate is elected and another is defeated.

Even the conscientious citizen cannot reasonably be expected to regularly attend meetings to watch the politicians in action. Judgments, then, about the virtues of officeholders must be made on the basis of scattered and incomplete news stories which fail to outline fully the nature of the various debates and the opposing sides.
Even when candidates take sides on an issue, voters find it difficult to weigh the probability that the issue is important to other voters, or to other candidates (so that they can either be supported or rejected). Further, they have very little idea about what will happen to the issue when it comes to the council.

Simply put, the present system of political competition at the local level fails us because the relationship between citizens and politicians is one of just individuals. The politicians attempt to get elected as individuals. The electors decide who will get elected by acting as individuals.

However, the final decision of the voters is a collective one. And what the politicians do after the election is a collective act, inasmuch as things are done or are not done on the basis of majority rule. Individuals may act but groups decide.

The municipal political process does not recognize this elementary—but crucial—fact of organized political life. What is needed, then, is an institution which can be an intermediary between the electorate and the government.

That institution, inescapably, must be a political party, of whatever label; that is, a group of people who are prepared to do something and are prepared to oppose something else.

Undoubtedly, it will be immediately objected that political parties have no place in municipal politics.

The core of the objection seems to be that local politics involves nothing more than the proper administration of civic affairs along business lines. The prime virtues, then, are efficiency and economy.

Furthermore, there are no great issues in the community which require advocacy by political parties. Moreover, political parties divide the community along "artificial" lines, creating differences where none exist; people become partisans—supporters of one party or another—and reject out of hand the good ideas of the other side.

The notion that politics is just administration is misleading if not destructive of a healthy political environment. It suggests that the problems confronting the community are minor, that no serious difference in interest crisis within the community, and solutions to problems require little more than the development and implementation of the necessary regulations.

Politics is essentially a choice between alternatives—the selection of one course of action over another.

While few will say that Ottawa is less important than, say, Kitchener, it still is the case that vital decisions are made locally which affect seriously the well-being of the community.

These decisions necessarily must involve different basic values and assumptions, but the present political system does not allow for these differences to surface.

These decisions will be made whether or not we have local political parties. And some people will continue to benefit—and some will continue to suffer.

To think otherwise is to accept the naive belief that political decisions can always be made for the good of all citizens; any decision inevitably favors one interest or point of view; any decision is contrary to one interest or point of view.

The present system of political competition does not allow the citizens to adequately control these decision-making processes.

We know very little about what has happened; we do not know what will happen; we do not know whom to blame; we do not know whom to praise.

By no stretch of the imagination are political parties perfect. What is argued here is that the failings of party politics are few compared to the present chaotic state of local political life.

Political parties can be expected to provide platforms, recruit candidates, finance campaigns, and, most importantly, provide a mechanism for the representation of whatever values and interests have significance in the community.

Whenever the electorate concludes that a change is needed, it will be able to know whom to blame and can be assured that there will be at least one alternative to the current set of political leaders. The present system does not allow for the clear delineation of who holds political power and who is in the opposition.

The inclusion of party politics into local government is no panacea; it will not solve all the problems confronting our local communities, but it will clarify the relationship between the citizens and their government, will make it easier for them to understand what is happening, and to act in light of that understanding.

A last note for those of you who remain unconvinced: Our present mayors, aldermen, and trustees are making decisions for the community in light of what they perceive to be the interests of the community. Most are already members of political parties.

It is hard to believe that there is no connection between their party philosophies and how they make their political decisions.

Of course, political parties do the same thing, with one crucial difference: They provide order, continuity and accountability, which are denied us by the present system.

We also know what we are getting!
Are The Gombe Chimpanzees Wild?

by Steven Gabow
Department of Anthropology

When J. Goodall first reported that chimpanzees made crude tools, it made anthropological headlines. She made the discovery that wild chimps modify branches to the desired size and shape to poke into termite mounds and retrieve the tasty insects. This was only the first in a long line of literally incredible observations she and others have made at the Gombe Stream in Tanzania. At Gombe whole families of chimpanzees are individually known through 2 generations. Tool-making of various kinds, including the making of leaf sponges for soaking up water, is now almost routinely observed. Cooperative hunting and meat sharing is also well documented at Gombe.

The chimps there especially favor hunting young baboons, and the incidence of this behavior seems to be increasing. Many of these behaviors were never before seen among non-human primates. All these discoveries were thought to be especially significant because they were made on wild chimpanzees.

But are the Gombe chimps wild? This question came up recently when it was noticed that the amount of aggressive behavior was rising sharply – chimps were even dividing into hostile factions, especially when preferred foods were available. The chimps had been given preferred foods by Goodall for many years. During the middle 60's and early 70's various methods of providing bananas were tried, in part to lure chimps into camps. After several failures – due to the chimps' tendency to dismantle containers and steal bananas – concrete bunkers with remote door releases were built, and these held the chimps at bay. Recently this provisioning has been stopped altogether. Many feel that the long period of provisioning has had an important and long-lasting effect on the chimps' behavior. The bananas attracted baboons to camp as well as chimpanzees. And the increased number of animals meant more competition over the bananas. Baboons and chimpanzees were on a familiar basis at Gombe, perhaps more than in an unprovisioned situation. Could this have contributed to the pattern of chimp hunting observed there? The high incidence of hunting, and the marked preference for baboons as prey, may have been an indirect result of provisioning. It is also possible that the provisioning, through attraction, increased the chimp population of the area to a point where aggressive competition became an important behavioral trend. In this connection it is known that rhesus monkeys who live in certain Indian cities, such as Calcutta, are much more aggressive and bold than their forest-living cousins. The urban monkeys generally live by stealing food from vendors' stalls.

At present it is impossible to evaluate these questions, and the Gombe Stream situation requires further investigation. It could well show, in an extreme fashion, how human influence can affect the behavior of a wild animal population.
Book Review

by Robert Williams
Department of Political Science


It is a curious fact that most Ontarians are very poorly informed about the history and operations of their own political system.

In contrast to their knowledge of national matters, the vast majority of graduates of the Ontario education system would have trouble identifying Sir James P. Whitney, E.C. Drury or even George Drew. Few would be familiar with the U.F.O., the origins of Ontario Hydro or the purpose of the O.M.B.

In part, this deficiency is related to the fact that the study of national political events, national personalities and federal political institutions is far more fully developed than similar topics in Ontario.

Now, Ontario scholars have begun to devote substantial resources to this "home front" and courses on Ontario politics, history and related topics are beginning to appear for the benefit of Ontario students.

To support this development, a book was finally published in 1975 which can serve as a basic text for the study of Ontario politics. The word "finally" is significant, for until Donald MacDonald's book there had not been in recent memory (if ever) a book capable of providing a broad introduction to Ontario politics and government.

To instructors in courses in Ontario politics (such as this reviewer) MacDonald's book was a welcome resource. It also should be of value to all Ontario teachers who deal with the Canadian political system in their work. If the focus has largely been on Ottawa, many readers may be amazed at how different institutions and processes are at Queen's Park. Ontario really is a rather different place than Canada - at least in the political sense.

Yet the general reader - or the secondary school reader - need not be frightened away by MacDonald's book. The editor, MPP for York South and former leader of the CCF/NDP in Ontario, has not aimed exclusively at the university classroom in collecting these papers.

Quite clearly, many of the essays are journalistic or largely impressionistic introductions to a wide range of issues, institutions and developments in Ontario. A few are controversial pieces and only a few are overtly "academic".

A number of the essays are notable for their attempts to explain what might be quite complicated or mystifying matters to the average
citizen.

The essays by Norman Pearson on regional government and development, by Fred Fletcher on news coverage of provincial politics, and by Joe Wearing on party organizations are examples of this kind of insight.

Many others, such as those dealing with the Workmen's Compensation Board and "interacting with government", are disturbing in their findings.

As might be expected in a large collection of this kind a few of the essays are disappointing, some by virtue of their superficial or haphazard features. Future books on Ontario will not need essays of this quality to round out the presentation of the various subjects. On the other hand, many essays include bibliographies for further study by the interested reader.

While readers will not always agree with the interpretations made here (for example, the Davis government is the target of many well-aimed spears), and while the shift to minority government after the 1975 election is not treated here, the basic information on such a wide range of topics is helpful to all but the best informed citizen. It will open a great many eyes and will correct the vision in many others.

The puzzling thing is why it has taken so long to make people realize how important and interesting provincial politics really are. MacDonald's book will help Ontarians recognize the extent to which the government at Queen's Park influences their lives and may prompt many to learn more about Ontario's tumultuous and colourful political past.
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I would like to suggest that:
Those Good Old Days!

The following is an extract from the formal contract which all female public school teachers were required to sign in North Carolina in 1927. The elderly lady who passed it on to us still deeply resented the fact that economic circumstances made it necessary to sign such a demeaning document.

"I promise to take an interest in all phases of Sunday School work, donating of my time, service and money without stint for the uplift and benefit of the community. I promise to abstain from all dancing, immodest dressing and other conduct unbecoming a teacher and a lady. I promise not to go out with any young man except in so far as it may be necessary to stimulate Sunday School work.

I promise not to fall in love, to become engaged or to get secretly married.

I promise not to encourage or tolerate the least familiarity on the part of any of my boy pupils.

I promise to sleep at least eight hours a night, to eat carefully, and to take every precaution to keep in the best of health and spirits, in order that I may be better able to render efficient service to my pupils.

I promise to remember that I owe a duty to the townspeople who are paying me my wages, that I owe respect to the school board and the superintendent that hired me, and that I shall consider myself at all times the willing servant of the school board and the townspeople and that I shall cooperate with them to the limits of my ability in any movement aimed at the betterment of the town, the pupils or the schools."