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ABSTRACT

ON THE FARM, IN THE TOWN, AND IN THE CITY:
NINETEENTH-CENTURY NETWORKS AND SPACES IN RURAL MIDDLESEX COUNTY, SOUTHWESTERN ONTARIO

Nicholas Van Allen
The University of Guelph, 2016

Between 1850 and the 1890s, farmers in Middlesex County participated in and experienced the growth of the City of London, Ontario, as it diversified economically and became a regional industrial hub. In doing so, agriculturalists shaped and reshaped their social and economic networks to take advantage of the city’s offerings, in turn enhancing their own neighbourhoods and communities.

Using an HGIS (historical geographic information system), this dissertation uncovers the rural/urban relationship by examining the networks of the county’s farm families via the diaries of the Errington, Glen, and Adams families of southern Middlesex. It discusses three types of farmers’ networks: two that were local, which are termed “neighbourhood” and “community” networks, and another that was “distant,” which involved interaction with urban centres, in particular the City of London.

By looking at the alterations that rural people made to their social and economic lives, this thesis shows that it was at the daily level that families experienced, encouraged, and negotiated the North American urban phenomenon. It argues that local networks did not suffer at the expense of distant networks. Producing for distant networks actually helped develop and maintain local networks of production, exchange, and sociability.
The analysis follows the lead of a number of historians who have highlighted the relationships between nineteenth-century rural and urban centres. My study’s close, family-level focus allows for the mapping of farmers’ daily patterns of local production and exchange. It considers their adoption of innovative agricultural technologies and use of improved transportation infrastructure, and it analyzes all this information within the context of changes in the families’ life cycles and their growing participation in urban-oriented trade networks.

This thesis finds that though the contexts of trade changed and the frequency of interaction with cities increased, the pattern of rural production and urban buying and selling did not. Into the 1890s, farmers continued producing goods in the countryside within their local networks and trading with cities via their distant networks. Similarly, farmers’ social networks incorporated new developments, but remained relatively persistent in their emphasis on home and church-based association throughout the second half of the nineteenth century.
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Chapter 1: Introduction – Getting to the City from the Farm: a Discussion of Rural Stories, People, and Networks

It was the summer of 1856. The spring of that year had been a busy one for Frederick Errington and his family, who lived and farmed in southern Middlesex County. As soon as the cold weather had broken, Frederick was active with the work of the farm – repairing barn gates, cleaning bushels of peas and oats, hauling the previous year’s crops to the mill, and worrying about the health of his horse Billy, who in mid-March began to show symptoms “of the distemper coming on”¹ and was not “on the mend” until early April.² Matilda Errington, Frederick’s spouse, had been no less occupied. While Frederick was tending to Billy, Matilda was concerned with son Freddy, the couple’s first child, who had fever and was in great pain.³

Soon it was the summer, and the weather was hot. Despite the heat, the Erringtons were emerging out of a difficult time and moving on with the summer work. In July, Frederick tore down the old house on the Errington lot; he put up a pig pen with the help of a small neighbourhood bee, and he worked the fields – plowing and dunging, haying and cutting.⁴ On July 26, he wrote that it was so hot that the straw Frederick intended to use for binding broke and he had to use grass instead.⁵ On that very same day, little Freddy, who had passed his first birthday earlier in June, was up and toddling around the field, carrying grass as the others drew in the barley.⁶

Seemingly straight out of a Sylvan-inspired Wordsworth poem, this image of the family might today be seen as a glorious existence by many observers: the beauty of outdoor work, a family spending days and nights side-by-side with nothing but the future ahead of them, and a life dictated by the slow

1 Errington Diary, March 21.  
2 Frederick wrote on the 3rd “I think Billy is on the mend”. Errington Diary.  
3 Frederick wrote on April 12 of this concern with Freddy. Errington Diary.  
4 These activities can be seen throughout the month of July. Errington Diary.  
5 Errington Diary.  
6 Errington Diary.
moving of the seasons. But like Tintern Abbey, the outward image masks the historical reality. In the second half of the 1850s, the Erringtons were part of a growing number of families in southern Middlesex who worked the land with increasing intensity, helped along by the development of urban and rural transportation and trade-oriented infrastructure begun decades earlier and directed toward the City of London, Upper Canada.

Introduction to the Study, Definitions, and Literature

Like some regions in other Canadian colonies, southern Upper Canada became part of a world of commercial exchange after 1791 and the market system was part of the settlement process. Early British Isles, American, and European arrivals made choices which indicated that they were concerned with the viability of farming operations and keen to access the market economy. They cleared parts of their land for planting; located themselves near urban marketplaces, near grain and saw mills, and along major roadways; chose economic strategies that referenced a desire for balanced growth; accessed consumer goods when available; and kept diaries and accounts which recorded such practices. This market system, based upon the everyday pattern of agricultural production and the exchange of farm and consumer goods, gave shape to the region and continued well beyond the 1890s. Ontario farmers in the twentieth and twenty-first centuries remained concerned with market activity and commercial viability, expanding and mechanizing their farms, specializing in certain crops and livestock, and participating further in international exchange. Yet, the pattern of local rural production and distant exchange, established during the settlement era, persisted, making the nineteenth century perhaps the starting point for a historical trajectory that southern Ontarians continue to experience.7

This study begins in the 1850s and 1860s, after the initial settlement period, when London was diversifying economically with the help of new railways and the surrounding county was becoming more densely populated with rural families. It then proceeds to the 1870 to 1890s era when the city became an industrial hub, diversifying and intensifying its production, and during which time farmers further developed their urban-oriented, distant networks of exchange. Such changes might be seen as marking an age of revolutionary transitional shifts in society, whether from a pre-industrial, moral economy to an industrialised and capitalistic one, from an a-liberal world based on community to a liberal world of the individual, or from a pre-modern to modernized society. This thesis, however, provides a narrative that describes instead changes occurring concurrently within an overarching period of continuity in everyday life. This continuity was defined by the continued overlapping of local, social and economic networks which made up a system of agricultural production. Change and continuity, in this sense, occurred synonymously. This study demonstrates that rural people adapted to and even encouraged “changes,” particularly through their willingness to respond to and take advantage of the growth of cities. But, overall, they experienced continuity within their local, rural societies.

This study discusses three types of farmers’ networks: two were local, which here are termed “neighbourhood” and “community” networks, and another was “distant,” which involved such trade with urban centres. Both local networks were propinquitous and featured frequent, daily interaction in the countryside; however, neighbourhood networks contained a sense of intimacy and reliance that community networks did not. Farmers’ “distant” networks, on the other hand, were oriented toward urban centres outside of the immediate vicinity of farm homes and contained interactions that were often impersonal and less frequent – occurring weekly or less-than-weekly. The study uncovers the qualities contained in these networks are explained more fully below.

---


8 See pages 12-13 for a discussion of this body of literature.

9 The qualities contained in these networks are explained more fully below.
rural/urban relationship by examining these networks of the county’s farm families via farm diaries and an HGIS. I argue that it was at the daily level that rural people experienced, encouraged, and negotiated the North American urban phenomenon, its economic and social implications. Here I use the word “urban” to denote large towns and cities, within their defined political borders, and “rural” to mean those areas outside of cities, which in Middlesex County were composed largely of agricultural land.  

Middlesex is an appropriate study site since it contained both farm land and a growing major city during the period, and because detailed farm diaries, atlases, and other primary sources from the county have survived which are appropriate for building an effective HGIS.

The thesis is noticeably less about the volumes or values of traded goods than it is about social and economic exchanges, trips to the city, and local production and trade. This concentration is owing to my focus on types of networks which were made up of interactions between people; these instances filled the pages of farmers’ diaries, the primary source-base used below. I thus look at the lives of farmers through a particular lens, in that I display the everyday experience of agriculture and rural space. By looking at the changes and alterations that rural people made to their social and economic networks, this study will make clear that those farmers both encouraged and participated in the development of nearby cities.

The analysis follows the lead of a number of historians who have highlighted rather than downplayed the relationships between nineteenth-century rural and urban centres. Rothenburg, McCalla, MacKinnon, and Samson, for example, have all shown that the countryside and urban societies, whether in New England, Upper Canada, or the Maritimes, were more interconnected and relational

---

10 For a recent discussion on “rural” and “urban” classifications, see Ruth Sandwell, *Canada’s Rural Majority: Households, Environments, and Economies, 1870-1940* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2016), 9.
11 The implications for this concentration on my method are discussed more fully below.
than they were disparate. While I identify that there were distinct rural and urban networks in which farmers participated, I argue that these differences were as much spatially based as they were ideological. Many historians of the marketplace and rural societies have argued that rural people fostered different sets of values and ways of life and that these were the markers of distinction between the urban and the rural “worlds.” Notably, these authors have also looked at the existence of distant and local networks of trade and seen tension or even conflict as the rural society, often presented as a world of community-mindedness and kin, lost out to the urban-centred world of the marketplace and industrial capitalism. Or, alternatively, they have shown that rural peoples “accessed” the marketplace or the city as a means to preserve their rural communities, but resisted being fully converted to its ethic. This study, however, shows that farmers’ participation in both distant urban and local networks actually enhanced both network types; local networks did not suffer at the expense of distant networks. Urban-oriented “distant network” trading required farm men and farm women’s at-home, on the farm production of agricultural goods. Therefore, producing for such distant networks actually helped develop and maintain local networks of production and exchange. The study thus tells a narrative about

12 Rothenburg, McCalla, and MacKinnon all showed regular trips to urban centres to take part in urban marketplaces were part of eighteenth and nineteenth-century farming. See: Winifred Barr Rothenberg, “The Emergence of Farm Labor Markets and the Transformation of the Rural Economy: Massachusetts, 1750-1855,” The Journal of Economic History 48/3 (September 1988); Douglas McCalla, “Rural Credit and Rural Development in Upper Canada,” in Rosemary Ommer, Merchant Credit and Labour Strategies in Historical Perspective (Fredericton: Acadiensis, 1990); Robert MacKinnon, “Road, Cart Track and Bridle Paths: Land Transportation and the Domestic Economy of Mid-Nineteenth-Century Eastern British America,” Canadian Historical Review 82/2 (June 2003), 177-216; and Daniel Samson, Contested Countryside: Rural Workers and Modern Society in Atlantic Canada, 1800-1950 (Fredericton: Acadiensis, 1994).


the Canadian rural past that places continuity at the forefront rather than themes of community
contestation, fracture, resistance, or disjuncture.

This theme of continuity is one that McCalla, in his recent study of Upper Canadian
consumption, has asked historians of nineteenth-century Upper Canada to carefully consider.\(^{15}\) It also,
notably, conflicts with ideas of the so-called \textit{Gemeinschaft} to \textit{Gesellschaft} transition that remains
present in histories of many Canadian communities.\(^{16}\) This is not to say that the period was without
contestation, either between regions and families or within them. In Chapter 5, for example, where I
look at the history of the rural post, I show clearly that communities and neighbourhoods contested
differing understandings of local geographies. The diarists also likely had conflicts within their own
families, such as between parents and children or siblings. Since this latter type of conflict did not
explicitly appear in the sources, however, I leave this narrative for others to pursue.\(^{17}\)

Historians have been debating the emergence of the North American “market” economy, and its
related cousin “capitalism,” for more than a century.\(^{18}\) As Beatrice Craig identified in her study of
Madawaska, the market economy can be a difficult concept to analyse historically since it can involve
anything from face-to-face exchanges, which are not necessarily capitalistic, to capitalism itself.\(^{19}\)
Indeed, studies of capitalism see it as defined by numerous, often differing, features, but what is
common to many studies of capitalism is a desire to source out its so-called “transition” or “emergence”
through study of ideology and farmers’ mindsets.\(^{20}\) My study, however, is less about this illusive aspect

\(^{16}\) See Walsh and High’s discussion of \textit{Gemeinschaft} and \textit{Gesellschaft} in John C. Walsh and Steven High, “Rethinking
\(^{17}\) For an example of a study looking at conflict both between families and in a specific geography, see Little, “A
Crime Shrouded in Mystery.”
\(^{19}\) Beatrice Craig, \textit{Backwoods Consumers and Homespun Capitalists: The Rise of a Market Culture in Eastern Canada}
(Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2009), 11-12.
\(^{20}\) For a thorough discussion of such literature in the American context, see Allan Kulikoff, “The Transition to
Capitalism in Rural America,” \textit{The William and Mary Quarterly} 46/1 (January 1989), 120-144. The study is
of market relations or shifts in farmers’ ethics and worldviews, and more about patterns of trading and exchanging between peoples inside and outside of cities.

While any study that looks at farmers, production, and trade networks has implications for such literature, I analyse the spatial nature of different types of exchanges and their contribution to the building of local and distant networks. I do so not only because the historical debate is without a clear definition of the market or capitalism, but also because the micro-historical focus on specific farm families shows just how blurred the lines between capitalist/market-oriented and non-market production were. For example, when James Glen, a farmer who will figure prominently in this study, borrowed barrels from his neighbour to take apples to the city to sell them to a London merchant in the fall of 1896, was he engaging in a market or a non-market economy? Some might see the borrowing as an act of reciprocity or cooperation, one similar to the “pre-capitalist” economy. But since James’ aim was to sell one of his farm’s important marketable products, the apples, was it in fact evidence of market behaviour, or alternatively an example of a farmer taking part in two economies, one market-based/capitalist and the other kinship-based/reciprocal? Such blurring leads to confusion for the scholar intent on identifying market and non-market behaviour and creates divisions in the economy which may not have actually existed. That said, however, the market literature, as will be discussed below, has hinted at an essential spatial component involved in trading networks and it has proved useful in its contribution to understanding rural peoples’ agency and participation in economic change.

important because it has influenced Canadian historians who have confronted similar issues – see Bouchard, “Marginality, Co-Integration and Change,” and Little “A Crime Shrouded in Mystery.”
21 Rothenburg notes that historians of the neo-Marist-Polanyi tradition like to celebrate such acts. Rothenberg, “The Emergence of Farm Labor Markets,” 287.
Middlesex and its Environs

Though judged suitable for settlement as early as 1793 when Lieutenant Governor John G. Simcoe toured the region in search of land for a capital for Upper Canada, Middlesex County, shown on Figure 1.1, did not start to fill in with settlers until a decade later. In Westminster Township, where the Errington and Glen families were located, land had initially been settled following Thomas Talbot’s receipt of a 5,000-acre land grant in 1803, some of which was in the London District and occupied the area that would become southern Middlesex (see Figure 1.2 for the location of the diarists’ homes). Following the ideas Simcoe had set out for the colony, Talbot from 1803 to the mid-1830s ensured that settlers cleared roads, built schools, populated towns, and performed other settlement-oriented tasks. By the 1830s and 1840s, farm diaries show that agricultural production was well under way, as families engaged in activities, regularly cultivating crops, logging, plowing, gardening, and taking goods to mills and markets in newly developed towns. From very early on, then, the area was already part of the market culture that had developed during the eighteenth and early-nineteenth century in the North American colonies.

Throughout Upper Canada in the 1830s, government and farmers’ demands for canal-building projects enhanced the agricultural economy as did the highways and trunk roads that Simcoe and others

24 Brunger notes that both Hamil and Craig argued that Talbot’s supervisory role was nearly completed by the mid-1830s. Brunger, “A Spatial Analysis of Individual Settlers in Southern London District,” 28-37.
25 See for example, James Rawlings, Diary of James Rawlings, Farmer, Delaware, 1838-1843, Box B4244, ARCC; the letters of Thomas Spencer Niblock, 1849-1852, Thomas Spencer Niblock and Family Fonds, Microfilm Reel A-304, Library and Archives Canada; or the activities of the rural Irish in Middlesex in Bruce Elliot, Irish Migrants in the Canadas: A New Approach (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1988), 176-8.
initiated and local residents developed and maintained. But progress was slow until the choice of local and metropolitan governments to develop railways pushed change along at a greater speed. In the southern part of the province, the 1850s saw the coming of the Grand Trunk Rail (GTR) (1852) and the Great Western Railroad (GWR) and the London and Port Stanley Railway (LPSR) (1853). As McCalla identifies, these railway connections very quickly came to service the region’s urban centres and thereby fostered extra-regional and international trade systems. By 1856, he says, “All the major urban centres in the province were linked” to their web. In Middlesex County, it was London that experienced this rail linkage-led urban boom.

Governor Simcoe commented in 1793 that a city at the forks of the Thames River would be “the metropolis of all Canada”. London’s first house, however, was not built for another thirty years. Urban growth in Middlesex clearly started off slowly. During this early period, the city’s garrison fostered the initial concentration of population in the centre and urban/rural trade. In the 1830s and 1840s, approximately 500 soldiers residing in the city garrison consumed locally produced agricultural products. Just prior to rail development, the city’s population stood at 7,035. Within only a few years, however, the population grew to 10,000, and London was incorporated as a city in 1855. Just prior to the summer of 1856, when London attained city status, the Erringtons were busy setting up house.

---


28 McCalla, *Planting the Province*, 201-203.

29 Dates for the creation of these railways are for the acts of incorporation, not the opening of the rail. In most cases, construction followed shortly after, within two to three years. See J.M.S. Careless, *The Union of the Canadas: The Growth of Canadian Institutions, 1841-1857* (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Ltd., 1967), 143.

30 McCalla, *Planting the Province*, 201-203.


33 James Henderson notes that the population of the garrison fluctuated due to colonial requirements, but that ranges between 409 and 521 were experienced during these two decades. James Henderson, “A Study of the British Garrison in London, Canada West (Later Ontario), 1838-1869” (master’s thesis, The University of Western Ontario, 1967), v-8 and 20-23.

34 *Census of Canada, 1851*, “Population of the Counties, Cities, and Towns of Upper Canada, as returned in the Census of 1851,” xvii.
On Cities, People, and Networks

It is doubtful that Frederick Errington’s diary for 1855, if it had survived, would have an entry recording the day on which London became an official city. More often he wrote about the daily tasks of the farm. Both American and Canadian historians have noted that steady urbanization throughout the continent was one of the major transitions of the nineteenth century, and it is a major theme in the historiography. From Conzen’s early study of Madison, Wisconsin, to Cronon’s larger, Chicago-based study, American historians have examined the relationship between the process of urban growth and rural society through the lens of commodity-centred trade systems. They have examined the import and processing of commodities, from natural resources to agricultural products and even to financial systems and investment. For them, the story of urban growth is one of market and environmental integration.

In the Canadian case, the analysis of the urban/rural relationship began with Careless’ metropolitan thesis. Careless was the strongest advocate of Canadian “metropolitanism” – the idea that “large cities not only dominate their own countryside but smaller cities and their countrysides, economically, socially, politically, and culturally.” While these discussions of rural/urban relationships

35 Urbanization is here viewed as a process, rather than as a movement. For a further discussion on the term urbanization, see Chapter 2 of Canadian Cities in Transition: New Directions in the Twenty-First Century, edited by Trudi Bunting (Don Mills, Ontario: Oxford University Press, 2010); and Clare Mitchell, “Making Sense of Counterurbanization,” Journal of Rural Studies 20/1 (January 2004), 14-34.
37 The idea of market and environmental integration fits with the “heartland and the hinterland” narrative, whereby “heartlands,” according to McCann, are defined as centres of population integrated into a market system. The narrative is also related to Friedmann and Miller’s “urban field,” in which an understanding of cities are seen as part of an ecology in which metropolises interact with their peripheries. See L.D. McCann, A Geography of Canada: Heartland and Hinterland (Scarborough: Prentice-Hall, 1982); and John Friedman and John Miller, “The Urban Field,” Journal of the American Institute of Planners 31/4 (1965), 312-320.
were fundamental to a preliminary understanding about the growth of Canadian cities, they tended to, as Widdis noted in his study of Bellville, “picture the countryside as a passive entity, shaped by urban centres” and see farmers and farm families as residing in a landscape that was only a peripheral part of the “city story.” Since then, historians have brought rural people and their agency into the story of city development. Cronon, looking at the American Mid West, for example, argued that rural people contributed to the urban-oriented infrastructure through their participation in a new national trade system, by shipping meat, grain, and timber to the city and opening products to consumption, trade and speculation. Widdis argued that Belleville, instead of industrializing and growing to dominate the surrounding countryside in the nineteenth century, responded to the local needs for a distribution and purchasing centre for agricultural work. Crerar, looking at late-nineteenth and early twentieth-century rural/urban relations in Ontario, found as well that the urban-domination story was not so straightforward. Even into the twentieth century, he argued, rural people regularly crossed the physical urban/rural boundary, by moving in and out of cities, and the discursive boundary, by blending the two worlds together via letter writing and communications.

These later investigations suggest that much more can be learned about rural/urban relations when cities themselves are not at the centre of the story. As Sandwell has made clear, rural society in and of itself is deserving of historians’ attention since large proportions of the Canadian population remained rural well into the twentieth century. In other words, by looking at individuals within the countryside, historians can ask questions about the ways in which the urban-development phenomenon

---

40 Randy Widdis, “Belleville and Environ: Continuity Change and the Integration of Town and Country During the 19th Century,” Urban History Review 19/3 (February 1991), 182.
42 Widdis, “Belleville and Environ,” 186.
was experienced, negotiated, and managed throughout the nineteenth century by rural people themselves. This dissertation looks at such rural agency by following the lead of those historians who, noted above, examined market integration and capitalist development. They proved particularly adept at highlighting the agency of farmers in the developing modern economy insofar as they discussed the role that rural people played in economic change, and in doing so they also identified spatial aspects involved in the economy which will feature importantly in this thesis.

Pentland was one of the first Canadian historians to analyse the development of capitalism in Upper Canada and place rural society at the centre of change. He saw the arrival of the rural Irish and their provision of labour to others as the mark of an emerging capitalist economy, thereby making the countryside the site of an important economic transition. In the 1990s, Bouchard presented Saguenay farmers as participants in a capitalist economy through occasional market contact, and Loewen argued that his western Canadian Mennonites showed a similar mediation of economic change through their willingness to access the Winnipeg economy. Importantly, both authors argued that such contact did not commit farmers to full-scale agrarian capitalism or its ethic, showing that rural people could alter the level to which they chose to participate in the marketplace and retain many aspects of their former way of life. Craig, in 2009, also saw her Madawaska farmers as participating in a market that contained capitalists, but argued that they were more commercially minded than capitalist since farm households avoided the exploitation of labour (except their own) and were more interested in raising their standards of living and accessing consumer goods than extracting profit from multiple investments. It was rural merchants instead, she says, that caused the “capitalist penetration of the countryside”. Whether farmers or merchants were responsible, however, Craig sees change as developing from within

46 Bouchard, “Marginality, Co-Integration and Change”; Loewen, Family Church and Market.
47 Craig, Backwoods Consumers and Homespun Capitalists, 19-20.
48 Craig, Backwoods Consumers and Homespun Capitalists, 113-114.
the countryside rather than being forced upon it from outside sources, and rural people as able to negotiate market participation. This brings us to the essential component of space and location that is involved in such economic change.

As Craig said, local markets “mattered – and they mattered a lot.”\(^49\) This is a common thread running through the studies of nineteenth-century capitalist development, and it is the spatial aspect of rural life that this dissertation highlights since it was in local spaces that “the everyday” took place. Craig, Bouchard, Little, Loewen, Samson, and Sylvester, among others, have all showed that “the local” was at the heart of rural life. Bouchard, for example, said that distant markets were accessed not for the purpose of profit, but out of a desire to preserve local ties and culture. In this sense, he presented a differentiation between the “société globale” and that of the local, rural Saguenay community. For him, the extra-regional and international economies were accessed by local peoples for local reasons, and he noted a value difference within each of the two economies.\(^50\) Little, in his study of Kinnear’s Mills, Eastern Townships, also referenced the existence of these two economies – one being an industrial-capitalist market from without, and the other a “traditional” one, made up of locals and defined by common culture, religion, and familial values. The Kinnear’s Mills community, he says, was actually fractured when community members speculated in the outside economy rather than continuing to invest locally as they had done for generations.\(^51\) Sylvester, discussing the “Montcalmois” of Manitoba, argued that farmers avoided “financial entanglements with outsiders” and that this limited their engagements with capitalism and created, for a time, a tightly knit rural society.\(^52\) Like the others, Sylvester described one economy as external and distant, and another as local and community-oriented.

In all of these important studies, a differentiation between local, rural economies, and extra-regional

\(^{49}\) Craig, *Backwoods Consumers and Homespun Capitalists*, 8.  
\(^{50}\) Bouchard, “Marginality, Co-Integration and Change,” 25.  
\(^{52}\) Sylvester, *The Limits of Rural Capitalism*, 9.
trade systems has been described. The feature fits with Ruth Sandwell’s argument that there was a difference between local, rural cultures and distant, urban ones. Indeed, she argued that Saltspring Island’s agricultural community, while it co-existed with nineteenth-century capitalism, urbanization, and modernization, lived differently. As expressed in her earlier work, she argued “people living outside towns and cities...behaved and thought in ways that were different from their urban counterparts.”

Thus, a spatial element has been identified in these works which needs further examination. This is precisely what this dissertation seeks to interrogate. By looking at farmers and their participation in local and distant networks of exchange, the text here puts farmers’ experiences first and it considers space as a variable. I examine the rural/urban relationship by studying specific farm families near the City of London, their primary centre of distant trade, and their everyday participation in local spaces. The growth of cities was not just a phenomenon experienced within urban boundaries, but was lived and shared by rural people who engaged with them.

*The Diarists and Families*

In order to hone in on the daily experiences of the farmers and their families, I employ a micro-historical approach focusing on the Errington family of Westminster Township, their neighbours the Glens, and the Adams family of Delaware Township. Each left a set of farm diaries, detailing their daily activities, which are examined here. The surviving diaries for the Erringtons begin in 1856; the Glens’ in 1866; and the Adams’ in the early 1880s, their first full year of records being 1884. For the 1850s and 1860s period, then, the Errington and Glen diaries are used; and for the 1870s to the 1890s, all three sets are employed.

---

While other diaries from the county were available, the Errington, Glen, and Adams diaries were chosen because of their appropriateness for studying urban and rural networks over time.\(^5\) First, each of the three diaries span multiple decades, which was important for analyzing change and measuring family life cycle — the Errington and Glen diaries each spanned half a century or more, and the Adams diaries more than three decades. Other diaries, however, such as those of John Jamieson (discussed below), covered only a few short years (1852-1854) and would not have been as fruitful for HGIS mapping. Second, each of the diarists recorded both economic and social exchanges, and they did so consistently over multiple decades. Since this thesis seeks to show how social and economic networks overlapped with one another, these features were necessary. Finally, the diarists each operated farms which were of a size that made them fairly comparable to others in the region — namely, medium to large-sized farms (between 50 and 200 acres) — and they were each Protestant and of British Isles origin, so their stories can be viewed as somewhat representative of this class of farmer, numerous in Middlesex.\(^5\) Altogether, the three diaries are able to tell a story through the use of HGIS which is suggestive of the social and economic lives of other nineteenth-century, Middlesex County agriculturalists.

The study ends in 1896 — just prior to the Queen’s Diamond Jubilee and Laurier’s term as prime minister, and during the last full year of Frederick Erringtons’ diary records. The ending in 1896 is appropriate not just because it marked the end of the source base, but also because it fits with the view that the decades between the 1850s and the 1890s formed a distinct era. By 1850, Gilmour commented

\(^5\) In this author’s initial searches for diaries of southwestern Ontario farmers, thirteen diarists from Middlesex were considered and reviewed, including the Errington, Glen, and Adams diaries. The others were not chosen because of either: their inconsistency in recording habits, illegibility of the diaries, in part or in full, short coverage of time, lacking of social and economic detail of farming operations, their location in parts of southwestern Ontario not covered by the HGIS, or their diaries being chronologically too distant from the dates of the maps consulted for the HGIS. These diarists (in chronological order) include: James Rawlings (1838-1843); Thomas Spencer Niblock (1849-1852); John Jamieson (1852-1854); Admiral John Nelson Conrad (1864-1871); Rev. Lachlan McPherson (1870); Robert Oakes (1866-1872); William Neno (1870); Alexander MacDougald (1870s to 1920s); Wesley Phelps Charlton (1889-1938); and Catharine Fallows (1899-1903).

\(^5\) See below and Chapter 3 for a discussion of farm size.
in his examination of early industrialization, most parts of southwestern Ontario had been sufficiently settled; between 1850 and 1890 the rail networks in the region were first developed and almost fully completed; and industrialization expanded in urban centres.\textsuperscript{56} Further, according to McCann, the era is important because it was after Confederation that a “metropolitan presence” could be felt in Ontario as Canadian regions began to interact more, especially after the beginning of the National Policy in the late-1870s and growing entrepreneurial influence.\textsuperscript{57} The study therefore begins at the end of initial settlement, sees the region through the initial development of railways and early industrialization, and ends just before the Laurier years.

The narrative that follows shows that some aspects of pioneer life continued into the 1850s and 1860s. Seasonal change, part of agricultural life generally, continued to dictate production and trade as the seasons shaped the contours of farmers’ participation in local and distant networks of trade. In some seasons, for example, farming remained a highly localized experience because of the weather’s impact on agricultural production and travel conditions, and in others farmers were able to travel to the city more often to trade or source goods.

During the later period, the 1870s to the 1890s, the families’ patterns of behaviour began to change as roads and rail transport improved and London’s demand for agricultural products and the services it provided increased. They began to make weekly or even more frequent trips to London, and to a lesser extent St. Thomas, to sell as they had earlier and also to consume. While their journey into the city was still seasonal in nature, their engagement with distant networks of trade slowly became more regular and an increasingly important part of their lives. As their distant networks further developed, however, so too did their local networks; families did not engage in city activity at the expense of rural networks. Instead, each family continued their involvement within their local

\textsuperscript{56} James Gilmour, \textit{Spatial Evolution of Manufacturing: Southern Ontario, 1851-1891} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1972), 10-11.

\textsuperscript{57} L.D. McCann, \textit{A Geography of Canada}, 25-27.
community and neighbourhood networks at the same time as they developed their urban-oriented networks. The family farm relied on the help of other farmers, labourers, and tradespeople in the neighbourhood and community. Their diaries demonstrate these webs of local interaction. Social activities also remained rurally based, from the 1850s on, reinforcing local work connections. The study therefore comes to the conclusion that while interaction with the city came to occupy an important part of the experience of nineteenth-century farming, it did not overtake local, rural ties.

The choice to study rural “families” is a reasonable one based on the sources that exist and the nature of family farming. Neth, commenting on American Midwest, argued this point clearly. She noted that when studying agriculture it is beneficial to place “the family” at the centre of analysis because “farm people understand their lives” through the social relationships of this group. Even individualistic farmers, she said, depended on their kin to work the land.58 In Canada, Craig echoed this point in her study of Madawaska, noting the necessity of women and children’s labour to the long-term viability of a farm.59 Because of this mutual dependency, this thesis promotes the idea that family farms were built upon a social contract between their members, rather than viewing them as small-scale firms headed by a patriarch. Farms headed by parents, for example, depended upon children’s labour just as children depended upon parents for other provisions, and husbands depended on wives for their labour and efforts even though men were legally the “heads” of the household. Whereas Cohen and Parr promoted the latter view, showing women and children, respectively, as giving their labour to the heads-of-household in an unequal relationship, I view the household as de Vries has defined it: as the “unit of co-residence and reproduction, of production and labour power, of consumption and distribution among its

members, and of transmission across generations.\textsuperscript{60} De Vries’ definition, from his study of western industrialization, retains the idea that the farm household was central to production, which Cohen would accept and which is important for an understanding of urban/rural market relations, without sacrificing the idea of familial interdependence that Neth and Craig identify. In southwestern Ontario, the family farm was indeed the mode of production and the defining rural social institution. The focus on family is common in Canadian rural history generally, as well, for similar reasons. From Little’s Scottish-Canadian crofters and French-Canadian habitants to Wilson’s Ontario tenant and “beeing” families, and to the western-Canadian families of Loewen and Sylvester, historians have identified that the rural family was integral to settlement, the employment of economic strategies, and the negotiation of cultural change.\textsuperscript{61} This study therefore follows the lead of this genre of rural historical investigation, while also connecting it to the broader context of urban development and regional integration.

\textit{Defining Neighbourhood and Community, Working with Diaries}

Neth further identified that farm families did not exist in isolation from others. Farms and the families that ran them were enmeshed in a web of community and neighbourhood associations, whether farm families, workers, town dwellers, or others.\textsuperscript{62} In order to understand rural change between 1856 and 1896, this thesis focuses on this web of local networks, including neighbourhood and community, and places it centre-stage, but adds to it the networks of trade that existed between city


\textsuperscript{61} John Irvine Little, \textit{Crofters and Habitants: Settler Society, Economy, and Culture in a Quebec Township, 1848-1881} (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 1991); Catharine A. Wilson, \textit{Tenants in Time: Family Strategies, Land, and Liberalism in Upper Canada, 1799-1871} (Toronto: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2009), and “Reciprocal Work Bees and the Meaning of Neighbourhood,” \textit{The Canadian Historical Review} 82/3 (September 2001), 431-464; Royden Loewen, \textit{Family, Church, and Market and Diaspora in the Countryside: Two Mennonite Communities and Mid-Twentieth-Century Rural Disjuncture} (Toronto: University of Toronto Press), 2006; Sylvester, \textit{The Limits of Rural Capitalism}.

\textsuperscript{62} Neth, \textit{Preserving the Family Farm}, 2.
and country. Therefore, the thesis will examine three types of networks. Two that were “local,” consisting of 1) neighbourhood and 2) community networks, and 3) others that were “distant,” involving urban-oriented trade.

Neighbourhood networks and community networks were important to the Erringtons, Glens, and Adams, though each network was somewhat different and defined by different qualities. This is not to say that they were hierarchically ordered or separate, but that they can simply be understood to have served varied functions and uses. The key defining feature of both local networks was proximity, so space is integrated within the definition. As Bulten described, space can be “an actor or agent in the creation and transformation of daily life and social networks”, insofar as propinquity is “a tool” that can “facilitate interaction”. Similarily, according to Mayol, local space is where the social contracts that make “everyday life...possible” are forged. For rural historical geographers, such as John Clarke, this idea of everyday, local interaction was the basis upon which relationships between settlers of Upper Canada (Ontario) were built. In this sense, borrowing from Donald Lafreniere’s interpretation, in his study of nineteenth-century urban Ontario, close social relations were correlated with close spatial relations. Therefore, it was within “the local” that we can find the densest networks, since living nearby one another helped foster more frequent social contact, whether in the fields, on the roads, or in the farmhouses themselves. Within neighbourhood networks, however, there was also the important element of intimacy, which, as Wellman revealed in his study of East Yorkers and Wilson has discussed

---

66 Donald Lafreniere adopted Robert Park’s idea “that social relations are inevitably correlated with spatial relations” – in other words, physical distance can both make and unmake social relationships. He also employed Chombart de Laveu’s idea of the “Hierarchy of Social Spaces,” which relates frequency of contact with closeness in physical proximity. See Donald Lafreniere, “Reconstructing Patterns of Daily Life in the Nineteenth-Century City: A Historical GIS Approach” (PhD thesis, The University of Western Ontario, 2014), 19-20.
in her study of bees, was the foundation for social support mechanisms. This is because strong
neighbourhood ties between very close kin, such as parents and children, allowed for the accruement of
social capital, the provision of aid, emotional and financial, as well as companionship and services,
whereas community networks featured spatial closeness but were usually without a sense of intimacy
and mutual familial reliance.67

Thus, within “the local” there were two types of networks – those that were built upon frequent
interaction and spatial closeness (community) and those that were built upon both frequent interaction,
close proximity and social intimacy and bonding. This text utilises the terms “community networks” and
“neighbourhood networks” to delineate the two types. Importantly, each existed within the local
“space” of the countryside, nearby the homes of the diarists. Community networks were most similar to
Dennis’ interpretation of community, which he defined “as people from the same area sharing the same
attitudes, beliefs and interests, and expressing their commonality of interest through social
interaction”.68 Community networks were therefore built upon frequent interaction and association, as
fostered in local space. Neighbourhood networks, however, were similarly localized and propinquitous
but more deeply characterized by social support and bonding.69 This interpretation of neighbourhood is
extended here beyond the family to include social interactions between people living nearby who
shared the provision of aid and emotional support, similar to the pattern described by Wilson in her
study of reciprocal work bees.70 As Walsh and High, Wellman, and Wilson noted, community and

67 Barry Wellman, “The Community Question: The Intimate Networks of East Yorkers,” *American Journal of
Sociology* 84/5 (1979), 1201-1231; Barry Wellman and Scot Wortley, “Different Strokes from Different Folks:
Community Ties and Social Support,” *American Journal of Sociology* 96/3 (November 1990), 558-588; Wilson,
“Reciprocal Work Bees.” On social capital, see Robert Putnam, *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of
68 Richard Dennis, *English Industrial Cities of the Nineteenth Century* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press,
1984), 270.
69 Wellman, “The Community Question.”
neighbourhood must be seen as a process.\textsuperscript{71} In this sense, they were fluid networks; members of one network might easily become members of another.

Distant networks were based upon infrequent associations with non-locals. It was this type of network that was forged through trade between the diarists’ families and urbanites in London, and to a lesser extent in St. Thomas, a small urban centre in Elgin County which became a city in the 1870s, at the midpoint of this study. For all three families throughout the period examined here, distant exchanges were occasional, either weekly or less-than-weekly, and were not part of the day-to-day experience of agriculture and country living. Additionally, many of the exchanges were impersonal – the diarists rarely mentioned by name the people in cities with whom they traded, unless they were the representatives of a large business or were well-known people. Instead, the network featured the buying and selling of items without overlapping business or familial relationships. Taking into account Lafreniere’s observation, this lack of frequent, urban-based social relationships makes sense since the lack of proximity between country and city residents prevented frequency of contact throughout the nineteenth century.

This thesis is based on farm diaries, an underused but highly valuable type of source material. At face value, farm diaries appear banal and deficient. This is largely because their entries often are short and lacking in descriptive detail – they do not lend themselves easily to narrative construction. One Middlesex County farm diarist, for example, wrote on May 30, 1839, “Planing siding Tiffany came to work I went fishing and caught 7 fine day”.\textsuperscript{72} This entry not only withholds telling us what the siding being planed is for, but it is also without a description of who “Tiffany” is, where the farmer went to fish, what it meant to be a “fine day,” or the ideal temperature or climate. For these reasons, few would undertake to read a farmer’s diary with the relish that one might pick up the detailed letters of a

\textsuperscript{71} Walsh and High, “Rethinking the Concept of Community”; Wellman, “The Community Question”; and Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees.”

\textsuperscript{72} Rawlings, Diary of James Rawlings.
nineteenth-century novelist, politician, or Parisian flaneur. This is because, as Carter says, farm diaries are similar to account-book diaries which are “not immediately forthcoming” and they require a mediator to uncover their hidden information. Once interpreted, however, “they are...a richer source than they might initially seem.”

A variety of other historians have shown that this is in fact the case – that daily diaries are rich, narrative-inspiring sources. Laurel Thatcher Ulrich found that it was within the “very exhaustive repetitious dailiness” of Martha Ballard’s diary that its historical usefulness lay and that, when such sources are read within the historical context of their time and place, “they can be extraordinarily revealing.” Other historians followed Ulrich’s lead, and they too found similar results. Anderson, for example, was able to see the world of the seventeenth-century Connecticut farmer within Thomas Minor’s agricultural diary. Through its entries, Anderson was able to understand the centrality of “the dignity of labor” to the farmer’s life, which fit with the protagonist’s New England Puritan character, and the importance of family and Minor’s own identity as “a farmer.” Additionally, like Ulrich, McCarthy and Carter looked at female diarists and their records. While McCarthy found that the diaries themselves became central to the women’s ability to interpret and shape their own lives, Carter saw in Emma Chadwick’s account-book diary details about the economic role of a mid-nineteenth-century, P.E.I. farm-woman. Each historian approached the complexity of these diaries in order to understand their recorders and contexts and found that, with a careful reading and matching with other sources, they could offer important and significant historical detail. Since their writing, Wilson has termed this

73 Kathryn Carter, “An Economy of Words: Emma Chadwick Stretch’s Account Book Diary, 1859-1860,” Acadiensis 29/1 (Autumn 1999), 44.
74 Laurel Thatcher Ulrich, A Midwife’s Tale: the Life of Martha Ballard, Based on her Diary, 1785-1812 (New York: Knopf, 1990), 25.
77 Carter, “An Economy of Words.”
style of investigation of diaries as “focussed digs,” a method which allows her to uncover the density of relationships supporting a particular event, for example, between farm families and their members, though the diaries do not immediately make apparent such relations.\footnote{Catharine Wilson, “Procuring Help: Neighbourhood Exchange Networks and Ontario Farm Diaries” (presentation at the Rural History Roundtable Symposium, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, November 2012).}

Despite the benefits, these diaries can also be problematic sources. The first criticism is the problem of scale: the diaries offer only the particular weltanshauung of their recorders, usually one person’s or one family’s perspective. As Anderson stated regarding her New England diarist, “no claim can be made that Minor’s experiences represented in every instance those of his fellow colonists.”\footnote{Anderson, “Thomas Minor’s World,” 499.} In essence, Anderson reminded readers that historians using diaries must be mindful that their protagonists are not necessarily representative of the society writ large.

The following study, therefore, offers a detailed history of the three families alone in one particular county and admits that other farmers may have acted differently at any given time. That said, the narratives that follow involve more than just the Erringtons, the Glens, and the Adams since none of these three families lived in isolation, in a historical vacuum, or absent from other individuals and groups. Given the nature of nineteenth-century agricultural work, families regularly called upon others for assistance. Also, while the study offers a history of the families themselves, those very same idiosyncratic stories are deeply intertwined with the lives of other farmers, town dwellers, urbanites, and anyone else with whom they came into contact. So, because the history that follows also studies and listens to the wider society of the farm families, it is suggestive of the lives of others as well.

There is also the problematic issue of the gender and class of the diarists. Though diary keeping was considered to be an activity that was as beneficial for both nineteenth-century men and women,\footnote{McCarthy, “A Pocketful of Days,” 285-286.} the diarists studied in this study are all male – Frederick Errington, James Glen, and Thomas Adams.
They were husbands and fathers within their families and managers of their farms (i.e. they possessed the land title, paid their workers, etc.). So we must rely upon Frederick, James, and Thomas to tell us about the activities of their wives, children, parents, and siblings. This can have positive and negative consequences. Frederick, for example, made a habit of recording Matilda’s activities quite often (almost daily); however, usually he gave a better image of her social activities than her farm production activities. Thomas, in contrast, regularly noted when his daughters and wife Rosalia contributed labour, but James was much less detailed, often grouping Rose’s activities within the first or second-person pronouns “we” or “they” rather than discussing what Rose did as an individual. We must read between the lines and pay attention to the silences in the diaries on women’s activity, therefore, to attempt to understand farm women’s role in the rural economy.

While these limits remain problematic in the study, it can be argued that the children’s and wives’ labours are a part of the story nevertheless, since the family unit or group is what is being discussed. I have made every effort possible to highlight women’s activities. In Chapter 3, for example, in the discussion of each family’s dairy and fowl-related sales, the contribution of the women to market activity is discussed in full. Further, the thesis discusses how farm women’s absence from certain activities, such as from regular market-going and city-based buying and selling, references the limits of their experiences as well.

Finally, each diarist had his own style of recording. While Frederick Errington, James Glen, and Thomas Adams all wrote about similar tasks – travelling to the city, harrowing, hoeing, or plowing, choring, working with livestock, or others – each only documented what he wanted to remember or what he thought was of importance. Thus, certain types of trades which are contained in some are left out in others. As discussed more fully in Chapter 2, for example, Frederick rarely recorded information about small purchases such as groceries and dry goods, whereas James kept track of every such
exchange. These styles of recording prevent us from comparing each farmer’s diaries with one another in a fully quantifiable way. We can, however, analyse each individual family’s exchange trends over time by comparing the records of one decade to another. Also, where gaps in one diary exist, the others can help fill their place. While the diarists’ recording habits are difficult, they do not fully prevent historical knowledge or analysis.

Additionally, these families represent a particular class of farmer. Though each farmer’s land holdings and property values are discussed in more detail in the following chapters, they were all within the middle-class type of farmer examined by Darroch, possessing medium-sized farms – between 70 and 169 acres of land as of 1871. In other words, each had a level of “scanty fortune” which grew in size over the course of the study period, was modestly financially secure, and was able to produce enough agricultural products for family and market without the need for extensive off-farm labour. They also invested in farm machinery, which contributed to their daily patterns of behaviour and neighbourhood participation. At the same time they were not so well off that they could fully rely on hired, full-time help. Each family was, in essence, a full-time family farm, engaged in the work of agriculture with their own labour and that of friends and neighbours at harvest or for other farm projects. It should be no surprise that it was these types of families who had the time and inclination to keep a farm diary: they took pride in their accomplishments, had the opportunity to write daily, and required constant record keeping to account for work and goods given and received.

Finally, the diaries are also somewhat limited because of the amount of material they offer – not too little, but too much. As Ulrich stated, Ballard’s diary was problematic because it produced such a wide array of stories that could not be recovered in a single study, or absorbed in a single read, as each
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81 Gordon Darroch, “Scanty Fortune and Rural Middle-Class Formation in Ontario,” The Canadian Historical Review 79/4 (December 1998), 634-35. It should be noted that Thomas Adams’ diary begins in the 1880s, so later than Darroch’s 1871 figure. Middlesex County Land Property Records, Abstract Index to Deeds, Delaware Township and Westminster Township, 1780-1920 (Reels E-33T-021 and E-33T-005), Middlesex County Land Registry Office, Ground Floor, 100 Dundas Street, London, Ontario.
entry only teased readers with glimpses at life and society. It is up to the historian to piece together these glimpses in order to form a readable and analytically useful history. Given that the history in the text that follows studies three families’ diaries, involving daily entries over the course of five decades for the Erringtons (1856 to 1896); four for the Glens (1866 to 1896); and two for the Adams (1884 and 1894), the problem of the volume of information is ever present. As Carter said, however, with a mediator, the diaries can be put to use. In this text, the mediator is both the historian and the HGIS.

Method

Due to the size and breadth of the diaries, not every year has been transcribed for HGIS mapping – this would have led to more information than could easily be handled or interpreted. Instead, the first full year of each diary was used, followed by the tenth year, twentieth, and so on until 1896. For the Errington diary the years used were therefore 1856, 1866, 1876, 1886, and 1896. For the Glen diary, I used 1866, 1876, 1886, and 1896, and for the Adams diary I used 1884 and 1894. The diary records were then incorporated within an HGIS built upon georeferenced historical maps and atlases, census and voting records, and county directories. Assembled together, they create a highly detailed HGIS, of which I can ask questions about these diarists and their local and distant exchanges and see patterns emerge.

Usually, diaries are mined for quotations, narratives, or local detail. By using an HGIS, this thesis examines farm diaries in a systematic and analytical way. As will be seen below, the maps uncover information about the relationship between local and distant networks and changing life cycle, urban and rural markets, the buying and selling of goods, and the continued overlapping of farmers’ social and economic lives. Additionally, the HGIS allows information in the diaries to be quantified, which lends a sense of concreteness to the overall narrative. While being a highly useable tool for historical analysis,

82 Ulrich, A Midwife’s Tale, 25.
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HGIS does have its shortcomings. One issue in particular is the problem of time. The assemblage of the material needed for an HGIS is quite involved – one must first locate the appropriate maps, and then one must digitize and georeference them in order to use them in GIS software. All in, the process can span months if not years. It is for this reason that many HGIS studies in Canada have tended to be large in scale, involving multiple contributors and a sharing of resources, and be concentrated on specific geographies – such as those which have recently looked at Montreal, Victoria, or London, Ontario.\(^8^4\) Incorporating diaries into an HGIS complicates the process, as the diaries must be first transcribed and then transferred into a useable database that can be uploaded into a mapping program. Thus, this thesis’ application of HGIS to diaries and its focus on a rural region and its relationship with an urban centre is unique, something that was beyond the scope of these urban-concentrated HGIS studies. The rural perspective that this work brings to the topic, in essence, makes the whole process a worthwhile investment.

In order to make the diaries workable for HGIS, they had to be broken down into “events” that could be mapped into single points. An event is defined as a diary record of an act of exchange, either social or economic. Because some events were economic events, with exchanges of goods or services involved, and others were social events where no material exchange occurred, each type was defined somewhat differently. Economic events were defined by a single exchange of a product or a service. Each time an item was purchased or sold this was considered an “act” of exchange, and therefore an economic event. In a January 7, 1876 entry, for example, James Glen wrote “Straightening up old shed A McPherson and Willie helped me Jobbing Stationary 40c Jerry 1.10 Watts 25c Fine Day.”\(^8^5\) While this is a


\(^{85}\) Glen Diary.
single day, and only one shed was fixed, the entry actually contains seven economic events: both A. McPherson and Willie sold their act of helping to James (two events), James also worked on the shed himself and “jobbed,” performing acts of labour on his own farm (two events), he bought stationary from Glanworth (one event), and then finally he paid his workers Jerry and Watts for their labour services performed earlier that week – the final two events for that day. Each event was thereby mapped in the HGIS, so that six were placed on Glen’s farm and one in the town of Glanworth. At times the actual location of an event was not recorded, such as James’ stationary purchase; however, by reading all of the Glen diaries it is clear that James bought stationary most often from the general store in the town, and he did not make a trip to London that day, nor did his children. Similarly, the same patterns have been ciphered in the Errington and Adams diaries. Therefore, when such an event was noted, it was fairly easy to locate it. Whenever this was not possible, the events simply were not mapped – however, this occurred less than 10 percent of the time.

Each “act” of trading or socialising received the nominal value of “1” when it came time to map patterns of distribution in London, Glanworth, or elsewhere. So a single trade of 10 lbs of butter in London, for example, received the same spatial weight as a single trade of 1 lb of butter on a neighbour’s farm. This may seem to discount the volume and value of trades occurring in the city in favour of local trades. Though high volumes were often sold in London, it should be remembered that what is being mapped is not the amount (volume or weight) of goods and commodities, but rather the acts of trade out of which networks were formed or maintained. Each act, in this sense, was an equal event no matter the amount or cost of the item exchanged. The method counts moments in farmer’s lives, not commodities.

Social events had no material exchange involved – so a single gathering was regarded as a single event rather than broken down into its component parts. This was somewhat easier to do for the Glens,
for example, since James almost always noted where these events occurred, usually at his churches, his home, or other farmers’ homes. An example from June 2, 1896, describes this well. James wrote “Dave and Nettie and Geo and Annie here visiting.” As with economic events, while this was a single gathering of people, the involvement of the four relatives meant that the entry was mapped as four social acts, one for each member who visited. The study therefore relies on each diarist’s own records, and how they viewed the visiting occasion themselves. James could have written “the Turnbulls” visited, which would have included both Nettie and David Turnbull, thereby assigning the event as one. Since he chose to see the event as one between he and the other four individuals, the social event therefore contained socialising exchanges between multiple actors. In this sense, the HGIS maps how Frederick, James, and Thomas recorded events as much as it maps and counts what they felt was of note.

Occasionally, the lines between economic and social events were blurred. At a county fair, for example, a significant number of trades and purchases most certainly would have occurred and yet the event also could be considered very much a social gathering. This ambiguity is a problem noted by Sweeny, who said that economic relationships could very well contain a social component – such as trust between families and the extension of credit. In these instances, the deciding factor was whether or not a material good or service was exchanged by the diarist or a member of his family. If this occurred, then the event was considered economic; however, if an exchange was not recorded, the event was defined as social. When both were noted, such as if a diarist went to visit a family for tea but also bought a sack of potatoes, these events were separated so that neither the economic nor the social components were discounted. As with any methodology the choice in how to record and count information dictates, to a certain degree, the end result. The methodology here, however, was created

---

86 Glen Diary.
out of a holistic involvement with the sources and the diarists’ own recording habits and the needs of the HGIS. Primarily, the incorporation of error was avoided by ensuring that these methodological rules were clearly defined and strictly adhered to.

What is noticeably absent from these categories of events are those types that took place without the meeting of two persons through face-to-face contact. Many historians have examined these non-physically defined communities in the past few decades as part of a furthering of Benedict Anderson’s *Imagined Communities* paradigm. Cultural historians succeeded in this by studying contact made through media sources and letter writing. Korineck’s study of 1960s Canadian women who found relationships with other women in the pages of *Chatelaine* magazine is one of the most prominent examples. The nineteenth-century equivalent, as Noel has shown in her study of Upper and Lower Canadian sociability, was letter writing. Noel shows that habits of correspondence in Upper and Lower Canada maintained communal bonds and a sense of intimacy between family and friends over long distances. Adam Crerar, too, has argued that at times letter writing could bridge the urban and the rural world for those who had recently left the countryside for cities. Each historian has been able to show that one did not need to be physically present with another in order to establish a relationship, or maintain one that had already existed, since print could serve as a surrogate means of contact.

While the relationships shown in these studies were important, and even fundamental, to certain communities in North America, especially recently arrived immigrant communities, they are not the primary concern here. This is because letter writing and media contact occurred without the involvement of two or more persons in a common physical space. There was no handshake, no meeting

---

on a street, and no buggy ride during interaction, and the actors were clearly in different locations. In some sense these relationships were without the grit of real contact, or the shared experience of being together in a tangible space at the same moment in time. These “communications communities” require a different set of analysis than that offered here, where shared physical space is the defining feature.

Chapter 2 examines economic networks during the early years of urban growth in southwestern Ontario, looking at the Errington family in 1856 and the Erringtons and Glens in 1866. In this period, distant/urban buying and selling was occasional and seasonal change shaped their participation in the system. The families also traded with, lived, and worked alongside neighbours and community members, often kin or church members, which added to the localised experience of their day-to-day networks. Chapter 3 describes the diversification and industrialisation of the City of London, and the smaller urban centre of St. Thomas, which contributed to their growing influence in the region from the 1870s to the 1890s. It then looks at the expansion of urban networks for the Erringtons, Glens and Adams families which accorded with these developments. Each family, it will be seen, traded in the city more often and throughout the year.

Examining the same era, Chapter 4 shows how the growing urban influence of London and St. Thomas intertwined with the work of families in their own local areas. I argue that families accepted the increased urban-oriented, distant network activity while at the same time continuing and expanding their networks of local trade and association, both in small towns and on farms. Chapter 5 takes a break from the diaries and examines the institution of the rural post office during the 1870 to the 1890s era. In this chapter, co-written with Don Lafreniere, we use an HGIS that maps the locations of the homes of petitioners who demanded changes to their postal services from the Postmaster General. We show how fundamental postal services were to local landscapes, particularly the space of the post office itself which served as a node or anchor of local networks. By looking at the creation, maintenance, and
contestation of rural post office “spaces,” the efforts of rural people to maintain local ties of community and neighbourhood can be seen as practiced county-wide and not just in the diarists’ own townships.

Finally, Chapter 6 turns back to the diarist families and looks at rural social networks during the entire second half of the nineteenth century. It shows that social networks were a reinforcing part of the local, rural experience throughout both the pre and post-1870 eras. Through churchgoing, home-based visits, parties, dances, and voluntary societies, farmers remained connected with one another, buttressing the trust forged through neighbourhood networks. While social activities, such as at fairs, shows, and popularized trials, occurred in cities, rural people often attended them because of their relevance to agriculture or rural life. So, even though located physically in urban spaces, they added to rural social experiences as well.

What results from all this information is a story about urban and rural Middlesex County and the farm families who resided within it during the early years of Canadian industrialization and urbanization. The examination will show that farmers negotiated and encouraged urban development, but they did not do so at a cost to their own local communities and neighbourhoods. Instead, rural towns, families, post offices, and societies benefitted from the growth of cities and a greater connection to and with urban centres. In turn, this led to a continued rural experience “on the farm and in the town” in southwestern Ontario that was not overshadowed by the province’s metropolises.
Chapter 2: Economic Networks in Mid-Nineteenth-Century Southwestern Ontario Farming Communities

The first generations of pioneers in Middlesex County had brought with them their hopes for a safe and secure settlement, their kin, knowledge, and skills, and made their homes in the county’s townships between 1791 and the 1840s. While some were out for a quick profit and soon left, others sought permanent spaces for themselves and their families. These Upper Canadians had reshaped the land into their image of a productive rural society comprising settled communities and neighbourhoods where people met daily with kin, friends, and acquaintances and produced goods that they exchanged locally or took to market. By 1851, many of the sons and daughters of these pioneers occupied their parents’ farms. They found themselves in a region with a well-developed economy composed of two networks: one dedicated to local production and trade, where farmers worked the land with members of their own communities and neighbourhoods and exchanged goods with each other, and another oriented toward an urban market which offered an outlet for both buying and selling. The “mid-century” period (the 1850s and 1860s) shows this dual-network system at work in the countryside.

This chapter explores two major features of the rural economy at mid-century and the relationships between them. As the seasonal round of farming subtly influenced interactions, I look at farmers’ participation in the dual-network system in each season: Spring, Summer, Fall, and Winter. Spring called for the purchase of farm inputs and the plowing of fields; summer required work at home to cultivate and start to harvest the fields; fall needed frequent trips to the city to unload crops and livestock and to buy goods; and winter allowed for time to be spent travelling about or engaging in local
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90 McCalla discusses such early country/city links in McCalla, “Rural Credit and Rural Development in Upper Canada,” 265. He also notes that even small farms were able to “produce...enough to support their occupants and leave some surplus to market,” so we might think of many classes of farmers taking part in such marketing efforts, not just those with large or well-developed farms. McCalla, Planting the Province, 71.

91 Here and below I use the seasonal dates established by O’Mara – Spring, being March to May; Summer, June to August; Fall, September to November; and Winter, December through to February. See James O’Mara, “The Seasonal Round of Gentry Farmers in Early Ontario: a Preliminary Analysis,” Canadian Papers in Rural History Volume II (Gananoque, Ontario: Langdale Press, 1980), 103-112.
activities. I seek to complement the works of those historians who have examined nineteenth-century North American markets. As discussed in Chapter 1, Bouchard, Loewen, Craig, Little, and Sylvester all identified the presence of both local and extra-regional “spaces” in their studies. Bouchard discussed the “société globale” and the local Saguenay community; Loewen, the Mennonite neighbourhoods of Hanover, Manitoba, and Waterloo, Ontario, and the urban centres of Winnipeg, New Dundee, and Berlin; Craig, the rural region of Madawaska and the broader Atlantic economy; Little, the neighbourhood of Kinnear’s Mills and the external financial community; and Sylvester, the world of the French-Canadian Montcalmois and that of “outsiders.” In this chapter I analyse the seasonal nature of “local” and “distant” networks and discuss how the two were intertwined. More importantly, however, the chapter offers an image of the dual-network system leading up to the late-century period (1870 to the 1890s), the subject of later chapters, in order to establish a “base” from which to compare later changes and trends.

Here, I focus on Westminster Township, Middlesex County, by examining the Errington and Glen family farm diaries through an HGIS. During the period, the county became home to a number of railways and transportation networks, many of which led directly to nearby cities. As Christopher Clark and Kenneth Sylvester argue, it was at the level of individual families, such as the Erringtons and Glens, that the roots of rural change can be found since “people did not just respond to things, they make them happen.” Both the Errington family and the Glen family participated in these changes as they
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93 By adopting Clark and Sylvester’s interpretive stand, I seek avoid the type of technological determinism that other authors encourage (intentionally or unintentionally). In his study of the nineteenth-century Great Lakes region, for example, Bukowczyk states that early transportation networks “called forth staples surpluses in British North American…and therefore fostered Canadian settlement and administration of Upper Canada.” As discussed in Chapter 1, Widdis cautions that such statements tend to make people of the countryside seem passive and reactionary. Christopher Clark, The Roots of Rural Capitalism: Western Massachusetts, 1780-1860 (Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1990), 8; Sylvester, The Limits of Rural Capitalism, 8; John Bukowczyk, “Migration, Transportation,
sought opportunities for their farms and families. Westminster had its own particular set of spatial, demographic, and cultural circumstances and the diarists’ families differed in important ways. The Erringtons were more advanced in age, held more property, and had a larger family than the Glens. When Frederick and Matilda Errington had their first child in 1855, for example, James Glen was only 15 years of age. These familial peculiarities coloured the ways in which the Erringtons and Glens experienced and shaped their networks during the period. At the same time, each farmer had also developed a system of agriculture that was similar to the other’s, and, importantly, similar to that of residents in other parts of rural southern Ontario. 94 Both families relied on hired labour, reciprocal labour and help, lived in communities of kin and neighbours, experimented with different crop and livestock choices, and produced agricultural goods for consumption and the marketplace. 95 These features of the Errington and Glen experiences are brought out in detail in the study below.

**Historiography**

Since the 1990s, historians’ interpretations of the early and mid-nineteenth century have changed dramatically as numerous studies have shown that Upper Canadian farmers actively engaged in both local and extra-regional markets. Douglas McCalla, for example, successfully challenged the older view that the pioneer period was a time of autonomous, self-sustaining farm households that financed initial settlement via the export of wheat and lumber. In *Planting the Province*, he argued that there was “balanced, relatively self-sustaining development within the control of the dynamic economy of the
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94 For a description of the agricultural practices of other southern Ontarians, see Clarke, *The Ordinary People of Essex*, particularly Chapters 3, 4, and 5; Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees”; McCalla, *Planting the Province*; and Marvin McInnis, “Perspectives on Ontario Agriculture, 1815-1930,” in *Canadian Papers in Rural History VIII* (1992).
95 In this chapter, “help” is inclusive of voluntary labour and lending and borrowing between families or individuals. For a description of hired labour on Canadian farms, see Terry Crowley, “Rural Labour,” in *Labouring Lives: Work and Workers in Nineteenth-Century Ontario*, edited by Paul Craven (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1996), 10-103; for reciprocal labour and communities of kin see Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees”; and for crop choices and markets see McCalla, *Planting the Province*. 
North Atlantic” and that “[p]roduction for household consumption and for local markets was...as vital to
the economy’s survival and expansion as these external dimensions of the economy.” He developed
this position even more by looking at the intensity of consumption via general stores in *Consumers in the
Bush*. Here he showed that market-based purchasing activity was part of the early settlement
experience and that settlers had access to a “world of goods” from the early nineteenth century
onward. Further, Roelens and Inwood showed in their study of Leeds County household cloth
production that such home manufacturing and production was key to accessing consumer goods and
taking part in the wider marketplace. Since Livingston-Lowe found similar wool-oriented market
activity occurring within Middlesex, it is clear that agriculturalists there had made such choices as well.

These historians have shown that, throughout the Canadian colonies, rural men and women had
established well-developed internal economies as part of the settlement experience which they coupled
with extra-regional and international trade. This chapter shows that southern Westminster Township
farming conformed to these broader economic trends. More importantly, however, I examine the
connections between people via exchanges across “space” by looking specifically at the role that urban
centres, communities, and neighbourhoods played in the lives of farmers in each season of the year. I
offer a meaningful description of the relationships between “local” and “distant” spaces and, rather
than describing them as disconnected or conflicting, I highlight their complementary nature. As McCalla
identifies in *Consumers in the Bush*, American studies of the eighteenth and nineteenth-century market
often argue that during periods of rapid change or even “revolution,” “local worlds [were] brought

96 McCalla, *Planting the Province*, 5; 10 and 6.
97 McCalla’s position in this text counters the argument put forward by Greer, who said that most farm households
“operated outside of any market system”, and fits with Darroch’s estimate that while most Ontario farm families
consumed goods locally they also produced marketable surpluses. See McCalla, *Consumers in the Bush*; Greer,
“Wage Labour and the Transition to Capitalism”; and Darroch, “Scanty Fortunes,” 626. For a similar debate in the
Maritimes, see Craig, *Backwoods Consumers*.
98 Janine Roelens and Kris Inwood, “‘Labouring at the Loom’: A Case Study of Rural Manufacturing in Leeds County,
Ontario, 1870,” *Canadian Papers in Rural History Volume VI* (1990), 217.
99 Deborah Livingston-Lowe, “Counting on Customers: John Campbell, 1806-1891” (master’s thesis, University of
Guelph, 2012).
increasingly within, and under the power of, external forces”, namely capitalism and its so-called anti-communitarian ethic.\textsuperscript{100} Thus, while some historians have described a restructuring of relationships and power after the rise of “corporate capitalism…and the accompanying bureaucratic ethos,”\textsuperscript{101} I seek instead to emphasize the endurance of local and distant economic networks, from the mid-nineteenth century onward, and their complementary nature. The chapter also benefits from the views of Inwood, Craig, and McCalla as it considers the role that consumption had within the market system, since buying was as important as selling in terms of seasonal and everyday networks of exchange.

By arguing that such commercial exchange was an essential feature of early settlement, this chapter makes itself open to a criticism that has been levelled at other historians – namely that it assumes early Ontario emerged out of the development of the enactment of a laissez-faire, capitalist economic system.\textsuperscript{102} I agree with McCalla who sees commercial exchange for the “market” as a central aspect of nineteenth-century rural life. Additionally, whereas others have argued that “kin, community, and religious ties” were a preventative force which limited such market behaviour, I recognize that they worked alongside and even complemented the commercial system.\textsuperscript{103} Both, in this sense, made up the everyday experience of nineteenth-century agriculture. The choices that the diarists’ parents had made – to obtain farms near major market routes, to spend time clearing lands in order to grow more crops, to call for the building of local rail depots in nearby towns, etc. – indicate that they expected trade with

\textsuperscript{100} McCalla also finds such episodes of disjuncture in Canadian studies, identifying Sylvester’s *The Limits of Rural Capitalism* and Walden’s *Becoming Modern in Toronto* as examples, though I would add to them Little and Bouchard’s respective studies of Kinnear’s Mills and Saguenay, since they too argued that local, communitarian and extra-regional, capitalistic “worlds” were in conflict. McCalla, *Consumers in the Bush*; Sylvester, *The Limits of Rural Capitalism*; Keith Walden, *Becoming Modern in Toronto: The Industrial Exhibition and the Shaping of a Late Victorian Culture* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1997); Little, “A Crime Shrouded in Mystery”; Bouchard, “Marginality, Co-integration and Change.”


\textsuperscript{102} This point was made by Albert Schrauwers in his discussion of Douglas McCalla’s *Planting the Province*. See Albert Schrauwers, “Revolutions without a Revolutionary Moment: Joint Stock Democracy and the Transition to Capitalism in Upper Canada,” *Canadian Historical Review* 89/2 (June 2008), 230.

\textsuperscript{103} Schrauwers, “Revolutions without a Revolutionary Moment,” 231.
urban centres and the marketplace to be advantageous to their respective and collective situations, as did early governors of the colonial state. As McCalla says, “surpluses reflected intention, not just luck”. Thus, I also advance the position that such commercial exchange was established already by the 1850s in Middlesex, and I do so with a clear understanding that ties between kith and kin accompanied the economic system and were major features in their lives.

The diaries written by the Errington and Glen families show that Westminster Township had a well-developed dual-network system established by the mid-nineteenth century. First, each family accrued social capital by involving themselves within local networks of exchange comprised of community and neighbourhood members who lived and worked within the southern part of the township. The Erringtons and Glens bought and sold goods and services with kin, friends, and other local residents; this was a key part of the everyday experience of their agricultural work. Farmers traded crops and livestock, hired and reciprocally exchanged each other’s labour, and purchased the services of skilled residents, such as blacksmiths and farriers. As McCalla argues, local communities provided a market for surplus goods, allowing farmers to exchange with one another without travelling great distances. Many of these exchanges also contained the qualities of mutual familial support and trust that defines the idea of neighbourhood. As will be seen, proximity contributed significantly to fostering these local networks.

Second, the Erringtons and Glens also bought and sold goods in London and St. Thomas, urban centres
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104 McCalla, Consumers in the Bush, 128.
105 See Chapter 1 for a definition of Community and Neighbourhood.
106 Such exchanges have been shown by numerous historians to have been essential to rural development. See David Schob, Hired Hands and Plowboys: Farm Labor in the Midwest, 1815-1860 (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1975), 3; 4; Darroch, “Class in Nineteenth-Century Ontario,” 67-68; Voisey, Vulcan, 148; 221-224; Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees.” On social capital and its relationship to networks, see Putnam, Bowling Alone, 18-24.
107 McCalla, Planting the Province, 69.
108 Of course, not all local exchanges are inherently infused with a neighbourly attitude. As Daniel Samson points out, a lack of coercion in an exchange does not imply neighbourliness. But here in Westminster, the diaries show that many of them did in fact have these qualities. In David Danbom’s words, such neighbourliness served as an early “social safety net” at critical moments. Daniel Samson, The Spirit of Industry and Improvement: Liberal Government and Rural-Industrial Society, Nova Scotia, 1790-1862 (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2008), 204-205; David Danbom, Born in the Country: A History of Rural America, Second Edition (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 2006), 91.
that were connected to extra-regional and international markets and to the countryside by early road and rail development. While London had a greater variety of retail opportunities, both centres were important to these diarists. Frederick and James’ trips to the centres were largely occasional (weekly or bi-weekly). However, since they were seasonally influenced, certain times of the year intensified rural/urban contact, such as following harvest time when crops were ready for market. This meant that the two families’ day-to-day experiences remained localised and that most days were spent on their own farms or those of nearby residents.

Farming in the Mid-Century World of Railways and Cities

In the County of Middlesex, the mid-1850s and the 1860s saw extensive rail development, the growth of London and St. Thomas, and coinciding rural/urban integration, each built upon the rural/urban relationships established during the early colonial period. As David Wood declared, the incoming railway systems magnified “the roles of almost all the major centres.”109 Farmers such as the Erringtons and Glens took advantage of the cities’ needs and resources and built up their networks of distant trade. The Erringtons and the Glens were well positioned to do this. As seen on Figure 2.1, Frederick worked a lot on the seventh concession, in Westminster; and James worked two lots: one on the sixth concession, across the road from his father-in-law, and another on the eighth concession, where the couple resided.110 All three properties were within close proximity to major routes running north and south to London, giving Frederick and James access to the urban marketplace.

Roadways, agriculturally based trade, and centres of commerce had been central to the original vision for Upper Canada and were major features of “Simcoe’s Plan.” According to Randy Smith, in his study of southern Ontario’s urban system, the colony’s planners envisioned an extensive system of trunk

109 Wood, Making Ontario, 8.
110 James recorded in his diary each time he went to the sixth concession farm to work, and his returning back “home” to his other field on the eighth. This occurred frequently throughout the summer and fall of 1866. Glen Diary, 1866.
roads which would lead to “miniature central places,” namely those built to support saw mills, flour mills, and inns. In Middlesex County, roads had been steadily improved by local farmers and government officials from the 1790s onward. It was during this period, according to Bukowczyk’s history of nineteenth-century Canadian and American borderlands, that the Great Lakes region saw extensive transportation enhancement. Both surveyed roads and those developed from centuries-old First Nations footpaths helped farmers to trade goods and access friends and neighbours. Settlers who took an active role in encouraging such development initially blazed trails nearby their properties, and later government investment allowed for the planking, gravelling, and macadamizing (the process of creating a road paved with crushed rock) of major throughways. In London and Westminster Townships, Commissioners Road and Dundas Road, for example, both heading east and west, were major beneficiaries of these efforts as were farmers along their paths. By the 1820s, settlers near Commissioners Road could take advantage of its thrice-weekly stage coach travel which travelled at an average of eight to ten miles per hour. Later government macadamization of Dundas Road complemented such east-west trade. Further, by the late-1860s, regular stage coach travel connected regional towns and cities. According to an early history, Richard Rose, the first settler on the eighth concession in southern Westminster, where the Erringtons and Glens would eventually settle, cleared
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112 Bukowczyk uses the term “transportation revolution” to describe the changes in transportation-oriented infrastructure in the Great Lakes region. Since much of the development occurred over the course of four or five decades, however, the term “revolution” is slightly hyperbolic. It is more accurate to use the term “enhancement,” as I have above. I thereby account for steady change and continuity, and avoid establishing a historiographical break from the past and/or a new era. For an idea of Simcoe’s vision for the colony, see S.R. Mealing, “The Enthusiasms of John Graves Simcoe,” Report of the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Historical Association 37/1 (1958), 50-62; for the “transportation revolution,” see Bukowczyk, “Migration, Transportation, Capital,” 29-77.
113 The active role of farmers within the building process was a common part of settlement. Derek Murray, for example, found that northern settlers similarly encouraged the building of roads via the Bureau of Agriculture’s “colonization roads scheme.” Derek Murray, “Equitable Claims and Future Considerations: Road Building and Colonization in Early Ontario,” Journal of the Canadian Historical Association 24/2 (2013), 158.
115 David Wood, Making Ontario; Lovell’s Canadian Dominion Directory, 1871, 505 (online via ancestry.ca).
his land in 1834 and soon after blazed the road from London, through to Glanworth, and then on to St. Thomas shortly afterward.\textsuperscript{116} The development of the roads system meant that farmers could take their crops to market throughout the farming year, or at least when weather allowed.\textsuperscript{117} As Richard Rose had likely planned, residents of southern Westminster, including the Erringtons and Glens, benefited from these connections as they eased their access to distant centres. After 1853, railways arrived which augmented and complemented the existing road system in southwestern Ontario.

By the 1860s, few regions in Canada could compare with southwestern Ontario in the density of rail development. Shown on Figure 2.1, the region featured the Great Western Railroad (GWR) after 1853, as well as the London and Port Stanley Railway (LPSR), and the London and Lake Huron Railroad Company (LHRC) after 1857.\textsuperscript{118} As Bukowczyk and Kelly observed for the Great Lakes Region and Central Ontario, respectively, such rail development opened cities and towns to new markets and hinterlands.\textsuperscript{119} A consequence of London’s proximity to Lakes Erie, Huron, and Ontario, for example, was that it was also a crossroads for American goods coming from Pennsylvania and New York on their way to the American Mid West. Railway centres in the area thus became “exporters of virtually all commodities.”\textsuperscript{120} As rail links developed, Middlesex farmers were major beneficiaries since railways heading through London could bring farmers’ goods through London and to the American or international marketplace with even greater ease than the road system allowed.\textsuperscript{121} According to Cronon, railroads fostered a “liberation from geography,” allowing users to ship materials wherever demand justified their use

\textsuperscript{116} History of the County of Middlesex, Canada: From the Earliest Times to the Present (W.A. and C.K. Goodspeed Publishers, 1889), 580.
\textsuperscript{118} Dates for the creation of these railways are for the acts of incorporation, not the opening of the rail. In most cases construction followed shortly after these years, within two to three years; see Careless, The Union of the Canadas, 143.
\textsuperscript{120} McCalla, Planting the Province, 223.
\textsuperscript{121} Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis.
almost year-round. Traders and merchants could obtain farmers’ goods confidently even in the muddy months of the year, and shipments which had taken two weeks to receive now arrived in just two days. By the 1860s, even heavily loaded rail cars travelled at speeds above twenty miles an hour, more than double that of farmers in their carts.\(^\text{122}\) As shown on Figure 2.1, the diarists’ farms were almost directly located on the north/south LPSR line, which increased their ability to access these extra-regional markets.

Just as local boosters and members of civil jurisdictions had identified “the practical impact of trunk and feeder lines” in their calls for access to rail networks,\(^\text{123}\) farmers in Middlesex also quickly understood the consequences of better transportation infrastructure. A resident of Delaware Township, for example, wrote in February, 1854, regarding the effect that rail development was having on property values. He commented that “The Great Western Railway here has just been opened thus leaving only a ride of 24 hours at furthest from New York.”\(^\text{124}\) As soon as the rail was built, the writer, referring to property values, was able to state with certainty that rail had “raised the price of everything”, therefore altering farmers’ circumstances.\(^\text{125}\) Such transportation development had local effects in Middlesex County “on the ground” as the region became further integrated into the extra-regional economy.

Notably, while the Erringtons and Glens’ connections to the city were improved early on, other regions in Middlesex had to wait for such improvements in infrastructure. This meant that the Glens and Erringtons’ connections to the centre were greater than those of other farmers in parts of the county that were more distant, or more recently settled. In Adelaide Township, western Middlesex, a farmer named John Jamieson left a diary recording events from 1852 to 1854, which depicted the staggered

\(^{122}\) Cronon, *Nature’s Metropolis*, 74-81. Early rail, of course, had its limitations. Bukowczyk notes, for example, that it was not until the 1880s that rail lines overcame the problem of winter transport. Bukowczyk, “Migration, Transportation, Capital,” 54.

\(^{123}\) Bukovzyk, “Migration, Transportation, Capital,” 62.

\(^{124}\) Letter from Bullen to Spencer, February 1854, Niblock and Family Fonds.

\(^{125}\) The writer here, in his use of the word “everything,” is referring specifically to the price for property.
integration of the rural townships and London. In April of 1853, he planned a trip to the city so that he could obtain his certificate of qualification in order to teach at a rural school. He left on Tuesday, April 19, in the evening, and covered a distance of more than 20 miles to reach the city at sundown on Wednesday the 20th. He commented on how dusty the roads were, making for difficult and uncomfortable travelling. Two days later he was ready to come home. He left at 10 o’clock in the morning, and while the weather had been dry on his way into the city, he encountered constant rain throughout the evening. Luckily he was able to stay at the house of John McIntyre, who provided him with shelter that evening. In Jamieson’s words, he was “pretty tired” and “pretty dirty”. By April 23, he reached home “much crippled” and likely exhausted.\textsuperscript{126} In February of 1854, he took the stage coach between London and Adelaide, but even then the trip still took a full day of travel.\textsuperscript{127} Compared to Jamieson, the Erringtons and the Glens, however, lived only a third of the distance from the city. As will be seen below, this meant that both families could travel by either road or rail to London in the morning and return home the same day. In essence, Frederick and James’ families were at the cusp of London’s urban field.

The 1850s were also a time of agricultural growth internationally, and locally it was a time for heavy labour invested in family farms.\textsuperscript{128} High prices in wheat, brought about by the Crimean War, meant healthy profits for those farmers who could access international trade routes. The aggregate census numbers for Middlesex County in 1851 and 1861 demonstrate farmers’ active participation in encouraging these trends. McInnis, in his study of mid-century agriculture, argued that as of 1851 approximately 37.5 percent of farmland in Upper Canada was improved, suggesting that the initial

\textsuperscript{126} John Jamieson Diary, April, 1853.
\textsuperscript{127} John Jamieson Diary, February 13 and 15, 1854.
\textsuperscript{128} Annie Tindley and Andrew Wodehouse give a good description of the state of farming in the British Empire in “The Role of Social Networks in Agricultural Innovation: The Southerland Reclamations and the Fowler Steam Plough, c. 1855-1885,” \textit{Rural History} 25/2 (2014), 203-204.
settlement period had largely ended yet room for expansion remained.\textsuperscript{129} For Middlesex in particular, he calculated that the county’s farms had, on average, 32 acres each of improved land – roughly 31 percent of their overall acreage.\textsuperscript{130} Figure 2.2 correlates with these views, showing that prior to 1851 Middlesex County was still largely composed of wood or wild land, though township-level variance is clearly present. In its western and southwestern townships, including Williams, Lobo, and Adelaide (where John Jamieson lived), and Mosa, Ekfrid, and Metcalf, respectively, roughly two thirds or more of the total acreage remained unimproved as distance from London and poor natural drainage (in the southwestern townships) prohibited early settlement. Delaware, London, and Westminster townships, however, were more developed because access to London was easier and land was made available earlier by the “Lake Erie Baron” Thomas Talbot.\textsuperscript{131} In the diarists’ township of Westminster, just under half of the land was under cultivation in 1851, and ten years later, more than half of the acreage was in crops, pasture, or gardens. As shown on Figure 2.3 and Figure 2.4, Westminster and London farmers were thus higher producers of both hay and butter, some of which was likely destined for urban markets, in comparison with the rest of the townships.\textsuperscript{132} Farmers in these two townships were by the 1850s already part of the urban field of London, as they were connected to the city by seasonal and weekly flows of goods, people, and information.\textsuperscript{133} As seen on the two maps, the roadways and rail connecting the two townships to the London market had a significant impact on the production of both hay and butter.

Notably, Middlesex farmers avoided being overly invested in one crop type, a strategy which reduced risk and contributed to agricultural stability and population growth. As seen on Table 2.1,

\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{129} McInnis, “Agriculture at Mid-Century,” 59.
  \item \textsuperscript{130} McInnis, “Agriculture at Mid-Century,” 71. Given that Jack Little has estimated, in his study of oxen and horse power use in nineteenth-century Canada, that as of 1851 the per farm number of cropped acreage was 22.9, McInnis’ estimates seem reasonable.
  \item \textsuperscript{131} Alan Brunger, “A Spatial Analysis of Individual Settlers in Southern London District,” 143.
  \item \textsuperscript{132} As a point of comparison, Westminster farmers produced 5,799 tons of hay in 1851 and 5,657 in 1861, a figure nearly double the production in Caradoc (a township of comparable size), where farmers produced only 1,813 and 3,264 tons in those two census years. \textit{Census of the Canadas 1851/2}, Return of Agricultural Produce for 1851-2.
  \item \textsuperscript{133} See John Friedmann and John Miller, “The Urban Field,” for a discussion of the urban field concept.
\end{itemize}
residents grew a variety of agricultural products, whether cereals or livestock, thereby spreading risk to multiple commodities. The pattern shows that in doing so residents of Westminster followed county-wide trends. Both in Middlesex and Westminster, settlers produced wheat and potatoes as major non-animal crops. Correlated with increases in improved acreage and population, and despite troubles from the 1857 market crash, the Hessian fly, and the wheat midge, wheat production still increased from 453,596 bushels in 1851 to 1,222,378 in 1861. Shown on Table 2.2, this meant an increase of 13.8 bushels per resident in 1851 to 23.03 in 1861. The increase came from outside of Westminster, however, as this township’s total spring and fall wheat production only increased by roughly 10 percent (from 103,207 to 114,884 bushels), and fell from 20.36 bushels per resident to 18.28. County farmers also harvested higher amounts of potatoes – seeing totals go from 126,148 to 640,201 bushels in the same years, or 3.84 bushels per resident to 10.87. Westminster-specific numbers follow this wider trend, as their township farmers similarly increased potato production from 19,158 bushels in 1851 to 76,598 in 1861 – representing an increase of nearly ten bushels per resident (3.78 to 12.19). Both in Westminster and the rest of Middlesex, wheat and potatoes were thus important crops into the 1860s.

Though farmers continued to grow wheat throughout Middlesex, they also shifted greater attention to livestock, a process McInnis said began in the late-1850s in Upper Canada. Between 1851 and 1861, for example, the numbers of bushels county farmers produced of animal feed, such as peas, oats, and turnips, more than doubled. Peas went from 129,506 to 529,984; oats, from 466,279 to 941,192; and turnips, from 135,170 to 1,369,309. Each of these three products increased in numbers of bushels produced per resident as well, showing that this was not just owing to population increase (Table 2.2). As seen on Table 2.1, Westminster producers encouraged these trends by adding nearly 60,000 bushels
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134 According to McCalla, the 1857-8 crisis, though “exceptionally severe in Upper Canada”, did not interrupt “the basic expansionary trend in Upper Canadian output”, so the continued increases are to be expected. McCalla, Planting the Province, 217.

of oats to their production, more than five bushels more per resident, adding to their pea harvest significantly (from 27,880 to 86,170 bushels – an increase of nearly ten bushels per resident), and vastly increasing their overall numbers of turnips (from 34,020 to 307,805 bushels, or 6.71 to nearly 48.97 bushels per resident). Importantly, horses were gradually replacing oxen as draft animals which had been important to breaking rough ground early on. According to Jack Little, Ontario farms had, on average, 2.0 horses per farm in 1851 but ten years later they had 2.9.136 In Westminster, as shown on Table 2.2, the number per resident increased from 0.23 to 0.29. Farmers were also raising higher numbers of milch cows in Westminster Township, referencing their desire for diversified farms. Across the county, milch cow numbers, for example, nearly doubled from 11,738 to 19,006, as did pigs, going from 27,187 to 42,648. These numbers were indicative of minor increases in the per resident amount – in 1851 there had been 0.36 milch cows per resident and 0.83 pigs, but by 1861 these went to 0.39 and 0.88, respectively. In Westminster, however, the number of pigs per resident actually lessened (from 0.87 to 0.77) but the growth in the number of cows was higher than the county average (0.24 to 0.41). The increases in butter production, from 557,970 pounds to 1,081,805, or 25.99 lbs per resident to 26.02, partially reflects the increased numbers of milch cows. Producers continued to raise sheep in the county, though there was only a slight county-wide increase and a small drop in Westminster, both in total number and per resident value. The animals nevertheless remained an important source of income and were found on many farms, including those of the two diarist families. As scholars have noted, farm diversification was a “safety first” strategy designed to allow agricultural producers to weather

136 J.I. Little, “A History of Oxen and Horse Power in Rural Canada from the Seventeenth to the Twentieth Century” (presentation to the Rural History Roundtable, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, February, 2015), Table 5, “Average Number of Horses per Farm.”
economic ups and downs.\textsuperscript{137} Throughout the county, and on the homes of the Erringtons and Glens, the practice seems to have been well implemented.

County agricultural production correlated with county population increases and the adoption of new technologies. Middlesex County increased in population from 32,863 residents in 1851 to 66,769 in 1871, and Westminster from 5,069 to 6,386 (Table 2.3). The growth helps to account for some of the increased agricultural production shown on Table 2.1 and 2.2: more county dwellers meant more labour invested in farming, and those families also consumed more goods. The growing Errington and Glen families were a part of these trends. Both families followed their neighbours in continuing to diversify their farms, and they became connected with the growing numbers of residents who settled nearby. Farmers also used new technologies on their farms to manage increased acreages and outputs, though they did so in combination with older methods. As will be seen below, the Erringtons and Glens, for example, had shifted from ox to horse power alongside other farmers and had access to new machinery, such as mowers, threshers, and sawing machines, though they still utilised more labour-intensive methods when necessary, such as flails and scythes. Innovative harvesting methods were thus available to a growing population of farmers in the county, helping to spur agricultural growth.

London grew as a commercial centre for many of these diversified farm goods during the period and was the entry point for agricultural products destined for wider markets. Upper Canadian urban populations numbered 132,927 at the mid-point of the nineteenth century, and in 1851 the population of the London was 7,035. By 1861 it was 11,555, as seen on Table 2.3 (an annual average growth rate of just over 5 percent).\textsuperscript{138} Railton’s London City Directory shows that in 1856/7 the city was home to numerous banks, including the Bank of British North America, the London Savings Bank, Gore Bank, the

\textsuperscript{137}See Samson’s discussion of the “safety first” strategy in \textit{Contested Countryside}, 7-8; McInnis, “The Changing Structure of Canadian Agriculture, 1867-1897.”
\textsuperscript{138}Population of Middlesex County and London City; growth rate is compound and is averaged over 10 years between 1851 and 1861 to produce an annual estimate. See \textit{Census of Canada}, 1851 and 1861; Smith, \textit{Aspects of Growth}, 65.
Commercial Bank, and the Bank of Montreal. The 1861 census listed four tanneries, six foundries, a pair of breweries (Carling and Labatt’s), wagon, soap, candle and potash factories, a fanning mill, hat factory, and a pair of tin factories as well. The G.W.R. Shops (train manufacturing), a major city industry, had already been established, and the city had plow makers, physicians, lawyers, postmasters, and milliners. The city also remained home to the London section of the British Garrison until 1874, whose 230 to 1,400 soldiers created a substantial need for agricultural goods and products.

Retailing in London increased substantially during the mid-century, especially around the city’s central marketplace. In 1844 London had only 27 “Merchant Shops”; by 1863 it had 306. Forty-three percent of these retailers sold fashion items, 23 percent sold food, and another 23 percent sold other goods. The Covent Garden Market, London’s farmer’s market, was established in 1846, ten years before Frederick began his farm diary. Marketplaces throughout Upper Canada were, according to Matthews’ study of early markets, crucial to colonial life as they were key centres of commercial trade. The market in London consisted of a large courtyard with stalls for farmers and merchants indoors and spaces for bulky products such as hay and lumber outside. As with other Upper Canadian markets, Covent Garden Market held a monopoly in the city that made it the only market centre citizens
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139 The importance of banking to farmers will be described below, in the chapter discussing the post office and postal banks. Railtons London City Directory, 1856-7 (online via ancestry.com).
140 Census of Canada, 1861, Return of Mills, Manufactories, &c, for 1860-61.
141 See Railtons London City Directory, 1856-7.
142 The number of soldiers at the garrison varied depending upon the needs of the British Empire. Henderson puts the number of soldiers located at the garrison as fluctuating between lows of 234 men during the Crimean War to highs of 1,400 during the American Civil War. Henderson, shows, for example, that between March and November, 1845, the Garrison contracted 1,800 cords of wood and, in only October, 1,200 barrels of flour, fresh beef, and other supplies. Henderson, A Study of the British Garrison in London, 28.
143 Novack and Gilliland, 550-555.
144 Matthews also notes the correlation between the importance of markets and the presence of a military garrison in particular centres. W. Thomas Matthews, “Local Government and the Regulation of the Public Market in Upper Canada, 1800-1860: the Moral Economy of the Poor?” Ontario History 79/4 (December 1987), 297-299.
of London and travellers could visit for buying or selling produce without fear of fines.\textsuperscript{145} This system meant that the market centre was regularly “flooded with people who came to buy” and encouraged the clustering of other retailers in the area, such as those selling harnesses, flour and seeds, tin ware and agricultural implements, among other goods.\textsuperscript{146} Taverns and inns located nearby provided a space where men could conduct business, get a hot meal, and stay overnight, if necessary. As of 1856/7, 71 London taverns and saloons were licensed (including two Ball-Alley Licenses), many of which were located in the market district.\textsuperscript{147} The collection of these stores and services combined with improved roads and railways meant that Middlesex farmers could travel to the city’s core to access these services and sell their goods.\textsuperscript{148}

London, which began as a garrison city and county seat, was therefore a city of substantial size by mid-century. While it was by no means as large as nearby centres, such as Toronto, Hamilton, or Detroit, it still had enough of an industrial and retail presence and a concentration of residents to make it a destination for farmers to buy and sell goods. While urban dwellers tended to maintain small gardens to supplement their consumption needs, the city needed farm products such as hay for horses, or fruit, milk, and butter for home consumption.\textsuperscript{149} Furthermore, many London businesses required crops and livestock for their mercantile efforts. Labatt’s Brewery, for example, needed ever larger

\textsuperscript{145} While the law granting Covent Garden Market a monopoly may have been transgressed by some traders of agricultural produce, the idea of a single marketplace would have made it the primary centre of agricultural exchange in London.


\textsuperscript{147} Railton’s London City Directory, 1856-7, 75-7. By 1865 tavern owners paid approximately eight percent of the total non-tax income for the city – more than double that of House and Store Rents collected, and triple that of butchers. Only the market fees, which were more than 12 percent, brought in more income. Numbers from the “Annual Statement of the Financial Accounts of the Municipal Corporation of the City of London”, printed in the Farmer’s Advocate, April 17, 1866.

\textsuperscript{148} Novack and Gilliland, 559.

\textsuperscript{149} Darroch and Soltow noted the continued importance of home gardening for family economies, as shown in the 1871 Census. See Gordon Darroch and Lee Soltow, Property and Inequality in Victorian Ontario: Structural Patterns and Cultural Communities in the 1871 Census (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1994), 33.
quantities of grain to expand its production of beer, and Hyman’s Tannery, which supplied the Garrison with many of its leather products, needed animal hides for processing. As will be seen, the Erringtons and Glens took advantage of the city’s needs, offerings, and market opportunities.

*The Diarists and Rural Westminster*

The rest of this chapter follows the Errington and Glen families during the 1850s and 1860s as they developed their local and distant networks in mid-nineteenth-century rural Ontario. Their initial settlement story is similar in its general contours to many of the county’s pioneers. Frederick’s family, coming from Northumberland County, England, arrived on the aptly named ship “Frederick Young” in 1836 when he was 10 years of age. Travelling from Montreal to Kingston to Niagara Falls, then to Buffalo, and finally to Port Burwell and St. Thomas, they trekked northward into Westminster Township where they chose a lot on the sixth concession, about seven miles south of London. Though little else is known about the family before Frederick’s appearance in the 1851 census, the elder Erringtons likely began the process of clearing their land and creating a family farm alongside other nearby residents. The concession where they settled was without any mills or factories within the immediate vicinity, but the village of St. Thomas had already begun to supply this need. The Erringtons were one of the first families to settle in this southern part of Westminster and they became a permanent part of the community’s social landscape in the decades that followed.

We know about Frederick and Matilda Errington, partly, from Frederick’s surviving farm diaries, dated from 1856 to 1897. The Erringtons were Church of England adherents and early members of Christ Church, Anglican, which was located close to their farm and just west of the Glanworth junction. Frederick, showing his faith in the Anglican tradition, was named as First Church Warden to Christ
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150 Errington Family History, in Diaries of Frederick W. Errington.
151 See page 168, *Census of 1851*, Westminster Township, where his early location is cited.
152 See the Introduction for a methodological discussion of the Errington diaries.
Church in March, 1856. The family’s churchgoing is discussed further in Chapter 6, though it is worth noting that church membership helped the Erringtons forge economic connections with local families.

While the Errington diaries are extensive, they are problematic. This is primarily because Frederick avoided recording the buying and selling of small purchases, such as dry goods, tools, or other items. Thus, we cannot measure how such exchanges contributed to the family’s network experience, nor can we compare their networks with other diarists in any exact, quantitative measure. From 1856 to 1896, however, he recorded each of his trips to London, St. Thomas, or elsewhere, the sales of items at the marketplace, trades in labour and goods within the Glanworth region, his patterns of socializing and churchgoing, and other miscellaneous information, such as the weather and notable family events. So while comparisons with other families cannot always be made (in terms of small purchases) we can compare the Errington family’s habits across time to get a sense of chronological trends and changes. The number of trips Frederick made off the farm to urban centres in the winter of 1856, for example, can be compared with that of the winter of 1866 or even 1896 and set within the context of family life cycle changes, new technologies, and agricultural practices. We can also read the diary to see the relationships between local families and the Erringtons over time to understand their longevity or temporary nature. Therefore, much can still be learned even though the diary is limited in some ways. Additionally, a surviving page from the family’s account book, for January 1866, is suggestive of some of the items that they bought on a day-to-day basis during the mid-century period. The diaries offer a substantial image of economic networks in the 1850s and 1860s which can set the stage for later chapters.

As Osterud and Neth have shown for New York and the Midwest, respectively, few farmers could run a successful enterprise without the necessary assistance of wives, sons, and daughters, in
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153 Errington Diary, 1856.
terms of labour and emotional support. When we first encounter Frederick’s diary in 1856 he was involved in developing his farm and engaged with his new family. Frederick and Matilda Wright, a local Westminster resident, married in 1854 and the couple had Freddy a year later. By 1856, the family numbered three persons, though labourers who joined them swelled the family’s ranks from time-to-time. In 1856 these temporary residents included Henry Bennett, who joined them during the spring and summer, Mr. Carey during the fall, and a Mrs. Jane Frank, during the summer. Ten years later James Glen would be similarly occupied, with both a new wife and their first child. Both sets of diaries consequently begin when the two farmers were starting a new stage in life, with independent households and young, dependent children.

Frederick had a few advantages over James Glen; in particular, he was older, had migrated earlier, and had invested in property outside of the home farm. He had benefitted from some of the land speculation that was occurring in London, namely that he was the owner of four lots on Craig Street in the city which he rented to tenants. City land was quickly growing in value during the boom of the 1850s, with London historian Orlo Miller remarking that the value of city lots hit heights between 1851 and 1857. The profits from Frederick’s urban properties were likely reinvested in the Errington farm during this period, helping to supplement the family’s income. The 1851 agricultural census shows that Frederick had, on his first farm in Westminster (which was 100 acres), 40 acres of woodland and 60 acres under other cultivation – 45 dedicated to crops, and 15 to pasture. Of his crop land he had 15 acres, producing approximately 300 bushels of wheat. He also had a pair of oxen or steers, a team of horses, and five pigs. As seen on Table 2.4, the second Errington farm (on which they permanently settled) changed little in overall acreage during the period; it was roughly 90 acres in total until the late
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155 Freddy’s first birthday is recorded in Frederick’s diary in 1856, as is the couple’s second anniversary.
157 Census of Canada, 1851, Agricultural Census, Middlesex County, Westminster Township.
1860s, about half of which was under cultivation. However, the farm did grow in other ways. By 1867 the Erringtons had three teams of horses, 15 hogs, 26 sheep, and eight cattle. So while the family cleared very little additional land, they were increasing their livestock capacity in a manner congruent with other Middlesex County residents. The Erringtons’ mid-century farming habits exhibit a combination of new technologies being used alongside other simpler implements. The presence of three teams of horses, notably double the average per farm number of horses on other Ontario farms, gave the Erringtons the ability to work their land and travel at the same time. It additionally shows that the family had transitioned away from oxen as a power source along with other Middlesex residents. Frederick and his neighbours also “bargained for [a] thrashing machine” in 1856 to speed their processing of grain. This showed their willingness to use complex new machinery when available. At the same time, they farmed using older methods when needed, such as binding straw with grass or using flails. Consequently, the family employed both innovative technologies in combination with older methods of farming.

Between 1856 and 1866, the family continued to grow. By 1866, Frederick and Matilda had eight children, including Matilda “Tilly” (b. 1857), Elizabeth “Lizzy” (b. 1859), Margaret “Maggie” (b. 1860), Mary (b. 1861); John Edward (b. 1862); and Frances (b. 1864). Farm labourers continued to be present on the farm as well since the Errington children, mostly girls, were not yet old enough or able to help with the heavier farm tasks. In 1866 labourers “Dannie” and “Fred” worked alongside Frederick from January to April and April to November, respectively. Notably, Matilda did not engage domestic help in this year, whereas she had in 1856. Freddy was eleven years old by 1866, and his brother William was born in that year as well. A family of eight children and two adults, along with farm labourers, meant that home
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158 According to Skeoch, the transition to horses was a wise decision following initial clearing since an ox was 30 to 100 percent more expensive for a day’s labour than a horse. See Skeoch, “Developments in Plowing Technology in Nineteenth-Century Canada,” in Canadian Papers in Rural History Volume III, 156-177.

159 Little, “A History of Oxen and Horse Power,” Table 5.

160 Errington Diary, July 25, 1856.

161 Errington Diary, July 26, 1856 and March 28, 1856.
consumption requirements on the Errington farm were significantly higher than in 1856 when only Frederick, Matilda, and Freddy had occupied the land. As seen below, these familial circumstances had an important impact on the Erringtons’ economic behaviour and their local and distant networks.

The Glen family arrived in Middlesex in the 1850s and settled 1.3 kilometres to the east of the Erringtons’ farm in Westminster where they would remain for generations. Similar to Frederick Errington, James Glen left a significantly detailed set of farm diaries, and the earliest available began in 1866 when he was 26 years of age.\textsuperscript{162} James’ father, Michael Glen, had already been farming in York County, so both men were experienced in Ontario agriculture when they began farming in Middlesex.\textsuperscript{163} Michael Glen, having been an Irish immigrant in Scotland prior to the family’s departure to Canada in the late-1840s, gave his son James a combined Irish and Scottish background. Religiously speaking, James and his family fluctuated between the Presbyterian Church and the Church of England throughout the 1860s, though James served on the board of St. Andrew’s Presbyterian.\textsuperscript{164} Similar to the Erringtons, the Glens’ church membership helped establish and confirm their economic associations.

James Glen became a farm operator in the early 1860s when he was in his early twenties. At first he worked in conjunction with his father Michael Glen on the eighth concession in Westminster before he and Rosella “Rose” Hare married in 1865. James then started to work his two fields separately from Michael. When James’ records begin in 1866, he was therefore already deeply involved with the work of agriculture and had started his family. Though the diary does not record it, Rose also gave birth to her first child early in that year, naming her “Mary Ann” Glen, after James’ sister.\textsuperscript{165} In many ways, in 1866 James was in the same sort of situation as Frederick had been ten years prior – with a farm and family in their early stages.

\textsuperscript{162} See the Introduction for a discussion of the Glen diaries. 
\textsuperscript{163} Harry White, \textit{Sketches of the Oliver, Hair, Gavenlock, Scott, Munro, Glenn, Turnbull, White Families: Compiled by H.O. White} (Glanworth: H.O. White, 1978); and Roswell’s 1851 \textit{Toronto City and County Directory}, 83.
\textsuperscript{164} See James Glen Diaries, 1866-1925.
\textsuperscript{165} Glen Diary, 1866.
The Glen farm was also quite similar to the Erringtons’ in terms of crops and livestock. As shown on Table 2.5, James and Rose also owned three cattle by 1867 and 10 sheep. They also had a team of horses, one horse fewer than the Ontario per farm average, but like the Erringtons they had done away with oxen-based farming. With only two horses, James therefore did not have the same flexibility with the use of horse power that Frederick had; he needed to borrow other farmers’ teams during periods of heavy work to get to London or St. Thomas. The couple also had hay, clover, millet, and peas planted in their fields. Additionally, like the Erringtons, the Glens employed both new and older farming methods. James recorded using a Buckeye mower in the summer of 1866, for example, but also the more “traditional” scythe to bring in the family’s hay crop, thereby showing that he was like other farmers in his pattern of adoption of technology.\footnote{Glen Diary, July 3 through 5, 1866.}

Both farmers travelled into London and St. Thomas throughout the farming year and traded locally. As seen on the Tables 2.6 and 2.7, activities in London and St. Thomas, which are termed exchanges in Distant/Urban centres, were plentiful. Of the Erringtons’ overall 648 economic exchange events in 1856 and 481 in 1866, 112 and 67, respectively, took place in urban centres (roughly 17 and 14 percent of the years’ totals). Given the Erringtons’ familial makeup in these years, the disparity between the two years is not surprising. In 1856, Frederick’s family was much smaller and his time could still be spent away from the farm. Ten years later, in 1866, he was required at home more often, which made trips to London or St. Thomas more difficult. Since the first of James’ diaries only began in 1866, his activities in that year cannot be compared to an earlier year for trends. Like Frederick, though, James used London and St. Thomas often for his buying and selling needs. In that year of diary records, James Glen recorded 832 total economic exchange events. Of these, 81 exchanges occurred in London and 41 in St. Thomas (making his distant network of exchange 15 percent of the total). These distant urban exchange events
were important parts of mid-century farming for both families as they allowed crops to be marketed to urban buyers and other items could be obtained.

These trips were seasonally influenced. In both farmers’ diaries, for example, trips to the city in the summer were fewer as work often kept them at home. And those in the winter were more numerous as winter freed farmers from heavy farm work, allowing them to leave home if needed. Snow-packed winter roads also encouraged local activity via sleigh travel. Finally, both spring and fall brought farmers into the cities regularly: the planting season required farming inputs that were often available in London and St. Thomas, and the fall meant trips to the marketplace to sell the harvest.

In contrast to these distant exchanges, they contributed to their local exchange networks throughout the entire year. As shown on Tables 2.6 and 2.7, more than 80 percent of the Erringtons and Glens’ overall exchange events occurred in the rural regions surrounding their farms. Thus, while urban-oriented economic activity was important for the Errington and Glen family economies in certain seasons, buying and selling with local families who knew each other was important throughout the entire year and made up their day-to-day farm experiences.

A Mid-Century Spring

In the spring (March 1 to May 31) of 1856 the Errington family was busy preparing the ground for cultivation. Of the 163 economic events that season, 22 occurred in London and six in St. Thomas (Table 2.6). As seen on Figure 2.5, this oriented the Erringtons’ economic exchange network towards two distant centres, a trend displayed via the distributional ellipse. The shape of the ellipses along the x and y-axis references the “pull” of significant outlying features (primarily London and St. Thomas) and
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167 The distributional ellipse measures the spatial trend of the exchange events, shown in points on the map. The ArcGIS program calculates the mean centre feature and creates an ellipse covering approximately 68 percent of the geographical features (those occurring within one standard deviation of the mean feature), which here are the “exchange events.”
the centrality of the centre points, most occurring in the Erringtons’ own neighbourhood. Though a smaller centre, St. Thomas contained important grist mills that the Erringtons and Glens used. Access to water power had enticed millers to St. Thomas. As McCalla comments, grist mills both small and large were seasonal operations, increasing their output during peak flouring times, and they were important sites of economic activity throughout the colony.\(^{168}\) Frederick’s activity in London, however, was more varied and often involved other family members. Frederick went to London twice with Matilda and her mother Mrs. Wright, and once with little Freddy.\(^{169}\) He did not always record his purpose, but he may have purchased groceries and dry goods while in the city. We do know that London was an important centre for Frederick’s banking and cash-related activity, as he recorded these transactions. Six of these London events involved the exchange of a note, a contract, or cash. Some of these financial transactions occurred at the Bank of British North America and the Gore Bank; others involved his tenants at his Craig Street properties.\(^{170}\) He also paid his debts to Dr. Salter, a druggist who was located in the city and purchased a new cutter at an auction.\(^{171}\) What is surprising is that Frederick did not once record buying or selling an agricultural product that spring at the London market. Likely, this was a result of Frederick’s record-keeping habits which show only major farm purchases. Instead, his 28 exchange events mostly reference his cash-oriented activity.

Shown on Figure 2.5, Frederick’s diary recorded 99 economic events which took place on his own farm that spring and 36 which occurred in the rural areas surrounding the family’s home. Not surprisingly, Frederick’s activities on his own farm outnumbered those in any other location. In the

\(^{168}\) For McCalla’s discussion of gristmills, see *Planting the Province*, 94-104. McIlwraith suggests that high seasons for milling were fall and winter. Frederick and James’ grist exchanges correlate roughly with this position. In 1856 Frederick had one grist exchange each in the spring and the summer, none in the fall, and three in the winter. His 1866 pattern was similar, with one each in the spring and fall, none in the summer, and two in the winter. James, in 1866, had four in the spring, one each in the summer and the fall, and four in the winter. See Errington and Glen Diaries; McIlwraith, "The Adequacy of Rural Roads," 357.

\(^{169}\) Errington Diary, March and May, 1856.

\(^{170}\) Errington Diary, May 17, April 7, and May 8, 1856.

\(^{171}\) Errington Diary, March 22 and 15, 1856.
springtime work was heavy as Frederick was involved with chopping wood, fixing fences, spreading dung, plowing, sowing grain, and cultivating root vegetables and gardens. Frederick’s livestock required attention too, whether clipping the tails of his lambs or altering his pigs. The other events were often reciprocal exchanges (such as when labour was given by one family in exchange for labour received at a later date, as at farm bees or during day-to-day acts of helping, and when equipment was lent/borrowed between neighbours) or were for labour paid to the family’s waged workers. In farming, Frederick had others to help him with heavy and dangerous work that required more than one man. Without any sons of workable age, paid or shared labour was required.

The reciprocal part of Frederick’s spring exchange network involved neighbours Mr. Pearce, Henry Bennett, Joshua Lewis, and Matilda’s mother Mrs. Wright. Shown in more detail on Figure 2.6, all lived near the Errington farm, allowing their local networks to become intertwined. On one day, for example, Frederick had Henry Bennett, who lived just north on the sixth concession, come down to help him draw up two loads of wood and lay some fences between his and Mr. Pearce’s property. On another day, Mr. Pearce crossed the fields and offered his services on the Errington farm by helping to prune apple trees and slaughter a sow. Frederick also helped his mother-in-law with building a chicken coop as well as plowing her oat field. Finally, Joshua Lewis lent his pair of oxen to Frederick in order to use them to draw a pair of posts for his fence. The day-to-day work of the spring, therefore, saw the sharing of labour and draft animals between neighbours.

Frederick also brought on paid labourers when extra help was needed. It was similarly local, and often involved those same families with whom Frederick exchanged work. That spring, for example, Henry, who was in his twenties and starting a new farm, was employed as a hired man on the Errington farm. (Errington Diary, May 19 and April 1, 1856).

See Errington Diary, April 18, 1856.

See Errington Diary April 8 and 10, 1856.

Errington Diary, May 14 and 17, 1856.

Errington Diary, April 22, 1856 and February 1, 1866.
Henry was employed on the farm from April until the fall, during which time he drew rails, fixed gates, brought home milled grain, and performed other tasks.\textsuperscript{178} Even during that period, however, he and Frederick had reciprocal exchanges together, too, such as in April, 1856, when Henry lent Frederick his horses so that he could go to London to visit the Gore Bank or in February 1866 when Frederick went to Henry’s timber bee.\textsuperscript{179} The pattern suggests that the close proximity of Henry and Frederick’s farms not only made the young Henry a trustworthy employee, but also tied the two families together in mutual assistance as they advanced their farms. The spring’s labour, then, meant that Frederick’s activities were very much localised on his and his neighbours’ farms and each worked together daily on agricultural tasks.

A significant number of the Erringtons’ spring exchanges also involved the buying and selling of agricultural goods within the local community. As seen on Figure 2.5, the spring directional ellipse centred upon exchanges occurring on their farm on the seventh concession and on other nearby farms. Frederick exchanged sheepskins, pork, cattle, barley, and feed locally that spring in some of these trades.\textsuperscript{180} McCalla describes such exchanges as the sharing of “timeless rural essentials”; they supplied local peoples with food for their animals and themselves, or other household needs.\textsuperscript{181} Despite London’s substantial mid-century growth, the local township also provided farmers with their necessary goods, in a pattern similar to other parts of the province.\textsuperscript{182} All of this local activity, including reciprocal and paid labour and the buying and selling of goods between rural suppliers and farmers, kept the Erringtons’

\textsuperscript{177} According to the census of 1851, Henry Bennett was three years younger than Frederick, but was listed as a single labourer in the census. In 1861, the agricultural census records that Henry owned his own farm, and so it is likely that in 1856 Henry was transitioning to full farm ownership, or he had just purchased a plot prior to 1856.
\textsuperscript{178} See Errington Diary, March through May, 1856.
\textsuperscript{179} Errington Diary, April 7, 1856.
\textsuperscript{180} Unfortunately Frederick’s records of the quantities and values of these sales are spotty; most record simply the prices received, such as on October 28, 1856, where Frederick wrote, “Went to London with wheat got 11s 6d per bush”; Errington Diary, October 28, 1856.
\textsuperscript{181} McCalla, \textit{Consumers in the Bush}, 115.
\textsuperscript{182} 1856 Errington Diary, March 1 to May 31; see McCalla’s discussion of local exchanges in Chapter 6 of \textit{Consumers in the Bush}. 
spatial orientation firmly within rural Westminster. Even in the 1860s, the pattern of spring activity was much the same for both the Erringtons and the Glens.

James Glen’s diary shows that the spring of 1866 was a busy year for his family as well. For the Glens, planting meant numerous trips to London and St. Thomas in search of hardware, lumber, and household items. Figure 2.7 shows that he had 213 economic exchange events that spring – 15 in London and nine in St. Thomas. From St. Thomas, for example, he bought roofing shingles, beer, leather, and groceries. In London he bought more beer, “various things for the house,” and hardware.\textsuperscript{183} James’ double purchase of beer fits with the consumption patterns of other residents, with alcohol being both an “accompaniment to daily work routines and an escape from them,”\textsuperscript{184} and his spring construction project of the new granary was the likely cause of the purchase of shingles and hardware. McCalla comments that hardware was available and affordable for many rural residents, making it a common purchase.\textsuperscript{185} These occasional trips reference that, for the Glens, the two centres offered important resources for sourcing nineteenth-century goods.

Even though St. Thomas was an important part of his distant exchange network, James rarely sold any farm products there. In 1866, for example, he had to return from town to his farm with four bushels of millet that he was unable to sell.\textsuperscript{186} Likely, St. Thomas’ population was not yet sufficient enough to create a reliable demand for his farm’s goods. Nevertheless, the centre offered a nearby grist mill that James needed. He visited the business four times that spring to process 33 bushels of wheat, four

\textsuperscript{183} For London trips, see Glen Diary, March 29, April 7 and May 5, 1866; and for St. Thomas trips, see March 7 and 15, and May 22, 1866.
\textsuperscript{184} McCalla, \textit{Consumers in the Bush}, 74.
\textsuperscript{185} McCalla, \textit{Consumers in the Bush}, 94.
\textsuperscript{186} Glen Diary, March 15, 1866.
bushels of millet, and six bags of oats and peas.\textsuperscript{187} This meant that the Glens’ distant exchange network, as seen on Figure 2.7, pulled his exchange distribution southward.

Springtime also required significant work at home, often with nearby families, in a pattern similar to the Erringtons. James’ close church and kinship connections meant deep, meaningful relations were formed and reinforced between neighbours with whom he cooperated on work. Shown on Figure 2.6, the Glens worked to get through the season by reciprocally sharing labour and goods with numerous local families. For example, William Hair, James’ father-in-law, lent James bags for his crops\textsuperscript{188}; James borrowed fellow church member Gregor McGregor’s harrow\textsuperscript{189}; and he used Ralph Errington’s (his brother-in-law) team of horses to help plow his fields prior to planting.\textsuperscript{190} James and Ralph also helped Mr. Fisher and Christopher McKenzie, both long-standing members of St. Andrew’s Church, with their planting.\textsuperscript{191} Notably, by 1866, James and Frederick’s reciprocal labour network was intertwined. In May, 1866, for example, Frederick’s son Freddy served at James’ father’s barn raising.\textsuperscript{192} This is not a surprising development given the proximity of the two family’s farms to each other, James and Frederick’s mutual attendance of Christ Church, and each family’s history in the region. Ten years prior, in 1856, Frederick had voted Michael Glen as a school trustee, suggesting that the two families were known to each other for quite some time.\textsuperscript{193} These reciprocal acts of helping, “beeing,” borrowing, and lending, all part of the neighbourhood network, continued through the 1860s for both Frederick and James. Such springtime interactions created familiar, trustworthy neighbourhood networks which helped the families through the time-consuming and heavy work of the planting season.

\textsuperscript{187} Glen Diary, March 2, 7, and 15 and May 16, 1866.
\textsuperscript{188} Glen Diary, April 19, 1866.
\textsuperscript{189} Glen Diary, April 27, 1866.
\textsuperscript{190} Glen Diary, April 26 and 28, 1866.
\textsuperscript{191} Glen Diary, Spring 1866.
\textsuperscript{192} See Errington and Glen Diaries, May 14, 1866.
\textsuperscript{193} Errington Diary, January 9, 1856.
A Mid-Century Summer

Summer, stretching from June 1 to August 31, was the busiest time of year for Middlesex farmers. Grain and feed crops needed constant tending and weeding so each diarist recorded cultivating, hoeing, and harrowing their grain crops, and mowing their hay and clover crops. Tools also needed frequent repairing; James needed to go to London, for example, on three separate trips for repairs to his Buckeye mower, right in the middle of his haying. For James, the summer of 1866 was especially difficult as between June and August the family also struggled through a major bout of illness. For both families, the season was heavily localised.

As seen on Figures 2.5 to 2.8, both James and Frederick’s local activity was anchored in south Westminster. The two families, however, still made some trips to London and St. Thomas. In late July and early August of 1856, Frederick sold grain in London, including a load of wheat and another of oats, and in 1866 he went to St. Thomas to sell a load of wool. He also exchanged cash in London – collecting money owed to him and paying off his mortgage debts. Likewise, James went to London in the summer of 1866 for exchanges when time permitted, selling three loads of potatoes at the city’s market. He also had his Buckeye repaired at Elliot’s Foundry, and he bought dry goods, groceries, beer, and tobacco. While his family was a small one, these foodstuffs helped sustain them during the hard work of the summer before garden produce ripened and at a time when Rose was busy working at home with baby Mary Anne. Purchases in the two urban centres of London and St. Thomas, then, supported the farm work that the two families accomplished.

194 See Glen Diary, June 19, July 3 and 18, 1866.
195 Errington Diary, August 4 and August 9, 1856; June 13, 1866.
196 Errington Diary, June 9 and 19, 1856.
197 Glen Diary, June 19 and 23, and July 14, 1866.
198 We do not know exactly which dry goods or groceries James bought on these occasions, as he did not list the items in further detail. Glen Diary, June 19, 23, July 3, 13, 18, and 24, and August 25.
Bees and helping, lending and borrowing, continued throughout the summer for farm families involved in the neighbourhood networks of the Glens and the Erringtons. In the summer of 1856 Frederick did not hold any reciprocal work bees himself, but he contributed to those held by the Jacksons, the Pearces, and the McKenzies (shown on Figure 2.6), to raise a barn, draw rails, and log.\(^{199}\) In 1866 his bee network expanded to include the Bennetts, Glens, and Regans who lived on nearby concessions and in the Glanworth neighbourhood. Frederick went to a bee at the McKenzies’ and sent his hired man Fred to the Bennett and Regan farms.\(^{200}\) The Glen family fell ill right when their hay and wheat harvests needed to be brought in, but the regular helping network came through; in July and August of that year the Rose family was on the farm frequently helping with raking the hay and bringing in the wheat, as were the Erringtons, Govenlocks, and Flemmings, the latter members of James’ church.\(^{201}\) These exchanges in labour contributed to the localisation of the summer farming experience. For the Erringtons and Glens, reciprocity helped the neighbourhood get through trying times, accomplish the work of the summer, and maximize their harvests.

Summer also required farm inputs, many of which could be found within the Glanworth region. In 1856 Frederick bought peas and wheat from local community members to supplement his own production, and he gave his and his labourer Henry’s time to other farmers.\(^{202}\) In 1866, James was more involved in local purchases; for example, he had his horses shod and re-shod in June at Begg’s, the local farrier shop at Glanworth Junction.\(^{203}\) And he bought stones from nearby resident, Mr. Munro, for underpinning Michael Glen’s new barn.\(^{204}\) Economic exchanges of these sorts continued throughout the summer as well, bolstering local networks.

\(^{199}\) Errington Diary, June 30 and July 2, 3 and 4, 1856.
\(^{200}\) Errington Diary, June 15, 28 and 30, and July 4, and August 7, 1866.
\(^{201}\) See Glen Diary, particularly August 22 through 30, 1866.
\(^{202}\) Errington Diary, June through August, 1856.
\(^{203}\) Glen Diary, June 5 and 18, 1866.
\(^{204}\) Glen Diary, June 29, 1866.
A Mid-Century Fall

The fall season, September 1 to November 30, was a time when the Erringtons and the Glens experienced returns on the spring and summer investments. Significantly, the harvesting of their fields meant the two families made regular trips to urban centres to sell their year’s products in the marketplace. In 1856, for example, Frederick went to London six times between September and October, where buyers like John Labatt (of Labatt’s brewery) bought his barley. In 1866, he even made trips on successive days – such as on September 24, 26, and 28, and October 1, 4, 16, and 19. Shown on Figures 2.5 and 2.8, such London-based distant exchanges pulled the Erringtons’ fall distributional ellipses toward the city. And for James, in 1866, we similarly see a clear pull to London and St. Thomas, where the Glens had, respectively, 28 and seven exchanges.

The income gained during the fall from agricultural sales also allowed the Glen family to purchase goods for the home and farm, some of which were beyond the family’s need for subsistence. The fall brought about the need for farmers to sell their products in a timely manner in cities and to purchase others when they had the available income. James bought a number of goods while in London on sales trips. As in the spring season, these purchases conformed to broader trends in consumption, including hardware and tools, household items, dry goods, groceries, and beer. Hardware purchases included a hammer, a harness, and a jackknife, each allowing the family to do the work of the farm. The dry goods and household items, however, offer a different image. Though James bought regular items such as boots which were similarly utilitarian and likely destined for use in the fields, he also picked up new cutlery, a bonnet, a hat, and shoes. The dry goods represent a style of purchasing similar to that which Craig found occurring in Madawaska in the mid-century period. Merchants offered rural buyers a “world of goods,” she says, with fabric, clothing and footwear being categories of purchases often found

205 See Errington Diary, September 25 and 27, 1856.
206 See Errington Diary, 1866.
207 See Glen Diary, October 10, 16, and 27 and November 9, 24 and 25, 1866.
in store records. Furthermore, the new cutlery, which James and Rose likely bought to outfit their developing home, represented the rich “domestic possibilities” available to Canadian colonists. As discussed above, London’s growing retail sector offered these types of items to those who had the capacity to buy, and for the Glens, this ability came during the fall season.

While such urban marketing was on the rise in the fall, farm work at home continued apace. Each farmer’s diary noted that southern Westminster remained busy with activity, as seen on Figure 2.5 through 2.8, with numerous exchanges occurring locally. For the Glens, many of the local exchanges shown on Figure 2.6 were in response to their need for help with the fall harvest. In October and November, James called in favours from his neighbours and had one threshing bee after another – eight in total over a six-week period on his two fields – to catch up following a bout of illness. The neighbouring families who came were the Hairs, McMillans, McInneses, McGregors, McColls, Fishers, McPhersons, Jacksons, Ramplins, Donahues, and Roses, all of whom were known to the family via kin or church-based association. Figure 2.7 shows that he was busy that fall with such work at home and only had a few other local exchanges, thereby partly concentrating his exchanges on his two fields.

During the fall season families regularly and frequently travelled to cities. They joined other agriculturalists in making the city marketplace bustle with agricultural excitement as families unloaded their carts of produce, bought other items, and quickly returned to the countryside. When at home, their work with fellow farmers was intensive and much time was spent with neighbours and community members to get the crops in on time – whether at bees or working their own lands. The season thus typified the experience of the dual-network system at work, whereby local exchanges occurred alongside extra-regional buying and selling to urban markets.

---

208 Craig, Backwoods Consumers, 207.
209 McCalla, Consumers in the Bush, 131.
A Mid-Century Winter

During winter, from December 1 to February 28, farmers had less work to do as crops were in and none could be planted, giving them extra time to spend travelling or visiting. Except during winter storms, transportation was also easier on snow-packed roads, which encouraged off-farm visits either to distant centres of exchange or in and around the countryside. These two seasonal circumstances balanced the winter’s local and distant network participation.

Farmers noted constantly in their diaries the state of the roadways and the precise point at which sleighing could commence. Often, they classified the roads as “good sleighing” from December through to February. Frederick, for example, mentioned that the “Good sleighing” of January 2, 1856, allowed him to access the side road to visit his neighbours the Blutters in the morning and the Wrights in the afternoon. He later noted that the weather made for “still beautiful sleighing” through to mid-February. As will be seen in Chapter 6, in a discussion of the diarists’ social networks, winter gatherings and celebrations were a key part of the localised experience, adding to the density of neighbourhood and community meetings.

Winter allowed Frederick to get into London with his sleigh on the snow-covered roadways. Frederick recorded 30 events in London and 11 in St. Thomas in 1856 (Figure 2.5). Frederick wrote that he took Freddy to London to have a vaccination, and he bought beer, a straw cutter, a coon skin sleigh robe, and paid his taxes. Frederick also went to St. Thomas to the grist mill, where he sold 29 bushels of oats and bought lumber and a new farm gate. Notably, as seen on Figure 2.8, Frederick visited the two urban centres less in the winter of 1866 than in 1856 (having only 13 exchanges in London, for

---

211 Errington Diary, 1856.
212 Errington Diary, February 9, 1856.
213 See Errington Diary, Winter 1856.
214 See Errington Diary, January 21, February 6 and 9, and December 6, 1856.
215 Errington Winter Diary 1856.
example, compared to 30 in 1856). This seems to have been caused by his desire to remain at home while he and his neighbours shared temporary access to a sawing machine and when his children were ill, and also because he no longer collected rent from his London properties. Nevertheless, he still went to London to unload some farm products and maintain the family’s income, selling pork, barley, and a load of peas on 10 separate trips. It is possible that he could only take a limited number of items at one time on his sleigh, thus the need for multiple trips.

A surviving page of the Errington family’s account book for January, 1866, offers an image of their consumption patterns and what they bought while in town. While only a single month in the mid-century period, much can be learned. The entries suggest that the Erringtons bought consumer items like the Glens did. Frederick recorded in his diary that he went to London three times – on January 4, 13, 20, and 23. On the January 4th trip, Frederick brought with him pork that he sold at the market. The account book shows that he then bought boots for the Errington children, bag salt, groceries, paper, and medicine. On the 13th he bought more groceries, “things for Mrs. Errington”, and knives. And on the 20th and 23rd he bought still more groceries, a barrel, and some tobacco. While this is only a glimpse at the family’s mid-century consumption patterns, it would seem that the Erringtons bought dry goods, groceries and other goods from London’s growing retail sector, as did the Glens. Whether the dry goods consisted of finery or more utilitarian items for use on the farm, the readymade products indicate that the Erringtons were far from relying on homespun. Their buying of cutlery, and possibly the “things for Mrs. Errington”, hints that they practiced a style of domesticity that McCalla identified as common in the mid-century rural world. As will be seen in Chapter 6, this domestic ideal fits with the Erringtons’ style of socializing, particularly their habitual visiting and sharing of afternoon tea. Finally, items such as

216 Frederick referenced taking the “sawing machine” to his neighbours on January 22 and 24 and the children’s illness on February 7. Errington Diary, 1866. Frederick seems to have sold his properties in town in 1860. As shown on Table 2.4, his number of acres dropped from 91.3 to 90.8, reflecting that sale.
217 See Errington Diary, January, February and December, 1866.
218 See Errington Diary, January 1866 and account book.
barrels were those which Craig would classify as purchases that indicate the Erringtons also “consumed to produce,” as the Glens did via their hardware purchases. The winter season brought both of the diarist families into London where they accessed a “world of goods.”

The Glens’ 1866 diary shows that James travelled both throughout Middlesex and other nearby counties, taking advantage of the easy winter roadways. As shown on Figure 2.7, James travelled east to buy lumber, shingles and culls for his and his father’s building projects, visiting eastern Middlesex and Oxford County where such items were plentiful. This pulled his distributional ellipse eastward along the map’s x-axis, a feature not seen in any of the other seasons. The winter roads also allowed James to make it to London seven times to sell potatoes, pork, hides, a sheepskin, hay, and peas. He also bought groceries, some items for his house, and paid for a photo of his recently deceased mother. He made the trips in addition to his other countryside travel, taking advantage of the season’s decreased travel time.

An important amount of choring was also completed at home during the winter months, and buying and selling items locally continued. Such activity is depicted on Figures 2.5 to 2.8, where clusters of activity with community members and neighbours can be seen occurring in the immediate vicinity of the two diarists’ farms. In 1856, for example, Frederick recorded cutting wood, drawing logs, grinding axes, framing buildings, and taking care of his livestock on the farm. In 1866, both James and Frederick did various repairs and chores inside houses and barns, including threshing, killing a heifer and some hogs, and sawing logs. James also went to Glanworth to pay James Reid, a blacksmith and farrier, for his services.

---

221 See Glen Diary, January, February and December, 1866.
222 See Glen Diary, December 5, 1866.
223 See Errington and Glen Diary, January, February and December, 1866.
224 Glen Diary, January 2 and December 31.
Local neighbourhood and community exchanges and at-home farm activity therefore continued throughout the winter season as farms needed tending and maintenance. In Chapter 6 it will be seen that local social events were also highly important in the winter. Whether at New Year’s celebrations and visits, or at Christmas dinners and church gatherings, social gatherings increased the localised feeling of the season along with off-farm travelling.

Conclusion

The mid-century period in rural Middlesex featured two network systems which the Erringtons and Glens developed. The first was local, and was comprised of the farmers’ community and neighbourhood networks, which were woven through the space of the countryside. The diarists encouraged this local network by exchanging goods and services with others in southern Westminster, whether out of need for a local source of crops when a trip to the city was impossible, to have a horse shod or wagon quickly repaired, or to help out fellow farmers in times of sickness or at harvest.

The two families also participated in a distant network of exchange involving the City of London and St. Thomas. London, in particular, offered a central marketplace at which the families could unload their goods and buy others. The Erringtons and Glens took advantage of its opportunities, making the city part of their agricultural activity. In each season, the dual-network system was present and influenced the farmers’ exchange patterns. As will be seen in later chapters, this dual-network system remained thoroughly in place while the two families’ life cycles changed and evolved.
Chapter 3: James and the Giant City: Cities, Agriculture, and Rural/Urban Exchange Networks in Late-Nineteenth-Century Middlesex County, Ontario

London had been only a village in the first half of the nineteenth century and a burgeoning urban centre mid-century, but by the 1870s it started to take on a new shape, new industry, and new populations. Over the next three decades, the city expanded as manufacturing and retail sectors within it matured and grew. Farmers located outside of London’s boundaries were an integral part of this process.

London was in some ways similar to other centres throughout Ontario as it served the needs of its hinterland populations and urban-based industry. The city was a site where agricultural products were consumed, processed, and traded, and it supplied farmers with services and manufactured goods. Farmers took advantage of what London offered and altered their farms, their spatial participation, and even their landscapes in order to access them further, in turn assisting urban growth. St. Thomas, in Elgin County, also served the needs of the area’s farmers, and its businesses continued to attract the Glens and Erringtons who lived just six miles away. This chapter is about the changing shape of farmers’ distant networks of exchange and their relationship with the City of London and St. Thomas. I argue that farmers responded to the needs of the urban population and their own desire for city-produced goods and services with flexibility and willingness and that, overall, rural families’ innovativeness in experimenting with new technologies, crop types, and harvesting methods furthered the system of urban/rural trading that had been in place since settlement.

---

Each diarist family’s stage in life played an essential role in their ability to alter their distant networks of exchange. This chapter uses an HGIS and focuses primarily on the Glen family of Westminster Township. The focus on the Glens is justified by their diaries, since they contain the widest range of detail – from small farm sales to those of large quantities, and from banal purchases occurring on a day-to-day basis to those of major, annual importance; thus, they help answer certain questions with which this chapter is concerned. Since James Glen was a disciplined diary-keeper, his diaries offer a detailed record of the farm economy in terms of production and consumption and, importantly, their relation to family life cycle changes. I incorporate the Errington and Adams diaries as well in order to further demonstrate certain points. Each family was at a stage in their development that allowed them to take part in the spaces of the rural/urban economy. The Glens, Erringtons, and Adams had, by the 1870s, established themselves within the social and agricultural fabric of their local communities. They also each had more mature children who could work as labourers, produce agricultural commodities at home, and sometimes travel to distant centres to buy merchandise that the families consumed. Importantly, female and male members of each family were essential to their respective farms – boys, girls, and farm women were just as much farm workers as Frederick Errington, James Glen, and Thomas Adams. Each individual contributed to the networks that the families developed, consequently influencing their involvement in distant spaces of economic exchange.

This chapter is split into two parts. Part I describes the growth of urban populations between 1871 and 1891, looking closely at London and St. Thomas. I also examine the changing nature of the City of London, its population, businesses, and industries. Here, I make heavy use of the aggregate census records of the city centre for 1871, 1881, and 1891, alongside secondary research on the city. I also look

---

226 The year 1896 is chosen as the “end date” of this period largely due to the primary sources used for the HGIS, as discussed in Chapter 1. Notably, the date fits with the image of Canadian agriculture supplied by Marvin McInnis, who argued that the period of 1867 to 1897 was an era in which the Canadian agricultural economy transitioned from being a major, Ontario-based wheat producer to a Western-based wheat producer. See Marvin McInnis, “The Changing Structure of Canadian Agriculture, 1867-1897,” *The Journal of Economic History* 42/1 (March 1982), 191.
briefly at St. Thomas since it too was featured in the farmers’ diaries. The data from these censuses provide a decade-by-decade glimpse at changing agricultural conditions in Middlesex over the course of the late-century period, which I fit with the diary sample years. In Part II I employ a diary-driven HGIS that focuses upon the Glen family and their London and St. Thomas-oriented distant network of exchange between the 1870s and the end of the century. I fit the development of the Glen family and their farm within Middlesex County by comparing it to the census material for the township as well as to the Errington and Adams families.

By using the HGIS, I also show how the innovations that the families employed allowed them to further incorporate the city into their economic networks. I examine the family economy by looking at their adoption of new technology, the participation of women in dairy and poultry work, the role of market gardening, and patterns of family consumption. In many ways the Glens were consolidating earlier agricultural gains made on their farm during the mid-century period and expanding into new areas of family production. For the Glens, the expansion of London and their interaction with the centre was one of the most significant developments in their distant networks during the late-century era.

A Late-Century Historiography

As discussed in Chapters 1 and 2, historians have been particularly clear in depicting the linkages between farmers and urban centres during the colonial period. Rothenburg, McCalla, and MacKinnon each showed that towns and cities, from their very inception, were intrinsically linked to the countryside.227 In Upper Canada, after all, it was part of the blueprint for the colonial state that farmers would have the transportation infrastructure they needed to take their goods to urban marketplaces.228

For the late-century period, Cronon, Conzen, Nye, Loewen, and Drummond have likewise described the

227 Rothenberg, “The Emergence of Farm Labor Markets”; McCalla, “Rural Credit and Rural Development in Upper Canada”; MacKinnon, “Road, Cart Track and Bridle Paths.”
interconnectedness of rural and urban spaces, of farmers and urban people. For example, Cronon and Conzen, in their studies of cities in the American Mid West, emphasized the association of hub and hinterland geographies through their portrayals of the flow of commodities from one region to the other.229 David Nye, in his examination of American energy systems, echoed this point for rural America generally, saying that “The [American] homesteader was not a peasant; he was a specialized farmer deeply enmeshed in the capitalist system. He was a speculator in land and a consumer linked to distant markets.”230 For southern Ontario, Loewen showed that the situation was not dissimilar, that the Mennonites of Waterloo had “almost daily interactions with” merchants in the region’s towns and cities.231 Finally, Drummond, in his history of the Ontario economy, even suggested that late-nineteenth-century urban growth depended in part upon farmers for its expansion. He stated quite clearly that if farmers had not been adaptable and become specialized agriculturalists, “cities would have been less attractive” and the story of Ontario’s growth after 1871 would have been substantially different.232 These historians show that the trade of goods between the countryside and the city, or vice versa, was an integral part of the experience of rural life from the early colonial period onward.

It is therefore difficult to account for images of contestation between rural and urban societies, especially those depicted in sources contemporary to the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century. If one were to go by the image provided by farmers’ political organizations of the period, it would appear that they were not on good terms with their urban counterparts. W.C. Good, head of the Dominion Grange, which was founded in 1874, for example, said in 1913 “Both men and money have been drained to the cities, leaving a disheartened remnant to battle against weeds, isolation and despair.”233 Possibly influenced by such representations, Ernest Home, an Oxford County farmer who worked a farm just east

229 Conzen, Frontier Farming in an Urban Shadow; Cronon, Nature’s Metropolis.
232 Drummond, Progress Without Planning, 51.
of Middlesex during the same era, said in a reminiscence-style newspaper article called “I Believe” that early twentieth-century cities were “modern Babylons...huge amorphous aggregations of inharmonious elements and utterly beyond the grasp and understanding of their citizens”.234 The rhetoric of such people glorified a supposed “stable and knowable past”, Ruth Sandwell argues, in order to allay growing fears of urbanization.235 These illustrations of tension and conflict between the city and the countryside even slipped into the historical literature of the 1980s, albeit with most of the extravagant hyperbole removed, whereby urban centres of the period were depicted as the houses of international capitalism which battled rural peoples and their kin for influence and power.236

Given the pace of change in the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s, it is easy to see why some historians found such narrative strains to be reasonable and, at times, even convincing. Indeed, it was in these last few decades of the nineteenth century that urban populations boomed and some farmers reworked their farms to fit their needs, often with almost dizzying speed. In terms of farmers’ networks and relationships with cities, such change, however seemingly rapid, did not necessitate a gestalt shift. The farmers of southern Middlesex had for some time been marketing their goods within the marketplaces of London and St. Thomas. That is why, as discussed in Chapter 2, some of the earliest Glanworth-area settlers had cleared roadways leading straight to and from these two centres.237 So though I show below that the late-nineteenth century saw the Glens’ relationship with the cities extended and furthered, the connection had been part of the foundation for countryside settlement early on.

---

234 Ernest Home, “I Believe,” published date unknown, Ernest Home Fonds, Box B4176, ARCC.
235 Sandwell, Canada’s Rural Majority, 80.
Part I

London and St. Thomas

Ontario saw continued population increases during the late-nineteenth century. As seen on Table 3.1, Canadian and Ontario growth rates hovered at just over one percent annually between 1871 and 1891, much of which can be attributed to the urbanization process. According to Drummond, the desire for urban output and the need for urban “houses, streets, commercial buildings and factories” contributed to the process. The province’s urban population expanded from 355,997 in 1871 to 818,998 in 1891 (Table 3.2). This expansion occurred despite the fact that the 1880s are often seen as a decade of slow growth in the Canadian economy. London’s population grew from 15,826 in 1871 to 22,281 in 1891, creating an annual growth rate of 2.2 percent between 1871 and 1881 and 1.2 percent between 1881 and 1891 (Table 3.3). Though these were somewhat lower than Ontario’s numbers, substantial urban growth was clearly present in London. The smaller centre of St. Thomas, in Elgin County, grew at a rate even higher than London within this period (Table 3.4). It expanded from being just a small, regional town in 1871 with only 2,191 residents, to a city of over ten thousand by 1891 – a roughly five-fold increase. London and St. Thomas grew upon their early foundations to meet the needs of township, county, and international trade.

Railway development contributed to the region’s economic and demographic growth. The Canada Southern Railway (CSR), completed in the late-1860s and early 1870s, complemented the
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238 Drummond, Progress without Planning, 22.
239 Annually, growth rates were fastest between 1871 and 1881, standing at 4.9 percent, as some slowdown occurred between 1881 and 1891. In the latter decade, however, growth still stood at 3.6 percent annually. McInnis, Chapter 4 “Output and Productivity in Canadian Agriculture”, in Perspectives on Ontario Agriculture, edited by R. Marvin McInnis (Gananoque, ON: Langdale Press, 1992), 100.
240 Notably, London’s population growth rate was slower than the provincial average in both decades, though the increases were nonetheless substantial as the city grew by nearly 7,000 people in just twenty years.
241 See discussion of infrastructure in Chapter 2 for details on this growth during the mid-century period. For a background on the foundations of the urban system in Upper Canada see Smith, Aspects of Growth in a Regional Urban System, 61-62.
region’s rail transport, which had been in existence since the Great West Railroad (GWR) was built in the mid-1850s. Furthermore, the Canadian Pacific Railway (CPR) extended into southwestern Ontario during the late-1880s. These railways can be seen on Figure 2.1; while London had been a railway centre since the mid-century period, its service as a rail hub had intensified by the 1890s. People in the surrounding countryside benefited from the railway networks as they opened the urban space to ever-increasing trade networks.

Once a small city that had stump-filled farms only steps from the downtown core, by the late-nineteenth century London spilled into the areas of London South, London West (also known as Petersville), and London East. While the former two parts of the city were largely suburban, London East was home to the region’s heavy industry and manufacturing sector. London was significantly developed in terms of retail shops by 1871 and even more so by 1891 as urban-based factories grew in number and size. London’s retail and industrial growth overlapped with an older, crafts-worker base, and expanded to new areas of production. Like Hamilton and other Canadian cities, London was filled with a combination of “traditional” industry (leather production and related industries, craft tailoring and dressmaking, and others) and “newer enterprises” (machine manufacturing, agricultural tool fabrication, and furniture production). In 1871, London was already home to a number of industries producing textiles, dry goods, and other wares, and by 1891 their presence increased. In 1871, London had 17 dressmaker shops, for example, employing 123 people, and by 1891 there were 111 of the

---

242 McCalla, Planting the Province, 200-203.
243 Drummond, Progress without Planning, 252-253.
244 Novack and Gilliland, “Trading Places: A Historical Geography of Retailing in London, Canada,” 552.
shops, with 464 employees. In a related industry, the number of tailors went from 19 (employing 204) in 1871 to 46 (employing 561 people) in 1891. The region also saw growth in heavy industry, much of which was located in London East. The area, for example, was home to a number of foundries, which expanded from nine in 1871 to 11 in 1891. While the number was only a small increase, the foundries employed 366 people in 1871 and 566 in 1891, referencing a more substantial contribution to the city’s workforce. By 1891, London also had several brick and tile manufacturers (three separate firms, employing 25) and engine building shops, two of which employed 122 people. Farm diaries demonstrate that blacksmiths, who worked in an industry related to the foundry production, remained important. James Glen, for example, wrote that he had his horse shod while in the city upon many of his visits to London before heading back home. Though there were only 12 people employed in this craft in 1871, the number tripled to 37 in 1891. Also serving farmers were the 20 carriage makers in the city in 1891, five more than in 1871. Heavy industry and retail professions were therefore a significant part of London’s growth and maturity, employing large numbers of the city’s expanding blue and white-collar workforce. These growing numbers of industrial businesses demonstrate the energy being directed to the production of finished items and the new jobs offered to the city’s growing population.

London was also home to a number of food and drink producers who both bought from and supplied local and rural populations with such goods. London breweries, for example, employed 38
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\(^{248}\) Census of Canada 1871, Table XXXI; Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Dressmakers.

\(^{249}\) See Census of Canada 1871, Table XXXIV and Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Tailors.

\(^{250}\) Census of Canada 1871, Table XXXII; Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Foundries.

\(^{251}\) Census of Canada 1871, Table XXXIII; Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Foundries.

\(^{252}\) Census of Canada 1871, Table XXX; Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Brick and Tile, and Engine Builders.

\(^{253}\) Wylie notes that in the last few decades of the nineteenth century more smiths worked in factories than during the earlier period, a change which would have likely affected some of these 37 London-based smiths. Many, however, also continued to work independently as they had for decades, serving the agricultural population. See William Wylie, “The Blacksmith in Upper Canada, 1784-1850: A Study of Technology, Culture and Power” in Canadian Papers in Rural History Volume VII (Gananoque, Ontario: Langdale Press, 1990), 183. Census of Canada 1871, Table VII; Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Blacksmiths.

\(^{254}\) Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Carriage Makers; Census of Canada 1871, Table XXX.
people in 1871 and 126 twenty years later. By 1891 the city was also home to eight confectioners (employing 436 people); 11 cigar factories (employing 439 people); and even four coffee and spice mills (employing 23 people). Many of the goods that consumers bought in the city would have been sold in the city’s retail shops which, in 1881, numbered 719 in the city’s business directory, an increase from 306 in 1861. According to Novack and Gilliland’s study of London retailing, the retail sector had “88 categorical listings, from dry goods to butchers to wine merchants and booksellers”, referencing the variety of goods available from multiple proprietors. As will be seen, farmers took advantage of the foodstuffs and material goods that these business sectors offered.

Notably absent from London’s overall expansive growth were a few industries. Grist and flour mills, for example, numbered only three in 1871 and remained at that number by the 1890s. As will be seen below, the diarist farmers preferred visiting the grist mills in Lambeth, a rural town southwest of London, and those in St. Thomas. The Elgin East region, for example, where St. Thomas was located, was home to 18 mills in 1871 and 19 in 1891. James Glen in particular made heavier use of one of these southern mills, the New England Grist Mill in St. Thomas, and Thomas Adams went to Calcott’s mill in Lambeth. London did not compete heavily with milling that had become established in the other regional spaces during the pioneer and mid-century periods.

While London was small compared to Montreal or Toronto, it nevertheless was home to a significantly developed industrial sector and workforce. There were, by 1891, a total of 567 industrial
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255 Census of Canada 1871, Table XXXIV; Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Breweries. The Minister of Agriculture, John Carling, of course, was owner of one of these breweries, as was the politician John Labatt.
256 See Census 1871 and 1891, Table I, for each industry type.
258 Census of Canada 1871, Table XXXI; Census of Canada 1891, Table I.
259 Census of Canada 1891, Table I, Flour and Grist Mills. Though for an earlier period, Brunger shows that Yarmouth Township, where St. Thomas is located was home to roughly half of the region’s grist mills, though others were spread out in other townships as well. See Table 6.1 in Brunger, “A Spatial Analysis of Individual Settlers in Southern London District,” 169.
260 See Chapter 2 for a discussion of the role of mills in the mid-century countryside.
establishments in London, in which 5,331 people were listed as employed in the census.\textsuperscript{261} The expansion was notable not only because it helped bring farmers into the city to buy and sell, but also because the ever larger numbers of urban people consumed more foodstuffs which farmers supplied. The Glen family altered their distant exchange networks to take advantage of the opportunities.

St. Thomas experienced both a steadiness in industrial capacity and growth in a few key sectors. Since St. Thomas was not officially a city until 1891, however, census information describing its industrial makeup is not available for the period, so we must look to Elgin East, its district, for records of business and industry. In terms of flour and grist mills, which attracted the Glens to the region, Elgin East had 18 businesses in 1871 and 19 in 1891. The number of people employed at the mills grew from 37 to 80, however, suggesting that the businesses operated at a higher capacity by the 1890s. There were also 100 dressmakers in 1891 and 53 Tailor and Clothiers, whereas there had only been nine and 12, respectively, twenty years prior. The overall numbers of other agricultural service industries, such as saddle, agricultural implement, and blacksmith shops, however, stayed roughly the same throughout the period.\textsuperscript{262} We cannot find in the St. Thomas region a vast expansion in most areas of industry as we see in London, though important sectors – such as milling and clothing shops – grew fairly substantially. It is possible that St. Thomas saw limited growth in these agricultural implement providers because London became the primary destination for the in the area. For our diarists, St. Thomas would not have commanded the same influence as London, but it did have some attractive sectors through which they might source goods.

\textsuperscript{261} See Census of Canada 1891, Table I.

\textsuperscript{262} In 1871, Elgin East had 14 saddle shops, employing 35 people, and by 1891 it had 19; these, though, only employed 29 persons, six fewer than twenty years prior. And in Agricultural Implement shops, there were five in 1871 and six in 1891, employing 29 and 25 people, respectively. Similarly, there were 54 blacksmith shops in 1871 and by 1871 the number had only grown to 55 (employing 88 and 78 people, respectively). See Census of Canada, 1871, Table XXXI and Census of Canada 1891, Table I and Table VII.
Between the 1870s and 1890s the rural population in Middlesex grew at a rate slower than urban centres.\textsuperscript{263} The populations and growth rates for Middlesex, London, and select townships are shown on Tables 3.5 and 3.6. Middlesex County (not including the population of London) numbered 66,769 in 1871 and by 1891 it was 80,753. Rates of increase were slower than those made at mid-century, though rural sons, daughters, and new arrivals could still find some room on farms and in rural villages and towns. Frederick Errington and James Glen’s Westminster Township continued to grow throughout the era, though it slowed in the 1880s. Overall, the township population went from 6,386 to 8,506 between 1871 and 1891. Compared to overall country growth rates, which stood at 0.94 and 0.97 annually, its annual growth measured 2.14 percent for 1871 to 1881 and 0.75 percent for 1881 to 1891. Delaware Township, in which Thomas Adams and his family resided, saw only slow growth and likely some outmigration at the century’s end. In 1871 the population was 2,523 people, and between 1871 and 1881 the growth rate was 0.58 percent annually, when the township reached a period high of 2,674. Then, between 1881 and 1891, the population declined 0.48 percent as the population settled at 2,549. Overall, the late-century era appears to have been a period marked by steady yet slowing rural growth in these southern Middlesex townships and a mild continuance of the “middling” class stability that Darroch found in place by 1871.\textsuperscript{264}

As discussed in Chapter 2, rural people who lived closer to the city joined its urban field before others living further away. By the 1870s, however, even farmers in the distant southwestern corner of Middlesex were able to take part in London’s markets, a result of improvements in transportation. One farmer, John A. MacDougald, lived in Ekfrid Township in southwest Middlesex, close to the GWR and CSR rail towns of Middlemiss and Longwood (also known as Melbourne). By using the railways running

\textsuperscript{263} Drummond notes that even despite “the troubles” of 1870s and 1880s farming, the overall number of farms in Ontario increased, as did their average acreage. Drummond, \textit{Progress without Planning}, 30.

\textsuperscript{264} Darroch, “Scanty Fortune and Rural Middle-Class Formation in Ontario,” 623.
through the towns he was able to get to London fairly conveniently. He noted in his 1874 diary that he
went to London “by cars” via Longwood in February, on Saturday the 28th. He conducted his business
and left by 6:30 p.m. Even though his train was delayed by a fire on the way home, he still made it back
to Melbourne by 2:00 a.m. Sunday morning. The trip to and from the city could thus be made in a
single day, even with a train delay, from the distant southwest corner of the county. It was therefore
much quicker than in previous decades when farmers like John Jamieson had to find overnight
accommodation at mid-points in their journeys. Jamieson, of Adelaide Township, west Middlesex, had
had to travel two or three days by stage coach in the 1850s to get to London; but by the 1870s daily
trade was possible in parts of the county that were farthest from the city. Additionally, rail allowed
farmers to avoid going to the city, as they could simply sell products at rail stations nearby. McDougald
wrote in 1877 that he “Butchered a cow in the afternoon” and then took “the beef to Middlemiss
Station after dark”. Such local rail depots provided a more convenient alternative than making the trip
oneself. These other diaries display that the Erringtons, Glens, and Adams were part of a rural
experience that was not peculiar to their own narratives. Indeed, the increasing accessibility of the city
for farmers throughout the county brought the whole region into the range of London’s marketplace.

Farmers’ efforts at land clearing continued alongside rural and urban growth, a process begun
much earlier in the century and one which is important for understanding urban and rural networks. As
seen on Figure 2.2, the process of turning “wild land” into “improved land,” begun after initial
settlement, continued from the mid-nineteenth century onward in Middlesex. Whereas in 1851 most
farms had roughly a third of their land cleared, the maps shows that by 1891 almost all land was cleared
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265 McDougald Diary, 1874, as in Jo-Ann Lucas Galbraith, Melbourne, Ontario, Canada: A Split Village at a Crossroad (London, ON: Middlesex Printing, 2002).
266 See Chapter 2 for the discussion of John Jamieson’s two-day journey to and from London via cart.
267 November 15, 1877.
and used for crops, pasture, or gardens.\textsuperscript{268} The progress made at clearing is reflective of the labour and man-hours that the diarists and their communities invested in their farms. While at mid-century townships closest to London had more crops, pasture, or gardens than others, by the 1870s and 1880s those in the southwest and northernmost reaches of Middlesex had caught up. By 1891, wood and wild land, much of which farmers maintained for fuel, made up only a small part of each township’s overall land use.\textsuperscript{269} While most cleared land was being cropped throughout the entire era, it is noticeable that farmers were shifting to pasture lands in each township, demonstrating livestock growth. Whether crops, pasture, or gardens, however, the point is clear – farmers in each township clearly sought to open up their farms’ potential and had reached a stage in land clearing that allowed most of them to do just that. Such productivity affected the diarists’ distant networks of exchange, as will be seen below.

A closer look at farm diaries and census data shows how communities and neighbourhoods changed to take advantage of the agricultural opportunities of the era. Table 3.7 details the total number of residents in Westminster and their acreages, as recorded in the census. The number of people residing on 10 acres or less increased from 139 in 1871 to 853 in 1891, showing that large numbers of people were living outside of London’s borders who did not own farms of a size big enough to be considered “farmers.” Many of these residents likely resided in and near rural towns, creating small central places built upon rural stores, hotels, and other businesses – important parts of rural networks (these are discussed fully in Chapter 4) – or on the southern fringes of London itself. The number of people working 10 to 50 acres, many of them farm labourers holding small plots, however, held steady at just over 200 people into the 1890s.\textsuperscript{270} Larger producers, working 100 to 200 acres or

\textsuperscript{268} McInnis, “Agriculture at Mid-Century,” 71.

\textsuperscript{269} Joshua MacFadyen argues that between 1870 and the 1930s farmers in eastern Canada came to treat their lots as a sort of “crop” resource, investing time and energy in maintaining a steady inventory for fuel. Joshua MacFadyen, “Seeing the Forest: Toward a History of Firewood in Eastern Canada, 1870-1935” (presentation at the Rural History Roundtable Symposium, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, November, 2012).

\textsuperscript{270} This accords with the persistence of single laborers shown in Darroch, “Class in Nineteenth-Century, Central Ontario.”
more, in which the Erringtons and Glens were included, increased their acreages throughout the period.\textsuperscript{271} Those owning over 200 acres increased from 24 people to 37 by 1891, and those owning between 101 and 200 grew from 149 to 159. Given that medium producer totals (those owning between 51 and 100 acres) dropped from 311 to 266 between 1871 and 1891, it would seem that the gains made by larger producers occurred as medium producers either sold out, became smaller producers, moved up the rank to large producer, moved on to other territories, or died off and left their farms to others.\textsuperscript{272}

The image accords with Drummond’s description of the steady increase of farmers’ acreages across Ontario, from the 1870s into the twentieth century, and Darroch’s identification of a “middling” class of farmers in place by 1871.\textsuperscript{273} The Glen, Errington, and Adams families were a part of this process since their farms were each above 100 acres by the 1880s, so the transition is notable. Overall, in the late-century era, the three families all had more acreage to work and therefore increasing farm potential.

Middlesex County farmers who worked larger cleared acreages did so, partly, for four major reasons: technological improvements, particularly in plowing methods, the availability of rural labour (both hired and family labour), the shift to livestock production, and the growing market demand in cities. New plow technologies arrived between the 1860s and 1890s, coinciding with increased land clearance. American James Oliver developed chilled-iron plows in the late-1860s, and his technology

\textsuperscript{271} The growth of the large and very large producers is a fundamental part of the Glen, Errington, and Adams family stories, as each family became occupants of between 100 and 150 acres between 1870 and 1891. Thomas Adams became the occupant of 151 acres in 1884; James Glen is recorded as having 105.5 acres as of 1875; and Frederick Errington occupied 140 in 1892 jointly with his son Freddy. Each of the diarist families discussed below were of the larger occupying groups within the township, having invested in their lands in order to expand their working acreage.

\textsuperscript{272} The pattern in Delaware was similar but with important differences, particularly with respect to the changing numbers of smaller and medium producers. As shown on Table 3.8, very large producers numbered between nine and 12 throughout the era, and large producers, in which the Adams family was located, increased from 43 persons in 1871 to 65 in 1891. Unlike Westminster, however, the number of medium producers (51 to 100 acres) increased, from 99 in 1871 to 111 in 1891. Smaller producers, occupying 11 to 50 acres also increased in Delaware, from 152 in 1871 to 187 in 1891, and the under-10-acre group also remained fairly stable (ranging from 89 to 110). Though such differences between the two townships existed, overall number of families with large farms grew.

\textsuperscript{273} Drummond notes that the average farm size in Ontario was 93 acres in 1871/81, but by 1941 it stood at 125.6. Drummond, \textit{Progress without Planning}, 30; Darroch, “Scanty Fortunes,” 653-654.
began to appear in Ontario after the 1870s, partly, via the Verity Plow Company operating out of Exeter, Huron County. The chilled-iron plows were less breakable than steel plows, cheaper to produce, and turned furrows better than the older cast iron variety. In addition to the improvements made to the plow shares themselves, innovators created plows that increased coverage and comfort and reduced the time spent plowing. In the 1870s, gang plows, those with more than one share, and sulky or riding plows began to appear on a mass scale. Skeoch notes that the Levi Cossitt Company in Guelph, Ontario, sold 2,000 of its gang plows between 1875 and 1876, referencing their popularity and speedy adoption. Each of these plow types was well suited for the already cleared lands of Middlesex County and allowed farmers to work their cleared lands more effectively – either more quickly and comfortably, by riding the sulky plow, or by plowing more furrows per pass (usually two) using the gang plow. Each diarist used advanced plowing technology on their farms fairly soon after they became available.

Frederick Errington recorded that he and his labourer, David, gang plowed during the summer and fall of 1876. James Glen does not appear to have had the technology as early as Frederick; however, his 1886 diary shows that he was gang plowing his fields as well, and Thomas Adams had the same technology by 1884. These new technologies allowed each of these families to increase their coverage and efficiency in plowing and work the new lands that they acquired or cleared during the period. The adoption of such innovations accounts for some farmers’ increased holdings and movement into the large-producer farm range in Delaware and Westminster – with better technology, more land could be worked and made profitable.

---


276 See Frederick Errington’s diary for 1876. The first mention of the gang plow was July 27 of that year, when David used the plow, and Frederick notes having used it as of September 2.

277 James mentions gang plowing in 1886 on a number of dates, but first on August 5. Glen Diary.

278 Thomas mentions the gang plowing on September 17, 1884. Adams Diary.

279 As is described below, family size was also important – technology helped, but was not the whole story.
Better threshing and processing technology also aided in the management of grain harvests. Since farmers were working more land per labour-hour with advanced plows, older threshing technologies had to be replaced in order to keep up with production. As discussed in Chapter 2, both Frederick and James had used new technologies alongside older, muscle-powered methods during the mid-century era. By the final three decades of the nineteenth century, however, the pair replaced older forms, such as flails, almost entirely on their farms and committed fully to the new technologies. It was during this period that steam threshers began to appear, and horse rakes, reapers, and mowers became more common on provincial farms and arrived on the diarists’ farms. The Erringtons, for example, added a “horse power” machine (a small, gear-driven engine powered by a horse) to their farm in the 1880s, helping them with jobs such as threshing and cutting thistles and corn stalks. James’ sickles and scythes, used in earlier years, now made only rare appearances since he had access to a mower/reaper. In terms of his ownership of agricultural implements, James only had two plows and a fanning mill in his own possession, according to the 1871 census, but he borrowed other implements, such as a mower, from family members when needed. So while in earlier decades a single family may not have been able to handle Frederick’s 140-acre plot, by the 1890s it could. The increased overall cleared acreage numbers on the diarists’ farms during this decade can be partly accounted for because of their choice to invest in such technological change.

With the help of such technology and a growing population, farmers put much of their newly improved land under crops. As seen on Table 3.9, production of cereals, roots, and other agricultural commodities increased between 1871 and 1891 across Middlesex County in total volume. Some products also increased in per resident values, even though in townships like Westminster non-farming
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280 Drummond, Progress without Planning, 40-42.
281 Frederick ordered the horse power from Fingal, in Elgin County, on January 19, 1886, and picked it up on January 27 with Freddy. See Errington Diary, 1886.
282 Certain jobs such as cutting grass between trees, still required James to bring out his old sickles and scythe – as on September 18, 1896 – though his diary references increasing use of new equipment. Glen Diary, 1896.
populations were quickly growing (a process which would have tempered per resident increases).\footnote{As in Chapter 2, “per resident” refers to number of bushels produced per individual persons. Some of the population increase in Middlesex and Westminster occurred as a result of growth in the region’s village and town populations and those living just outside the southern fringes of London, which, as will be seen in Chapter 4, was an important part of the era. Therefore, the per resident production increases are likely somewhat tempered by this expansion in the non-farmer class.} Wheat, for example, went from 437,555 bushels produced in 1871 to 1,696,378 twenty years later. Per resident (as on Table 2.2) this marked an increase from 6.55 bushels to 21.01 across the county, and from 6.23 to 12.82 in Westminster.\footnote{It is important to note that the figure in 1871 was after a drop from the 1861 mid-century high of 1,122,378 bushels produced, as shown on Table 2.1, or 23.03 bushels per resident.} Similarly, farmers produced oats, corn, and hay in greater quantities. Oats, for example, increased from 21.31 bushels to 35.35 per resident. Given that oats, corn, and hay were for animal feed, the increases show the transition to livestock that many farmers in southern Ontario made during the period. Westminster farmers in particular also invested more heavily in growing hay, nearly doubled their oat production (from 146,673 bushels to 234,023), and nearly tripled their corn output (19,763 to 54,953 bushels). These represented increases per resident as well – with hay going from 1.97 bushels to 2.16; oats from 22.97 to 27.51; and corn from 3.09 to 6.46. Each of these fodder-crop choices demonstrate the importance that Middlesex farmers gave to livestock farming during the period.

Livestock and livestock products also substantially grew in influence, both being products which farmers brought to cities. This transition is demonstrated on Figure 2.2, which shows the increase of pasture land. In Middlesex County, the total acreage dedicated to pasture nearly doubled from 119,600 acres in 1871 to 217,847 in 1891. This same pattern is witnessed in Westminster, where farmers dedicated 13,960 acres to pasture in 1871 and 16,961 by 1891, and in Delaware, where farmers doubled pasture land from 3,434 in 1871, to 7,092 in 1891.\footnote{Notably, the Errington family had 25 acres dedicated to pasture according to the 1871 agricultural census data, and the Glens had 14 in that year. See Agricultural Census, 1871, for the Glen and Errington Families.}
Farmers found livestock farming more attractive owing to improved transportation and increased demand from cities and the export market. The railway-based trade of dressed beef, for example, became achievable as refrigeration technology developed after the 1870s and 1880s. Detroit packer George H. Hammond experimented with using a refrigerated rail car to send beef to the Boston market as early as the late-1860s. Hammond felt the success of the project encouraged more development so he began ice harvesting on a large scale near Chicago’s Calumet River. By the 1870s, this became a major business market and other packers followed suit. As with plow technology, these inventions and adaptations were developed in the United States, but became prevalent in southwestern Ontario shortly afterward. Dressed-beef shipper and enterprising entrepreneur Gustavus F. Swift, for example, had established an ice-harvesting operation in Sarnia by 1883. In addition to beef, pork products, particularly bacon, remained an important export product from Canada until 1900, further helping to explain the concentration of livestock on Middlesex farms. According to Ian MacLachlin’s study of the Canadian beef industry, until the mid-twentieth century cattle processors were located near both local markets and major railway transportation nodes. London was well positioned to take advantage of the opportunity since it had easy access to rail lines and agricultural land. Since London had 76 butchers in 1881 and 28 meat curing shops by 1891 (up from just five in 1871), the city would have increasingly been able to help with preparing meat for sale.

These technological changes contributed to the livestock-related activities, “on the ground” in Middlesex County. As seen on Table 3.9, the total number of milch cows increased between 1871 and
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288 Drummond, *Progress Without Planning*, 34.
290 See *Census of Canada 1871*, Table XXXVII and *Census of Canada 1891*, Table I and Table VII. A city directory for 1881 listed 76 butchers or butcher-grocers working at 13 separate businesses, one of the largest of which was Elson and Keenleyside Butchers, established in the 1840s. *History of the County of Middlesex*, 806 and *London City Directory*, 1881 (courtesy of Jason Gilliland, University of Western Ontario).
In Westminster there were 4,138 milch cows in 1891, up from 2,601 in 1861. This was an increase per resident from 0.41 to 0.49. This change allowed for a related rise in butter production as well, shown on Figure 2.4; butter production clearly increased in each of the townships in Middlesex between 1871 and 1891. As shown on Table 3.9, Middlesex farmers recorded an output of 1,924,971 pounds of butter in 1871 and 2,449,582 in 1891, whereas in 1861 they had produced just 1,081,805 pounds. In Westminster, farmers produced 163,551 pounds of butter in 1861, but by 1891 they were producing 232,542. These numbers reference the investment that farmers in the two townships put into their production of dairy products and building up of the milch cow population. In a concurrent development, in Middlesex overall, going back to Table 3.9, the total numbers of beef cattle increased as well, from 44,488 in 1871 to 71,121 in 1891. There was a steep drop in the numbers of sheep over the period, as many farmers moved away from homespun wool production, but swine production hit a two-decade high of 57,894 in 1891. Farmers also clearly had more horses on their farms in Westminster, as there were 0.29 per resident in 1861 and 0.40 in 1891, as seen on Table 2.2. This substantial shift related to the adoption of better plowing technology and more horse-drawn implements.
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291 These numbers resulted in a small increase of 0.47 to 0.49 milch cows per resident.
292 Unfortunately, township-level data of livestock and livestock products is not available in Middlesex for 1871 and 1881, thus I have used data from 1861 (Table 2.1) to show such change. In 1871 Westminster Township animal product records were included in the broader regional numbers, such as western, northern, and eastern Middlesex, rather than at the township level.
293 Though the increase seems small, the fact that it occurred despite the jump of non-farming populations in Westminster references its importance.
294 Data for 1871 and 1881 at the township level is not available.
295 Per resident, this meant an increase from 28.83 pounds in 1871 to 30.33 in 1891, not a large increase, but a notable one nonetheless.
296 This represented an increase of 26.02 pounds per resident (in 1861 – as 1871 numbers are not available) to 27.43 in Westminster. In Delaware, the Adams’ township, farmers produced 34,781 pounds in 1861 and 93,533 in 1891.
297 Westminster farmers, however, clearly were “on the outs” with wool production, as 1891 marked a century low output per resident. The drop was possibly related to ease of access to new manufactured cloth or the increased profitability of other livestock types. Because township-level data is not available in the census for 1871 or 1881 for the number of cattle, we cannot compare it with 1891. However, the county trends likely speak to a similar transition taking place here, as do the total 4,138 cattle recorded in the 1891 census (comparatively, in 1861 there had been 3,367 calves of heifers and 188 bulls, oxen, and steers). See footnote on previous page about the limitations of 1871 and 1881 township-level data.
Drummond identifies that as livestock increased in number, so too did the need for animal fodder. While sheep had been able to graze on natural pasture, the increases in cattle could not be sustained by this system – beef cattle and milch cows, with high daily caloric needs, required other food inputs. Local markets in fodder trade, Drummond states, were “bound to be comparatively buoyant” during the period. Feed for dairy cows and beef cattle came in the form of increased oats, hay, and clover grown on local farms, which, as noted, farmers were able to harvest more efficiently in the late-century period with new machine technologies.

Importantly, these crop and livestock changes were also related to family changes. This highlights the role of family life cycle since each diarist’s family grew in number over the era, allowing the Erringtons, Glens, and Adams to increase their overall production.

Part II: Selling to the City

The Glen family was a part of these county-wide trends in crop and livestock production and in distant networks of exchange. Family life cycle also played a major role in these processes, as the increased numbers of maturing sons and daughters contributed their labour. The Glens’ maturing family resulted in closer contact with urban centres, as some members of the family could afford the time to be away, visiting the cities for buying and selling while others stayed home to mind the farm.

The James Glen Family

In the 1860s, James Glen and his family had farmed on two plots of land – one on the sixth concession in Westminster Township and a section of his father’s plot on the eighth. Rose had given birth to their second child, Janet “Nettie” Glen, in 1868, who was followed by William “Willie” Glen,
named after James’ brother, in 1869. This family size, until the late-1870s, put the Glen family at “Stage II” of historian Lee Craig’s delineation of family life cycle stages, whereby the family had only young children, all under thirteen years of age. Most agricultural labour at this stage, including child rearing, was still being performed by the parents or other labourers.\(^{300}\) James’ brothers, parents, and in-laws (the Hairs) aided the family in their agricultural work on his farm. James’ original lot on the sixth concession was medium-sized in 1871, standing at 54 acres (see Table 3.10), though it would not take him long to expand into the large-producer class. The land, though, was well developed in terms of clearing. According to the 1871 agricultural census, the farm had 40 acres under crops and another 14 under pasture; thus, all the land was “improved.”\(^{301}\)

The Glens’ hay, peas, and oats growth, most importantly, signals a shift to livestock production in the township. James had three milch cows in 1871, four beef cattle, 17 sheep, 16 pigs, and a team of horses (Table 3.10). With the milch cows, the family appears to have managed to produce 580 lbs of homemade butter.\(^{302}\) They likely produced far more butter than they consumed, so dairy production for trade appears to have been an important source of the family’s farm income.\(^{303}\) The Glens were not alone in their dairy production. The Erringtons, for example, produced 472 lbs of butter for consumption and trade.\(^{304}\) Both families clearly sought to make dairying a major part of their farms’ operations. This data, though, is only a snapshot of the Glen farm according to the 1871 agricultural census. Local

\(^{300}\) Lee A. Craig, To Sow One Acre More: Childbearing and Farm Productivity in the Antebellum North (Baltimore and London: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1993), 55.

\(^{301}\) James Glen’s primary grain crops were oats, barley, hay, and wheat (his farm produced 198, 86, 40, and 34 bushels, respectively, of each – Table 3.10). By comparison, as seen on Table 3.11, in 1871 the Errington family produced far more barley and oats but showed the same desire to grow a wide variety of crops.

\(^{302}\) Canadian Agricultural Census, 1871, Westminster Enumeration Division 4, page 7.

\(^{303}\) Given Frederick Bateman’s estimate of 25 lbs. of butter consumption per adult, it would appear that James’ family of five produced an excess of, at least, 455 lbs. The figure was likely even higher, given than the James’ children were under 13, as mentioned, and would not have consumed as much as Bateman suggests for adults. See Fred Bateman, “The Marketable Surplus in Northern Dairy Farming: New Evidence by Size of Farm,” Agricultural History 52/3 (1978), 354.

\(^{304}\) Canadian Agricultural Census, 1871, Westminster Enumeration Division 5, page 9.
assessment rolls for the 1870s, when coupled with these snapshots, are more useful since the documents’ annual nature show the farm as it progressed, rather than just every ten years.

The Middlesex County Assessment rolls show some important developments occurring on the Glen farm in the early 1870s. Between 1871 and 1872, as shown on Table 2.5, the Glens intensified their dairy production. While they remained on the sixth concession lot until 1874, they had already begun to accumulate dairy cows and beef cattle, as James had 10 listed in 1872. James’ early shift to dairy production was encouraged, partly, by the development of the Glanworth Cheese Factory (in place by the 1870s), where James was one of the original owners. 305 Early on, he attempted to run its milk route in addition to his farm, but by February 1876 he gave up, sold his share of the factory, and re-dedicated himself solely to farming as he had by then acquired part of his father’s larger farm. 306 In 1873/4 James received his father’s bequeathed land, doubling his total acreage and allowing the family to expand their dairy operation. 307 James also sold his sixth concession land and bought a lot on the seventh concession across the street from his father’s former lot. The move allowed James and his brother William Glen to work side-by-side, as William received the other section of Michael Glen’s land. This was the largest amount of acreage the Glen family farmed during the period of study, and its size was well suited for James’ combined livestock, dairy, and grain production. The move to the seventh concession was a major change, but it was well timed as the Glen family added a second son, James A. Glen Jr. (“Jamie”) to the family in 1873. Two years later, a seventh member, Isabella Flora “Flor” Glen, similarly joined the group. By 1876, the year I have mapped in HGIS diary entries, the Glens were thus situated on a larger

305 McInnis notes that the major shift to large-scale dairy production in Ontario would not be until the 1880s, so James was at the forefront of this process. See McInnis, “Output and Productivity,” 101.
306 See Glen Diary, February 17, 1876, for entry on the sale. Documents stating the exact date of the cheese factory opening are not available, but Jennifer Grainger notes that the factory likely opened earlier than the first mention of it in an 1884 directory, see Jennifer Grainger, Vanished Villages of Middlesex (Toronto: Natural Heritage Books, 2002), 299.
307 Table 2.5 shows that between 1873, when Michael Glen died, and 1874, his farm expanded to 106 acres (though his number was adjusted the following year to 105.5).
plot of land, much of which was dedicated to dairying and livestock, and the family was expanding in size.

1876: A Growing Family

The Glens’ changing farm and growing children brought the family in greater contact with London and, to a lesser extent, St. Thomas. Most importantly, as the family needed goods in greater quantities, James sought to find them in the region’s urban centres where retail sectors were expanding and offering new types of products. James also sold farm produce to urban buyers, particularly quantities of cord wood and butter, both of which marked shifts in the family’s farming operation. The Glens’ buying and selling activity in the urban centres was not entirely new in the 1870s. After all, he had been visiting London and St. Thomas for that purpose since the mid-century period, but the exchanges increased as his family expanded.

The Glens’ London and St. Thomas exchange events influenced the family’s distant exchange network, as seen on Figure 3.1.\textsuperscript{308} The map depicts proportionate symbols showing where James’ buying and selling activity was highest and the distribution of the Glens’ activity via the ellipse for each decade of diary mapping. For 1876, the overall distribution shows that London and St. Thomas were important centres of exchange since the map’s distributional ellipse is pulled toward the two centres. London and St. Thomas were, as they had been at mid-century, key places of buying and selling.\textsuperscript{309}

\textsuperscript{308} See Introduction for a thorough explanation of “exchange event.”
\textsuperscript{309} To further understand the weighting that contributed to the ellipse, it is important to look back to Table 2.7 and consider the number of events in specific spaces. According to the table, James’ 1876 diary contained a total of 1,083 economic exchange events, of which 100 took place in London and 57 in St. Thomas. In terms of overall share of the diary entries, in 1876, 14 percent occurred within distant centres. James had more selling and buying exchanges in the two urban spaces in 1876 than in 1866 – 19 more in London and 16 more in St. Thomas – even though the proportions of diary entries were similar. It is thus reasonable to say that distant centres were increasingly apparent in the family’s economic exchange choices. James’ activities in London reflect the life cycle stage of the Glens, shifts within the farm to new crop types, and the growing opportunities for trade that London in particular afforded.
During the first few months of 1876, James spent most of his time working with his farm labourer “Jerry” at home, clearing parts of the new farm’s woodlot. Between Monday, January 24, and Saturday, January 29, for example, the two farmers cleared brush and cut, drew, or split wood every day. While some of the wood was for home use, James had also been preparing the product for sale in London. On March 1\textsuperscript{st}, 2\textsuperscript{nd}, and 3\textsuperscript{rd}, he made trips to the city to sell cord wood, the sales culminating in a total of 384 feet.\footnote{Glen Diary.} He sold more wood on March 6 in the city, and again on the 23\textsuperscript{rd}. Finally, James returned three more times in June, once in July, and again in December.\footnote{Glen Diary, June 23, 24, and 26, July 3, and December 23, 1876.} In clearing more forest for additional fields, James found that he could make money from the cord wood as urban buyers needed fuel. Cronon sees wood and lumber, which he terms “stored sunshine”, as one of the natural commodities that linked Chicago and the countryside together.\footnote{See Cronon, Chapter 4, “The Wealth of Nature: Lumber,” in Nature’s Metropolis, 148-206.} Importantly, James was not alone in such activity. While more is said about his farm and diary below, Thomas Adams, who had a large wood lot, went to London 18 times between January and March, 1884, to unload wagon after wagon full of cord wood.\footnote{Like James, he went on successive days – such as each day between January 11\textsuperscript{th} and the 17\textsuperscript{th} (except for the 13\textsuperscript{th}, which was a Sunday) and between February 5\textsuperscript{th} and the 8\textsuperscript{th}. Given that Thomas had two sons, ages 18 and 12, who could work alongside him on the farm, the wood harvesting was extensive. In total, Thomas seems to have sold 18 loads of wood, which by his calculations meant between 2,376 and 2,520 feet. Thomas’ records do not give the exact measurement for each sale of wood. Instead he often wrote “Went to London with a load of wood...”, such as on January 3, 1884. However, on some days he wrote more detailed descriptions. On January 14, for example, he wrote “Went to London with a load of wood, got $5.75 for 132 feet...”, and on January 15, “went to London with wood, got $6 for 140 feet.” Thus, we can estimate that each trip likely contained a full load, which he measured at between 132 and 140 feet. Adams Diary.} For the Glens, the city’s desire for fuel coincided conveniently with land clearing.

Londoners bought other products from the Glens in addition to the family’s cord wood. The products James sold often reflect his shift to dairy. Rose Glen, for example, produced extra butter that James took to the city’s marketplace. James went three times to the city, once in January and twice in April, to unload large quantities of the product (he sold 25 and 20 lbs on the two trips in April, for...
Since he did not yet have a son who could manage the farm while he was away, James sold most of his remaining butter in the town of Glanworth, where countryside middlemen bought large volumes – which they may have then sold to London buyers themselves. Additionally, the family sold eggs, apples, and “fowl” in London. Like the Glens’ dairy products, these items would become more important to the family’s economy and distant networks of trade in the 1880s and 1890s, so they are notable here. James also sold a few other commodities in the city throughout the year, including beef, timothy seed, ducks, and barley. The pattern of unloading goods in the city was a practice continued since mid-century. Overall, James’ selling activity in London in 1876 marks a transition year as he was busy clearing land on his new farm lot and beginning to concentrate on certain products. Both processes would have important ramifications for the family’s distant exchange network in later decades.

Given the Glens’ growing family, which numbered seven persons in addition to farm labourers, it is not surprising that many of the trips they made to London were to buy goods. Attracted by London’s expanding retail sector, James was in the city sourcing out dry goods, hardware, and other products as early as January 22, and he visited regularly throughout the year until his last trip on December 23. In all, the diarist made twenty trips to London during which he bought items. Some purchases were for agricultural needs and continued a style of buying that was common in the mid-century era, whereby the family “consumed to produce.” For example, James recorded buying lumber, hardware, and agricultural goods – including “mill dust,” wire, seeds, pails, barrels and pitchfork handles – all part of farm production. Other purchases depict the family’s increased ability to buy commercial goods that were available to late-Victorian consumers, such as when James bought oranges, curry, and candy in
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314 Glen Diary, January 22, April 15 and 22, 1876.
315 Glen Diary, September 23, 1876.
316 Glen Diary, March 4, April 15, September 23, and October 4, 1876.
317 Glen Diary, January 22, March 23, April 22 and 29, July 3, August 7, and October 10, 1876.
April, or lead pencils, stationary, and checkers at the end of the year. As well, James went to purchase other household goods, including dishes, a broom, combs and pins, and coal oil. Thus, the family was also “producing to consume.” Donica Belisle, in Retail Nation, argues that it was after the 1870s that Canadians began to show a willingness to spend money on such retail goods, whether domestic food, clothing, or other wares. While Doug McCalla has contested the idea of a “consumer revolution” during this period, it is fair to say that owing to London’s growth in retailing the Glens had increased access to such products. Importantly, many of these buying excursions coincided with selling opportunities, showing that James continued the practice of making multipurpose trips. It was during a butter-sale trip in January, for instance, that James paid his taxes in the city and loaded up his cart with dry goods, hardware, and dishes before returning back home. The diarist likely remained aware of the time-costs of travelling to the city and combined his buying and selling accordingly.

James also went to St. Thomas for urban-based exchanges. While St. Thomas did not compete with London in its range of consumer products, its proximity continued to make it a good place to pick up goods from time-to-time. In 1876, James went to St. Thomas to pay for his newspaper subscriptions to the London Advertiser and The Farmers’ Advocate, he visited the dentist, bought magenta, shoes, ale, groceries, whiskey, a lamp chimney, some tobacco, corn meal, bread, and onions. As in London, some of these buying opportunities coincided with James’ travelling to St. Thomas for other purposes, namely his visiting the grist mill. In turn, the activities pulled the distribution ellipse on the maps southward and
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318 Glen Diary, April 22 and 29, September 23, November 16 and December 12 and 23, 1876.
319 Glen Diary, January 22, March 4 and 29, and November 15, 1876.
320 As discussed in Chapter 2, however, McCalla advises that we should avoid seeing “revolutions” in consumerism since after all many household wares were available to Upper Canadians from early on. I thus note their arrival in the Glen diaries with some caution. Donica Belisle, Retail Nation: Department Stores and the Making of Modern Canada (Vancouver: UBC Press, 2011), 28-29; McCalla, Consumers in the Bush, 12-14.
321 Glen Diary, January 21, 1876.
322 Glen Diary, January 10 and 15, March 9, 14, and 21, August 12, October 4, and December 5, 1876.
closer to the southern urban centre. With visits to London and to St. Thomas, the Glens were able to access household goods with remarkable ease in 1876. The variety and regularity of goods purchased and sold in the diary that year speak to the family’s need for supplies as its numbers grew. In the coming years, their buying power would continue to increase, further influencing their distant network of exchange.

1886: Making Changes

By 1886, James’ family was located in Lee Craig’s “Stage III” of the farming family life cycle, as they had young and older children present in the home. Mary Ann turned 20 in 1886, and James and Rose’s other daughters Nettie and Flora turned 18 and 11, respectively. Importantly, each female member of the Glen household contributed to the family’s dairy production, which had expanded further since the 1870s. As well, sons Willie and Jamie reached the ages of 17 and 13 that year. Their maturity meant that three male members of the Glen family now worked the fields and tended to the livestock, providing James with the ability to make extra trips to London and St. Thomas while the boys looked after the farm. One other new member of the family, Maria Rose Glen, was born in 1878. Since she was eight years of age in 1886, she was beyond the difficult years of childhood and likely worked on the farm in small ways. Finally, James was 46 and Rose 48. The family was therefore at its productive peak – James’ diary and the farm trading activity reflects these life cycle changes.

Though the family still farmed the 105.5 acres they occupied in the early 1870s, important changes were occurring on the farm. By 1886, as shown on Table 2.5, the Glens had at least 88 acres of
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323 While these purchases in 1876 were extensive, as were the sales, James still managed to buy many other items locally (making up the other 86 percent of his exchange activity) from other farmers and in the town of Glanworth. These activities are discussed in full in Chapter 3.

324 Craig, To Sow One Acre More, 55.
cleared land, nine cattle, two sheep and two hogs.\textsuperscript{325} By the 1880s, the Glens therefore occupied a large farm with greater productive potential. The acreage figure meant that the Glens had at least eight more acres improved than ten years prior. Though the assessment rolls for 1885 record that James only had two horses, by 1889 he had five. Further, James’ 1886 diary suggests that he did, in fact, have more than one team.\textsuperscript{326} This number meant that James could drive one team to buy or sell in London and St. Thomas while his sons employed the other team on the farm. Noticeably, the family had largely done away with sheep. In previous years they had as many as 18, but in 1875 he only recorded two of the animals. This meant that land previously used for their pasture was redistributed to other purposes. It would seem that James had chosen to commit his farm more fully to dairying. When James was asked to comment for an 1886 Government-published Report about agriculture in southern Middlesex he said:

> The dairy industry is flourishing; nothing to grumble at except the short pastures and scarcity of winter provender. The cutting box will be a great institution this winter, and with cheap bran and coarse grains every particle of rough straw and old hay may be utilized. Cheese is favored as compared with butter, except with stock-raisers. The best dairy cow is the kind that the \textit{Live Stock Journal} calls a scrub – a breed without a pedigree, but looking like an Ayrshire grade of an improved Jersey – although a dash of Short-horn blood is liked by a good many on account of their ultimate destiny.\textsuperscript{327}

James’ observations describe the positive attitude of farmers towards dairy. According to Ankli’s study on dairying, the industry had improved in Ontario by the 1880s after decades of trial and error.\textsuperscript{328} Dairying had become an attractive option for farmers looking to capitalize on their farms’ productive capacity. Given James’ \textit{Bureau Report} statement, technology had played a part in this process. Since cutting boxes had become available, James and other dairy farmers could feed their cows with greater

\textsuperscript{325} Exact data for 1886 is not available in the assessment rolls, but 1885 and 1889 statistics are, which suggest these figures.

\textsuperscript{326} His frequency of trips to London and St. Thomas, which coincided with heavy, on-farm working, suggest this was the case.

\textsuperscript{327} \textit{Annual Report of the Bureau of Industries for the Province of Ontario, 1886} (Toronto: Warwick and Sons, 1887), 132.

ease and efficiency through the winter, a much better situation than when the animals had simply been left to run loose throughout the winter to find their own forage. Dairy specialists recommended offering cattle hay fed through the cutting boxes mixed with warm bran, corn, and pea meal throughout the winter as better feed meant they could be milked for longer periods. Some farmers were also experimenting with better breeds, such as the Jersey. James’ comments suggest that the Glens may have used this breed of cattle for both milking and for meat. With more land, better technology, and numerous children who could help with milking, the family appears to have positioned themselves to take advantage of the demand for dairy products in the city.

Table 2.7 shows that 1886 was the busiest year for the Glen family during the period of study, going by the total number of exchange events. James recorded 1,470 that year, nearly 400 more than in the previous decade. Notably, the Glens’ activity in distant centres increased, occupying nearly 20 percent of their exchange, up from 14 in 1876. In total, he recorded 252 events in London and 22 in St. Thomas. So, while St. Thomas was of less importance to the family in that year, their London-based activity had more than doubled. This was a substantial change in the family’s distant network orientation. The effect of the increased London activity is shown on Figure 3.1, where the pull of London upon the distribution ellipse can be clearly seen. Importantly, St. Thomas was less important to the family as a centre for business than it had been in previous years. The items he bought show that he likely only went when he needed animal feed to fill a shortage or for specific services.

In 1886, James travelled to London to buy a large variety of items, sometimes making trips just to buy. That year he bought everything from tea, duck eggs, and meat to tanner’s oil, beeswax, blacking,
gunpowder, and a book. He also accessed new services in the city, including watch repairs and a telephone. Though some trips remained dual purpose, such as on January 26 when James sold wood to a London buyer and picked up pot barley and a new horse bit, others appear to have been trips to the city to access the variety of goods the city now offered. On July 19, for example, he went to London solely to buy groceries, including flour, oatmeal, and beans, as well as cement and glycerine. And, on August 3, he went to London just to buy shoes, flour, pea meal, and horse collars.

James was, though, most often in the city to sell farm produce to urban buyers. In 1886 he recorded 39 total sales in the city. Dairy, eggs, and fowl made up the most of the family’s marketed goods. James exchanged butter four times, each in large amounts, selling six, 15, 20, and 25 lbs at each sale. He also sold cheese twice, though the amount was not recorded, chickens twice, ducks three times, and eggs five times. All of these dairy, eggs, and fowl sales amounted to 16 total exchange events. Since the items were likely produced by Rose, Mary Anne, Nettie, or Flora, the female members of the family were contributing in important ways to the farm’s production. This brings us to a discussion of women’s roles in the Glen-family distant network of exchange.

Unfortunately, James’ diaries are relatively quiet on women’s presence at the London marketplace. According to his entries, the Glen women rarely went to the Covent Garden Market. Neither Mary Anne nor Rose, for instance, appear to have visited the city without being accompanied by a male. At Christmas in 1886, to cite one example, Mary Anne needed to buy groceries, so she went to London with James. Only James or his sons appear to have gone alone.

333 Glen Diary, April 10, May 10, June 6, June 22, and 26, 1886.
334 Glen Diary, June 26, 1886.
335 Glen Diary.
336 Glen Diary.
337 Glen Diary.
338 Glen Diary, April 10, May 1, 8, and 15, 1886.
339 Glen Diary, Dec. 24, 1886.
If the Glen women did indeed avoid the marketplace, as is suggested by these records, a contributing factor may have been the location of the market. The market itself was situated near the city’s rough, downtown core, near the city gaol, the police station, and numerous taverns, which at times could turn into a violent environment. For example, one buyer wrote that fist fights sometimes broke out between people. John B. Cox, a buyer for a local tannery, recorded in his 1878 diary that he was quite pleased one day when buyers “I. Fowler” and “I. Reird”, likely working for other tanneries, got in “a real fight (English Style)”. He commented that Reid’s subsequent black eye was “a genuine one in every shape and form.” After another incident, Cox wrote that the buyers all got in a snowball fight one morning, and when a police officer, Paddy Wallace, attempted to put an end to the ruckus, he “got several snowballs himself.” Into the 1880s, as well, inebriates and other miscreants were regularly cited in market square where drink flowed freely. A newspaper entry from 1881, for instance, stated: “A drunken man who was put out of a Market Square saloon yesterday deliberately took off his coat, and spreading it on the sidewalk settled himself down for a sleep. Not considering this a very good sign to have there, the keeper of the house took him inside again.” This is not to suggest that the commercial centre was a space only open to men (indeed, some market taverns were possibly run by women directly), but simply that, out of concern for a marketplace that featured the possibility of run-ins with violent businessmen and over-indulging tipplers, the Glen women may have chosen to avoid the square when alone.

We must also not assume that Rose, Mary Anne, Flora, or the other Glen women had to avoid the marketplace because of its location and association with violence – more practical reasons involving the opportunity cost of a trip to the city may also have been at work. Records show that they were the
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340 April 1878, John B. Cox Diary, Box AFC 20-5, ARCC.
341 February 1878, John. B. Cox Diary.
primary producers of the dairy products on the Glen farm, and likely of the eggs and fowl as well. In a speech to the Forest Rose Grange, James argued that farm women were tasked heavily with the burden of dairying, saying that the labour used on his farm for his butter production was “performed...by the already overworked lady members” of his family.\textsuperscript{344} Furthermore, instruction manuals published on dairying also specifically addressed “sisters in toil” who were responsible for working many farms’ dairies.\textsuperscript{345} Since the Glen women were so heavily preoccupied with such farm work in addition to maintaining the family household, making regular meals, and childcare, it is possible that they simply chose not to attend the urban marketplace regularly because they could not spare the time away from their other occupational tasks. The Adams family also sold butter, fowl, and eggs often, showing that the Glens were not alone in their desire to bring dairy and other “female-produced” goods to urban markets.\textsuperscript{346} On the Adams farm, it was likely Rosalia and her daughters who did such work. The Glen and Adams women, then, were the drivers of some of the change in their family’s selling habits. The families’ dairy, fowl, and eggs sales, since they made up nearly half of James’ sales in the city and almost a third of the Adams’, show that the female members of the two families were integral to the families’ distant exchange networks.

It can therefore be argued that even though James did not record the \textit{physical} presence of women at the city’s marketplace, his diaries do show their agricultural products in the market and their influence on the family’s commercial activity. This image of women’s involvement in commerce accords

\textsuperscript{344} James’ activities with the Grange chapter are discussed in Chapter 6. James Glen, Speech to the Forest Rose Grange, No Date, No 77, Southwold Tp., Elgin County, Box 4822, ARCC.
\textsuperscript{345} Mrs. E. M. Jones, “Preface,” in \textit{Dairying for Profit, or, The Poor Man’s Cow} (Montreal: John Lovell and Son, 1892).
\textsuperscript{346} As shown on Table 3.12, the family held a large swath of land – 151 acres, about two thirds of which was cleared by the mid-1880s. The overall number of cattle on the Adams farm suggests extensive butter production, with the assessment rolls for Delaware putting the family at owning between 14 and 20 head. According to Table 3.13, Thomas recorded 89 exchange events occurring in London in 1884 that year. Like the Glens, as shown on Figure 3.2, urban-centred activity pulled the Adams’ distribution ellipse towards the London marketplace. That year, Thomas recorded selling fowl nine times in the city, dairy products three times, and eggs once. In total, the 13 events accounted for more than 20 percent of the family’s 58 urban-based sales in 1884.
with the secondary literature on women in the era, namely those authors showing that we must view women’s roles in a more nuanced fashion than that described in the prescriptive literature which supported “separate spheres” ideology. The at-home work of the female members of farm families, according to Ulrich, shows the places in which women contributed to the commercial economy and patterns of trade. And as Van Die suggests, we must not view “the home” and “the public” as independent of one another. In this sense, farm women noticeably influenced the family’s distant/urban networks even if they were not often mentioned in the diaries or present for the buying and selling of produce in London itself.

Fruit sales were another important introduction to the family economy and accompanied the dairy, eggs, fowl, and apple products that the Glens sold to the London market. They had become fruit producers for the London market, as the family had between three and four acres of orchard and garden land. Until the early twentieth century, market gardens and orchard production near cities supplied urban dwellers with produce that would have perished had it been imported from further away and supplemented their small, urban gardens. James’ orchards created enough fruit that he recorded 10 apple sales in London, many of which went in large quantities to a Mr. Harris, likely a London wholesaler. Harris bought 33 barrels of James’ apples on November 10 and 11. James’ other sales of apples were in smaller quantities, either in bags or single barrels.

347 See Ulrich’s description of Martha Ballard and her daughters’ work processing flax in Ulrich, A Midwife’s Tale, 29-30.
349 See Table 2.5, for 1885 and 1889.
350 On fruit production in Ontario, see Drummond, Progress without Planning, 36-37; and on market gardening and cities see Conzen, Frontier Farming in an Urban Shadow, 92-96. Darroch and Soltow argue that gardening remained “of vital importance” to urban households in 1871, showing that while farmers grew such products for the cities they were not the only suppliers. Darroch and Soltow, Property and Inequality in Victorian Ontario, 28.
351 Glen Diary, 1886.
352 Glen Diary, January 22, February 20, August 21 and 24, October 10, November 13, 1886.
The Glens’ 1886 activity therefore had grown substantially from its early beginnings. James’ sons and daughters were all productive members of the farm, and this increased their agricultural output substantially that year. Flora, Nettie, Mary Anne, and Rose produced butter and cheese, and Jamie and Willie worked the orchards, fields, and forest. The complexity of the 1886 diary entries reflect these activities and the family’s larger volume of purchases and sales.

1896: Maintaining Productivity and Trimming Back

By the 1890s, the Glens had a much smaller household. In 1889, Nettie Glen had married David Turnbull, the son of the Glanworth Postmaster and general merchant, and by 1891 the pair had moved to Aylmer, in Elgin County.353 That same year Willie Glen married Louisa Nowell, the daughter of a livestock breeder who lived southwest of the Glen farm on a nearby concession.354 And, finally, in 1894, Mary Ann Glen married George White, a local farmer’s son, and moved out of the Glen household.355 This left James and Rose, now in their late fifties, with Maria Rose (18 years old), Flora (21), and Jamie (23) in the household, putting the family in “Stage IV” of Lee Craig’s family life cycle, with only adult or teenaged children living at home.356 Jamie’s adulthood played a key role on the farm since it allowed James to continue to go to the distant centres of exchange throughout the week, and Jamie went on his own as well. Notably, both Jamie and James still performed heavy farm tasks, so James was not yet cutting back on his work efforts. Overall, in 1896, the family was trimming back in terms of household size after decades of expansion.

353 Middlesex County Records, Schedule B, Marriages, David Turnbull and Nettie Glen, 1889, no. 007932 (online via ancestry.ca); 1891 Canadian Census, Elgin County, Aylmer.
354 Elgin County Records, Schedule B, Marriages, William Glenn and Louisa Nowell, 1889, no. 002902 (online via ancestry.ca).
355 Middlesex County Records, Schedule B, Marriages, George White and Mary Ann Glen, 1894, no. 007492 (online via ancestry.ca).
356 Craig, To Sow One Acre More, 55.
Despite a smaller household, the Glens maintained productivity on their seventh and eight concession farm. While assessment roll data for 1896 is not available, Table 2.5 shows that as of 1894 the farm stood at 105 acres, of which 93 acres were cleared. The family had thereby further increased their total of improved land by another five acres since the mid-1880s. The Glens also had seven cattle, a hog, 10 horses, along with 12 acres of woodland, and four acres of orchards and gardens. As will be seen, James had maintained the farm’s concentration on mostly livestock production, fruit, and some other products into the 1890s, thereby continuing his pattern from the previous decade.

James’ diary was in some ways less busy in 1896 than in 1886. As seen on Table 2.7, the total number of economic exchanges lowered from 1,470 to 1,368. This was, partly, a result of the decreased family size. Despite the lessened overall total number of exchanges, James actually had more of them in London and St. Thomas that year – 323 such events occurred in these distant centres, compared to 274 ten years before. Of these, 278 took place in London. For the first time in the Glen diary, the distributional ellipse looped the southern fringes of the city, a remarkable transition since the mid-century period. This is partly owing to a change in the Glen family locally. James’ brother William Glen had passed away in 1893 and his sister Isabella “Bella” Glen died in 1895. As James was given the duty of settling their estates, some of his London activities were influenced by their deaths. Interestingly, as well, James’ St. Thomas activity returned to its previous level, standing at 45 exchanges, showing that the centre was still attractive to him for buying and milling. These two figures mean that, for the first time, nearly a quarter (24 percent) of the Glens’ economic exchange activity occurred outside of rural areas and in either of the two urban centres. Activity in London and St. Thomas outnumbered activity in the nearby town of Glanworth, showing that James and his family chose to rely less on the local town suppliers than before, even though the family was now directly related to the

357 See Diary Statistics Table.
358 Middlesex County Records, Schedule C, Deaths, William Glen, 1893, no. 016520 (online via ancestry.ca); Middlesex County Records, Schedule C, Deaths, Isabella Glen, 1895, no. 011029 (online via ancestry.ca).
general store owner, John Turnbull. As will be seen in Chapter 4, however, part of the lessened
Glanworth transactions were a result of James’ reduction of his town-based drinking. Nevertheless, the
effect of London and St. Thomas upon the family’s distant networks of exchange is apparent.

In 1896, James was on his way to London early in the year. After spending just a few days at
home following New Year’s Day, he went to the city. On January 4, 1896, he bought beef from butcher
George Morris and attempted to sell him a cow.\(^{359}\) He returned to London on January 18, sold chickens
and 5 lbs of butter, paid his taxes, bought glycerine, and had his horse shod.\(^{360}\) On January 30, he was in
London again selling turkeys while Jamie stayed at home “jobbing” on the farm. While there, James
bought whiskey and had another horse shod.\(^{361}\) And two days later, on February 1, he went to the
marketplace to sell pork, chickens, buy books from book dealer J.J. Anderson, pick up some onions, and
drop by the Agricultural Bank.\(^{362}\) In the first two months of the year, James was in London nine times
buying or selling goods. Such frequency of travel was the norm for the family for the rest of the year,
showing how important the centre had become to the family since the mid-century period.

The Glens continued to sell their farm produce in London. Of James’ 79 sales in London, 18 were
sales of butter, nine were chickens, seven were eggs, and two were turkeys. Many of the butter and egg
sales were for large quantities, ranging from five to 24 pounds of butter and eight to 11 dozen eggs,
demonstrating the continued importance of Rose, Flora, and Maria Rose’s dairy and fowl production.\(^{363}\)
They sold butter from January through to September and eggs in the Spring and early Fall. With four full
acres under orchards and gardens, James also persisted with his market gardening activities, selling fruit
24 times, including gooseberries, currants, citrons, pears, apples, and cherries.\(^{364}\) These market-

\(^{359}\) January 4, 1896.
\(^{360}\) Glen Diary.
\(^{361}\) Glen Diary.
\(^{362}\) Glen Diary.
\(^{363}\) Glen Diary, 1896.
\(^{364}\) Glen Diary, 1896.
gardening activities were new to the Glens’ late-century diary, showing the farm’s growing diversification, and they were especially important throughout the summer and fall. Notably, many of James’ apples sales occurred in October, November, and December when his butter sales were fewer. The seasonality of such sales suggests that they ensured cash flow and income throughout the year. The rest of his sales were of pork, a large load of hay (1,810 lbs), and a cow.\textsuperscript{365} The patterns in James’ selling shows that the Glen farm had adapted to access new selling opportunities over the course of the previous four decades, as they concentrated on dairying and raising fowl, attractive commodities in the urban marketplace.

The Glens were not alone in developing such urban-influenced farming practices. The Adams family, which was in many ways like the Glens in the 1890s with six older children filling the home – four girls and two boys, ranging in ages from 14 to 26 – also concentrated on shifting their farm operation to take advantage of urban needs. They too sold eggs, butter, and fowl in London to urban buyers in the 1890s.\textsuperscript{366} Additionally, the family sold feed, livestock, and livestock products in the city, including hogs to the London Packing house, calves, and beef.\textsuperscript{367} This pulled the distributional ellipse toward the city in 1894, with it even encompassing Petersville, the city’s southwest fringe (Figure 3.2). The Adams clearly took advantage of a similar set of circumstances that had attracted the Glens, namely a cohort of female farm children and Londoners’ desire for the family’s products.

James’ purchases continued to be partly for farm use and others for pleasure. Others reflect the state of the Glen farm and the settlement of Bella and Willie Glen’s estate. Buying in London pulled the overall Glen exchange activity northward, as shown on Figure 3.1. James continued to buy dry goods

\textsuperscript{365} Glen Diary, January 2, November 11, and October 14, 1896.
\textsuperscript{366} In 1894, in fact, Thomas recorded 25 exchanges of the three products having occurred at the marketplace, accounting for more than a third of the family’s 68 urban-based sales. Adams Diary, 1894.
\textsuperscript{367} Adams Diary, May 22, July 14, and February 24, 1894.
consistently and he also sought out agricultural services and products.\(^{368}\) Such buying had been common for the Glens for some time, showing that London had established itself as the place to access such goods. Interestingly, James also purchased bread frequently in London – a total of eight exchanges were for this product. These occurred mostly during the hottest months of the year – June, July, August, and September – and were likely made not just for convenience but also to save the household from being heated by the kitchen stove.\(^{369}\) The purchases tell us that the Glens had enough buying power to enjoy access to such labour-saving luxuries.

The city also offered services to the Glens which came in handy during the settlement of the Willie and Bella Glen estate. James wrote that he had dealings with the \textit{London Free Press} for the purpose of advertising the sale of the Bella and Willie Glen farm.\(^{370}\) Other exchange events relating to the estate involved the purchase of legal services from the offices of Meredith, Fisher, and Stanley, London-based lawyers.\(^{371}\) While some of these purchases were just occasional, they add to our image of London’s supply of a variety of services to rural visitors in the late-century period.

Having been relatively unimportant to the Glens in 1886, St. Thomas appeared several times in James’ 1896 diary. He was actually able to sell hay there twice, in large amounts (1775 lbs and 1905 lbs), a rarity in the Glen diary.\(^{372}\) Most of the other exchanges in St. Thomas were, however, still purchases, as in other diary years. Since his doctor appears to have been located in St. Thomas, James bought medicine there six times, in July, August, September, and October, bitters in May, and he picked up

\(^{368}\) Shoes were purchased on June 27, August 8, September 12, and November 10; “Sundries,” April 7, June 6, July 4, and February 6; buttons on February 6; and clothes on July 15, 1896. James had his buggy repaired on July 15, his tire welded on December 1, and horse shod on January 18, April 28, June 29, October 30, and December 22, 1896. He also picked up some extra clover and bran when his supplies ran short. Glen Diary, April 13, February 6 and March 14, 1896.

\(^{369}\) Glen Diary.

\(^{370}\) Glen Diary, November 11, 1896.

\(^{371}\) Notably, the “Meredith” firm was associated with William Ralph Meredith, conservative MPP and successor of John Carling.

\(^{372}\) Glen Diary, May 20 and June 17, 1896.
some shingles and nails in July from a hardware retailer.\textsuperscript{373} While the cause of the return of the frequency of St. Thomas-based exchange is unclear, the city’s growth likely played a role.\textsuperscript{374} The centre also remained a convenient space for quick buying and selling or for specific services.

Small purchases and frequent sales formed the basis of the Glen distant network of exchange in 1896. Over the three decades of study the family’s participation in buying and selling activity in St. Thomas and London had increased in frequency and in variety. New services were available in London, in particular, such as the telephone and insurance, and larger urban populations required food in larger quantities. The Glens’ production of dairy, fruit, and fowl products were designed to serve these urban needs. The fact that the Glen women were highly productive members of the family allowed for this system to develop, as they produced nearly half of all the items sold in London in 1886 and 1896. Further, the family’s buying habits, whether of dry goods, groceries, or others items in London, or doctor’s services and milling in St. Thomas, fit with the needs and opportunities of the Glens at different life cycle stages. The family’s spatial orientation toward London brought them into contact with urban people, city retailers, and businesses that had developed during the same decades.

\textit{Conclusion}

The rural population could experience the city in many different ways. We cannot say that the Glen experience was the norm for all other farm families in the region. The Adams and Erringtons, though, did have similarities – particularly their agricultural choices, including women’s involvement in dairying and fowl production, and their patterns of buying and selling, showing that the Glens were not

\textsuperscript{373} The diary records for 1896 are not clear on why James required medicine from St. Thomas doctors. James did say that the medicine was “for myself,” thus hinting that he had some medical condition that required attention throughout the summer and early fall. Given that James laboured heavily, even in the days immediately before and after many of these medical purchases, it would not seem, however, that the condition affected his ability to work to any great degree. On one trip day to St. Thomas, made on July 8, 1896, for example, James proceeded to “horse rake,” drawing in five full loads of hay, and the next day he was up and on his way to London. Glen Diary, May 1 and July 8, 1896.

\textsuperscript{374} See St. Thomas population growth Table 3.4.
entirely alone in their experience. In this sense, individual family choices were encouraged by generational development.

The Glens’ participation in the city was not an entirely new development. That said, they did live within a world with changed circumstances, whereby London, in particular, offered new services and goods to the family which they chose to access. Similarly, Londoners themselves desired products which the Glens chose to produce, taking advantage of this need. Overall, this was a period of change occurring within pre-existing rural/urban buying and selling relationships.
Chapter 4: “The More Things Change”: Productive Neighbourhoods and Local Farm Networks in Late-Nineteenth-Century Ontario

This chapter focuses on local spaces of interaction, the fields, concession roads, and towns, in the communities and neighbourhoods of the Erringtons, Glens, and Adams between 1876 and 1896. I argue that the urban-based buying and selling of the late-nineteenth century fit with already-established patterns of work and exchange in local neighbourhood and community spaces. Farmers first produced agricultural goods at home in local contexts before taking them to cities to trade, as they had at mid-century. This ensured that local work continued to be a part of the overall production chain. The Erringtons, Glens, and Adams continued to work alongside their immediate family, friends, church members, and others on the fields of their townships. Most importantly, they did not market in cities at the expense of their own neighbourhoods and communities – local exchanges continued to grow during the period. I show this by looking closely at the maintenance and development of each of the three family’s local networks, which included their exchanges of goods, services, and labour in Westminster and Delaware. By looking at all three families, the chapter details the variety of local exchanges among different producers and analyses the relationship between family life cycle changes and local networks, as the three diarist families were each at different stages in their lives.

As Gerald Pocius described in his study of Calvert, Newfoundland, sharing dispersed resources and working together in local spaces ensured the continuation of community and neighbourhood sensibilities. Farm work in Middlesex County still required this local activity, and diaries show that rural exchanges occurred almost every day between families, whether out of the need to access local services or to buy and sell feed, livestock, household products, or other items. These local needs allowed for overlapping connections between families and the continued accrualment of social capital. The same person that James Glen bought goods from in Glanworth, often on credit, for example, was also a

relative and church member. Thomas Adams worked in the fields with his local Postmaster, and the Postmaster’s wife visited Rosalia Adams on occasion for tea and quilting bees.\textsuperscript{376} Trust, a “nearly universal concomitant of dense social networks,”\textsuperscript{377} grew from such overlapping connections and continued to be important as agricultural work required reciprocal exchange between neighbouring farmers and relatives. Such agricultural work was “lubricated,” to use Robert Putnam’s term, by such trustworthiness since having confidence in the reliability of neighbours provided a basis for reciprocity and support.\textsuperscript{378} As at mid-century, proximity allowed for overlapping networks, frequency of interaction, and the maintenance of trust between neighbours.\textsuperscript{379} Though Cronon pointed out that railways liberated trade and commodities from geographical restrictions, proximity clearly still mattered.\textsuperscript{380}

This chapter covers the rural experience of the farmers in Westminster and Delaware Townships in two parts. Following a brief historiographical review, Part I discusses the maintenance of local exchanges of goods and services between farmers and nearby residents. This includes the diarists’ participation with townspeople, as town growth was one of the key developments of the era that contributed to an ongoing density of local community ties. Part II looks at local labour exchanges, involving both paid and unpaid work, as well as related lending and borrowing networks. Each were a part of local production which maintained the systems of trust between neighbours that had been part of agricultural work since the county’s initial settlement.

\textit{Historiography}

As discussed in Chapter 1, much is often made about the supposed incompatibility of farm and urban life in the late-nineteenth and early twentieth century. In the American Mid West, for example,
Neth argues in *Preserving the Family Farm* that farm people maintained the strength of their own communities and neighbourhoods by resisting coercive “rurban” Progressive Era social reform movements. She says that some farmers created “alternative farm organizations that challenged agricultural institutions and businesses,” and even states that most rural people resisted urban-idealized control through practices in “their daily lives.” The image Neth presents is similar to that of Hann’s early study of Ontario farmers or Bouchard and Sylvester’s later works on Saguenay and Montcalm, in that each emphasized contestation and disjuncture in their narratives, whether between large agribusiness and small family farms, change and resistance, capitalism and community, or modernity and tradition.

While it is fair to say that such resistance did exist, in this chapter, however, I emphasize the complementary nature of urban marketing and rural production, as shown in the farm diaries. This perspective accords with Loewen’s findings. In *Family, Church and Market*, particularly, he shows that Mennonite farmers in Manitoba took part in urban-based trade in order to maintain their own style of life – that of independent farmers in a rural community built upon a common religious and ethnic identity. Loewen’s observation is important in that it points to the association between community-centred rural production and urban-oriented trade. As Jacques Ferland and Christopher Wright argue, urban industrial cores relied upon all labour efforts throughout “the path of commodity production. Basic commodities such as food textiles, clothing, footwear, printed matter, furniture, building materials, and housing were not just made in the city, as is often suggested in the historical literature...all those who devoted time and energy to” the production process were contributors.

---

381 Neth, *Preserving the Family Farm*, 146 – see also Chapter 5, “Reorganizing the Rural Community,” 122-146.
383 Loewen, *Family, Church, and Market*.
Cronon and Nye also describe the linkages between rural people and the market, their communities, and those of the city and industry.\textsuperscript{385} For urban growth to have happened, as Drummond says, rural people had to be willing to take part in the process.\textsuperscript{386} Urban people therefore needed the support of local, rural trade networks and neighbourhood exchanges, since it was in the countryside that rural people produced goods later taken to cities.

Farm families worked together locally to prepare goods for the city. In order for the Glens to make butter and cheese, for example, they bought fodder crops for their cows from local farmers, or harvested their own with the labour of neighbours. Occasionally they sought the help of other local labourers, often sons from neighbourhood families, to supplement their efforts. Finally, general store owners and town craftsmen and merchants provisioned working families with everyday items, such as groceries and dry goods, or agricultural services, such as shoeing and blacksmithing, without the need for a distant trip into the city. Buying and selling goods in London, while indeed contributing to city growth, also helped to build rural neighbourhood and community networks. In this chapter, I have made every attempt to make clear that rural and urban networks were important to each other.

In all three families’ diaries, community and neighbourhood exchanges were frequent throughout the late-nineteenth century, showing the continuing importance of local economies. Referring to the diary statistics tables for each family (Tables 2.6, 2.7, and 3.13), it can be seen that in each decade the families maintained a steady number of local sales and purchases with community and neighbourhood members. Frederick recorded from 555 to 615 exchange events within his local, rural networks between 1876 and 1896 (85 to 89 percent of his overall exchange events); James Glen recorded between 926 and 1,045 during the same years (between 76 and 86 percent of his overall exchange events).


\textsuperscript{386} Drummond, \textit{Progress Without Planning}, 51.
exchange events); and Thomas Adams recorded 425 in 1884 and 287 in 1894 (83 and 72 percent of his overall exchange events).

The density of local goods and services exchanges is shown on Figures 4.1, 4.2, and 4.3. Each family had numerous exchanges each year with families who lived near to them, whether in the Glanworth area or the Adams’ central Delaware. The diarists accessed many services locally, particularly those dedicated to agricultural production, such as farrier, blacksmith, and harness maker services, and others, such as postal services. They bought a large variety of goods for the farm and the home nearby as well – everything from alcohol, to dry goods, groceries, and hardware – and they sold others, such as eggs, dairy products, potatoes, wood, feed, and livestock.

The diarists also exchanged labour with other farmers and farm labourers and they lent and borrowed items regularly as well, both of which added to the density of their local networks. Figures 4.4, 4.5, and 4.6 depict the diarists’ labour exchange and lending and borrowing exchanges. Here, labour exchanges are defined as comprising two types: 1) paid labour, where the diarists hired farm workers in exchange for wages, and 2) unpaid labour, which included the labour of the diarists’ sons, daughters, and spouses and the labour given and received in the neighbourhood as part of a reciprocal relationship (when farmers gave their labour but expected to be repaid with equal labour, such as at farm bees or during less eventful and more commonplace acts of helping). Since lending and borrowing exchanges similarly involved elements of reciprocity and trust between local peoples, I have included them on these maps as well, though these exchanges refer to the lending and borrowing of equipment and should not be confused with labour. Overall, these local exchanges encouraged the maintenance of local networks throughout the late-century period.
Part I: Local Exchange of Goods and Services

As Douglas McCalla has shown, local markets were fundamental to agricultural life. Each family bought and sold nearby, often out of a need to conveniently access goods and services or to generate income without leaving the local region. Furthermore, the diarists expanded their activity in local markets in ways that reflected their changing buying power, households, and farm size.

Farmers remained aware of the opportunity costs associated with buying and selling in cities and often preferred to shop locally. Even though roadways were improved and the diarists had more free time to leave the farm as their children matured, the costs associated with a morning or afternoon’s travel persisted. Each family would have been well aware of the value of accessing services and goods and selling produce nearby. This is especially true of James Glen, whose accounting skills meant that every purchase, even those as small as 5 cent candies bought at the Glanworth general store, made it into his diary. Whether buying and selling services or exchanging agricultural products or household goods, such pragmatism ensured that farmers continued to look to their community and neighbourhood networks for many of their needs.

Exchanging Services Between Locals

The Erringtons, Glens, and Adams each accessed a variety of services that people supplied locally and occasionally provided them to others, often benefitting from or creating overlapping network connections between the families. Exchanges of these services are included on Figures 4.1 through 4.3. Raising livestock necessitated many of these exchanges. Most often the exchange took the form of bull “servicing.” Frederick, for example, wrote in 1886 that he sought bull servicing 14 times, from the

---

Mills, Nowells, and Shores, all local neighbours. Since the Shores were fellow attendees of the Erringtons’ Christ Church, the two families had overlapping social and economic connections which would have encouraged such activity. Like Frederick, James brought his cows and heifers to the Nowells’ bull. In 1886, the visits numbered 12 between May and September. The frequency of contact between the Nowells and the Glens, nearly weekly at important times of the year, coincided with a marriage between the two families when James’ son Willie married Louisa Nowell in 1889. The business connection between the families remained into the 1890s as James continued to bring cattle to the family’s bull in 1896, thereby creating an overlap between kinship and local exchange networks.

James and Frederick also had particular sets of skills that others needed. James, for example, worked occasionally as a local auctioneer in addition to his farm work. In 1886, he recorded 10 auctioneering events at the McGregors, Bennetts, Delaes, Hairs, Johnstons, Nixons, Murays, Regans, and Sinclairs, families who lived nearby and many of whom he knew from his churches. While we do not know how James acquired the auctioneering ability, he was busiest in the 1880s when he had several adult children who could take over while he was away auctioneering. Frederick Errington served as a “sheep valuer” for nearby residents on a number of occasions. He offered the service to local residents George Weekes and Dugald McPherson, the former also a member of Christ Church, on a number of occasions in 1876, 1886, and 1896, possibly so that McPherson could collect insurance money. On January 22, 1896, for example, one of McPherson’s sheep had been killed by a pack of

---

388 Errington Diary, 1886. Most of these purchases occurred in the summer months, except for on February 3rd and another on November 30th.
389 Glen Diary, 1886.
390 Glen Diary, June 10 and 28, 1896.
391 Glen Diary, 1886, most of these “sales” occurred in March, April, May, October and November, surrounding the planting and harvesting seasons.
392 Details on the reason for the exchange are unclear; however it is possible that Frederick was a “third-party” valuer for such collection. Notably, he does not appear to have collected pay for the service, as neither the diary nor the family’s account book record income coming from the activity. Errington Diary, October 12, 1876, November 15, 1886, and January 22, 1896.
stray dogs, so Frederick walked over to conduct the valuation. For both diarists, such services created overlapping networks in their local space.

*Exchanging Goods Between Locals*

All three diarists bought and sold goods locally as well, including agricultural products and household goods. Farmers exchanged agricultural products when they had a surplus of one product or were in short supply of another. They also exchanged products that were especially bulky or inconvenient to take to London or St. Thomas, such as loads of animal feed or livestock that might require a morning’s travel or were difficult to transport.

No matter how improved road conditions were between London and Delaware and Westminster Township by the 1890s, feed could be a bulky product to trade so it was ideal for local exchange – especially for a crop such as hay. For all families involved in exchanging feed, the avoidance of a trip into the city to buy or sell it could be particularly convenient. Exchanging it locally reduced worry about overturned carts, poor roadways, or being away from the farm when work was heavy, and buyers also knew where it originated and could see its quality first hand. Each diarist exchanged animal feed frequently with other farmers or local merchants throughout the years. Looking just at the 1880s (1886 and 1884), for example, James exchanged hay, “shorts” (course wheat meal and bran), peas and “chop” (usually pea chop) 19 times, Thomas recorded 16 such exchanges, and Frederick six. \(^{393}\) Many of these trades were for large quantities. James’ hay exchanges were for between 1,000 and 1,790 lbs, and they went to local Glanworth merchants John Turnbull and John Drumgould, possibly as part of payment for debts incurred at their shops. \(^{394}\) Frederick was particularly effective in making local sales of feed, and many of them occurred immediately at his farm gate. When he sold barley to a Mr. Walker on February

---

\(^{393}\) Adams Diary 1884; Errington Diary, 1886; and Glen Diary, 1886.

\(^{394}\) James recorded 1,000 pounds of hay went to a Mr. Campbell on January 7, 1886, and 1,790 pounds to J. Turnbull on the same day.
18, 1876, for example, he noted that the buyer simply stopped by “and got 10 bushells of barley.” Very little effort had to be made in marketing, as customers just came and went throughout the day and arrangements could be made while visiting the post office, attending church, or helping a neighbour harvest, showing the continued effect of propinquity and overlapping local connections.

While the diarists each sold surplus feed locally to other farmers, they also bought some of the same crops when they were short, sometimes for cash. In June of 1876, for example, James was in need of a small quantity of peas as his own had not yet ripened. He also did not have enough teams of horses with which to travel to buy feed elsewhere and still perform the farm work that day. His father-in-law, William Hair, supplied turnips on the 10th, and James picked up more from his neighbour Mr. McMillan, member of St. Andrew’s, for which he paid 60 cents, on the 12th. Thomas similarly sourced oats locally, 286 lbs to be exact, on July 1, 1884, from a Mr. Kaiser who lived one concession west of the Adams farm.

Livestock too was difficult to transport over long distances so the diarists traded animals locally when possible. Throughout each decade, sheep, calves, heifers, cows, steers, and pigs changed hands on the concessions of Westminster and Delaware Township, adding to the density of local exchanges. In 1876, for example, James had a labourer named Jerry who worked his own plot of land as well, so the worker bought one of James’ calves. That year James also bought some pigs and cows from his neighbours Mr. Pearce and Hugh McPherson, respectively. Frederick, who had a substantial livestock holding, bought locally as well. He was able to secure sheep from the Weekes in 1876, pigs from the Bennetts and the Wrights in 1886, and more pigs from the Bradishes and Hawkshaws in 1896 – all

395Errington Diary, 1876.
396According to the Westminster Assessment rolls, James had between two and four horses throughout the 1870s. See Table 2.5.
397Glen Diary.
398Adams Diary.
399Glen Diary, April 11, 1876.
400Glen Diary, October 31 and January 17, 1876.
notably members of Christ Church and part of his local social network.\textsuperscript{401} Finally, Thomas Adams picked up a cow at neighbour Anson Hunt’s in March of 1894, and he sold a bull and a hog to the Bignalls and Dingmans that same year.\textsuperscript{402} In the Glen diary alone, James made eight rural exchanges of livestock in 1876, 11 in 1886, and 11 again in 1896.

The diarists also bought and sold meat locally. Though it cannot always be determined in the diaries, the exchanges were made sometimes to pay debts and other times for cash. In either case, when farmers slaughtered their animals, they often traded the excess that their own family could not consume. It was important to avoid spoilage when families had excess of the product or to obtain some quickly to fill short-term needs. As such, Frederick was able to obtain a quarter of beef from neighbour Mr. Wright on January 14, 1876.\textsuperscript{403} As well, James got beef locally from Ralph Errington on two separate occasions, in August and September of 1886.\textsuperscript{404} In both Frederick and James’ exchanges, it is possible that they received the meat in payment for debts incurred. James also received beef twice more from Ralph in 1896, here paying both times in cash.\textsuperscript{405} Whether a cash sale or not, the exchanges show a steady continuance of rural livestock and meat buying or selling in rural Middlesex.

Purchasing extra beef was often necessary when diarists held a work bee or another special event. As discussed by Catharine Wilson, farmers had to acquire items a day or two prior to holding a bee as they were required to serve their labourers plentifully in exchange for their work.\textsuperscript{406} James’ receipt of a large quantity of beef (25 lbs to be exact) from Ralph on August 31, 1886, for example, was likely for the manure bee that he had on his farm the same day. He had also acquired 82 lbs of flour

\textsuperscript{401} Errington Diary, December 4, 1876; March 31 and October 21, 1886.
\textsuperscript{402} Adams Diary, March 21, October 25, and November 27, 1896.
\textsuperscript{403} Frederick does not make it clear in his diary if he paid cash for this sale. Errington Diary, January 14, 1876.
\textsuperscript{404} Glen Diary, August 31, September 15, and January 21, 1886.
\textsuperscript{405} Glen Diary. The Ralph purchases were on October 27 and November 3, and Mr. Smith July 22 and November 18, 1896.
\textsuperscript{406} Catharine Wilson, Foods of Plenty Workshop Presentation (Foods of Plenty Workshop, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, June, 2013).
from the Jacksons the day before and he had prepared plenty of cider for his workers in advance. 407 The large quantities of food fed fellow local “bee-ers” F. Errington, Willie Glen, William Hair, George Weekes, the McPherons, H. Bennett, R. Rose, Johnny Caughlin, David Turnbull, and J. Brady. 408 The other beef acquisition (of 10lbs) was needed for James’ gravel bee a couple of weeks later. 409 In addition to bees being a part of the reciprocal exchange network that will be discussed below, the events required local exchanges of food as part of the preparation for hosting a “good bee.” Meat was thus an essential part of the community exchange network, with some acquiring it to augment their household supply and others to get rid of excess quantities.

The diarists also listed the occasional exchange of “other” items, such as agricultural necessities, household goods, or food. The pattern behind most of the exchanges shows that they occurred because the products were available and conveniently located. In 1876, for example, James mentioned that he drew tile from the farm of Mr. Gerrard, a resident a few concessions north of Glen farms, to help with James’ draining. 410 In 1886 and 1896 he obtained more tiles from neighbours Mr. McIntosh and the McPhersons. 411 Evidently, the tile was either produced locally or available from farmers who had leftover tiles after completing drainage projects on their farms. James also obtained other miscellaneous goods. In 1886, he bought shoes from D. Regan and a milk can and stove elbow from Mr. Jackson. 412 And in 1896 he got a pair of pants from his son-in-law George White. 413 The acquisition of these items shows that they were, even though occasional, part of the interconnected local network of Glen farms. The Adams and Erringtons noted a few of these types of events, with Thomas getting a plow from nearby resident “Frank Garnett the American”, who lived a few concessions to the west of the Adams, and

407 Glen Diary, August 30, 1886.
408 Glen Diary, August 31, 1886.
409 Glen Diary, September 15, 1886.
410 Glen Diary, June 9, 1876.
411 Glen Diary, May 1886, April 22 and 23, 1896.
412 Glen Diary, October 23, April 22 and 26, 1886
413 Glen Diary, December 15.
apples from his brother Sam Adams in 1884.\textsuperscript{414} Similarly, Frederick picked up five bushels of wheat from Henry Bennett when he was short of his own.\textsuperscript{415} Small exchanges or not, for each family they were representative of local networks.

Overall, the trading of goods and services between farmers continued to be a part of farm life into the last decade of the nineteenth century. Many of the exchanges involved people who were found in other networks, whether kinship, church, or neighbourhood based. The exchanges added to the frequency of contact made between families in local spaces, furthering the everyday, rural experience that had been part of mid-century agriculture.

\textit{Exchanging Goods and Services in Town}

Small towns throughout Canada were an essential component of local life and were prevalent in Delaware and Westminster Townships. While they had been present from the very inception of settlement, many towns grew between 1870 to the 1890s as they came to offer similar services and goods as cities did, just closer to home. Smaller centres in Delaware and Westminster townships offered services with which neither London nor St. Thomas could compete in terms of convenience. Town businesses were vital to supplying farm households with their everyday needs. As a result, each family’s local networks involved people in town.

Townspeople helped shape and nurture networks of community. As Randy Widdis says in his study of Belleville, close friendships and associations were built through regular town-based trade.\textsuperscript{416} According to Whetherell and Kmet, who look at the growth of town life in Alberta during the same period, towns were in some ways like cities insofar as they offered services and commercial amenities

\textsuperscript{414} Adams Diary, September 30 and October 6, 1884.
\textsuperscript{415} Errington Diary May 17 and February 18, 1886.
\textsuperscript{416} Widdis, “Belleville and Environs,” 186.
clustered together in a small space. In *Vulcan*, Paul Voisey discusses the services that many rural towns offered in the Canadian Prairies, noting that in Vulcan-area towns, 34 to 49 percent of businesses sold either consumer goods, including food, clothing, furniture, and drugs, or agricultural goods, such as farm implements and hardware. The other largest cohort of commerce was in the service sector which made up 52 to 65 percent of businesses, including blacksmithing, grain elevators, and consumer services (professional, personal, and recreational). Though geographically disparate, Ontario towns of the nineteenth century were in many ways similar.

Glanworth, Lambeth, and the town of Delaware were the major centres of town trade for the Glen, Errington, and Adams families. The towns’ growth can partly be seen in the numbers of occupiers of land who held under ten acres (Tables 3.7 and 3.8). In Westminster, between 1871 and 1891, the number of occupiers of such small plots increased from 139 people to 853 – making an annual growth rate of 9.5 percent. When compared with the annual population growth in the entire township for the same period, which was 1.4 percent, it can be seen that the growth rate for those holding properties that were clearly not designed for farming outpaced that of the township as a whole. Similarly, in Delaware Township, the growth rate of the under-10-acre class of occupiers was 1.1 percent. Though small, the number was still more than the growth of the rest of the township, which stood at only 0.1 percent annually over the course of the two decades. While not exact replicas of the overall town and village population, the numbers hint at the growing prevalence of a non-farming but rural population in the two townships, some of whom would have lived in or on the edges of Glanworth, Lambeth, Delaware, or other small centres. Townspeople would have needed products that farmers supplied and, importantly, offered services to farmers in exchange that might otherwise have had to come from cities.

---

418 Voisey, *Vulcan*, 68.
Despite James’ more thorough descriptions of town trade, each diarist showed that towns formed a part of their local activity throughout the late-nineteenth-century era. As seen on Table 4.1, Glanworth served as the Errington and Glens’ primary town space. Located just 1.03 and 2.31 kilometres, respectively, from the Glen and Errington households, Glanworth was within a short walking or riding distance from their home farms. The inception period of the town had come in the mid-nineteenth century when settler Minchin Jackson helped to secure “the railroad depot for Glanworth” along the London and Port Stanley Railway (see picture of the depot on the first page of this chapter). As discussed in Chapter 2, however, the town itself was only a minor player in the economic exchange networks of the Glens and the Erringtons at mid-century; it did not come into its own until the 1870s. By 1888, the town had a population of about 160 inhabitants. There was a general store, inn, and post office run by the Turnbull family, with whom James was familiar via St. Andrew’s Church. Another general merchant, Joshua Kendree, was frequently mentioned in the Glen diary as selling a variety of products and services. James also visited the hotel run by the Drumgoulds, and a tavern whose keeper was a widow named Anne Collins. The town was well supplied with agricultural services and retailers, including A. Scott, carriage builder, A. Tayler, blacksmith, D.W. Turner, dealer in Agricultural Implements, Mr. Doan, harness maker, and the Glanworth Cheese Factory, which had been operating since the early 1870s. The 1888 History of the County of Middlesex also lists the Coughlins as stock growers and dealers. Though it was only a rail stop in the 1850s, by the last two decades of the nineteenth century Glanworth had become a centre of local, rural commerce. It was no wonder that the Glens kept Glanworth as their primary non-city supply centre, since it was only a few farms away and offered such a variety of services.

---

419 History of the County of Middlesex, 580.
420 History of the County of Middlesex, 580.
Lambeth, in northwest Westminster Township, was a much older town than Glanworth. It is shown to the northwest on Figure 4.1 and northeast on Figure 4.3. Originally nicknamed “the Junction,” it had been settled as early as 1809. It was also much larger, having 270 inhabitants by 1888. Like Glanworth it was filled with merchants, tailors, blacksmiths, carpenters, and inn-keepers; it also housed the physicians J. McLelland and George Routledge, and was the location of a number of flour and saw mills. Both Thomas Adams and Frederick Errington cited the centre often in their diaries. Importantly, Thomas Adams had two towns to choose from, Lambeth and the town of Delaware, though they were not as close to his farm as Glanworth was to the other diarists.

The town of Delaware had been established long before other settlements in the region, since its land was originally patented in 1798. It saw mixed development over the following decades, and for a time was considered for the county seat before London obtained the title. It was therefore a larger town than both Lambeth and Glanworth. In 1888 it had a population of about 300 – including bakers, harness-makers, blacksmiths, flour millers, carriage builders, postal workers, and others. It was also home to two hotels, the Delaware House and the Delaware Stage House, though Thomas Adams’ involvement in local Temperance Societies certainly precluded his involvement in activity at either space. The town, though 6 kilometres to the west, was the Adams’ major centre of exchange activity outside of London and Lambeth due to its range of services. Frederick even visited Delaware a few times in 1876 and 1886. Thomas’ distance from Delaware and Lambeth shows why he was able to access the services in either centre with some regularity. As shown on Table 4.1, Thomas’ farm was about 6 kilometres east of Delaware and 5.85 kilometres southwest of Lambeth. This allowed the Adams family to visit Lambeth on their way to and from London, head to the town directly, or go west to Delaware when its particular

---

421 History of the County of Middlesex, 578-579.
423 History of the County of Middlesex, 482.
services were needed. Since Delaware and Lambeth were located along Longwoods Road, the major highway running west out of London, either centre was accessible to them.

Voisey notes that in winter many Western towns were more attractive than cities further away, as farmers “yielded to the tyranny of distance” and visited the towns closest to their homes. In the townships of Delaware and Westminster, town trade remained relatively steady throughout the year in the 1870s, 1880s, and 1890s. As shown on Table 4.2, though there were some seasonal variations, James Glen’s exchanges in Glanworth were spread throughout the year. In 1876, he was in Glanworth most often in the winter months of the year; in 1886 Glanworth-based exchanges were highest in the spring and summer; and in 1896 summer was the high point as well. Only the fall season affected James’ Glanworth exchange frequency – this was when James was in London selling his harvested crops and products, so he was in Glanworth less often. The town remained a key part of the Glens’ rural network, however, with 91 and 51 fall exchanges in Glanworth in 1886 and 1896, respectively.

Glanworth’s merchants offered a variety of services to James over the years. For the Glens, town trade even grew throughout the period, despite the family’s increasing numbers of urban-based exchange (Table 4.1). In 1876, for example, when the Glen women had extra eggs and dairy products, James was able to unload some of these products in Glanworth, often at the general store. In that year, as shown on Table 4.3, James exchanged dairy products 16 times, almost all of which were sales: four involved cheese and the rest were butter sold in quantities ranging from three to six pounds. Another 13 of his sales were of eggs, ranging from one to three dozen at a time. The Glen family’s egg supply was so plentiful that they never once bought eggs in town from other producers. These foodstuffs would have been essential to the diets of townspeople and supported the growing town population. Since at
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424 Voisey, *Vulcan*, 68.
425 Glen Diary, 1876 – these sales occurred throughout the year, but most in the Winter or Spring months, and a number in September as well.
426 Glen Diary, 1876, most of these sales occurred between July and September.
that point James was without an adult male son to work the farm, selling products locally allowed him to stay close to home rather than head to London for a morning, afternoon, or an entire day away. James accessed this convenience repeatedly in 1876, unloading feed in the town five times (including hay, timothy, and barley), potatoes four times, and wood three times. He also sold a pair of lambs once, two cows, and a sheep-skin. Local sales were not a loss for the Glen family since local merchants tended to pay an amount commensurate with London prices. On April 10, 1876, for example, James sold butter at 30 cents a pound in Glanworth. Five days later, he travelled to London and sold the same product at 26 cents, and three days after that he sold again in Glanworth at 25 cents. The prices in town and in London, at least for butter that April, were therefore analogous.

James maintained a steady number of sales in Glanworth in 1886, when he recorded 72 town-based sales. These sales were part of the 437 Glanworth exchanges the family had that year, as shown on Table 4.3. As before, the vast majority were of eggs, butter, feed, and livestock, mostly sold to merchants John Drumgould and John Turnbull who likely in turn sold the goods on to townspeople. Even though James had a larger and older family, allowing him to go to London much more frequently that year, he nonetheless continued to sell in Glanworth. It is also likely that some of these sales were forms of payment to merchants to whom James had been extended credit, though this cannot be determined from the diaries or available sources.

427 Glen Diary, 1876. 428 Glen Diary, December 19, November 14, and September 25, 1876. 429 Glen Diary, 1876. Unfortunately James’ records do not show if the pattern was similar that year for eggs or cheese, since he tended to write either the total amount of money he obtained for the product rather than the price per unit. 430 Frederick only recorded a single sale of a product in Glanworth in 1876, which was simply a load of scrap iron that he and Freddy had collected from the farm. Since the Errington diary is silent on such small purchases, we see only rare mention of Glanworth throughout the same period. Errington Diary, February 10, 1876. 431 Glen Diary. These sales occurred between January 1st and February 3rd, 1886. 432 In 1886, the Errington diary shows that they too took advantage of the town’s resources, as Frederick noted six wheat sales there (he only sold the product in London once that year). Errington Diary, 1886 – the London wheat sale was February 9th, and the Glanworth wheat sales occurred in April, June, September, and October. The
local trade as they had 36 total sales recorded there. Though reduced from the number of sales in 1886, town merchants were buying in larger volumes which lessened the frequency of the exchanges. In previous years, James had sold smaller quantities of butter, but in 1896 James noted selling butter in volumes of between 4 and 28 lbs per sale, with all but two at over 8 lbs.\textsuperscript{433}

Whether Glanworth, Lambeth, or Delaware, the diarists went to town to buy consumer products; this was a key part of their local networks. In 1876 James Glenn recorded buying items in town 220 times, nearly five times the total number of sales.\textsuperscript{434} Table 4.3 shows the types of goods and services he acquired. Most often, in 1876, James was in Glanworth buying alcohol and grocery items, which supplied his need for a third place of socialisation (a place other than work or home).\textsuperscript{435} Given the size of the Glen family in 1876, perhaps he wanted to get out of the house occasionally and meet up with locals and partake in whiskey or beer alongside them. By 1886, James even had other establishments to choose from, including “Drumgould’s” and “Collins,” both taverns/hotels owned and run by local families. By 1896, however, his purchasing of alcohol had lessened, as he only recorded 23 alcohol exchanges, and these were usually of beer from Turnbull’s, rather than harder spirits.\textsuperscript{436} To supplement, however, James was making his own cider at home.\textsuperscript{437} The frequent need for groceries also brought James into Glanworth. As shown on Table 4.3, James bought groceries 47 times in 1876, 43 times in 1886, and 65 times in 1896. The purchases included everyday items like sugar, tea, corn meal, flour, vinegar, and yeast, and in 1896 he bought bread regularly (a total of 25 times), as well as exotic fruits.

Erringtons also sold a load of oats on April 24 and six lambs to stock dealer Thomas Coughlin on January 8. Errington Diary, 1886.

\textsuperscript{433} Glen Diary, these sales occurred in January, March, April, May, June, July and August.

\textsuperscript{434} See Table 4.3.

\textsuperscript{435} Ray Oldenburg, \textit{The Great Good Place: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Bookstores, Bars, Hair Salons, and Other Hangouts at the Heart of the Community} (New York: Marlowe, 1999).

\textsuperscript{436} Glen Diary, 1896. James appears to have visited the town for alcohol most between January and May.

\textsuperscript{437} His cider habits are mentioned throughout the year, but on August 13, in his diary, it can be seen that he sold excess cider to other residents. Glen Diary, 1896.
not locally grown, such as oranges, bananas, and lemons.\textsuperscript{438} The family also bought a number of miscellaneous household products, such as camphor, matches, coal oil, combs, a sewing machine, starch, lantern chimneys, and lamp wicks.\textsuperscript{439} Evidently, the supply of grocery products and household items at the general store brought the Glens into regular contact with other farmers visiting the centre and with its merchants.\textsuperscript{440} For the diarists, accessing the post office was also essential to the maintenance of their towns and their communities, which they did with some regularity (see Chapter 5).

James and the other diarists also purchased agricultural products and services in town. Throughout the decades James bought seed, hardware, barrels, collars and whips, axe handles, and pesticides in Glanworth from store owners, farriers, and other town merchants. While James preferred St. Thomas for his grist-related activity, both Thomas Adams and Frederick Errington made visits to Lambeth and Delaware for their milling. Though he did not exchange goods in the town in 1876, Frederick recorded visits to the mill in Lambeth seven times in 1886 and 16 times in 1896.\textsuperscript{441} Thomas went most to Delaware and Lambeth for the same service, possibly running into Frederick on one of the few visits.\textsuperscript{442} The Erringtons also accessed Glanworth’s veterinary services from time-to-time. They contacted resident Colin McPherson when the Erringtons’ horse “Loty Fay” had a swollen leg and another time when their cow had an apple stuck in her throat and was in need of immediate attention.\textsuperscript{443}

All of these purchases in towns, for each family, helped keep their exchange networks firmly based in the local countryside. While the urban centres of London and St. Thomas had retail and service sectors that expanded greatly throughout the late-nineteenth century, the towns of Glanworth,

\textsuperscript{438} Glen Diary, 1876 to 1896.
\textsuperscript{439} Glen Diary, 1876 to 1896.
\textsuperscript{440} On general store provisioning, though for an earlier period, see McCalla, \textit{Consumers in the Bush}.
\textsuperscript{441} Figure 4.1 shows that Frederick did not go to Lambeth in 1876, but was there in both 1886 and 1896. Errington Diary, 1886 and 1896.
\textsuperscript{442} Adams Diary, September 27 and February 27 and October 9, 1894.
\textsuperscript{443} Errington Diary, March 21 and November 19, 1876.
Delaware, and Lambeth were able to keep pace. Farm families needed the towns for everyday items or leisure and agricultural supplies. And townspeople, in exchange, needed farmers’ products, whether feed, butter, eggs, or livestock. In all, the late-nineteenth-century world was one in which town-based commerce added much to rural networks.

Part II: Local Exchange of Labour and Equipment

The late-century rural economy relied upon horse power and labour to conduct the work of the farm. The Erringtons, Glens, and Adams utilised their own muscle power and that of their neighbours and extended family to accomplish a variety of agricultural tasks. This occurred alongside the diarists’ adoption of new technologies, such as the plows, threshers, and mowers discussed in Chapter 3. The labour discussed in this section was performed by the diarists themselves, by unpaid labourers (including the labour of the diarists’ immediate family and reciprocally exchanged labour within the neighbourhood and extended kin group), and by labourers paid with wages. Paid and unpaid engagements both had their advantages. Reciprocal labour could be convenient when the price of labour was high, when labourers were in short supply, or when networks of reciprocity were well-established in a region. Paid work, though, allowed farmers to take “the quality and quantity of the work done” into account when paying labourers in cash.\(^{444}\) The lending and borrowing of equipment, such as teams of horses, plows, carts, or other useful items that were needed at certain times of the year, was also part of a coinciding local exchange network. In particular, lending and borrowing was related to reciprocal labour since it too was about non-monetary forms of mutual assistance.

The reciprocal exchange of labour and equipment, whether at bees or for other commonplace acts of helping, was well-understood and had been established during the pioneer era. Reciprocal exchanges relied on trust between local farmers who were known to each other and who lived near one

\(^{444}\) Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees,” 462.
another. What made these exchanges reciprocal, of course, was that the givers of labour or equipment often expected help in return.\(^4\)

Here, I rely on the language of the farmers to recognize labour exchange “types” in several respects. First, I use their language to identify a reciprocal exchange event – i.e. either bees, helping, or lending and borrowing. The diarists recorded that they participated in bees by using the word “bee” directly in an entry or by writing that they went to “a thrashing” or “a raising” (using the article or the gerund), clearly relaying to historians that they were, indeed, at a bee event. They also indicated that they took part in commonplace helping exchanges by using words such as “helping” or “had help” and that they participated in exchanges of lending and borrowing equipment or animals (such as teams of horses) by using the words “lend,” “lent,” “borrow,” or “borrowed.” Second, I use the diary entries to understand the diarists’ relationships with their paid and unpaid labourers. Many of the diarists’ exchanges can be clearly understood to be for paid or unpaid labour – either wages changed hands, showing that a labourer was paid, or a reciprocal event was noted by using the language above. Some workers, however, appear to have exchanged their labour reciprocally with the diarists on some occasions, but on others they were paid. James, for example, received help from his brothers in exchange for help given at a later date, but he also occasionally paid them directly in cash (these events are described further below). Frederick Errington had a similar relationship with his neighbour Henry Bennett, whereby Henry was paid for his work on some occasions, and on others he received help from Frederick instead.\(^2\) Thus, while I can reasonably discern the number of reciprocal events by closely reading the diarists’ language, as noted above, the diaries do not allow for a full quantification or comparison of the number of paid versus unpaid exchanges. Where the relationships between paid and

\(^4\) As Catharine Wilson describes, farmers kept detailed accounts of their beeing activities in order to track work paid and work owed. Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees,” 5-6.

\(^2\) Their relationship is discussed in Chapter 2.
unpaid workers are clear, however, I describe them fully and show how they contributed to the work of the farm and were related to the lifecycle stages of the diarist families.

The total number of each family’s labour exchanges remained roughly the same in each decade (Table 4.4). James Glen, for example, recorded 561 labour exchange events in 1876, 611 in 1886, and 628 in 1896 (making up 52, 42, and 46 percent of his total number of exchange events). Frederick recorded 490, 549, and 494 labour exchange events in those same years (making up 75, 76, and 79 percent of his total number of exchange events). And, finally, Thomas Adams recorded 324 labour exchange events in 1884 and 263 in 1894 (60 and 66 percent of his total number of exchange events). \(^{447}\)

The data shows that farm labour continued to be central to the diarists’ local networks, helping to maintain bonds between kith and kin, alongside the increasing number of urban and rural goods and services exchanges discussed above and in Chapter 3.

Each diarist continued to exchange labour locally with neighbouring families, as depicted on the labour exchange maps. In each decade the Glens, for example, traded labour with the Erringtons as well as with the extended Glen family, which included Willie Glen, James’ brother, and by 1896 the Whites as well (shown on Figure 4.4). Likewise, the Erringtons maintained their labour exchange network through trading work with families such as the Wrights, the Weekes, the Glens, the Jacksons, and others – each notably part of the Erringtons’ social and religious network (Figure 4.5). \(^{448}\) And the Adams traded labour with neighbouring families as well, many of whom lived within walking distance of the Adams’ farm (Figure 4.6). Overall, the exchanges reflected the life-cycle needs of each family and the continued requirement of farm labour. Since this labour was part of the local web of interaction which produced goods for the city, the exchanges show that the diarists continued to choose to conduct the work of the farm with the help of local families.

\(^{447}\) For a discussion or nineteenth-century rural labour see Crowley, “Rural Labour,” 10-103.

\(^{448}\) See Chapter 6 for a discussion of the complementary nature of the Erringtons’ social and economic exchanges.
Throughout each decade, the Glens, Erringtons, and the Adams families maintained their networks of reciprocity, allowing them to manage the work of their farms. Farmers knew that the social practice allowed them to concentrate and redistribute labour and accomplish difficult or heavy tasks with greater efficiency and speed, making it a key part of farm life into the final decades of the nineteenth century. The Glens recorded 98 reciprocal labour exchange events in 1876, 106 in 1886, and 105 in 1896, and they lent and borrowed on occasion in each diary year (Table 4.5). The Erringtons took part in reciprocal exchange events, too. Frederick recorded 79 in 1876, 74 in 1886, and 67 in 1896, and, like the Glens, they occasionally lent to and borrowed items from other farmers. Notably, as the Glen and Errington families shared labour on each other’s farms, some of the reciprocal exchanges actually refer to those at which both diarists were present. Only the Adams family saw a sizable drop in their total number of reciprocal exchange events – while Thomas had noted 35 such events in 1884, in 1894 this number fell to 19. The drop seems owing to Rosalia Thomas’ ongoing illness, which meant that Thomas was not as available to give help to others as he was in other years. Nevertheless, Thomas seems to have made his best effort to keep up his and his sons’ presence at local bees so that they did not entirely exit the reciprocal network.

By the late-nineteenth century, paid and unpaid labour exchange and lending and borrowing practices showed no sign of fading. The persistence of exchanging labour and equipment was simply still a requirement of everyday farm work. Also, as at mid-century, such networks were interwoven with church and kinship networks since each developed in local spaces surrounding the diarists’ farms.

*Farm Labour and the Glens*

The labour patterns shown in James Glen’s 1876, 1886, and 1896 diaries (Figure 4.4) reflect the family’s life cycle stages as they moved from being a small family requiring help to a larger, more self-

---

sufficient unit. During the 1870s, for example, James needed extra labour from farm workers since he was without a son old enough to undertake heavy farm work and Rose Glen was busy with young, dependent children. To address this need, the family hired a farm labourer named Jerry between January and October of that year to work full time on the farm in exchange for cash wages. 450 Occasionally, when James’ small family could not handle the work themselves, James’ brothers Willie, Adam, and Robert came by to work as well. Each performed similar tasks as James, often alongside each other. 451 Willie, for example, built a gate for James in August, Adam drew in clover in October, and in November Bob (Robert) Glen jobbed (did chores), dug around James’ apple trees, husked corn, and picked apples. 452 Sometimes the expectation was that James would return the favour whenever these relatives needed some extra help. For example, in March, 1876, James wrote that his brother Willie helped “draw out rail timber” during the morning of the 27th, and on the 28th he noted that, in turn, he had his labourer Jerry give half a day’s labour back to Willie, likewise drawing logs. 453 At other times James paid his brothers in cash, using them as sources of wage labour, and eliminating the need to return labour. After Jerry’s time on the Glen farm had finished in late-October, 1876, for example, James wrote that he paid brothers Adam and Bob wages for their efforts. 454 James also actively gave labour to his neighbours, in order to maintain reciprocal connections. James, for example, attended several manure bees, a sign of increased density of livestock in the region, on the farms of the Crowleys, the Roses, and the McPhersons, each members of St. Andrew’s Church. 455 As the farmers increased their

450 Jerry’s work was largely paid for in cash. On January 22, 1876, for example, James paid Jerry $1.30 after having written “Jerry thrashing timothy.” Glen Diary, 1876.
451 Glen Diary, January to October, 1876.
452 Glen Diary, 1876.
453 Glen Diary, 1876.
454 On November 8 he wrote “Paid Bob 1.50” for work conducted about James’ farm, for example, and on November 17 James wrote “Paid Adam wages 3.00 in full to date”. Glen Diary.
455 Glen Diary, August 29, October 5, and June 13, 1876.
acreages and livestock numbers, such bees helped them manage the expanding labour requirements at particular points in the year.\textsuperscript{456}

By 1886, the Glen children were more able to contribute to the farm, lessening the need for full-time hired labour. Willie Glen was then 17 and Jamie was 13, so their labour took the place of some of James’ outside help. Both Glen boys were regularly noted in James’ diary as performing farm-based tasks. James referred to “the boys” cutting wood, digging potatoes, jobbing, and making cider. The Glen women managed the household, though childcare needs had largely subsided (the youngest Glens, Flora and Maria Rose, were now 11 and six years old), and they worked the farm as well, particularly by managing its poultry and dairy. So plentiful was James’ own family’s labour that he was able to share it with nearby families. Willie worked for Frederick Errington for a day in February, for example, and James himself worked for his brother-in-law.\textsuperscript{457} James now largely only needed to hire locals with special skills to perform specific tasks for short periods of time in exchange for wages. William Coombs came, for example, to fix the Glens’ cistern in August and September of that year and Helena and Aggie Caughlin were hired to make clothes for Annie Glen in November.\textsuperscript{458}

The Glens also made use of farm bees to help them with their production. Such reciprocal exchanges were crucial to producing agricultural goods which farmers then took to cities, reflecting the interconnectedness of local labour exchanges and the urban marketplace. In 1886, for example, James was involved in a “round-robin-style” sawing bee network between families around Glanworth, including the Erringtons. In March and April of that year, both the Erringtons and the Glens took part in eight sawing bees. The first was at G. Weekes’ farm, followed by another at the Glens’, then more at the

\textsuperscript{456} Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees,” 3.
\textsuperscript{457} Glen Diary, February 2 and August 11, 1886.
\textsuperscript{458} Notably, James paid “Mrs. Caughlin for Dress making”, presumably Helena and Aggie’s mother, rather than the two girls themselves. Glen Diary, December 7, 1886.
Fishers’, Erringtons’, H. McPherson’s, Willie Glen’s, D. McPherson’s, and finally A. Fisher’s. After his sawing bee, James sold some of the resulting cord wood in London. Throughout the rest of the year, James cited numerous other bees occurring when work was heavy. For example, he recorded hosting two threshing bees in 1886, one in August and another in September, which would have helped him with his crops as they came in.

By 1896 James’ son Willie had married and moved off the farm and Jamie replaced him. Jamie was, by then, 23 years of age so he was able to handle any of the tasks that James himself performed. Jamie plowed, jobbed, harrowed, fenced, and cultivated crops, either side-by-side with James or by himself when the latter was making off-the-farm trips. Due to Jamie’s regular work and fewer young dependants, James continued to have little need to hire a full-time farm labourer throughout the year, though local sons and daughters were engaged to perform occasional tasks as a supplement. Jack Bennett, for example, a member of Christ Church, came to the farm daily in November to help plow, ditch, and clean apples alongside Jamie in exchange for wages. Other temporary workers included George Weekes and George and Annie White; Mr. White and Annie picked berries and White and Weekes plowed. Notably, neither George Weekes nor the Whites were paid wages for their labour. Instead, George Weekes had given his labour to James in exchange for the Glens’ help at his threshing bee, and likewise the Whites had received the Glens’ help regularly throughout the year, particularly with cutting feed and threshing. While in 1876 James had had to hire a full-time labourer, the latter two decades of the nineteenth century saw James using the labour of his sons and daughters on the home farm with other local workers occasionally brought on to help.

---

459 See Glen and Errington Diary, March and April, 1876.
460 Glen Diary, 1886.
461 Glen Diary, 1896.
462 James noted paying Jack $5.00 on November 24, presumably the latter’s wages. Glen Diary, 1896.
463 George worked on November 20th and George and Annie (Glen) White came on July 2nd to pick berries.
464 Glen diary, August 28 and December 18, 1896.
Farm Labour and the Erringtons

Farm labour was also important on the Errington family and it helped them to take on increasing acreages (Table 2.4). The family’s labour exchange locations are depicted on Figure 4.5. Unlike James, Frederick’s children were older in 1876, so they were able to take part in the work of the farm earlier. Freddy, for example, was by then 21 and able to handle most farm work on his own. Freddy did much of the hard physical labour for Frederick, including harrowing, digging in the garden, working in the woods, opening pits, spreading dung, gathering apples, and plowing. Willie Errington was 10 in 1876, so he was able to work along with Freddy in the woods, sow barley, work the turnip land, draw manure, wash the sheep, and perform other such tasks. Additionally, Frederick employed local farm labourer David Mann between March and November to plow, cultivate, and perform odd jobs when farm work was at its height and the other Erringtons were already busy working the family’s 91 acres. Mann was paid wages, though the Erringtons paid in both cash and kind. In a June 12, 1876, account book entry, for example, the family recorded “Gave David Mann wages 15.00”; however, on October 26, 1876, it stated “Paid David Mann by fat pig 9.00”. So while Frederick had the labour of his sons, the Erringtons’ large farm required extra help which they received through paid employment. Frederick also had other men, including Christ Church member Thomas Meadows and a Mr. Coombs (likely the same Coombs who repaired the Glens’ cistern), work occasionally at specific tasks. Mr. Meadows, for example, came in May to make gate posts and a new pig pen, and Mr. Coombs came in November to plaster the Erringtons’ kitchen. Notably, Mr. Coombs, too, was paid in cash. These occasional work contracts fit much of the variety of needs that the Erringtons had.

---

465 Errington Diary, 1876.
466 Errington Diary, 1876.
467 Errington Diary, 1876.
468 The wages paid to David Mann appear in the family’s account book. Errington Account Book, 1876.
469 Underlined in original. Errington Diary.
470 Errington Diary, 1876.
When the Erringtons could not handle all of their work on their own, they called upon their reciprocal exchange network to help out. Frederick, for example, still regularly relied on neighbours to help slaughter or process livestock, harvest grains, plow, and draw or chop logs. In the 1850s, he had regularly sought the help of the Pearce family to slaughter and process sows, heifers, and other livestock as the work required more than one person. It remained that way into the late-nineteenth century. Frederick recorded in his diary in 1876 that members of the Wright family helped them to kill a pig, and in 1886 Mr. Weekes came by to aid with another pair. The proximity of the Wrights was what continued to make the neighbourly labour sharing so effective. The Wrights lived within one concession of the Erringtons, so they did not have to make a long trip to come and help out.

By 1886 it was clear that Freddy had chosen to remain on the home farm and would eventually take it over. Frederick also had Percy and Willie, then 16 and 20, respectively, at home. Even though they now had a 136-acre farm (100 of which were cleared), the maturing family was largely able to work the land on their own without the help of full-time, outside labour. The Erringtons only needed extensive outside work at a sawing bee in March and during the late-summer and fall, when “Mr. Weekes and his man”, Glanworth resident Tom Meadows, a Mr. Nixon, and a Mr. Macdonald came to help or to perform specific tasks. The diary is not directly forthcoming about how these workers were paid, but it is nonetheless fairly clear that some were paid in cash and others with exchanged labour. The day after Mr. Weekes came to help the Erringtons late in July with harvesting the wheat field, for example, Freddy and Willie Errington went to the Weekes’ farm to help him thresh. Additionally, the Errington account book notes that “Thos Meadows [was] Paid for work by peas”, referring to his help

---

471 On November 18, 1876, the account book states “Coombs on act of plastering 5.00.” Errington Account Book, 1876.
472 Errington Diary, December 18, 1876, and March 22, 1886.
473 The Erringtons increased their acreage from 91 acres to 136 by 1885 (Table 2.4).
474 For example, Weekes, “his man,” and Meadows came in July and August to help with the harvest, Nixon was given the task of draining the wheat field in September and November, and Macdonald pulled turnips and worked on the road in November. Errington Diary, 1886.
475 Errington Diary, July 30 and 31, 1886.
with the pea harvest, and that Mr. Nixon received wages “for draining”\textsuperscript{476}. Neither the account book nor the diary, however, offer any details on the enigma “Mr. Macdonald,” and if he was paid or unpaid.

Ten years later, in 1896, some of the Errington children had moved out of the house, including Willie and Percy. The loss of these grown sons meant that the Erringtons needed extra help once again, though Freddy remained, however, and Ralph was then old enough to work as well. Freddy and Ralph worked together in the bush in early January and on the hay lands and turnips in July; and by the end of the year they were husking corn, choring, and gathering stove wood.\textsuperscript{477} Without Willie and Percy, Frederick had to engage two farm labourers, Ernest and Launcie, between February and September and April and December, respectively.\textsuperscript{478} In exchange for wages, these labourers helped to work the family’s 130 cleared acres, roughly thirty more than the family had in the 1886 diary year.\textsuperscript{479} The family also hosted several bees to accomplish the farm’s work, particularly two threshing bees held in the early summer and fall to harvest wheat.\textsuperscript{480} The coincidence that these bees were held during Frederick’s last, full, 12-month farming year cannot be understated. In response to the increased acreage of the Errington farm, Frederick’s older age, and the loss of sons who had moved on, the family was in need of some help.

In 1896, the Errington family was showing signs of a shift whereby Frederick’s role on the farm was diminishing as he had begun suffering from age-related issues. On March 8, for example, Frederick wrote that he could not go to church, saying “I did not go as I had rheumatism in my hip.”\textsuperscript{481} Over the next few days, Freddy and the other Errington boys took over the heavy farm work, whether working in the bush, fixing sheep, or drawing loads of gravel to the side road. Frederick did not return to “active

\textsuperscript{476} Errington account book, November, 1886.
\textsuperscript{477} Errington Diary, 1896.
\textsuperscript{478} See Table 2.4.
\textsuperscript{479} The Errington Account Book details the wages paid to Ernest and Launcie. Errington Account Book, 1896.
\textsuperscript{480} Errington Diary, 1896.
\textsuperscript{481} Errington Diary, 1896.
duty” on the farm until the 16th, when he drew a load of gravel himself and cut some feed.482 Frederick’s symptoms had therefore prevented him from direct farm work for nearly a week. It was the labour of Freddy and the other Errington boys as well as paid and unpaid labours that kept the farm going when Frederick was held back. For the whole of the late-century period, then, the Erringtons combined the use of their own work with that of others, both paid and unpaid, ensuring that labour exchange remained a central part of their local experience.

Farm Labour and the Adams Family

The Adams family diaries featured many of the local labour dynamics that were shown on the Errington and Glen farms. These exchanges are shown on Figure 4.6. Thomas recorded in his 1884 diary some of the same tasks seen on other farms, such as sowing wheat, drawing manure, haymaking, plowing, threshing, chopping wood, choring, and others. He also tapped sugar trees throughout the spring and kept swarms of bees during the summer.483 In that year Thomas had the labour of his son Albert, who was 18, and Frank, who was 14. Albert laboured alongside Thomas in the sugar bush, in the fields drawing stones, and with other farm workers, binding oats, cutting clover, and “digging taters”.484 Frank, since he was only ten, performed less skilled and physically demanding tasks, but ones that were nonetheless important to the family economy. The boy spent time pulling bugs off potatoes, collecting turkey eggs, and budding thistles.485 In July, Frank proved of more use when the hay needed to be turned, and in September he and Thomas worked to bring in the clover.486 The Adams family clearly benefitted from the youthfulness of the children and their ability to work on the home farm with Thomas and others.

482 Errington Diary, March 8 to 16, 1896.
483 Adams Diary, 1884.
484 Adams Diary, April 7 and 8; December, 13; August 12; September 18 and October 14, 1884. Adams Diary, July 7, April 7, and June 11, 1884.
486 Adams Diary, 1884.
Unlike James and Frederick, Thomas discussed the home-based work of the female members of his family in his diary in detail. Thomas’ records show each member working on the farm and contributing to their labour network. For example, Thomas’ daughter Sarah “Ina” Adams worked with her brother Frank to bring in sheaves of wheat in August of 1884 and to turn furrows in the fields in September.\(^{487}\) Alongside her sister May, Ina also picked berries in July.\(^ {488}\) Rosalia, Thomas’ wife, was important to the outdoor farm labour in other ways; for example, Thomas recorded that she planted potatoes and onions in the spring.\(^ {489}\) The Adams women were essential as a reserve labour force in the fields during busy times and also at performing other tasks that provided the family with essential foodstuffs, such as the dairy and fowl products discussed in Chapter 3.\(^ {490}\)

The Adams could supply most their labour needs in 1884 within the family, so they did not hire full-time paid help. Like the Glens and the Erringtons, however, occasional supplementary labour was required. Throughout September and into October, for example, the Adams had local resident John Bain Jr. over to cut corn and perform other miscellaneous tasks during the harvest,\(^ {491}\) and they brought on a team of professional threshers (who Thomas called the “Thrashers”) with a machine in February and October to help thresh clover and oats.\(^ {492}\) Rosalia also held a quilting bee in 1884, at which female members of the Hammond, Beach, Bodkin, Howlett, Adams, and Sherk families, some nearby neighbours and others kin, were in attendance.\(^ {493}\) In order to provide similar reciprocal labour to others, Thomas attended several barn raising bees that year as well, at the Ireland, Bashel, and Howelett farms
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\(^{487}\) Adams Diary, August 19 and September 16, 1884.
\(^{488}\) Adams Diary, July 14, 1884.
\(^{489}\) Adams Diary, April 25, 1884.
\(^{490}\) Of course, the Adams women likely also performed many more tasks, such as tending to the dairy and butter production by milking the cows or feeding the calves, as discussed in Chapter 3.
\(^{491}\) Adams Diary, September 10, 16, 19, 22, and October 10.
\(^{492}\) Adams Diary, February 21 and 22, October 7, 1884.
\(^{493}\) Interestingly, many of these families knew each other via the local community that was built around the post office at which Mr. Hammond was Postmaster. In 1897, the Bodkins, Hammonds, Howletts, and Adams all signed a petition requesting the oddly named local post office be renamed from “Raper” to either “Harold” or “Howlett.” Not a single family opposed the request. See Postal Petition 82, 1897, Reel T-2258, Library and Archives Canada. Adams Diary.
(the latter notably present at Rosalia’s quilting bee). The Adams’ farm was a place bustling with activity in 1884, where children, women, men, and neighbours worked alongside each other, performing the work of the farm and contributing to the local labour network.

The diary year 1894 was different in many ways for the Adams family. Rosalia’s cancer prevented her from working for much of the year, and Albert seems to have left home, as his name does not appear in the diary once that year. These changes did not lower the efforts that the Adams put into their own farm, however, as other family members stepped in to complete the farm work. By 1894, though Albert had gone, sons Cratie and Frank were working more. Frank, then 24 years old, was able to help with the more physically demanding tasks, such as chopping wood, drawing dung, plowing, and harvesting, and Cratie, now 14, husked corn and raked in harvested grain. Thomas also sought the help of his neighbour, Mr. Hammond, with slaughtering livestock, and his relative Ed Adams came to help out at the farm between February and March to draw in wood, butcher a cow, and boil sap alongside the other Adams. Finally, Thomas held a threshing bee himself, calling in favours during a difficult year. So while the Adams struggled through a troubling period, the family network remained strong enough to complete tasks in the fields, barns, and woods, and they were still able to avoid taking on the cost of full-time, paid labourers.

Lending and Borrowing Equipment: Glen, Errington, and Adams Families

Finally, though lending and borrowing never occupied a highly significant number of exchanges, it nevertheless carried over from the mid-century era as part of the diarists’ reciprocal exchange networks. As seen on Table 4.5, the Glens, Erringtons, and Adams family each noted more than a few

---
494 Adams Diary, 1884.
495 Adams Diary, 1884.
496 Adams Diary, February 15 and 23, March 19 and 30, 1884.
497 Adams Diary, February 8, 1894.
acts of lending or borrowing in each year of diary records.498 Most of these exchanges occurred with families who lived very close by, showing the influence of proximity upon the lending and borrowing relationships. Frederick, who borrowed and lent the most, for example, traded with the Pearce, McIntosh, Wright, and Glen families, all of whom lived within the immediate Glanworth neighbourhood (Figure 4.5). The items that each family lent or borrowed are listed on Table 4.6. Frederick exchanged pieces of farming technology with other locals, including binders, grindstones, lime boxes, plows, rakes, and seeders, items which would not be necessary to own year-round but were occasionally needed for a short time. For example, he borrowed the lime box from the Turnbulls in October, 1876, when he was plastering his kitchen.499 Both James and Thomas borrowed and lent wagons and sleighs, which, like Frederick’s machinery, allowed them to fill temporary gaps in their supplies. Thomas, for example, borrowed Mr. Kelley’s sleigh in March, 1884, when his own sleigh runner broke down on his way to London, spilling a load of cord wood.500 On March 29, 1876, James lent his team to his brother Willie to help with drawing logs to the saw mill, and the next day Willie returned the favour so that James could go sleighing.501 These exchanges occurred only occasionally in each year of diary records, but they were part of the reciprocal exchange network between neighbouring farmers from 1850 to the 1890s. So while Susanna Moodie had pined about her borrowing experiences, saying that “Those who go a-borrowing, go a-sorrowing”, all three diarists continued the practise nearly half a century after she wrote those words.502

498 James had between two events in 1896 and seven in 1886; Frederick had a low of three events in 1896 and six in 1876; and though Rosalia’s illness prevented any in 1894, Thomas recorded five events in 1884.
499 Errington Diary, October 26, 1876.
500 Adams Diary, March 7, 1884.
501 Glen Diary, 1876.
Conclusion

By the 1870s, rural families of Middlesex County were confronted with the growth of the City of London, a larger and more populous urban entity. The urbanization process increased steadily into the 1890s as London’s economy diversified, and by that decade St. Thomas had grown, too. Farmers encouraged urban expansion by feeding city families with farm produce and by supplying them with wood for fuel and feed for their horses. Urban growth was therefore made possible by work conducted on the farms of rural Middlesex; thus, urban expansion and rural life coincided and reinforced one another.

Whether on the farms of Westminster and Delaware Townships or in the towns of Delaware, Glanworth, and Lambeth, the diarists continued to be regularly involved with other rural families via local patterns of exchange. This is not entirely surprising since, as Ferland and Wright note, the commodity chain web was deeply woven into the countryside. Producers had to exchange with other rural people and access their social resources to accomplish the work of the farm. Rural labour and local exchange were the inputs which made urban trading networks possible in the late-century era, just as they were at mid-century. The two continued to be mutually reinforcing and compatible.
The Post Office institution was an important part of the small-town experience in rural Middlesex. Prior to the institution of rural mail delivery in 1908, almost every hamlet, village, and town in the nation had a post office, and in most settlements the post office was the central feature for day-to-day business and social activity. Yet, while the story of the communications role of the Post Office system, the Post Office as an institution, and the Post Office as an arm of governmentality is relatively well known in Canada, what has not been thoroughly interrogated is the function of the social spaces of post offices and their contribution to the communities that frequented them. This is surprising given the prevalence of post offices in the nineteenth century and the important role that they played in building and maintaining local communities and neighbourhoods, especially in rural areas. In The Historical County Atlases of Ontario and directories that were compiled in the late-century period, post offices are prominently outlined as key pieces of the province’s infrastructure, and local, township

503 This chapter by Nicholas Van Allen was co-authored with Don Lafreniere of Michigan Technological College. Both authors attest that Nicholas Van Allen was the primary author of the text. In preparing this chapter, the share of the duties was as follows: Nicholas Van Allen wrote the first full draft of the chapter, Don Lafreniere added the methodology and performed the geo-analysis/HGIS mapping (Figures 1.1 and 5.1 to 5.10), and then both authors performed subsequent revisions to the text. Later drafts were revised by Nicholas Van Allen in order for the chapter to appear in this thesis. The text was also revised by both Nicholas Van Allen and Don Lafreniere for publication, and it appeared as a paper in the journal Rural Studies in July, 2016. Nicholas Van Allen was primary and corresponding author for this paper as well. See: Nicholas Van Allen and Don Lafreniere, “Rebuilding the Landscape of the Rural Post Office: A Geo-Spatial Analysis of 19th-Century Postal Spaces and Networks,” Rural Landscapes 31/1, 1-19.


histories are full of evidence of concern for “the local Post Office.” Post offices were thus woven into the social fabric of the region during the era and formed the basis for many local settlements. They were central to creating and maintaining communities and neighbourhoods in rural Ontario because the spaces of post offices and the postmasters who ran them became anchors of local networks of trade and socialisation.

This chapter will illustrate how rural post offices functioned in their local communities by utilising a corpus of detailed post office petitions written by residents of Middlesex County to their local postal inspectors and the Postmaster General between 1870 and 1900. We georeferenced and record-linked the petitions within a historical geographic information system (HGIS) that includes the precise location of all 7,100 rural households and the 102 post offices in Middlesex County in 1878. The petitions take advantage of the HGIS by allowing the study to identify not only the post offices in the county and the petitioners who signed them, but also to measure and analyse the spatial relationships between them. The petitions, when viewed through this geospatial lens, provide insightful detail about the debates surrounding post office locations, services, and their roles in maintaining and creating rural communities. Since each of the diarist families, the Erringtons, Glens and Adams, visited their local post offices, understanding the function of the post office in their neighbourhoods and communities is important for getting a deeper sense of the integration of local spaces and local networks.

*Post Office Literature*

The literature of the Post Office institution and post offices is limited in Canada. However, within the small cohort of scholars who have contributed, we find the topic to be inherently interdisciplinary, as historians, political scientists, and museum curators have written on the topic. The material, though,
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507 See Canadian Atlas Project, McGill University [online via: digital.library.mcgill.ca/countyatlas]; For a local history on Middlesex that discusses in depth the role of POs in building and maintaining small settlements see Grainger, *Vanished Villages of Middlesex*; or Anna Bycraft Ward, *Amiens: A Pioneer Settlement and Post Office Near Lobo Caradoc Townline in Middlesex County* (Ontario, 1985).
remains split into two distinct streams. Early examinations of the Canadian Post Office favoured looking at the Post Office as an institution, often examining its role in terms of the development of the Canadian nation. In this manner, these writers are similar to their American counterparts who have focussed on the role of the Post in American territorial expansion.\textsuperscript{508} Others have, more recently, attempted to follow post offices through a more social and cultural focus. Our study is similarly culturally focussed, but the discussion seeks to complement both sets of literature.

William Smith, writing in 1920, was one of the first historians to explore the development of the post office in British North America. Smith described the importance of the Post Office institution to the development of the Canadian nation, seeing it as a force linking Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, and the Canadas after 1784 and saw it as a “civiliser” of newly-settled populations.\textsuperscript{509} His interpretation formed the basis of two later studies, by Lee and Campbell, which each explored the contribution of the post office institution to national development.\textsuperscript{510} Osborne and Pike, and Amyot and Willis, however, examined the social and cultural forces behind the creation of the post office and their role in the community. They did not refute the ideas put forward by Smith, though, as they too noted the Post Office’s role as an essential “civilising” influence in Canadian society.\textsuperscript{511} Yet, they added to the discussion by describing the cultural and societal conditions that allowed for the post system to be developed – noting the coinciding but not coincidental increased rates of literacy, following the implementation of Egerton Ryerson’s public schools system in the 1840s, and Universal Elementary Education in 1871.\textsuperscript{512} They began a conversation regarding the social consequences of the growth of post offices and

\textsuperscript{511} Osborne and Pike, “Lowering the Walls of Oblivion,” 202-3.
\textsuperscript{512} Osborne and Pike, “Lowering the Walls of Oblivion,” 209.
identified the importance of post offices in communities, seeing them as the nuclei of local settlements.\(^{513}\)

The discussion was then picked up by Amyot and Willis in their *Country Post: Rural Postal Service in Canada* two decades later. This study viewed post office space as a location where people assembled to both gather mail *and* to socialize. In this sense, they recognized that post offices were similar to churches, markets, general stores, and taverns, which formed similar functions.\(^{514}\) Amyot and Willis were the first to look at the essential role of the postmaster as part of this process, arguing that postmasters themselves were central to the development of the community post office.\(^{515}\) Despite these important observations, the authors oftentimes described post offices in a nostalgic manner. The text also bounced between decades and places, moving from 1880s Nova Scotia to British Columbia in the 1940s without important contextual clues, thus *The Country Post* lacked some analytical detail, as their oral history source-base guided the tone of the study. The book offered the first substantial glimpse at the relationship between communities and their post offices. Amyot and Willis, however, did not consider the nuanced, fine-scale social and spatial relationships between postal consumers and postmasters and how they could create (and destroy) communities and neighbourhoods. This study seeks to take Amyot and Willis’ social focus and analyse these local spaces at the individual level. This intimate view of rural postal networks provides a better understanding of the relationship between space and the building of local communities and neighbourhoods.

*The Space of the Post Office*

Post offices were social spaces, similar to markets, taverns, and general stores, where community and neighbourhood networks converged through association and shared exchange. This

\(^{513}\) Osborne and Pike, “"Lowering the Walls of Oblivion,"” 215-219.


\(^{515}\) Amyot and Pike, Chapter 3, “The Rural Postmaster,” in *Country Post*, 69-104.
chapter uses the term space to mean not just a building, but also an area where people gathered for social or economic ends via everyday cultural practises. 516 As Linda Stoneall has described, spaces such as these can provide a community or neighbourhood network with an anchorage point (sometimes referred to as “nodes”) at which individuals fashioned linkages and meaningful associative connections with one another. 517 Post offices were also central to the founding, maintenance, and definition of a given region because they were able to contribute to and integrate the types of community and neighbourhood networks discussed in Chapters 2 and 4, as they were the site of many day-to-day interactions of rural people. The distant networks to which rural post offices contributed involved non-local trade and correspondence between separate communities, via letter writing, mail order commercial trade, newspapers, and other media. This type of network was one that was forged through trade between Middlesex citizens and people and businesses in other townships, cities, and even countries and is similar to the type of network that has been described in studies of nineteenth and twentieth-century communication. 518 At times, communities petitioned to keep the locations of their postal services intact so that these distant networks could be maintained, with the coinciding benefit that the local, rural space was preserved and continued to anchor a locality.

518 For examples of such distant community networks and commercialism to which POs contributed, though they are not specifically discussed, see Korineck, Roughing it in the Suburbs: Reading Chatelaine Magazine in the Fifties and Sixties; Noel, Family Life and Sociability in Upper and Lower Canada, 1780-1870; Adam Crerar, “Ties that Bind,“; Joy Santik, Timothy Eaton and the Rise of His Department Store (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990); and John Borchert, America’s Northern Heartland: An Economic and Historical Geography of the Upper Midwest (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1987).
The postal services in Canada were vital to the early colonies, as communications formed a critical part of settlement.\(^{519}\) The letters and diaries of early Middlesex settlers indicate that the post linked them to the outside world. Post offices in Delaware Township and in London, for example, allowed Thomas Spencer Niblock, a pioneer who attempted to start a farm in the region in 1849, to contact his family in England repeatedly for much-needed financial assistance as his “Wanderers’ Home Farm” struggled over the next three years.\(^{520}\) In Adelaide Township, in the west of Middlesex, the farmer John Jamieson used the post to help him conduct important church-related business in 1852.\(^{521}\) And the well-known letters of the Carrothers family, of southern Middlesex, maintained social ties from the 1840s to the 1870s between kin in Ireland, Canada, and Australia.\(^{522}\) These early beginnings marked the start of postal arrangements for the first two generations of southwestern Ontario settlement.

During the second half of the nineteenth century, Canadians took part in an “early revolution in communications” through the development of a mass, publicly owned, postal service.\(^{523}\) This was a significant innovation in public infrastructure and it was one that was started in 1851 when the British government gave the Canadian colonies control over their domestic postal facilities.\(^{524}\) An increasingly literate Canadian public quickly sought the benefits of the postal services; in 1851 there were only 601 Post Offices in the Canadas, but by 1875 there were 3,054. Further, in Ontario alone, the number of Post Offices nearly doubled over the next forty years, going from 2,130 in 1876 to 3,888 in 1911, made
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\(^{519}\) A History of the County of Middlesex, 33-34; Susan McLeod O'Reilly, On Track: The Railway Mail Service in Canada (Hull, Quebec: Canadian Museum of Civilisation, 1992), 20-21.

\(^{520}\) Letters of Thomas Spencer Niblock, 1849-1852, Niblock and Family Fonds.

\(^{521}\) John Jamieson Diary, July 5, 1852.

\(^{522}\) Houston and Smyth, Emigration and Canadian Settlement, 249.


possible by the development of the railways during the period.\textsuperscript{525} This increase in service meant that Ontarians, even those in areas that might be termed “frontier,”\textsuperscript{526} were now able to access a whole host of postal products, from simple letter and post card delivery, to money transfers and Post Office Savings banks.\textsuperscript{527} Letter carriers served local post offices weekly, three times per week, daily, or even twice daily to some parts of the province.\textsuperscript{528}

Rural peoples of Middlesex from the 1870s to the 1890s expected and required this postal system to service their commercial and communication needs. Like other Canadians, they increased or altered postal services through petitions addressed to the Postmaster General and submitted to local postal inspectors. Petitions had been an important part of the development of political culture in Upper Canada, so they were something with which rural dwellers were familiar, and instructions on how to write the petitions were readily available to rural people.\textsuperscript{529} Readers of the \textit{Canadian Almanac} were advised in 1891, for example, that “New Post Offices are established by the Department whenever it is ascertained that a sufficient number of inhabitants can be accommodated….a petition should be addressed to the Postmaster-General at Ottawa, signed by as many of the inhabitants as can conveniently subscribe.” Petitioners were also guided to describe the “lot and concession on which it is desired the office should be established; the distance from the neighbouring offices; whether there is a village at the site of the proposed Post Office; the number of mills, stores, taverns and houses thereat; the extent of the settlement” and other important facts justifying the proposed post office creations.\textsuperscript{530}
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The standardized format of the petitions, including requests for new offices, changes to existing service, new postmasters, and other issues, relate that the people of Middlesex County had consulted these types of instructions and conducted their petitions in the format prescribed.

Despite this formulaic nature to the petitions, their size and description ranged—some petitions had only a few signatures, while others had more than twenty or thirty. While we did not differentiate based on size, the longer petitions tended to offer better details and a greater number of household locations from which to glean spatial information, so they were more fruitful for mapping and analysis. Once an office was established, the post office site became a regular feature in the lives of farmers and ruralites in many Middlesex County towns and settlements. We captured these post offices at the cusp of late-nineteenth-century industrial development in Canada, between 1870 and 1900.

At this time, successful parts of rural Ontario were growing and urban publishers began creating atlases that detailed the settlement of each county in the province. Much like city directories, county atlases were a commercial venture, sold by subscription, and in them advertisements and biographical sketches were paid for by prominent county residents. Also like city directories, atlases listed the names of residents; however, whereas city directories provide civic addresses, county atlases mapped each residents’ location via their lot and concession, noting the location of the main places of residence. We harnessed this cartographic source by georeferencing it within an HGIS.

Once georeferenced, we mapped households to their exact residence, as noted on the maps. To our benefit, the county atlases also recorded which post office each household was assigned. We record-linked each household to their respective post office, and, using an algorithm used to study the home ranges of animals in the field of ecology, we mapped the postal spaces of each postal community. Each petition described in this chapter was then mapped and placed upon the historical atlas. This provides
us with the unique ability to measure changes in distances travelled when post offices are moved and to analyse the relationships between postal facilities and the customers they served.

In Glanworth, Ontario, James Glen and Frederick Errington’s hometown, a post office was established in 1857, shortly following the securing of a London and Port Stanley Railway depot. The place of the town in Middlesex County can be seen in Figure 5.1, just south of the City of London and east of Tempo. The town’s post became an excellent example of postal success and network facilitation over the next four decades. Though Glanworth was never a major settlement in Middlesex, its development of a diversified economy referenced the maturity of the region. By 1888, as shown in Chapter 4, it had a population of 160 people, numerous rural merchants, and two nearby churches, along with the town’s postal facilities. In 1866 John Turnbull took over the role of postmaster in Glanworth, a position he would hold until his death in 1900. He was also the owner and operator of the Glanworth general store and a hotel keeper, where James Glen frequently visited for his whiskey and beer. The tradition of the multi-functioning space of the post office was common since it located the post in an already-established system of shared social space, in this case with a hotel and general store. Rural merchants like Turnbull often occupied such roles in communities throughout Ontario, combining post offices with local businesses, as in Glanworth, but also mills, blacksmith shops, or others. The combination of services also allowed farmers like James to complete several tasks and maintain their networks on the same trip. During the visits with such customers, postmasters like Turnbull became involved in neighbourhood and community networks.
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Local farmers’ diaries note the frequency with which they made contact with John Turnbull, referencing the importance of the postal services that he provided. James Glen made a habit of visiting the post quite often, at an increasing rate by the end of the nineteenth century. His diary shows that he had three postal-related exchanges (these include paying for postage or stationary and the receipt of mail) in 1866; 16 in 1876; 18 in 1886; and 35 in 1896. As James lived only a kilometre away from the Glanworth Post Office, the nearly bi-weekly occurrence of the postal visit is understandable. This meant that James Glen and his family were a part of the communications revolution made possible through the use of the post. By the end of the century, he and his family were visiting the post office often, sometimes to contact family members in other Ontario counties, and, importantly, to conduct the important financial business required by his farm, such as making payments via money order to a distant insurance company. Owing to the post office’s central location, James was able to access the post when in town for other purposes. On June 18, 1866, after drawing rails all morning on his farm, for example, James went to town to have his horse shod and mailed a letter to a relative. In 1886, he dropped by the post office on January 4, sent a book and posters to the East Middlesex Township Society, of which he was a member, and then stayed to have a whiskey with Turnbull. The proximity of the office and its centrality to other local businesses allowed James to maximize the trip off the farm and into town, and it also gave him a good excuse to have a drink out of the house, which was filled with four Glen girls, two boys, and other farm labourers.

The Turnbull and Glen associations, however, did not stop at a simple exchange of mail delivery. As time passed, the Turnbull family attended James’ farm bees and the church; John lent James credit on a number of purchases; James helped John with pig slaughtering; and most importantly James’ daughter
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“Nettie” Glen married John Turnbull’s son David.\textsuperscript{540} As the Glen and Turnbull networks intertwined, they helped to forge those elements of rural neighbourhood that grew throughout the era. This level of familiarly was encouraged through the proximity and frequency of contact made possible via the post office and its services.

John’s “fitness” as an ideal postmaster contributed to this development. He was not only a skilled money handler, given his general store and hotel-keeping acumen, but he was also a respectable churchgoer and known resident of the community. So as post office petitioners demanded increased services, they also were enacting the organization of their own neighbourhood and community networks, of the type in existence in Glanworth around the anchorage point of Turnbull.

“\textit{We as a people}”: Building Communities and Neighbourhoods 1870s-90s: the Role of the New Post Office

Petitions were developed frequently in Middlesex County between the 1870s and 1890s as communities changed, were established, and local residents sought to have their postal situations updated. Middlesex petitioners made 22 separate requests to have local situations improved over the three decades, 11 of which resulted in detailed petitions. As seen in Figure 5.2, these places crossed the boundaries of other, existing post office sections. By writing the petitions, however, recorders identified that they were not well served by the existing postal arrangements, and they asked that they have a new central office placed nearby. Not all of the petitions were successful; nonetheless they show that citizens of specific communities and neighbourhoods attempted to control their own localities by centralizing the post office space where they saw fit. The petitions allow us to view the spatial extent of the petitioners’ addresses and give us a firm basis for reconstituting their postal communities and neighbourhoods. We obtained post office petitions from throughout the county, though a significant

\textsuperscript{540} See Glen Diaries, particularly 1886 and 1896, and Turnbull/Glen marriage certificate, Middlesex County Records, Schedule B - Marriages, No. 007930, 1889, 341 (online via ancestry.ca).
A cluster of requests came from the southwest portion of Middlesex, where, as will be seen, developments had encouraged the formation of new localities.

When applicants petitioned for a Strathburn and Wardsville post office in Mosa Township, southwest Middlesex, in 1891, they identified themselves as a community and a neighbourhood. The petition that they circulated argued that theirs was a growing community, as it contained nearly 80 people desirous of a post office, and already had a blacksmith shop, and a grocery store in which the post office could be stationed. Though the postal inspector said that the area “is not improving much...[and] is already well supplied with post-office accommodation” the petition nevertheless argued: “We as a people are asking for a post office.” The people of Strathburn and Wardsville did not like travelling elsewhere for mail and they felt that they deserved a new postal arrangement since they had the features of a community. They asked that the post office reflect their neighbourhood and community networks, which could operate through the rural grocery store run by Edwin Weekes, where such interactions would have been common. Interestingly, the petition noted that the local blacksmith was George Weekes, a relative of the proposed postmaster, who also signed the document. Strathburn and Wardsville’s commercial resources were likely run by the Weekes family, and the community’s openness to have Edwin serve as the postmaster meant that they had achieved a sense of familiarity with and trust in the Weekes family.

Often, the existing postal arrangements in the county seemed equitable, with most people being able to access a post office that was within 4 kilometres (see Table 5.1). Based on the petitions and Table 5.1, a distance of 4 kilometres or less was seen as the most convenient. Such proximity allowed for farmers to access the post frequently, whether by driving, walking or riding, in a reasonable amount of time. A contemporary estimate of a buggy ride said that farmers could travel at 20 kilometers.
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This meant that most postal services could be accessed through a drive of 15 minutes or less, if one drove. Since children were often sent to pick up the mail as well, the distance alternatively meant that they could walk to the post if horses and buggies were being used for other tasks. Further, in seasons when roads were difficult to traverse on horseback, buggy, or cutter, walking was the only option. Frederick Errington, for example, noted on March 20, 1896, that his son Freddy had to walk in the deep snow in the afternoon since earlier that morning he could not make it on horseback. Such proximity to a post office, however, was not always available because of the way local communities operated or had changed.

The people of a proposed site, referred to as “Delaware Centre” (as the name implies, located centrally in Delaware Township), noted that they had a problem with the way they were served. They had for some time travelled to the post office at Calder but the “short-cut” route between their location in central Delaware Township and the post office at Calder had been discontinued (Figure 5.3). The people therefore found that their community needed a change in affairs, so they petitioned for a post of their own. They said that “an office established on the 2nd concession, about midway between there would be of great convenience to your petitioners.” The proposed location was to be 8.3 and 5.7 kilometres, respectively, from the post offices in Calder and the town of Delaware. Residents would then have had a distance-to-post that placed them within the two to five-kilometre range that most settlers had achieved in Middlesex. The citizens of central Delaware Township had been able to manage the previously distant postal trip because of the shortcut, but once closed, petitioners knew that they were within their rights to request more convenient services. While their community had for some time been
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oriented to Calder, their settled township had changed in its pattern of behaviour because of the important loss of the roadway. This older rural community was seeking a new state of affairs and requesting that the federal government recognize the new spatial pattern of the settlement. The coinciding result was that the community in central Delaware Township which came together to record the petition gained a central meeting place via the new post office.

In 1888 the citizens of the new, official Delaware Centre region petitioned once again, this time for a request of a savings bank system. By then, the community had not only achieved a post office but also benefited greatly since its opening in 1879. The report of the inspector in 1888 stated “Delaware [Centre] is a prettily situated village, some 12 miles distant from London, containing one or two stores and some other small places of business."546 The people of the area asked for the savings bank so that they could better take part in the national monetary system. The petition testified that the rural people of Delaware Centre could only otherwise conduct this business in London, where the closest savings bank was located. The inspector declared that the Mr. Lawson who ran the post office was “quite competent” and would “do his best to make the Savings Bank system at his office a success.”547

As Osborne and Pike noted, savings banks run by the Post Office were seen as a way to promote thrift among Canadian populations who might not otherwise have had access to such banking services and also to give remote communities more convenient access to the cash economy.548 The system had been originally established in Winnipeg, Toronto, Nanaimo, Victoria, and New Westminster in the 1870s, and in 1885 in the Maritimes. It was only in 1887 that Ontario and Quebec saw the transfer of government savings banks to the Postal Department by an Order-in-Council.549 The request of the people of Delaware Centre for a postal savings bank in July of 1888 illustrates that they were aware of
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national communications innovations and eager to take part in the advantages that the new system offered. Complementary to this development is the highlighted role of Mr. Lawson, who, according to the inspector, was a “well-to-do” official similar to those of his community.\textsuperscript{550} When the post office in Delaware Centre combined with this distant cash/exchange network, it allowed local people to see each other more often, not just to get their mail, but also to conduct cash-related exchanges. This resulted in a further developed sense of local space by anchoring activity in the person of Mr. Lawson and the post office space community and neighbourhood networks.

The late-1850s had marked the arrival of rail in Middlesex County and rail development continued during the next five decades.\textsuperscript{551} In the 1890s, in particular, southwest Middlesex saw the development of the Canadian Pacific Railway heading from London to Windsor. The new rail created a junction in Eckfrid Township, and families began to locate themselves nearby it (Figure 5.4). The corresponding 1890 postal petition stated that “A new roadway is being opened from one concession to the other and a store and houses are about to be built...All...are desirous of having a P.O. established.” The people requested that the new hamlet near Appin Junction be named “McMaster,” a family name which appears in the list of signatures. The inspector’s report argued that the petition was somewhat premature as the CPR was not yet “in full running order” and that McMaster should first become more “built up” before a post office would be fitting.\textsuperscript{552} Though the only business was the rail station, petitioners recognized the role that post offices could play in day-to-day business and the organization of a local space. The positioning of McMaster in between the existing post offices in Appin and Glen Willow shows the pattern behind the request. Since Appin was 3.9 kilometres from the proposed new post office site and Glen Willow was 4.6 kilometres, the people of McMaster wished to have services offered more within the vicinity of their residences. “McMasterites” recommended to the inspector that
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this sense of place and orientation be recognized by the federal postal system. Though the office was not established, residents took an active role in the process of defining their own locality.

**Maintaining Community**

The development of rail in Middlesex did not always help to create the foundation for communities. At times, such new infrastructure also reoriented patterns of trade and spatial behaviour, altering local networks and causing problems in some existing communities as their postal services changed as a result. Despite this structural shift, rural citizens of the county sought to control some of the extant community and neighbourhood relationships by preserving postal anchorages, post offices themselves, and local postmasters.

In 1879, the people of Kilmartin, in southwest Middlesex, complained to their postal inspector that a shift to service coming through Glenwalker, another nearby community, had begun to inconvenience them. This was because Glenwalker was served by the St. Clair Branch railway, shown on Figure 5.5, rather than the southern Great Western Railroad (GWR), going through Glencoe, that had served them previously. The change had been made because it reduced the cost of running the Kilmartin post from $80 per year to $40. The people, however, were quite clear that the situation would not do. They argued: “we do not receive our mail matters as we ought to”; material posted “in Toronto on Thursday will not be received at Kilmartin until Monday morning and letters posted in Kilmartin on Friday...will not be delivered in London sooner than Tuesday afternoon...[the petitioners also] do a great portion of their business with Glencoe and London and other villages on the Great Western Railway”.

The rural petitioners fundamentally disagreed with the service that they had been given. Their community had developed in response to the building of the GWR in the 1850s, and the alteration to service coming from the St. Clair branch attempted to reorient the way in which their relationship
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existed with other city centres. The petition shows that the local postal space was not only important to
the community of Kilmartin, but also to the maintenance of postal contact with the larger centres of
Glencoe and London and others along the GWR. After all, many of the petitioners who are shown on
Figure 5.5 to have been spread out among the local area were running important rural businesses and
involved in international networks of agricultural trade. Even though the St. Clair rail was physically
closer, the community’s daily activity with Glencoe and London meant that service had to come from
the GWR and the Kilmartin post office. Any alteration in this system was opposed, and the people of
Kilmartin petitioned to keep their business patterns as they had been. They struggled to maintain an
interpretation of their community’s everyday spatial arrangement within a structure of the federal
government and within the processes laid out by government officials.

In late-nineteenth-century Middlesex, especially in rural areas, some farmers were leaving to
farm in the American and Canadian West. At the same time, families were becoming smaller
throughout rural Ontario and populations in some centres were dropping. So while some
communities in the county were growing, or being maintained, such as in Kilmartin, others were
decreasing in population. In Fielding, Delaware Township, and Devizes, London Township, the loss of their
postmasters meant that the two communities had lost the anchors of their networks. Fielding was a
small settlement in Delaware, and like Delaware Centre it was in an older part of the county. It had a
post office, but by 1879 the citizens of the community found themselves without a postmaster who
could run it. The inspector that year noted that “Mr John Scott Postmaster at Fielding Middlesex has left
the country for good – for some months since.” The inspector was right in saying that “The families are
anxious that his successor may be named” because they quickly scrambled to have another

555 David Gagan, Hopeful Travellers: Families, Land, and Social Change in Mid-Victorian Peel County, Canada West (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1981); and Crerar, “The Ties that Bind.”
Residents feared they might lose the Fielding post office altogether which would mean that their networks previously centralized in the town would be reoriented to Calder, causing some residents to have more than four extra kilometres of travel to their post office, as illustrated on Figure 5.6. The community therefore gathered together and found a suitable candidate; the petition stated “We the undersigned humbly pray that the office as formerly known as the “Fielding” Post Office in the Township of Delaware may be reopened as Tom Hall has offered to attend to the said office and will keep it at the old stand kept by John Scott.” Figure 5.6 shows that Scott’s position in the settlement was just within the network space occupied by the people of Fielding, so the transfer in location allowed for local patterns of behaviour to continue. The residents found a replacement and ensured that their community networks would be re-anchored in the same space that it had been prior, in the “old stand” of John Scott.

In Devizes the situation was similar, though it occurred 13 years later. In 1892, the London Township settlement found that the post office was closed because nobody was available to succeed the postmaster, Mr. C. Fitzgerald. This left the people of Devizes significantly isolated in terms of communication, because, as seen on Figure 5.7, they were located far from neighbouring centres. It took some time until Mr. Westman, a farmer on Lot I Concession 14, offered his services, solving the problem. The community took up the petition because Westman’s spatial offering was only 20 yards from the previous centre, which petitioners saw as “the most convenient locality” at which to redevelop a post office space. Like Fielding, this was a way of maintaining the internal network congruency within the Devizes settlement, by reinstating the postmaster who could re-anchor the community. They did not want to travel to Fish Creek, Union Hill, or one of the other nearest offices, all of which were over 3 kilometres further away (Figure 5.7). Residents in Devizes therefore saw the importance of
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maintaining the existing community network and attempted to station the new postal space as close as possible to the previous location, thereby preserving the settlement’s spatial relationships.

This same loss of a postmaster occurred in Plover Mills (1897) and Tempo (1890), showing that Fielding and Devizes were not alone in experiencing these community crises. While Hal S. Barron has argued that rural emigration created in some settlements an internal homogenization, part of this process of preservation and community crystallization was the maintenance of local social spaces, so that community and neighbourhood networks did not fall apart. The re-establishment of post offices and new local postmasters appear to have been necessary to this practice in Middlesex County. In Kilmartin, certain spatial re-arrangements proposed by outsiders had to be opposed by local community groups so that new infrastructure did not threaten the ways in which a settlement’s relationships worked. In all of these centres, what is important is that citizens actively and regularly participated in defining their own locales and sought to have their own spatial interpretations realized and anchored “on the ground.”

Where Business “Naturally Collects”: Contested Postal Communities

While many settlements throughout Middlesex banded together to request new facilities or changes to existing post offices, others experienced internal conflict over the issues arising from opposing requests. A number of communities remained divided about how their postal services should function – most often opposing groups disagreed over the location of the post office building itself. In these contested petitions, more colourful rhetoric was often employed in an attempt to convince postal inspectors of the necessity of one place over another. In trying to win over opinion, opposing groups described the spatial relations of their settlements. In both Muncey-Delaware and Dorchester Station, documents from 1878 and 1879 show that some petitioners argued that postal services should be
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moved while others said that they should remain in place. In each case the local geography played a role in the petitioners’ requests, as did the social makeup of the settlement. A little while later, in 1881, in the town of Evelyn, the same situation occurred as sets of petitions were drawn up to request and oppose removal of the post office. In all three cases the petition documents relate the heightened levels of concern that people had over the placement of their postal facilities. They also show the visions that each group had for how their communities’ social geographies should function and the ways that their networks should be oriented. As a result, they offer a detailed image of the relations in Middlesex and the function of the local post.

The town of Dorchester Station was a sizeable, older settlement in London Township, north Middlesex. By the 1880s, the town had over four hundred residents, including general merchants, harness-makers, hotel-keepers, and labourers in important milling facilities, ironworks, and some small factories. It served local agricultural production by offering such services. The postal facilities in Dorchester Station had been in place since 1855 and were well established in the community. The local History of the County of Middlesex, published in 1888, noted the succession of postmasters in the town, referencing their importance to the community.\footnote{History of Middlesex, 491.}

When the petition began circulating in 1878, the postmaster William Scott had been running the office since 1875 on the south side of the river, not far east of the town’s mill.\footnote{Post Offices and Postmasters Database [online via http://www.collectionscanada.gc.ca/databases/post-offices/001001-100.01-e.php], search term “Dorchester Station.”} The branch of the Thames River that ran through Dorchester Station proved to be one of the reasons for the opposing petitions. Petitioners in February 1878 put forth a request to have the office established on the north side of the river, near the rail station and across the bridge, since business in the town “naturally
collects” at that spot. Postmaster Scott, the note said, was “ready at any time to move to the northern side of the River, and to keep the post office there as requested by the petitioners.”

By April of that year, an opposing petition was submitted for consideration. These petitioners, the comments read, “have been informed that efforts are being made to remove the post office to the north side of the River”. Of course this would not do. The post office, they noted, “has been established in its present position for about thirty years and property has been purchased and buildings erected near it as a consequence thereof.” In addition, “a majority of the people requiring a post office reside on the south side of the River”, some nearly 4 miles away, down sandy and gravelled roads that were difficult to traverse in the spring and fall. These residents usually gathered their mail on their way to the London market and did not travel into town to the station. Mapping the petition shows that those opposed to the removal of the post office came from north side of the river as well (Figure 5.8). Notably, the petition argued, each had various political leanings as neither petition, it was pointed out, was more in support of the governing party than the other. This petition further opposed the establishment of a second office in the town as this would, they said, be “highly improper”, likely because of the small population and the reorientation of the town’s decades-old traffic flow.

The debate was not just between residents north and south of the river, but was also about where postal networks should be anchored – near the business district south of the river, by the town’s mill and along the road to London; or north, near the rail station, several hotels, and some manufacturing shops. The postal inspector noted the convenience of the southern post office to farmers travelling west to the London market and the hardship that crossing the river would cause them since the banks of the river were quite steep. There was also “quite a village around the post office”
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where it stood. This was a matter of balancing the social geography of a town which had developed two opposing centres of business – one utilising the new rail and another that serviced both local and distant needs. To balance both petitions, the inspector noted that on the north side of the river there were a number of inhabitants who lived near the station and that another village a quarter mile away would likely use its services. Notably, however, the inspector stated, there was “no leading road running through” this village and the station. His recommendation was to establish a new northern post office, but keep the other southern one intact. Postal records indicate that the southern post office was indeed maintained, as William Scott remained the postmaster until 1888.

The Muncey-Delaware set of petitions, from 1878-9, involved four groups’ views on the orientation of their postal community. The groups requesting a change to the postal facilities consisted of a number of residents of the region surrounding the recently developed Delaware CSR station and a group of First Nations peoples living on the reserve. The third group requesting a change was involved in running the Mount Elgin Industrial Institute, an agriculturally oriented residential school financed by the Wesleyan Methodist Society and the Indian Department. These three groups requested that the facilities be moved to a store, run by a Mr. McGregor, which was nearer to the rail station than the previous location. While only a few of the petitioners’ homes could be located on the map, most likely lived on the Reserve or at the Institute. Figure 5.9 shows that those who requested a change were clearly those who lived closest to the CSR Station and the reserve itself, just north of the Institute and the rail station.

The official petition noted that the current location required many users to walk nearly half a mile along the Thames River, if they lived to the west, cross at the railway bridge, and then travel another mile north to the home of Mr. Whiting, the current postmaster. This was made even more
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difficult because Mr. Whiting’s home did not have the space to occupy postal business, so petitioners argued that they had “to hover about in the cold till they can get” their mail. When sending a registered letter they also had to take the letters back to the station the next morning for shipping since Mr. Whiting was unable to make the journey to meet the morning visit of the Travelling Post Office. Petitioners stated quite plainly that this arrangement was “by no means satisfactory, and to which businessmen cannot long submit”; after all, work had to be done quickly, and the post was expected to keep up with such demand. It is no wonder, given these circumstances, why the group clustered so closely near the CSR Station banded together to get up a petition – the geography of the station clearly had augmented their closeness as a community and had driven them to request a change in the state of affairs. The records from the report also stated that “there are several large tribes of Indians anxious for the change.” On the petition itself, names including R. Brant, John Beaver, Daniel Burch, Thomas Salmon, and George Beeswax, each who signed with an “X”, leaving a mark rather than a signature, are listed. The names suggest that the report was correct in suggesting that the First Nations group indeed sided with the request.

Additional letters in the Muncey-Delaware postal collection describe the situation further, offering a deeper glimpse at the local relations involved in the petition process. A letter from James Graves, a resident of the area in favour of re-locating, hinted at some local political issues afoot. He wrote to the postal inspector to make clear that so few people desired to keep the post office where it currently was that Mr. Whiting had to start his own counter petition, taking it throughout the township to people who were not directly involved, an unusual set of circumstances. Graves was concerned that if Mr. Whiting was “capable of this smallness” he might also have falsified other information. Particularly,
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Graves was afraid that Mr Whiting may have “represented himself as a conservative and the store-keeper (Alex. McGregor)”, who would run the proposed office if its removal was successful, “as a Reformer.” The postal inspector was advised that indeed, “They are both reformers.” Graves then signed his letter, “James Graves, Liberal Conservative” to highlight the point as to whose side he was on and possibly gain some benefit from his associations with fellow conservatives in opposition, who were ready to take office later that year.\(^\text{573}\) The letters make it clear that important fractures existed within the postal community which likely contributed to disagreements over who should fill the important role of postmaster. Namely, Mr. Whiting’s self-initiated petition violated the desires of local residents for a new central place. In their eyes, he no longer could be the neighbourhood postmaster as he had lost local respect. In some ways, Mr. Whiting had removed himself from the Muncey-Delaware, neighbourhood network.

A letter from Thomas Cossford, Governor of the Mount Elgin Institute, was also included with the petition set and addressed to the Postmaster General. He noted that in his opinion six-eights of the mail running through the local post office was on school business. Furthermore, Cossford and four other “Ministers of the Gospel” all signed the petitions along with “all of the businessmen in [the] section”. He argued that the original purpose of having the postal facilities in the area was to serve the school; the office was only at the home of Mr. Whiting because the school had been briefly closed and because the deliveries had come via road from Mount Brydges prior to the CSR Station’s development. “Now that our mail is carried by the Railway to Delaware Station”, he said, “it intensified the hardship we have endured for years.”\(^\text{574}\) In the opinion of Cossford, the Muncey post office was for Mount Elgin, and therefore it should have been in a place central to the Institute’s geography and network orientation.

\(^{573}\) Letter of James Graves, Muncey (964 – 1879).
\(^{574}\) Letter of Thomas Cossford, Muncey (964 – 1879).
Given the closeness of the Mount Elgin Institute and the CSR Station, Cossford’s request seemed reasonable.

Those in opposition to the change, comprising the fourth group of petitioners, included the current postmaster, Mr. Whiting, and some others. If James Graves was correct, the “to stay” petition was taken up by Mr. Whiting himself and was taken throughout the township to whomever would listen. Proximity to the proposed site or the current site seems to have been the greatest factor involved in the postal communities’ orientation. Nevertheless, that Graves saw those who signed the petition as “outsiders” referenced a situation whereby those who lived near the post office may have been involved in Whiting’s personal network, but were not truly representative of a holistic postal community based upon Whiting’s Office. The two camps remained divided and did not see themselves as part of the same community.

Whiting simply believed that the Post Office in Muncey was “as near central as possible for all parties interested.” Unfortunately for him, the postal inspector, Gilbert Griffin, noted that those who had requested the office stay may have had “the largest correspondence” but “they would not however be very much inconvenienced by the change” in location. Griffin felt that Whiting’s postal network could easily reorient their trade toward the CSR and its travelling post, and that, in comparison to the inconveniences of the Government Institute personnel, local residents, and Natives on the reserve, those requesting a stay had little to complain about. Documents from later in 1879 show that the post was, in fact, moved to the CSR station. It is likely that some people involved in the conflict over the post office harboured bitter feelings for some time afterward.

575 Muncey (964 – 1879).
576 Letter of Gilbert Griffin, PO Inspector, to the Postmaster General, Muncey (964 -1879).
577 Muncey (1043 – 1879).
In the town of Evelyn in 1881, in Nissouri Township, Eastern Middlesex, the situation was somewhat different, yet similar nonetheless. Here, business networks already in place and geography dictated the origins of the requests for the post office to move or to stay. Postal Inspector Barker noted in his report that year that a Mr. Bray had become the postmaster in October of 1877, at which point he kept the office on the fifth concession. In 1879/80 or so, for an unknown reason, Bray moved the office to a position midway between the fifth and the sixth concession, near a side road. Just east of the new location, however, was the schoolhouse of the neighbourhood which made it easy for children “living about the corner [to] pass the Post Office when going to and from school” and pick up the mail. Barker further noted that the blacksmith was just a half mile east of the office, an important site for any farm activity, and that Barker’s wife worked at the office as well.\(^578\) These comments highlighted the features of the office at Evelyn and the ways in which rural people went about getting their mail. Bray’s office clearly was a fairly heterogeneous space as children could be present at certain points throughout the day. Also, it would appear that as farmers came to the blacksmith for repairs to plows, mowers, etc., they stopped by the post office to see Mr. or Mrs. Bray and gather their correspondence. This office was not just a masculine space, but a space for various ages and genders.

Petitioners requested that the post office be returned to where it was located prior to Mr. Bray’s relocation in 1879. They argued that the previous site of the post office had been on the fifth concession for nearly eleven years. This, they said, “gave great satisfaction to all the neighbourhood.” Henry Bray had moved the office, however, to a place that was “very inconvenient for the great majority of those who receive their mail through it” as it could then “only be a benefit to comparatively few people”, likely those with children and those who visited the particular blacksmith east of the new post office. This petition requested that the post office be put back at the “junction of four cross roads where there is a store and blacksmith shop and the centre of considerable business”. Here, they also

\(^{578}\) Letter of Mr. Barker to Postmaster General, Evelyn (420 – 1881).
noted, “there is a commodious store the proprietor of which is in every way qualified to act as Post Master.” The neighbourhood around the town of Evelyn, then, was defined by two centres of business, which are shown on Figure 5.10.

The opposing petitions seem to have been influenced by this lack of a single, central business district at the crossroads, and loyalty to the different blacksmiths likely also played a part in the disagreement. Those opposing the removal were caught off-guard by the other petitioners’ request. Some wanted the post office to stay in the hands of Mr. Bray, and they voiced their displeasure in their own petition. They argued that the relocation of the post office would cause inconvenience and be short sighted, noting that the recommended new postmaster “holds but a short lease for his store whereas Mr Bray is a freeholder.” The old line of tenant versus owner reared its head, then, in Nissouri Township, and it points to the desired characteristics of a postmaster. Those requesting Mr. Bray to stay clearly felt that their wishes were on more solid grounds because of the possible transience of a sojourning shopkeeper at the junction.

These petitions suggest that within the Evelyn region two networks were anchored at different places: one community via the junction, stores, and a blacksmith; and another via the school and the other local blacksmith. While those requesting the post retain its current position most often lived to the east and the others to the west, on the map for Evelyn it can be clearly seen that the two communities overlapped (Figure 5.10). The networks were not as spatially delineated as in Muncey-Delaware or Dorchester. Certainly this made for a difficult entanglement.

Faced with the job of sorting out the community’s needs, Postal Inspector Barker then attempted to summarize his opinions. He noted that there was “perhaps a slight advantage in favour of those protesting against removal” suggesting that Mr. Bray should stay on as postmaster. In addition,

---

579 Evelyn (420 – 1881).
580 Evelyn (420 – 1881).
“the office is as conveniently situated as it would be at the corner of the 5th concession, and that no change of site is desirable at present.” The positioning of freeholder Mr. Bray near the school and one of the blacksmiths swayed Inspector Barker. The Evelyn post, despite some protestations of the western postal network, would remain where it stood.

Conclusion

Post Offices were at the centre of rural life and business throughout Ontario in the nineteenth century for the Erringtons, Glens, Adams, and others. Since the time of initial settlement the communication tools offered through post offices had given rural people consistent contact with friends, relatives, business contacts and others in nearby and international geographies.

In addition to these broader results, post offices were central to the function of many Ontario hamlets, villages, and towns as they helped to integrate local networks. The founding of a new office could secure a central business location at a crossroads. Their maintenance at existing centres allowed for the continuation of patterns of behaviour, or their loss could reorient the daily activity for many families. And the placement of the post office location was central to rural people’s interpretation of local geographies, whether in Glanworth, Dorchester, Evelyn, or elsewhere. This chapter has shown these factors at play in the social fabric of late-nineteenth-century Middlesex County, through a fine-grained examination made possible by the spatial analytical power of the HGIS coupled with traditional narrative.

Through the petitions, rural Ontarians sought to have their postal needs met, and in so doing they left records of how post offices were an integral part of local community and neighbourhood networks. In going to the post office space, rural people got to know each other better. As a result, their lives intertwined often with those of the postmaster who anchored local networks – as was the case

581 Evelyn (420 – 1881).
with James Glen and John Turnbull’s Glanworth post office. The petitions show the rural people of Middlesex engaging directly and actively in this process.

As previous studies have shown, this early postal formation was an intrinsic part of the building of the Canadas and the Post Office as an institution was important to developing Canadian governmentality. While the Post Office institution was a government-run body, it was by no means a structure imposed upon agrarian families. Farmers and their neighbours “got up” these petitions themselves and saw to it that their own community and neighbourhood networks were governed in the manner that they saw fit.
Chapter 6: The Social Contexts of Nineteenth-Century Rural Ontario

Throughout the last half of the nineteenth century, Middlesex County farmers and their families stretched their networks within the surrounding countryside, taking advantage of new transportation infrastructure and spreading kinship ties. More formal associations grew in number and influence and rural people were able to attend events sponsored by the Grange, large-scale fairs, and other celebrations. Such association often offered overlapping leisure and educational activities, many of which were agrarian in subject matter and fit with the growth of farms and the development of new technologies, livestock, and crops. Farm homes/families and rural churches, however, continued to be central to social life throughout the entire era, as seen via the maintenance of overlapping neighbourhood networks. Farmers’ sustained dependence on one another for agricultural production and their desire to maintain connections with kin called for the continuation of such relationships. This chapter discusses these changes and continuities within the social networks of Middlesex County using a farm diary-based HGIS along with narrative and quantitative analysis.

In the first part of this chapter, I examine rural social networks during the “mid-century” period (the 1850s and 1860s) in order to establish a base from which to analyse later change. The mid-century period primarily featured neighbourhood-based kinship and religious socialization centred upon the home and the church, both set in local spaces. In the second part, I look at the “late-century” period, stretching from 1870 to the 1890s, when farmers expanded their social networks geographically by taking part in new volunteer associations and educational public events. In the last part of the chapter, I show that kin and neighbours continued to form the backbone of rural sociability into the 1890s. While it is tempting to tell a story about farmers moving from mid-century local events to a world of popularized, large-scale entertainment, I intentionally turn back to the “home and church” to describe

what the diarists practiced locally after 1870. I show in particular that the physical spaces in which people socialized were still populated by rural families and most often located on the concessions and side roads of nearby townships. Overall, I emphasise that the social networks of farm families in Middlesex remained, throughout the nineteenth century, firmly “rural.”

In rural life, what was and was not a “social” event is difficult to ascertain as work and leisure time were not viewed as separate activities. As Macdonald and Hansen identify, social occasions such as visiting were also often blended with work engagements. Since the two authors define a “visit” as any occasion in which two people from different families assembled together, included in their classification are gatherings such as slaughtering animals, shucking corn, or a whole host of other tasks conducted with neighbouring families.\(^583\) Likewise, Pederson notes that visiting in rural Wisconsin often accompanied negotiations in advance of an exchange, or even an exchange itself,\(^584\) and Wilson demonstrates that other rural recreations such as the “bee” made laborious activities more palatable.\(^585\) In this chapter’s maps and tables, however, I focus on those occasions that were primarily social, when no physical goods or services were noted as being exchanged by the diarists. The blended work/social gatherings where labour or helping exchanges took place are excluded, which under-represents some of the sociability occurring in rural areas. Not discounting the importance of all such social occasions, I instead have discussed these types of gatherings in the chapters on economic exchange.

**Part 1: Diarist Social Networks and the 1850s and 1860s**

The existing literature on sociability suggests a bifurcated periodization. Many studies depict the pre-Confederation era as defined by the presence of small-scale, local social events, and the post-1870

---

period as defined by the popularity of exhibitions, fairs, and other public gatherings. However, as will be seen, we can also view the late-century period as a time of new opportunities for rural people to enjoy public leisure in rural and urban centres and a time of continuity within local neighbourhoods.

During the 1850s and 1860s, social life in Middlesex County was “local” and centred on the home and the church. The home was the space in which courtship, childrearing, illness, and celebration took place, as well as day-to-day visiting. Since farmers could spare only so much time away from the farm, short visits and unexpected “drop-ins” were common. Jane Marie Pederson notes that many rural visitors paid little attention to “time-of-day” visiting schedules and instead visited when the seasons or weather allowed for the occasions to be convenient. The Errington family of southern Middlesex, for example, spent one Wednesday afternoon and evening in 1856 at a neighbour’s house, and when they arrived back home they simply “found Mr Bennett and his wife,” another set of neighbours, waiting and ready to socialize. According to American historians Earl Lewis and Karen Hansen, visiting also had a deeper meaning as it “afforded an opportunity to maintain key relationships” and included the values of “mutuality, reciprocity, voluntarism, and localism.” So while home-based socializing could


587 Noel, *Family Life and Sociability*; Cecil Houston and William Smyth, *Irish Emigration and Canadian Settlement: Patterns, Links, and Letters* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1990), 162. This pattern of socializing was similar to that within other North American settlements, with Danbom arguing that home-based visiting was “the most common rural diversion” in many farming settlements. Danbom, *Born in the Country*, 95.


589 Errington Diary, March 5, 1856.


sometimes be simply recreational, it also linked families together in networks of broader significance
which were a necessary part of their system of mutual familial help.

Churches at mid-century also served as anchors of social networks and tied people together via
common bonds and beliefs. During the era of initial European settlement, religious pioneers in
Middlesex had worshipped outdoors, in barns, and with itinerant ministers. By mid-century, the
dominant religious denominations, such as the Church of England, the Presbyterian Church, and
Methodist Church, had become more fully organized with resident ministers, church buildings, rectories,
and the organizational structures needed to support them.  

Farmers helped build the physical church
structures to access a space for regular worship and made them the central social institutions of many
communities. Houston and Smyth, for example, argue that Middlesex County Roman Catholic churches
became “the foci of Catholic communities” and can be regarded as part of “the core of many a rural
hamlet,” alongside schools, taverns, and other buildings.  

For rural Canadians, churches were both
centres of rural entertainment and spirituality; social ties and religious faith reinforced one another and
encouraged attendance.  

Churchgoing, like visiting, was similarly about propinquity – farmers attended

---


593 Houston and Smyth, Patterns, Links and Letters, 179-180. Hansen is careful, though, to identify that faith was also an important factor which encouraged attendance. See Chapter Six “Getting Religion” in Hansen, A Very Social Time, 137-164; Wetherell and Kmet, Useful Pleasures, 74.

594 Though Wetherall and Kmet say that churches theoretically were not spaces designed to foster entertainment until the end of the nineteenth century, Hansen convincingly argues that social ties actually incentivized churchgoing activities. Through ritual and religious spectacle, she says, churches served as forms of entertainment in a world where amusements were lacking and fostered moral accountability between churchgoing families. Hansen is careful, though, to identify that faith was also an important factor which encouraged attendance. See Chapter Six “Getting Religion” in Hansen, A Very Social Time, 137-164; Wetherell and Kmet, Useful Pleasures, 74.
the local church (or churches) on Sundays and throughout the week, and they worshiped with kin who lived nearby, as church adherence was strongly influenced by familial connections. We can consequently view the social networks of the mid-century period as characterized by a type of sociability that was built upon the institutions of the family and the church, both of which provided leisure opportunities and meaningful connections between local residents.

The HGIS I employ in this chapter depicts both the changing circumstances of southwestern Ontario in the second half of the nineteenth century and the lifecycle stages of the Errington, Glen, and Adams families. As discussed in previous chapters, Frederick and James were residents of southern Westminster Township and had new families when they began their mid-century diaries. I use these two diaries to discuss the 1850s and 1860s, and include Thomas Adams as well for the late-century period.

A general image of the social network trends should first be introduced. In Figures 6.1 through 6.3, each family’s social networks for selected years can be seen. Each image depicts the locations of the diarists’ social events, shown as points on the maps; but since different numbers of events took place at each point, the overall spatial trend of social activity is best seen via the weighted spatial deviation lines shown in the ellipses. The maps show important differentiations and commonalities between the families in their social networks. First, the social networks of each family were, in every year, centred upon the immediate locations of their homes and churches where most of their social activity took

595 Though for a different era and a non-rural space, Tom Bulten provides a thorough discussion of the relationship between propinquity and church membership in “Community and Propinquity of Church Members,” 359-375. For a rural examination, see Voisey, Chapter 8, “Schools and Churches,” in Vulcan, 175-200.
596 While Hannah Lane argues that there were “limits to the cultural influence of tribalism,” she identifies that religious tribalism was indeed the most common form of denominational identity in her early Canada settlement of St. Stephen, New Brunswick. See Hannah Lane, “Tribalism, Proselytism, and Pluralism: Protestants, Family, and Denominational Identity in Mid-Nineteenth-Century St. Stephen, New Brunswick,” in Nancy Christie, Households of Faith: Family, Gender, and Community in Canada, 1760-1969 (McGill-Queen’s University Press: Montreal, 2002), 103-137.
597 See method discussion in Chapter 1 for more detail on event mapping techniques.
598 As for maps in previous chapters, the ellipses were generated using the Standard Deviational Ellipse tool in the ArcGIS 9.3 program. It measures the standard deviation of the social event points in order to show a directional/spatial trend. See Chapter 2 for a further description of this technique.
place. For the Erringtons and Glens, these were within the Glanworth neighbourhood, and for the Adams family they were in the countryside of central Delaware Township. Though each family lived fairly close to the city of London, they each had differing levels of attendance at social events located in the urban centre (Table 6.1).\(^{599}\) The Errington family’s social networks, for example (Figure 6.1), took place both in urban and rural spaces, pulling their distributional ellipses north and south, except in 1866 when Frederick Errington attended the Toronto Exhibition.\(^{600}\) The Glens, on the other hand (Figure 6.2), had only a few urban events each year and none in 1866, pulling their distributional ellipses east and west; and the Adams family (Figure 6.3), like the Erringtons, accessed social events in London (nine in 1884 and 18 in 1894). Though the Erringtons and Adams were more apt to take part in urban-based social events, all three families socialized most often in local spaces in or near their homes.

Local travel for social occasions became steadily more accessible by the mid-century and after as roadways improved. For the Erringtons, shown on Figure 6.1, most of their rural social events took place in southern Westminster near their home, church, and immediate family, though a few occurred in Delaware and northern Westminster in 1896. The Adams had a wider spatial quality to their patterns of sociability, possibly caused by their participation in the local Methodist church circuit which brought them to churches scattered about the southern Middlesex countryside, rather than to one or two specific church spaces. The family participated in rural social events all over Delaware Township and into Lobo and Caradoc Townships as well. In contrast, the Glen experience (Figure 6.2) is shown via the exaggerated east-west ellipse. This is especially the case when the Glens’ social networks expanded in the rural areas surrounding their farm after the 1870s, when James Glen joined the Dominion Grange. Whereas in 1866 his diary records show that he socialized within the local Glanworth neighbourhood, in the remaining three decades his social network stretched south, east, and west, incorporating parts of

\(^{599}\) Frederick was 13.3 km from London, James 13.4, and Thomas 14.4. See Table 3.1.

\(^{600}\) As shown on Table 6.1, the family had four social events in London and St. Thomas in 1856, 11 in 1866, 17 in 1876, and eight and nine in 1886 and 1896.
nearby southern Delaware Township and northern Elgin County. For each diarist, the maps show the maintenance of traditional patterns of kinship and parish-based sociability along with an expanding, late-century ability to access social occasions in rural areas further away.

A high degree of fluidity characterized local social networks throughout the nineteenth century. No immediate neighbourhood, however tightly focussed, remained static; families moved on to other counties, farms changed hands, family lines ended, children married and set up homes of their own, and new neighbours arrived. This fluidity was recorded over time in each diary as new family names appeared and others disappeared. In Table 6.2, the social events with each family are counted in order to show this process. The families with whom the Erringtons socialized most frequently were the Jacksons, the Bennetts, and the Wrights, each a part of their extended kinship network, referencing strong attachments between kin. The Wrights, for example, were Frederick’s in-laws, and Frederick and Matilda remained in close contact with them through regular visiting. The Glen family socialized most with members of the Hair (Rose’s kin) and wider Glen family, and Thomas Adams socialized with close relatives, including members of the extended Adams family, and friends, such as the Dingman and Purdy families.

As time passed, relations with friends and relatives reflected families’ desire to retain close ties and the temporary nature of other associations. For Frederick to have maintained contact with his relatives the Jacksons for over forty years of farming shows that the two farm family’s lives were lived out together in close unity. Other family names appeared for the first time in later decades as the family life cycles changed and time passed. Frederick mentioned, for example, the Bradishes for the first time in 1896, and the number of Bradish/Errington social events soon equaled those of the long-standing Bennett/Errington association. The Whites were newcomers to the Glens’ network, as were the Bell and Hunt families to the Adams’ network. Such heightened frequency of social connections related to
changes in the diarists’ family makeup, such as the marriage of a son or daughter to another family. Finally, families dropped out of the diarists’ social networks in each decade as well. This occurred with the Pearce family in the Errington diary, with the Flemmings in the Glen diary, and with the Beach, Davis, Gibson, Howlett, Milne, Oliver, and Wonnacott families in the Adams diary. The reasons behind these disappearances are often less easily discerned than those for new arrivals, though reasonable conclusions can be made. In the Thomas Adams diary, for example, the Gibson family held a major sale in 1884, and then they are not mentioned in the 1894 diary. It is possible that they moved to another farm outside of the Adams’ neighbourhood or simply that the Gibson family name was lost. In either case, the Gibsons exited the Adams’ social network. The farmers’ habits of association hint at their desire to retain and forge social connections as part of the rural experience.

Social activity was also related to the economic activity discussed in previous chapters. Notably, almost every family listed in the social network tables also had economic relations with the diarists, reflecting the overlapping nature of social and economic exchanges. Shown in the “Traded With” column in Table 6.2, all of the important social network families named in the Errington and Glen diaries had economic exchanges with the diarists, and, in the Adams diary, nine of 14 families had economic exchanges with Thomas’ family. The element that linked these associations was proximity. Deals could have been made, for example, during a walk home from church; and plans for parties or suppers might have been discussed between families who were part of a labour exchange. Social and economic networks therefore contributed to one another.

At mid-century, the social networks of many farmers were built upon the institutions of the family/home and the church. This was true especially for the Erringtons, who visited with close family

---

601 Adams Diary, November 12, 1884.
602 See “Note on Defining “the Social”“ section above.
603 Documents from early settlers show that they too had made time to socialize, a feature of life made possible by the transportation infrastructure laid out during initial settlement. An early Delaware Township resident, for
often and were local church adherents. In both 1856 and 1866, most of the social events that Frederick Errington and his family took part in occurred at their home, at the homes of other farm families living nearby, and at Christ Church, Anglican, just west of Glanworth. Seventy-three social events took place in the home in 1856 and 21 in 1866 (Figure 6.4), a drop which accords with their changes in family life cycle. Matilda, Frederick’s wife, gave birth in 1855 to their first child “Freddy,” who was followed by another seven children during the next ten years; so, by 1866, the large number of children meant that trips to socialize were more limited. The Jacksons, Frederick’s sister’s family, and the Wrights, Matilda’s mother’s family, lived near the Errington home. The Pearces and Bennetts, members of Christ Church, were also not far off, allowing them to share numerous social experiences with the Erringtons during the two decades. Each of these families visited the Errington home regularly for social occasions in 1856 and 1866, with these visits taking the form of English-style “Teas,” dinners, overnight stays, or simple drop-ins.

While roadways had improved by the mid-century period, sociability was still subject to the seasons and variations in weather. Of the Erringtons’ social events in 1856 and 1866, many took place in local areas that did not require long trips since travel could still be unpredictable. Even the good sleighing roads of the winter months could be made impassible by inclement weather. In early March, 1856, for example, heavy snows made travel through the Glanworth district quite difficult. The roads were so bad that on Sunday, March 2, Matilda was not able to attend church and only Frederick made it

---

example, wrote in his 1842/3 diary that he made numerous visits to tea and parties with neighbours, visiting nearby residents, attending church services, and going to weddings or town meetings. These occasions had been part of the day-to-day life of Middlesex County settlement from early on and were deeply intertwined with networks of production. Diary of James Rawlings.

604 See Census of Canada, Westminster Township, 1861 and 1871.
605 Membership of Christ Church determined via Christ Church Parish Registers, 1850-1872 and 1874-1926, Bay 3, Shelf 60, Box 41, Diocese of Huron Archives, Huron University College, London, Ontario.
through to hear Father Caulfield. Later in the month, regular (nearly weekly) visiting returned. While sociability occurred often, it was therefore notably not guaranteed year-round.

Not all visits at the Errington home were light-hearted visits for tea, gossip, or company. Particularly in 1856, when the family was dealing with their first infant Freddy, they welcomed neighbours over who offered emotional aid to the struggling couple. Frederick wrote in his farm diary on May 5, “little Freddy is 11 months old to day his mother has commenced to wean him, poor soul, poor soul”, so the following night Matilda’s sister Emily Wright came to stay and assist. The Errington home bustled during these helpful visits. In return, Matilda Errington helped nearby families when they were in need. Helping others, Hansen says of her rural New Englanders, gave individuals membership in a group and sustained community.

Visiting was part of the “gendered” experience of North American farming and was often considered part of the female sphere of farm activity. Though Frederick was involved, Matilda’s prominence in the social aspects of his diary reflects her importance to the family’s social network. Often, it was Matilda who was central to many of these visits and kept the Errington family social network together when Frederick was busy with other farm work. On June 27, 1856, after Freddy had been put to bed one evening, for example, Matilda and Frederick walked over to Mrs. Wright’s house for a visit, possibly in a show of gratitude for the Wrights’ help earlier in May. In this case, Matilda seems to have ensured that Frederick maintained his share of social responsibility. Such mixed-gender and mixed-age visiting was common throughout rural North America. As Osterud has described, rural gatherings

---

606 Errington Diary, 1856.
607 Errington Diary, 1856.
608 In April, 1856, for example, Frederick’s sister was ill and was going through her own troubling time. Matilda stopped by first on the 17th, and then again on the 28th when she and Mrs. Mountford, another neighbour, went together. Later on in May, Matilda returned, this time with little Freddy. Even though Matilda was herself dealing with Freddy and her own responsibilities, her support was offered to Frederick’s in-laws. Errington Diary.
609 Hansen, A Very Social Time, 84.
610 See Chapter 2 “Building a Rural Neighbourhood,” in Neth, Preserving the Family Farm, 40-70.
regularly included people of all genders and ages in Nanticoke Valley.\textsuperscript{611} This integration allowed farm women freedom to operate outside the home since the events were family based and were therefore regarded as extensions of the domestic space itself.\textsuperscript{612}

Weekly churchgoing was also a major feature of the diarists’ social lives, and Sunday services were the central social occasion of their week.\textsuperscript{613} In Glanworth there were two churches: the Anglican Christ Church and the Presbyterian St. Andrews, both easily accessible to the Errington and Glen household. The Erringtons were firmly Anglican, though Frederick did not eschew St. Andrews (he attended two services there in 1856). Christ Church had been built in 1844, and Bishop Strachan led its first confirmation service on July 27, 1845.\textsuperscript{614} Figure 6.4 shows how involved the Errington family was with the organization. In 1856, the family had 35 social events at the church and in 1866 they had 42.\textsuperscript{615} In essence, they were at Christ Church on most Sundays when services were offered and when weather permitted.\textsuperscript{616} Frederick even recorded details about the services, such as the name of the minister preaching, the quality of his sermon, and the bible passage upon which the homilies were based. On Sunday, Frederick’s day of rest, he may have had more time to write in greater detail, but the level of detail shows that Sunday services were both social occasions for the family and important parts of Frederick’s religious experience and system of belief.

\textsuperscript{612} Osterud, \textit{Bonds of Community}, 232.
\textsuperscript{615} It is important as well to note Frederick’s diary recording habits here. Often Frederick wrote entries simply, such as “we went to church”, a line which counted as one social event on the map. Thus, the 35 and 42 social events, in 1856 and 1866 respectively, overall, represent near-weekly attendance.
\textsuperscript{616} In 1866, for example, Frederick noted that there were seven Sundays when there were no services at church, limiting the family’s ability to attend, as did cold and heavy snow (such as on March 25, 1866) or even when it was raining “a good deal” (May 27). However, they did skip the odd service from time-to-time, either out of a feeling that religious association for the week had already been fulfilled, such as on January 28, 1866, when Frederick had been to a missionary meeting just a few days prior (see Errington Diary, January 28, 1866), or after a hard day of work, such as on December 10.
At Christ Church, farm families like the Erringtons met and socialized together under the same theological umbrella. The church space served as an anchor point for both the Erringtons’ community and neighbourhood, as exhibited on Figure 6.5. On the map, these two types of associative connections, “community” and “neighbourhood,” can be seen when one contrasts the top and bottom images. The image at the top shows the wider church membership from the 1860s period, the “community,” including those families listed in the church baptismal, burial, confirmation, and marriage records. Families listed were those living near the Erringtons and others who lived further away, such as in southern Delaware Township and southeast Westminster. These more distantly located families, namely the Powells, Thomsons, Anselys, and Andersons, were members of the extended community that was fostered at Christ Church – people who knew each other through the church but were not part of each other’s immediate neighbourhood network. Looking at those who lived close by, the Shores, Biddulphs, Jacksons, Bennetts, and others, a much tighter, neighbourly network is depicted. This is especially the case for those families shown on the bottom image, as it was these groups that attended Freddy Errington’s confirmation and William Alfred’s baptism, in October and May of 1866, respectively, both of which were more intimate affairs. The two images provide a glimpse at the closer, church-related neighbourhood level of sociability that the Erringtons fostered through religious adherence. Each family lived within one or two concessions of the Errington home and were those with whom the Erringtons socialized and traded. In this sense, Christ Church reinforced the family’s neighbourhood network by offering an additional space for forging and maintaining local networks which extended beyond the church building itself.

In addition to visits and regular churchgoing, the Erringtons attended a few larger-scale events in London and in other areas farther from home – namely, circuses, a cattle show, and some fairs. These events increased in the coming decades for the other farmers. On one trip into the City of London in

\[617\] Christ Church Parish Register, 1850-1870 and 1875-1911.
late-September, 1856, for example, Frederick attended “Joe Pentland’s Circus.” Since his farm labourer Mr. Carey was working in his stead at a neighbour’s threshing bee, Frederick, after conducting some business with London brewer John Labatt, was able to take in the circus. Pentland’s Circus made its way through southwestern Ontario that fall, travelling through London in September, St. Thomas in October, and then to surrounding towns Staffordville, Otterville, Woodstock, Ingersoll, and Aylmer. According to an advertisement in the *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, the circus had “The best Clown in America, Joe Pentland. The best single rider in the world...the best female equestrian” along with tumblers and acrobats, a wire walker, and other exhibits. Given such hyperbole, it was no wonder that Frederick stopped to catch the show while in London. During another similar event, about a week later, Frederick found himself in the city again “to see the annual cattle show” while his farm labourer tended to the Errington farm’s needs. A result of improved road and rail infrastructure, livestock shows in particular had been growing in prominence since the late-1850s as buyers, often from the United States, had begun to visit them and Middlesex livestock numbers were beginning to increase. While Frederick did not buy or sell any stock at the show, he was nonetheless attracted to the event and joined in the company of fellow agriculturalists.

While the circus and the cattle show were the primary wider-social network events in 1856, Frederick cited other similar events in the following decade. In 1866 he was able to attend the annual exhibition in Toronto by taking “the cars” (referring to the railway) first to London and then farther east. His diary also noted a picnic in the vacation town of Port Stanley on Victoria Day, at which the
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618 Errington Diary, September 27, 1856.
619 Advertisement, *St. Thomas Weekly Dispatch*, Thursday, October 16, 1856 [online via Paper of Record].
620 Errington Diary, October 7, 1856.
621 Kenneth Kelly, “The Development of Farm Produce Marketing Agencies an Competition Between Marketing Centres in Eastern Simcoe County, 1850-1875,” *Canadian Papers in Rural History Volume I* (Gananoque, Ont.: Langdale Press, 1978), 76-84. For a discussion of livestock in Middlesex, see Chapter 2 and 3.
622 Errington Diary, September 26, 1866.
whole family was in attendance, and in July the family went to see a circus together in London.\textsuperscript{623} Such occasions were accessible to the Erringtons partly because of their farm’s maturity. Since Freddy was old enough to work on the farm and other farm labourers were able to manage the work while Frederick was away, the family had greater freedom in attending such entertainments. By comparison, James Glen’s social network consisted largely of church services and visiting in 1866, except for an election in a schoolhouse, a township meeting in a tavern, a single trip to Port Stanley, and a local plowing match.\textsuperscript{624} It was not until the later period that both diarists were at similar events in London.

One public event that both James Glen and Frederick did attend was the southwest Westminster district plowing match on November 7, 1866. It was a special, post-harvest occasion for the Errington family as Freddy competed in the men’s third class at only 12 years of age – a division Catharine Wilson identifies was usually reserved for those over the age of 16 or 18. Plowing matches, she says, were a style of recreation that tested men’s skill and prowess via a work-related sporting context, and while larger regional plowing matches existed, most were local affairs.\textsuperscript{625} According to The Canada Farmer, the match had perfect weather for such an event, and “it was truly a pleasing sight to see so many enterprising young men of [the]... township meeting together to engage in friendly competition”.\textsuperscript{626} The event took place not far from the Errington household, as shown on Figure 6.6, on the farm of Samuel Lewis who lived just west of the Glanworth rail stop. James Glen himself did not compete, nor did he have any sons ready to try out, but he did write in his diary that he “went to see” the match take place.\textsuperscript{627} Whether the Flemmings, Dawsons, Milnes, Buchanans, or others, local families gathered at the event, as shown on Figure 6.6. The image of the match is in contrast to those other events that Frederick attended in 1866 – especially when compared to the Toronto Exhibition or the

\textsuperscript{623} Errington Diary, May 24 and July 19, 1866.
\textsuperscript{624} The election occurred January 1, the tavern meeting March 12, and James went alone to Port Stanley on May 24. James Glen Diary, 1866. The local plow match is discussed below.
\textsuperscript{625} Wilson, “A Manly Art,” 159-167.
\textsuperscript{626} Observer, “South Westminster Ploughing Match,” The Canada Farmer, December 1, 1866.
\textsuperscript{627} Glen Diary, November 7, 1866.
London cattle shows. While these latter events were cross-township or cross-county, the southwest Westminster plowing match was fairly localised. Many of the competitors were members of St. Andrew’s Presbyterian church and were James’ fellow worshippers. Like visiting and churchgoing, the event was made up of local families who were part of the same social fabric.

Rural work bees were also commonly experienced social events for farm families throughout the nineteenth century, and in some ways they resembled local plowing matches in their combination of farm work/skill and neighbourly sociability. Though the diarists’ work bees are not fully analysed here because I have discussed them instead in the chapters on economic exchange (see Chapter 2 and 4 in particular), the events were remarkable for their social components. Ontario farm women, for example, gathered at local farms and in farm homes for many a quilting bee, pairing bee, husking bee, or others, where they had the opportunity to work, gossip, and have fun. Men, too, combined labour and leisure at events like barn raisings and logging bees. Indeed, some of the events even became sites of excessive masculine sociability when drink became involved. After the 1860s, once Temperance had taken hold, work bees replaced booze with post-bee “feasts,” where workers were rewarded for their labour with food and other types of entertainment. These events persisted into the twentieth century and are remembered fondly in reminiscences on rural life for the entertainment they provided to farm people.

The mid-century period for farm families around Glanworth was a fairly “local” time since most events took place on the farms of nearby residents and involved the family’s kin. Larger public events would soon gain in popularity, particularly after the 1870s, becoming prominent parts of each family’s social networks as the decades progressed.

628 St. Andrew’s Church Fonds, Baptismal Registers, Box 1-6, United Church Archives, Toronto, Ontario.
629 For a further discussion of their work arrangements, see Chapter 2 and 4, or Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees.”
630 Wilson, “Reciprocal Work Bees.”
In the post-1870 period, with the growing size of cities and improvements in transportation, rural people began to access a variety of new opportunities for sociability on a greater scale throughout the year. Across North America, farmers and their families quickly adapted commercial recreations that were developing in cities for their own use. Large outdoor social events like the fair were built upon earlier small-town fairs and plowing matches. Though smaller events certainly continued into the twentieth century, it was after the mid-century period that many of them became more formally and centrally funded/organized and expanded into annual attractions that drew attendants to regional and provincial shows. Plowing matches, for example, had been “crowd-pleasers” since the first half of the nineteenth century, but it was after provincial bodies took over organization of the province-wide match that their popularity peaked. For larger fairs, both Keith Walden and Elizabeth Heaman, in their studies of Victorian Canadian exhibitions, identify important changes occurring within the space of the fairground and exhibition hall during the late-century period as well. After the 1870s, the Toronto Industrial Exhibition offered fair-goers a “rapid succession of images, spectacles, and social environments” and fairs transformed from being simple displays of agricultural produce and industrial and domestic manufactures to events containing everything from natural history to the carnivalesque. As Heaman argues, exhibitions drew in larger crowds and new sources of funding by incorporating entertainment with agricultural instruction. Fair organizers accepted that amusements would have to accompany shows of machinery, livestock, “ladies work,” prize-winning fruits and vegetables, and other
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632 Ontario-wide plow matches were first organized after 1846 when the Agricultural Association of Upper Canada was formed, and, according to Wilson, they reached a peak in popularity in the 1870s when the Agricultural and Arts Association formalized an annual plowing match which rotated between Toronto, Ottawa, Kingston, and London. Wilson, “A Manly Art,” 163.
agriculturally oriented items. London’s Western Fair, for example, featured a grandstand for the first time in 1884.⁶³⁴

The Erringtons, Glens, and Adams enjoyed several other types of rural entertainment in the late-century period as well. Each diary recorded occasions such as oyster suppers, church picnics, neighbourhood parties, and sporting events. Rural people were keen to host smaller garden parties and local picnics. As Beausert has discussed, garden parties even evolved to take on specific themes, such as those featuring exotic sights, smells, and tastes out of a desire to emulate international festivals and contest the idea of the “isolated countryside.”⁶³⁵ There was indeed much opportunity for rural sociability in the local region. As Paul Voisey noted when studying the social lives of rural people in the Vulcan area of Alberta, the “variety and sheer number of social activities seem remarkable.”⁶³⁶ While Nasaw argued that “going out” was an urban phenomenon, it is clear that rural people “went out” as well.⁶³⁷

One peculiar feature of these late-century events was their “pre-planned” nature. Voisey argues that pre-planned activities were a representation of the growing institutionalization of social life. They stemmed from peoples’ desire for greater efficiency, ensuring that a drive to a location for socializing would not be a short visit but last long enough to justify the opportunity cost of leaving farm work behind and travelling. This was, he says, “the social cost of space,” one to which rural people were particularly attuned.⁶³⁸ The activities, in their higher level of organization and attention to scheduling, stand in contrast to the drop-in visits made between close neighbours at mid-century, though the new
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⁶³⁴ Heaman, 14 and 106-107.
⁶³⁵ Rebecca Beausaert, “‘Foreigners in Town’: Leisure, Consumption, and Cosmopolitanism in Late-Nineteenth and Early-Twentieth Century Tillsonburg, Ontario,” Journal of the Canadian Historical Association 23/1 (2012), 218 and 224.
⁶³⁷ Nasaw, Going Out: the Rise and Fall of Public Amusements.
recreations did not replace casual visiting but instead complemented it. Rural people enhanced their social lives by combining older patterns of sociability with these new, pre-planned recreations.

The diarists’ families were also changing during the late-century period. After 1866, James and Rose Glen welcomed new children, making the family a unit of eight by 1878. Frederick and Matilda’s family outsized the Glens’, numbering 12 in 1876 – six girls and four boys. Finally, the Adams family consisted of nine in the early 1880s. With aging children, the diarists had more freedom to spread their social networks geographically into new spaces since the children could be trusted to work the farm. Furthermore, as older children married and started families of their own, the diarists altered their patterns of sociability to encompass these new kinship relations and locations.

Farmers’ associations that developed shortly after Confederation came to be important elements in the social lives of the Middlesex County agriculturalists, and for our diarists. In his study of small-town Ontario, Holman comments that such “voluntary associations operated, first and foremost, in a local context.” In southern Middlesex, it was The Dominion Grange and Farmers’ Association that rose to prominence. The Grange in some ways mirrored others that became popular during the same period, such as the Odd Fellows or the Knights of Columbus, though the Grange was agriculturally focussed and offered membership to women. The Grange offered farmers regular neighbourhood meetings and leisure activities intended to teach them the latest agricultural techniques and form bonds
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641 Census of Canada, 1881, Schedule No. 1, West Middlesex, Delaware, 22.
between local families. Grangers held meetings for members at Grangers’ halls where they sang songs and shared information; and they organized large-scale public events, the most prominent being the annual Grangers’ picnics which were designed by and offered to farm people in particular. At the Canadian picnics, located in Port Stanley, Elgin County, representatives of agricultural firms presented equipment, speakers lectured on agricultural topics, and crowds enjoyed musical offerings and sporting events. The events both combated rural feelings of isolation and formed long-lasting bonds among members.

The Grange first entered Ontario via Middlesex County in 1874. In February of that year, on his way home from St. Louis, American Grange agent Eben Thompson stopped in London, Ontario, after “sentiment had already manifested itself in the London district...in favor of testing out the merits of the Grange as a farmers' organization.” London-based Farmers’ Advocate publisher William Weld said that the time was ripe for the development of a Grange, and not long after Thompson’s visit, the town of Glanworth became home to an “Advance Grange,” called the Forest Rose Grange. The association was a new feature in local networks; the Erringtons and Glens both attended events at the Glanworth location in the coming decades, and Thomas Adams participated in another Grange chapter in Delaware.

The Grange’s first mission was to enhance the lives of farmers and their families. One way it sought to foster such change was through the support of cooperative buying efforts, which members
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644 See discussion of the Grange above on page 7.
645 Though his discussion is of the American Grangers Picnic, see Warren J. Gates, “Modernization as a Function of an Agricultural Fair: The Great Grangers’ Picnic Exhibition at Williams Grove, Pennsylvania, 1873-1916,” Agricultural History 58/3 (July 1984), 262-279.
647 Louise Aubrey Wood, A History of Farmers’ Movements in Canada (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1924), 34.
believed would correct the control of monopoly capitalism and “big capital” over certain commodities, such as salt. Though the commercial exchanges that the group took part in were clearly economic exchanges and not social ones, a discussion of them must be offered here in order to relate a full image of the group’s activities. According to Ferry, Grange members and organizers felt that cooperation was “the solution to the dilemmas facing the agricultural population”. In Middlesex, the Grange attempted to alter commercial relationships by encouraging cooperative buying direct from producers, rather than via middlemen and retailers. The Grange thus attempted to turn the clock back for farmers to an era when powerful commercial speculation was, they felt, less in control over agriculture and when farmers had more influence. To attempt to do so, the organization created relationships within Grange chapters that were reminiscent of less formalized exchanges that had defined a large part of the mid-century local economy – that is, exchanges between local families who knew and trusted each other.

James Glen kept financial records for his Grange chapter which display the group’s buying efforts within the local area. According to the financial records of the Forest Rose Grange, which survived along with James’ diaries, the chapter operated on two fronts. As seen on Figure 6.7, goods that it bought came from dealers and merchants in Clinton, Seaforth, and Wingham in Huron County, and from London in Middlesex. Grange agents then sold the items, including groceries, chimneys, tea, salt, lumber, Paris Green, oatmeal, and even paper bags, to local members. James recorded transfers going to families such as the Fishers (friends of the Erringtons), William Glen (James’ brother), the Shores, Bainards, McGregor, and others located within nearby concessions. This was the standard experience for other county Granges as well. Thomas Adams, for example, noted that he bought tea, tartar, pepper, Royal Yeast Cakes, and machine oil from his Delaware Chapter Grange agents. A sense of neighbourhood was thus fostered by these types of economic activities as Grange agents became

---

650 Adams Diary, April 26 and December 2, 1884.
anchors of local neighbourly buying and selling. Though buying via the Grange potentially created hard feelings between local merchants and farmers, given the close connections between James Glen and general store owner John Turnbull, whatever conflict may have been created was likely overcome.

The organization also encouraged camaraderie among Grange members through its family-oriented social activities. At Granges in Middlesex, men and women took part in regular ceremonies and rituals. They gathered together to sing Grange songs, learn the newest methods of agricultural production, and participate in Grange picnics with their families. By attending Grange-hosted events, Ferry says, members tried to view each other as part of the same professional class – that of farmers. Since the Grange hall was seen as an extension of the home, the organisation included women in its membership rolls; they too were part of the Grange experience. Though the diarists did not mention if their wives or daughters attended, it is possible that they went. The social side of the Grange was key to the group’s mission as it reinforced local values between farmers which the association wanted to encourage, namely a sense of familiarity, trust, and association. According to a resident’s recollection of the Forest Rose Grange, “No opportunity was lost to develop the social side of county life.”

While each of the diarists took part in Grange activities, their involvement in the agrarian mission was unequal. In 1876, for example, James attended Grange hall meetings all through the spring
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651 See Chapter 3, 4 and 5 for a description of the two families’ associations.
653 Donald B. Marti, “Sisters of the Grange: Rural Feminism in the Late Nineteenth Century,” Agricultural History 58/3, 251. As Holman notes, most voluntary associations excluded women; the Grange was therefore one of the few that encouraged their participation. Holman, A Sense of their Duty, 107.
654 Alex Lyle, “The Story of the Grange”, undated reminiscence, courtesy of the Elgin County Archives, St. Thomas, Ontario; Ferry, of course, admits that the tensions of late-nineteenth-century Ontario limited the success of the unifying measures of the group, but that they nonetheless “united farmers as never before.” Darren Ferry, “‘Severing the Connections in a Complex Community’: The Grange, the Patrons of Industry and the Construction/Contestation of a Late nineteenth-Century Agrarian Identity in Ontario,” Labour/Le Travail 54 (Fall 2004), 47.
and summer, whereas the younger Freddy Errington only went to a meeting in January. The importance of the Grange for James is shown on Figure 6.8. The activity actually pulled his social network trend southward toward the Grange meeting hall. Most Forest Rose Grange events, except for two at the Division Grange in St. Thomas, were held at the local hall located near the schoolhouse on the road between Glanworth and St. Thomas. The space of the hall was thus added to James’ social network in that year. At hall meetings the diarists would have experienced the Grange ritual in its prescribed form, which included sitting in assigned positions, listening to Grange Chaplains open the ceremony and read the minutes, proposing new membership initiatives, bringing in new candidates, and announcing new business. The hall also would have been filled with singing. Using the Grange songbooks, farmers sang lyrics such as: “Sow in the morn thy seed / At eve hold not thy hand / To doubt and fear give thou no heed / Broadcast it o’er the land.” The words would have filled the schoolhouse during James’ visits, tying farmers together via such agrarian-related imagery. Whether they were singing about casting seed or having faith in one’s crop, the farmers who sang the words would likely have understood the unifying message.

Another important experience in the hall was the sharing of agricultural learning. As one contemporary of the American Grange stated, “the educational advancement” aspects of the movement were “never ignored, nor forgotten.” Since the Grange organization sought to raise the status of farming as an occupation, lecturing on agricultural science became part of its mission. James Glen himself was one of the lecturers at the Forest Rose Grange. He spoke to the assembled crowd in answer to the question “Which is the most profitable cheese making or butter making?” In the discussion he
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655 James noted hall meetings on April 15, May 20, and May 29. Glen Diary, 1876; Errington Diary, January 10, 1876.
656 Manual of Subordinate Granges of the Patrons of Husbandry, Adopted and Issued by the Dominion Grange of Canada, Seventh Edition (Uxbridge: Printed at the “Guardian” Office, Brock St., 1886), 5-6.
reflected upon the issue, going through the prices of cheese and butter per pound, labour and time invested, and other issues, finally concluding that he was “in favour of Butter as it is best for the farm in the end”, a statement that echoed some of his own agricultural practices.\textsuperscript{659} Similar lectures would have been held in Granges throughout Middlesex for other farmers.

While the Glanworth Grange struggled economically, the group had lasting effects on neighbourhood social networks.\textsuperscript{660} Many of the Grange’s economic aims had failed by the end of the 1880s, including cooperative buying, partly owing to fractured relationships between buyers and sellers. An article in the \textit{Farmer’s Advocate} shows that part of the lack of success was indeed caused by broken relationships between suppliers and the Grange. According to its author, Druggist company Lyman Brothers was forced to abandon its 10-year sales relationship with the Grange because of fear that they might “lose their trade with the retail men.”\textsuperscript{661} The weekly meetings were also no longer a part of James or Frederick’s rural life after the early 1880s.\textsuperscript{662} This is shown on Figure 6.2, in that the southward pull of the Grange hall space had disappeared from James’ network by 1886. Some of the social events founded by the group, however, remained. The annual Grange picnic was an oft-remembered social event for rural families, and it was a part of James’ diary into the 1880s. Louis Aubrey Wood, an early historian of the Grange, noted that the Port Stanley picnic of 1878 drew nearly 6,000 people from the surrounding countryside during the height of the group’s activity.\textsuperscript{663} The successes of the 1878 picnic meant that Grange members kept the event running for a number of years, and its pre-planned, annual nature meant that farmers could schedule the event into their work week, setting time aside to make the

\textsuperscript{659} James Glen, “To the Forest Rose Grange,” undated transcript, Box B4822, ARCC. See Chapter 3 for a discussion of James’ dairying habits.

\textsuperscript{660} Lyle, in his reminiscence of the Forest Rose Grange, mentions that social activities lasted past 1900. Alex Lyle, “The Story of the Grange,” undated reminiscence, courtesy of the Elgin County Archives, St. Thomas, Ontario.


\textsuperscript{662} There was no mention of a Grange meeting in either of their 1886 diaries, for example.

\textsuperscript{663} Wood, \textit{A History of Farmers’ Movements in Canada}, 61.
journey. In June, 1884, members of Grange chapters from Huron, Norfolk, Elgin, and Middlesex County gathered at the Grange Picnic in Port Stanley. Attendees heard an address by Col. J.H. Brigham of the Ohio State Grange as well as music from a brass band, and people consumed food and drink at local hotels. The improvements in transportation infrastructure helped facilitate the event; trains from throughout the GTR’s network ran throughout the day, dropping off and picking up participating “picnickers.” 664 Well into the 1880s, the Erringtons and Glens noted their attendance at the picnics even though they had stopped attending local meetings. The Grange thus showed farmers’ willingness and ability to take part in new larger-scale events, particularly those which had a practical economic focus and spoke to rural people. Furthermore, the prominence of the Grange in the two farmer’s diaries marked a life-cycle juncture at which the diarists were able to take part in such activities and had the time do so.

By the 1880s and 1890s, each of the diarist families incorporated public events even more into their social networks, both inside and outside of London, whereas before most of these distant trips had been feasible for only Frederick’s family. By the 1880s, Frederick’s 10 children were each over or nearing the age of adulthood, though the eldest, Freddy, still remained at home; five of James’ six children were all over the age of 11; and Thomas’ seven children were each contributing to work on the farm. The diarists’ houses were therefore full of young people seeking new opportunities and entertainments. To Nasaw, the late-nineteenth century was the “era of public amusements” in urban centres as theaters, saloons, fairs, shows, and other activities brought people together for large-scale social occasions and events. 665 However, in London, it was the relevance of some of these events to rural life that made them attractive enough to the diarist families for them to attend.

664 “Grangers’ Pic-Nic and Excursion of Port Stanley via Grand Trunk Railway,” June 10, 1884 (St. Thomas Ontario: Journal).
665 Nasaw, Going Out, 1.
One of the more popular types of events that brought country dwellers into London were legal trials. Legal cases had for some time been an attraction to farmers of Middlesex, so the events were not entirely new to the late-nineteenth-century world. John Jamison, for example, a farmer from Adelaide Township in western Middlesex, recorded in 1856 that he followed a court case involving local school trustees and travelled to serve as a witness. Similarly, Thomas Errington had discussed the results of a neighbour’s legal case with others during the evening of March 26, 1856. By the late-nineteenth century, Middlesex court cases had become much more sensational occasions, drawing farmers into London for multiple days. Based on hints in the Adams diary, trials had moved beyond being mere subjects of local discourse and single town visits. While they were intended to be legal and not social occasions, trials were exhibitions of a particular sort. For the Adams family, a trial in early 1884 concerning southwest Middlesex brought Thomas into London on successive occasions. He made five trips into London between January and May of 1884, the last with Rosalia, “to hear the Middlemiss murder trial”. The events actually made up more than half of Thomas’ London-based social visits that year. At first glance, the frequency of trips into London for the event seems to fit with a pattern whereby social life was shifting to the cities. A more thorough investigation into the trial’s themes, however, shows that the event was of concern to farmers like Thomas because of its rural focus.

The press referred to the trial as “the Middlemiss Murder” trial, following events that took place not far from the Adams farm at a home and general store in southwest Middlesex in late-1883. Ekfrid Township, the site of the murder, was about 20 kilometres away and was a region known to Thomas. This trial was not only about a familiar scene, but was also about a fracture occurring in the social fabric of a rural neighbourhood. A robber broke into Sicox’s general store, which was attached to the owner’s

666 John Jamieson Diary, October 28, 1853.
667 Errington Diary.
668 Adams Diary, May 10, 1884.
669 The diary is not forthcoming with information about whether Thomas knew any of the participants; however, he did trade and socialize in the area occasionally, so it is not entirely impossible.
home, and killed the storekeeper. Wrightman, the accused, then fled to a nearby hotel until police apprehended him.\footnote{\textit{The Murder at Middlemiss,} \textit{London Advertiser}, May 9, 1884; \textit{For Life or Death: Wrightman and Graham on Trial for the Silcox Murder,} \textit{London Advertiser}, May 10, 1884.} The man’s trial in London became so popular that on May 9, 1884, the courtroom “was filled to its utmost capacity” by 9:35 am, so much so that others were refused admittance. The murder’s familiar, rural imagery made the backdrop of the narrative highly identifiable for Thomas, and likely for other farmers as well.\footnote{See Chapter 4 and 5.} It was also brought out over the course of the trial that Wrightman had previously been employed as a clerk in Silcox’s store.\footnote{\textit{The Murder at Middlemiss,} \textit{London Advertiser}, May 9, 1884.} These rural themes of splintered community and local intrigue added to the trial’s popularity and newspaper readability, attracting rural people like Thomas to London to hear a trial about their very own countryside.\footnote{Thomas was not alone in his interest in the murder and the trial. Alexander MacDougald, a farmer and hotel keeper from southwest Middlesex, wrote about the events in his 1884 diary as well. See Joann Lucas Galbraith, \textit{Middlemiss, in the County of Middlesex, Ontario, Canada: A History} (Glencoe: Transcript and Free Press Ltd., 1990), 35.} As few types of social events caused successive trips to London, the trial was a remarkable one in the Adams diary.

Regional, provincial, and national fairs were another type of city-based event that grew in complexity, size, and duration during the late-nineteenth century.\footnote{Jodey Nurse notes that it was in the 1880s, with the help of the Department of Agriculture, for example, that agricultural fairs began to increase the complexity of produce and fancy goods competitions at local fairs, recognizing a shift in women’s farm activity. Jodey Nurse, “The Erin Fall Fair “Showed What the Thrifty Wives of Erin Could Do”: Women’s Participation at Agricultural Fairs in Ontario, 1850-1974”, Colloquium Paper, September 2013, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, 24-5.} During the mid-century period, the Toronto Exhibition had been a part of the social network of the Errington family, showing that Frederick took part in these occasions early on in their development.\footnote{Frederick went to the Belmont Fair on September 19 and the Toronto Exhibition on August 29. Errington Diary, 1866.} According to Wetherell and Kmet, almost all fairs offered the standard sights – exhibits showing agricultural goods and new technologies, competitions for livestock, crops, and fancywork and concessions with different foods.\footnote{Wetherell and Kmet, \textit{Useful Pleasures}, 318.} And according to Schlereth, late-century fairs also featured numerous entertainments, including sports, horse shows,
bands, light displays, and other amusements such as the midway, each designed to draw in patrons.\textsuperscript{677} Mizener, however, carefully notes that fair organizers added entertainments to their events but still made certain that their mission to teach fairgoers about farming was not forgotten.\textsuperscript{678} Though the diarists are quiet on their feelings towards the fair, each of them went to London’s Western Fair annually so the attractions seem to have had their desired effects.

The event drew them into London for multiple trips, even for overnight stays. In 1884, for example, Thomas went to the Western Fair on September 25, noting that Rosalia and son Albert accompanied him. The next day Thomas went again, this time with his son Frank. Frederick, in a similar fashion, went to the London fair on September 30, 1886, and stayed overnight so that he could visit again on October 1. Since Frederick took the train to and from London, Freddy, Lizzie, and the rest of the Errington children were able to drive into the fair separately on the 1\textsuperscript{st} to attend the event themselves. Lizzie and Matilda also stayed overnight, and Willie picked them up the next afternoon.\textsuperscript{679} Even James attended twice in 1886, going both on September 29 and 30, even though he had no other business to conduct in the city on those days, and in 1896 his son Jamie went as well. The family life cycle of the diarists contributed to their ability to take part in the festive occasion. As older and adult children worked the farm, the others took the drive into the city. Also, the pre-planned nature of the event allowed them to pre-schedule the activity.

Fairs were clearly rural in topic even though they were events that were physically located in cities. They offered liminal moments in which the diarists’ rural social networks were briefly

\textsuperscript{677} Schlereth, \textit{Victorian America}, 234.
\textsuperscript{678} David Mizener, \textit{Furrows and Fairgrounds}.
\textsuperscript{679} The same pattern occurred in 1896 for the Erringtons, with Frederick visiting one day, Matilda, Lyzzie, and Dora the next, and then Freddy and Nellie on the final day (September 15 through 18). See Glen and Errington Diaries, 1886 and 1896; and Adams Diary, 1884 and 1894.
reconstructed in the boundaries of the city. \(^{680}\) During the Adams family’s 1884 visit, for example, Rosalia, Albert, and Thomas met up with “David Adams’ girl and her Uncle”, who were part of Thomas’ extended kinship network, on one day, and his brothers Melvin and Sam Adams on the next. \(^{681}\) The pattern closely resembles that which Nancy Grey Osterud has found in Nanticoke Valley, where rural peoples’ oral accounts of early twentieth-century leisure activities reference that their enjoyment of urban-based amusements was partly attributed to going to them with “friends from home.” \(^{682}\) In a way, rural networks were temporarily replicated within the city, before once again dissolving into the countryside, the main location for rural sociability.

**Part 3: Still at Home in the Countryside**

While trials and fairs lured farmers into London for longer and more frequent stays, other events kept them firmly anchored within the countryside. It was these events that show continuity in rural sociability, since home-centred and church-sponsored social occasions remained central to each of the diarists’ lives.

The Erringtons continued attending Christ Church as they had in previous decades. The church was the site of 67 of the Erringtons’ 147 social events in 1886, and 65 of 159 in 1896, with Sunday services still making up the lion’s share of their social activities (Figure 6.9). Notably, the Erringtons found themselves taking part in an expanding array of other activities that the church offered which contributed to the institution’s prominence within the network. In 1886, Frederick wrote that he had

---

\(^{680}\) According to Karen Stanworth, in her study of nineteenth-century visual culture, fairs and exhibitions were both entertainment and important educational tools. Fair organizers, she says, had a mandate to introduce fairgoers to new methods of agriculture, horticulture, and manufactures. Karen Stanworth, *Visibly Canadian: Imaging Collective Identities in the Canadas, 1820-1910* (Montreal: McGill-Queen’s University Press, 2014), 145-146.

\(^{681}\) Adams Diary, September 24 and 25.

\(^{682}\) Nancy Grey Osterud, “Rural Youth Culture in Early Twentieth-Century New York State,” *Agricultural History* 89/1 (Winter 2015), 58.
begun to serve on the church management board and was going to regular meetings. Furthermore, Christ Church also actively recruited the daughters and sons from the community. Frederick noted that “the young people” in his family had begun to attend evening services and prayer meetings in 1886, and in 1896 James wrote that Nellie Glen started to take part in the church’s mission band. The same impulse saw the other Glen children move to Christ Church for their worship, leading to Jamie, Flora, and Maria becoming confirmed in 1895 alongside the children of the neighbouring Shore, Fisher, and Bennett families. This affected the Glens’ social network; they had 26 events at Christ Church in 1886 and 61 in 1896 (Figure 6.10). The efforts of the new minister, Reverend Eidelstein, a former Polish Jew who had been brought to the region by the Anglican Bishop Isaac Helmuth (also of Jewish-Polish background), and his particularly powerful mission was a significant part of this process, as was a wave of evangelism that was arriving in the protestant churches throughout the western world. Despite new urban amusements, the church continued to play an important role in local sociability.

Church-based sociability was maintained partly due to women’s increased participation in religious associations working inside the church space. In Glanworth, Matilda Errington became heavily involved with the Ladies Aid and Auxiliary, leading to her attendance at a number of meetings in 1886 and 1896. And further west, in Delaware, Rosalia and her daughters joined the newly organized

---

683 Frederick recorded vestry meetings in April, May, and July, of 1886.
684 See Errington diary, August 1 and December 31, 1886.
685 See Errington diary, April 4, 1896. On women’s involvement in Canadian missionary societies, see Wendy Mitchinson, “Canadian Women and Church Missionary Societies in the Nineteenth Century,” Atlantis 2/2, Part II (Spring 1977).
686 Christ Church Register, 1875 to 1911.
688 Errington Diary, December 8, 1886 and September 24, 189. See Lynn Marks, Revivals and Roller Rinks, for more information on church sociability and leisure activities during the period.
Methodist Epworth League. These activities, whether collecting dues, sewing, or meetings, meant that the work could be completed in the home or the church. Wendy Mitchinson argues that church-based societies like these allowed women to learn how “to manage the problems of organization and administration” and confront the public world within the accepted sphere of domesticity. Likewise, Van Die notes that the such activities gave women the opportunity to carve a space for themselves in the “area of charitable, political, and associational work that bridged the home and the public sphere.” Farm wives and daughters embraced these forms of late-nineteenth-century religious expression, in turn contributing to the maintenance of the local, rural neighbourhood and community.

The diarists’ experience of rural-based sociability also expanded through the adoption of pre-planned events, particularly picnics, sporting events, suppers, and parties. Though the diaries do not say it directly, farmers’ wives would have likely had a hand in the forging of such social events, whether organizing the events or preparing the food and entertainment to go along with them. The Erringtons and the Glens in particular expanded their social networks to include such amusements, with the Errington family, for example, attending both rurally based picnics and garden parties. Frederick wrote that the family hosted their own garden party on August 19, 1886, and a few days later they went to a Sunday School picnic, a church-sponsored and leisure-based social event, at the McPhersons’. The Glens also took part in new social events, with James noting that Willie Glen went to play a game of baseball on May 24, 1886, likely part of Victoria Day festivities, and James himself went to an oyster

689 March, 18, 1894; the League was well established in the Methodist church circuit in which the Adams’ churches were a part. See Reverend W.M. Kiteley and Ezra Hunt, “1920 Review of “One Hundred Years”,” *Westminster West United Church* (1968), 1.
690 Mitchinson, “Canadian Women and Church Missionary Societies in the Nineteenth Century,” 60.
692 See notes above on women’s participation in church leisure activities.
693 Errington Diary, August 19 and 27, 1886.
supper in January, 1896.\textsuperscript{694} Whether partying, playing sports, or socializing at picnics with neighbours, the countryside seems to have brimmed with activity.

Each diarist’s children, save those who took over the farms, eventually moved beyond their own homestead boundaries and began social networks of their own. Adam Crerar and Kenneth Sylvester have tracked this outward movement into urban centres.\textsuperscript{695} For the Glen family, however, the fanning out process took James’ social network not into the city of London, but into other rural parts of Middlesex and Elgin County. With improvements in roadways by the 1890s, James was able to maintain at least occasional, face-to-face contact with many of these children. In 1896, it was James’ daughters Nettie and Flora who moved outside of the immediate neighbourhood and caused these alterations. Nettie Glen married David Turnbull in 1889, and the couple moved to the town of Aylmer, about 20 kilometres southwest of Glanworth, in Elgin County, shortly after.\textsuperscript{696} Aylmer had not been a major centre of James’ activity before, so Nettie’s marriage caused a readjustment in James’ social network as he made an effort to maintain associations with his daughter and new son-in-law.

Despite the distance, the family maintained connections with those children who moved off the farm. James offered in 1896, for example, to serve as a financial security (likely on a loan) at a tea house on David’s behalf so that his son-in-law could work as an agent selling tea.\textsuperscript{697} During the same year, James spent a weekend in Aylmer visiting Nettie and even attending church services with her at Aylmer Baptist and Aylmer “English.”\textsuperscript{698} For James, this was a rare long stay away from the home. James’ other daughter Flora also moved away in 1896, in order to teach at a school in Tempo, a small village west of

\textsuperscript{694} It is not clear from the Glen diary entries which organization sponsored these social events. Glen Diary, May 24, 1886, and January 20, 1896.
\textsuperscript{696} Middlesex County Records, Schedule B - Marriages, No. 007930, 1889, 341 (online via ancestry.ca). The 1891 Census of Canada records the couple living in Aylmer. See Census of Canada, 1891, Schedule 1, East Elgin County, District A, Town of Aylmer.
\textsuperscript{697} Glen Diary, February 28, 1896.
\textsuperscript{698} Glen Diary, May 23, 1896.
Glanworth. During the period, James and his son Jamie made weekly trips into Tempo to visit Flora, often dropping her off after short visits back home with the rest of the Glen family.\textsuperscript{699} As shown on Figure 6.10, Flora’s removal to Tempo caused the 1896 Glen network to move westward, with Tempo-region events numbering 31 that year. Though James does not mention if Rose Glen went on any of these trips, Rosalia Adams went on similar voyages with Thomas, showing that such intra-county trips were not necessarily open only to rural men.\textsuperscript{700}

The continued importance of kinship connections in the Glen family fits with the maintenance of one other major sphere of rural social activity, the home, which remained a focal point in their social networks. As shown on Figures 6.9 and 6.10, farm homes continued to be central to rural social networks. The Glen family in particular used home-based events to hold the expanding family together. In the 1860s and 1870s, James’ family had associated most with his parents and his in-laws at their homes after James had married and moved out of the house.\textsuperscript{701} Now, in 1896, James and Rose’s house was the centre of visits for the next generation of Glens, which by the 1890s included the Turnbull and White families. For example, daughter Annie (Glen) White and her husband George White visited James and Rose for tea\textsuperscript{702}; and when local neighbours Bob Faulkener and Mr. McPherson came to visit, George and Annie also came “to tea”, along with Nettie, James’ daughter, and her husband David Turnbull.\textsuperscript{703}

These events continued to be deeply tied to the maintenance of kinship connections and the requirements of productive farming. Son-in-law George White was a regular aid on James’ farm, helping James to perform tasks such as cutting feed and slaughtering livestock, and James helped George in

\textsuperscript{699} Glen Diary, January to June, 1896.
\textsuperscript{700} On December 24, 1884, for example, Thomas wrote that he Rosalia, and their son Craty drove to Arkona, in Elgin County, to visit friends, before returning on the 27\textsuperscript{th}. Adams Diary.
\textsuperscript{701} Refer to Glen Family Association Table.
\textsuperscript{702} Glen Diary, September 6, 1896.
\textsuperscript{703} Glen Diary, September 20, 1896.
So while decades had passed and families changed, the overlapping nature of the Glens’ social and helping networks continued.

Part of the continued popularity of home-based events was owing to the fact that farm families began placing more emphasis on celebrating notable occasions, especially birthdays and holidays. Noel notes that prior to 1870, birthdays had few special celebrations attached to them and that it was only afterward that they became popular. In the 1850s and 1860s, Frederick had made a habit of mentioning birthdays in his diary, but the days were spent ordinarily, such as in 1856 when he did little more than help Edward Wright with his threshing. After 1870, the Erringtons in particular developed a tradition of celebrating these events. Frederick wrote in 1876, for example, that he “had a small party” to celebrate his fifty-second birthday, and Dora Errington made her sister Tilly a cake for her nineteenth that same year. The practise of celebrating birthdays in the family even became an opportunity for neighbourhood social activity. Frederick actually made a special trip to London in February of 1886 “to get things for [his] birth day party” as neighbours and family were attending the next day. In 1896, the Erringtons held another for Frederick, causing Jim Braddish, Dora, and Maggie to come home “to dine” as well. Birthday events thus became important parts of the Errington social calendar.

Similar to birthdays, Christmas celebrations began to develop as an important annual time for gathering within the diarists’ homes. The event had been considered a domestic occasion since the mid-century period, according to Noel. For the diarists, the day was a way to reunite with children who

---

704 For example, George helped James to cut feed, slaughter a heifer, and kill “3 pigs for market” during the winter of 1896, and Jamie went to George’s later that month to help him cut his feed. Glen Diary, January 2 to 31, 1896.
705 Noel, *Family Life and Sociability*, 195.
706 Errington Diary, February 16, 1856, 1876, 1886, and 1896.
707 Errington Diary, February 16 and March 6, 1876.
708 Errington Diary, February 17, 1886.
709 Errington Diary, February 16, 1896.
710 Noel, *Family Life and Sociability*, 195.
had moved off the farm or with other family and friends. On December 25, 1896, Freddy and Matilda attended church services in the morning, and in the afternoon the Fishers and the Bradishes, who lived just a short drive to the west and east, came to dine (Figure 6.11). For both families the distance was not a great one, as the Fishers needed to only travel 2.4 kilometres and the Bradishes only 1.0 kilometre. On the same day Glen kin came home to “Keep Christmas” as well. As James wrote in the corresponding diary entry, “Keeping Christmas had Dave and Nettie and George and Annie Willie and Louisa Ralph and Mary Ann and all the little folks and J Handford”. The quote, however short, describes the sizeable list of attendees, including sons-in-law, daughters, and a mysterious guest, showing that the sociability of the day’s events was of note. Each local family made short trips to the Glen home, not much more than a kilometre each, though Dave and Nettie Turnbull made a significant voyage of 21.1 kilometres from Aylmer. Their attendance shows the importance of the event for these members of the family and their desire to spend it within the Glanworth neighbourhood that they had left only a few years before. Such celebratory events reinforced the social networks of kin and neighbourhood via the farm and table.

**Conclusion**

From the mid-century period century on, the social networks of the diarists’ families expanded as they started to include events and occasions in cities that drew rural people from far and wide. At the same time, however, their local involvement with kin, church, and neighbourhood networks continued and evolved to fit the needs of the diarist families as well. The neighbourhood-based associative connections that the farm families established during the mid-century period remained central to their late-century experience of rural sociability. As Osterud observed in Nanticoke, there actually was little “opposition between the “traditional” countryside and the “modern” city”; though urban amusements
clearly drew rural peoples to cities, they did not prevent them from continuing to organize social events in their own rural neighbourhoods and communities. 711

The influence of propinquity upon the diarists’ social networks is clear: it was through the repeated experience of church visiting, kinship gatherings, and other events that farm families had the opportunity to come to know and trust each other. The practice established relations that were the basis of agricultural production. In essence, social networks continued to aid production into the 1890s, and from production emerged new and continuing social connections. The life cycle stage of each family also had considerable effects upon their social networks, since the presence and age of children altered the choices that the families made.

It can therefore be said that at no point did urban social activity threaten rural sociability. Indeed, the urban events, such as trials and fairs, actually contributed to the experience of rural life for the diarists. At city-based events, farm families joined other agriculturalists and kin, or attended them as family groups. While change in social networks occurred as new social events could be found throughout southwestern Ontario, it occurred alongside the continuing importance of home and church-based sociability.

711 Osterud, “Rural Youth Culture,” 58.
Conclusion: “Looking Backward,” on Conflict and Continuity in Rural Networks

Reflective Thoughts

A common theme running through much of Canadian rural history is that of conflict, often presented via narratives of challenge and resistance, or revolution. While I hesitate to say that this is a paradigm in which the historiography has operated, its influence is pervasive. In the early years of revisionist rural history, after the 1970s, this thematic mode of writing took shape via narratives of class conflict, whereby historians presented rural peoples as a proletariat battling with the forces of urban-centred industrial capitalism— the title of Hann’s Farmers Confront Industrialism is a case in point. Later narratives, influenced by the vestiges of the Annales, described cultural change having taken place among country-dwellers as farmers’ values changed from being essentially pre-modern and community-oriented to commercially minded or driven by the marketplace. In an overlapping timeframe, others have shown conflict between local, rural peoples and external forces—either by saying that countryside communities were fractured by or resisted extra-regional influences through a number of strategies. Recently, following Ian MacKay’s 2000 “Prospectus,” we have seen conflict between rural, “a-liberal” values and an urban-centred liberal hegemony. In each of these historiographical segments, we see confrontation between groups, between ways of thought, or a shift from one set of values to those of another as points of departure in the historical trajectory of rural communities.

When I began this study of rural southwestern Ontario many years ago, this literature was what influenced my initial questioning. In keeping with such historiography, I sought to look at urban and

---

712 See, for example, Hann, Farmers Confront Industrialism; Greer “Wage Labour and the Transition to Capitalism”; and Palmer, “Town, Port, Country: Speculations on the Capitalist Transformation of Canada.”

713 For examples of Annales-influenced historiography, on New England, see Appleby, “The Vexed Story of Capitalism,” and Clark et al. “The Transition to Capitalism in America”; in Canadian historiography, I refer particularly to Craig’s Backwoods Consumers and Homespun Capitalists, and Sylvester’s The Limits of Rural Capitalism.


715 Primarily, see Sandwell, Contesting Rural Space; and Ian McKay, “The Liberal Order Framework: A Prospectus for a Reconnaissance of Canadian History,” Canadian Historical Review 81/4 (December 2000), 617-645.
rural spaces to find conflict, either in values or between people. At first, I found much that fit with this
line of thinking. I saw, for example, conflict between the centralized state and local communities. This
took shape, for example, as the latter “got up” petitions requesting changes to their postal services and
defined themselves as a community, even though not officially recognized as such by the governing
body, as shown in Chapter 5. I also saw farmers’ participation in the Dominion Grange as a sign of a
rather radicalized, rurally based value system developing within the countryside, as discussed in Chapter
4. These farmers sought to wrest power from the hands of commercial monopolies, fighting what La
Follette, in the American Midwest, later called “the machine.”716 Finally, in keeping with Neth’s idea of
rural people’s resistance of everyday urban morality,717 I saw many of the diarists’ reliance on family and
mutually exchanged labour, shown in Chapters 2 and 4, as a signal that rural peoples chose to live in a
certain way, day in and day out, avoiding the assimilation of urban individualist value systems.
Therefore, at the outset, I was set to plot my story of rural/urban networks within the historiographical
tradition of rural and urban contestation.

When I went forward with my HGIS mapping, however, I viewed the maps from mid-century
diaries alongside those of the late-century period and saw signs of continuity. While analysing the
diarists’ social and economic networks, I saw stories of “changes” occurring within a larger, overarching
narrative of continuity. From 1850 to the 1890s, rural/urban spatial relationships stayed much the same.
Though the diarists changed their crop choices, expanded their farms, adopted new technologies, and
incorporated new opportunities for sociability into their lives, throughout each decade, they regularly
traded both within their rural neighbourhoods and communities and with the urban marketplace. The
rural/urban relationship that was established by Upper Canadian colonial officials and early settlers

716 For the story of Senator La Follette and contestation with commercial monopolies, see Robert M. La Follett, La
Follette’s Autobiography: A Personal Narrative of Political Experiences (Madison, Wis.: R.M. La Follette, 1913).
717 Neth, Preserving the Family Farm, 146 – see particularly Chapter 5, “Reorganizing the Rural Community,” 122-146.
during settlement thus remained in place in the 1890s in southwestern Ontario. Though the contexts of urban and rural exchanges changed between the 1850s and the 1890s, sometimes dramatically, the general shape did not. James Glen traded more within London in 1896 than he had in 1866, but he still continued to follow the pattern of everyday production in rural spaces and urban buying and selling. Similarly, farmers’ patterns of sociability incorporated new developments but remained relatively analogous, in their emphasis on home and church-based association, throughout the second half of the nineteenth century. As other scholars have recently argued, we need to look at continuity more often in our texts, avoiding exaggerating revolution and change. These stories of continuity need to be told in order to show that the rural experience could be quite linear, albeit with various modifications, and was not as fractured by the growth of cities as is so often suggested.

There are, of course, limits to this study. Here, I have only looked at continuity through a particular lens – that of the daily lives of Middlesex County farmers and their networks of social and economic exchange. Other studies, looking at population outmigration or commodity trading patterns, to just name two possibilities, might reach differing conclusions about disjuncture. Perhaps, when whole families or parts of them moved on to urban centres, leaving the countryside behind, the fracturing of community and neighbourhood can be seen more readily. Or, if I focussed on the volume of goods rather than total number of exchanges, the influence of cities might seem more revolutionary. A study making use of a selection of farmers’ account books, which might have more systematic data on volumes of goods than diaries, is one possibility for further research.

I have also examined a mid-sized centre and its hinterland and not a major metropolis like Toronto or Montreal. It remains to be seen whether or not farmers living outside those centres experienced continuity in the same way as I have seen taking place in southern Ontario. Outside of

---

719 Though Adam Crerar contested this idea in “The Ties that Bind.”
720 This is what is seen, primarily, via Cronon’s *Nature’s Metropolis*.
these metropolises, for example, farmers may have been more influenced by the weight of very large populations, perhaps trading more often with cities and less with their communities and neighbours. Another possibility is that as these cities grew, farmers’ direct urban marketing lessened as a result of the inconvenience of taking goods to market through dense city streets to central marketplaces. This troublesome rural-to-urban travel might have increased the role that rural merchants played in funnelling goods into cities, thereby making that type of rural service even more important than John Turnbull’s in Glanworth. While these are merely hypothetical situations, the point is that more research needs to be done to see how daily life outside these large centres changed over the course of the nineteenth century.

And since the Erringtons, Glens, and Adams were all fairly well-to-do farmers, holding over 100 acres each, I cannot say that rural people of other classes were similarly affected by urban growth. Rural labourers, especially those of less affluent backgrounds, for example, may have had fewer options than my southern Ontario diarists. This caste of rural people may thereby have been unable to take advantage of urban opportunities with such ease and been forced to assimilate to urban systems more than the Erringtons, Glens, or Adams.

So while I have attempted to solve the nagging problem for the three families under examination here, and likely for many of their peers, I am aware that I have not done so for all of rural Ontario, or even all of Middlesex, for that matter. Historians looking at other centres or classes or using alternative methodologies might come to different conclusions; though there is also the possibility that they might find even more continuity than I have seen.

The story I have therefore told in the preceding six chapters is one whereby the spatial systems that the colony’s first settlers and colonial visionaries put in place showed a remarkable degree of survivability and endurance. As I have discussed, the “blueprint” for the colonial state had been one
whereby farmers produced and consumed goods within their everyday, local communities and
neighbourhoods and also went to market in cities to either buy or sell. The first families of Middlesex
lived out this experience by establishing patterns of local exchanges of labour and goods and blazing
pathways, figuratively and literally, into cities to trade. The following generations, in which the diarists
are included, maintained this system into the 1890s. The experience was not uncommon to other parts
of Canada as well, showing that southwestern Ontarians were not at odds with larger national trends.721
The Erringtons, Glens, and Adams families, then, took part in and furthered a pattern of living and
working in local spaces and trading in cities that was a part of a much wider tradition, chronologically
and geographically.

Moving Forward

So, what has this study offered to rural historians generally? First, it is clear that McCalla and
others have correctly called upon historians to reflect upon the framing of their narratives and to think
about whether or not “revolutionary change” did indeed take place, or if, instead, that is just a tidy way
to construct a beginning and an end to a text. Second, we have seen that rural people took part in the
development and maintenance of spatial systems that encompassed their daily lives. Recalling
Christopher Clark’s statement that “people did not just respond to things, they make them happen,”722
diaries demonstrate that rural people were active participants in fashioning the world in which they
lived. Third, this study ends at the conclusion of the nineteenth century. So while I have found continuity
throughout the period, coming just around the corner of 1900 were several new experiences which may
have marked an end to nineteenth-century experiences of continuity. In 1908, the Model-T arrived, with
Ford having a factory notably within the City of London itself. Between 1908 and 1915 rural mail delivery
started to bring commercial goods directly to the doors of country people. Increasingly, as well, farmers

721 Voisey, *Vulcan*; Loewen, *Family, Church, and Market*; McCalla, “Rural Credit and Rural Development in Upper
Canada”; MacKinnon, “Road, Cart Track and Bridle Paths”; and Samson, *Contested Countryside*.
purchased tractors and other labour-saving agricultural implements from major manufacturers like Massey-Harris.\textsuperscript{723} It is up to other studies to explore the impact of these later changes; however, this dissertation calls for them to be investigated and suggests that, perhaps, continuity might be experienced into the twentieth century as well.

Finally, while historians should generally avoid talking about the present and keep their feet firmly planted in the past, this study opens doors for our understanding of the rural world around us, today, in the twenty-first century. While newsprint and media sources are replete with apocalyptic-inspired visions of commercial farming, I have to ask: How much change has there been since the nineteenth century? Yes, of course, James Glen produced turkeys on his farm at a level far below that of Middlesex turkey farm production today, and his dairy production, of ten or so head, would be considered laughable by all except a few twenty-first-century hobby farmers. Furthermore, some rural areas in Canada are no longer used primarily for agriculture and are now home to urban out-migrants and large-scale industry, making them more heterogeneous than they were in the late-nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{724} Farm businesses are now much different than they were in the nineteenth century and so too are rural landscapes.

However, when I travel in and about Middlesex County today, I still see farms and families, I still see fields and gardens, and I still see rural production and urban buying and selling. Family farming has persisted in Canada,\textsuperscript{725} as have many of the rural communities that live out the agricultural experience. It would be foolhardy to say that the countryside is without neighbourhood and community networks,

\textsuperscript{723} Sandwell has recently started such a conversation, in \textit{Canada’s Rural Majority}.
\textsuperscript{725} Al Mussell, “Four Fallacies in Agricultural Sustainability, and Why They Matter: Part 3 – Farm Technologies Can be Picked from a Menu” (George Morris Centre Research Report, September 2014), 2; Canadian Federation of Independent Business, “Realities of Agriculture in Canada” (Research Report, October, 2014), 6-7.
especially those running through local spaces like the rural church, the village store, or rural restaurants. For those of us who have lived in such regions, we know how important those spaces are to small communities and how full of life they remain. Also, “Farmers Feed Cities,” is not just a tired cliché. We might see the phrase as a signal to observers that the relationship between the countryside and urban centres in Canada exists today and has even been adapted by some new rural landowners, possibly in line with aspects of the systems that I have described throughout this text.  

Moving forward, this dissertation, hopefully, will give us pause to think about the relationship between everyday rural spaces and urban centres and how much the system that developed later was put in place by settlers and colonial visionaries, more than two centuries ago. It perhaps explains why, through decades of change and new experiences, when I take a drive south of London and into Glanworth, all I have to do is knock on a couple of doors to find relatives of the Glens and Erringtons working on the land and maintaining vibrant rural businesses and communities.

---

Ngo and Brklacich have commented that twenty-first-century Local Food Movement farmers practice a style of farming that features rural production directed explicitly to urban buyers. This pattern of agriculture can be seen as somewhat similar to the practices of nineteenth-century farmers, owing to its rural-to-urban network system. However, the authors carefully note that these new farmers often have not yet established deep community partnerships within their own municipalities and instead maintain more dispersed familial and friendship networks, a fact disparate from the nineteenth-century experience. Minh Ngo and Michael Brklacich, “New Farmers’ Efforts to Create a Sense of Place in Rural Communities: Insights from Southern Ontario, Canada,” 53-67.
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Figure 1.1 Middlesex County and Southwestern Ontario
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Figure 1.2 Diarist Family Locations and Middlesex County Townships
Figure 2.1: Showing Southwestern Ontario Major Rail Networks 1853-96
Figure 2.2: Showing Land Usage by Township, Middlesex County, 1851 to 1891
Figure 2.3: Showing Hay Production, by Tp. (Total Tons), 1851 to 1891
Figure 2.4: Showing Butter Production, by Tp. (Total Pounds), 1851 to 1891
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*Township level butter data is not available for 1871 or 1881.*
### Table 2.1: Middlesex County and Westminster Tp. Principal Agricultural Products, 1851 and 1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middlesex County Agriculture</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grain Product</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Bushels</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (spring and fall)</td>
<td>453,596</td>
<td>1,122,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>23,027</td>
<td>96,731</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>11,601</td>
<td>3,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>129,506</td>
<td>529,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>466,279</td>
<td>941,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckwheat</td>
<td>13,866</td>
<td>30,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>63,837</td>
<td>65,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>126,148</td>
<td>640,201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips</td>
<td>135,170</td>
<td>1,369,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>738</td>
<td>1,872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (Tons)</td>
<td>26,299</td>
<td>31,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (Lbs)</td>
<td>139,053</td>
<td>57,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Sugar (Lbs)</td>
<td>279,475</td>
<td>478,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livestock</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulls, Oxen, Steers</td>
<td>10,503</td>
<td>3,565</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich Cows</td>
<td>11,738</td>
<td>19,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calves or Heifers</td>
<td>12,184</td>
<td>24,501</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>7,996</td>
<td>11,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>51,269</td>
<td>52,202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>27,187</td>
<td>42,648</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (Lbs)</td>
<td>557,970</td>
<td>1,081,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese (Lbs)</td>
<td>52,606</td>
<td>79,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef (Barrels)</td>
<td>7,337</td>
<td>2,557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork (Barrels)</td>
<td>17,354</td>
<td>12,557</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westminster Tp. Agriculture</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grain Product</strong></td>
<td><strong>Number of Bushels</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (spring and fall)</td>
<td>103,207</td>
<td>114,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>6,686</td>
<td>28,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>4,368</td>
<td>839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>27,880</td>
<td>86,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>96,693</td>
<td>154,969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckwheat</td>
<td>3,824</td>
<td>5,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>12,131</td>
<td>7,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>19,158</td>
<td>76,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips</td>
<td>34,020</td>
<td>307,805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (Tons)</td>
<td>5,799</td>
<td>5,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (Lbs)</td>
<td>32,666</td>
<td>33,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Sugar (Lbs)</td>
<td>41,631</td>
<td>50,933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Livestock</strong></td>
<td><strong>Total Number</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulls, Oxen, Steers</td>
<td>1,390</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mich Cows</td>
<td>1,201</td>
<td>2,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calves or Heifers</td>
<td>1,108</td>
<td>3,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>1,164</td>
<td>1,807</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>10,023</td>
<td>9,941</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>4,405</td>
<td>4,839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (Lbs)</td>
<td>131,742</td>
<td>163,551</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheese (Lbs)</td>
<td>18,780</td>
<td>14,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beef (Barrels)</td>
<td>910</td>
<td>617</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pork (Barrels)</td>
<td>3,159</td>
<td>2,359</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2.2: Production of Select Crops and Products per Resident, Middlesex and Westminster Township

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Per Resident, Middlesex</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (Spring and Fall)</td>
<td>13.80</td>
<td>23.03</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>21.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>5.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>10.87</td>
<td>6.32</td>
<td>6.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>14.19</td>
<td>19.31</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>35.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>7.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>13.14</td>
<td>10.20</td>
<td>7.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips</td>
<td>19.48</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>6.98</td>
<td>12.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (Tons)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>2.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (Lbs)</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cows</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (Lbs)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>22.20</td>
<td>28.83</td>
<td>30.33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Production Per Resident, Westminster</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (Spring and Fall)</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>18.28</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>12.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>8.90</td>
<td>2.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>13.71</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>3.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>24.66</td>
<td>22.97</td>
<td>27.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>1.16</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>6.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>12.19</td>
<td>9.19</td>
<td>6.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips</td>
<td>6.71</td>
<td>48.97</td>
<td>13.88</td>
<td>9.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (Tons)</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td></td>
<td>Data not Available at Township Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cows</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter</td>
<td>25.99</td>
<td>26.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>27.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Aggregate Statistics, 1851 to 1891
Table 2.3: Population Growth: Middlesex County, London and Westminster Township, 1851-1861

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>1851</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County</td>
<td>32,863</td>
<td>48,736</td>
<td>66,769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London City</td>
<td>7,035</td>
<td>11,555</td>
<td>15,826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Tp.</td>
<td>5,069</td>
<td>6,285</td>
<td>6,386</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Schedules I and II 1851 and 1861

Table 2.4: Errington Family Assessment Roll Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Acres</th>
<th>Cleared Acres</th>
<th>Value of Lot</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Total Value of Real Prop and Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1857</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1858</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1540</td>
<td></td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1859</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1540</td>
<td></td>
<td>1540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>1320</td>
<td></td>
<td>1320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
<td></td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
<td></td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>2180</td>
<td></td>
<td>2180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3000</td>
<td></td>
<td>3000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2850</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>3070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2700</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>3040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>2450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>2550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2275</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>2525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3375</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>3650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1877</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6500</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>6700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1878</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>4700</td>
<td></td>
<td>6200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>4200</td>
<td></td>
<td>4200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1880</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>6300</td>
<td></td>
<td>6300</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(continues on next page)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dogs</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Acres Woodland</th>
<th>Acres Swamp/Waste</th>
<th>Acres Orchard and Garden</th>
<th>Acres Fall Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Blank cells indicate unknown values

* Data includes lands shared jointly with Frederick C Errington after the 1870s and 1880s

Source: Assessment Rolls, 1851-1894, archives and research collections centre (ARCC) Western University, London, Ontario, M91-93
Table 2.5: Glen Family Assessment Roll Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Acres</th>
<th>Cleared Acres</th>
<th>Value of Lot</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Total Value of Real Prop and Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
<td></td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 100</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1868</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1869</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>1 450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1870</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1 450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>1 420</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>1 390</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1 390</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>1 590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>2 450</td>
<td>200</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 875</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>4 025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>3 870</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>4 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>105.5</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>4 600</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>4 700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>5 000</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4 600</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>4 600</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dogs</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Acres Woodland</th>
<th>Acres Swamp/Waste</th>
<th>Acres Orchard and Garden</th>
<th>Acres Fall Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1867</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1872</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1873</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1875</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4 14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Blank cells indicate unknown values
* Data for 1889-1894 reference lots shared with James' sons Wm Glen (1889-1892) and James Jr. (1894)
Data from Assessment Rolls, 1851-1894, archives and research collections centre (ARCC) the Western University, London, Ontario, M91-93
Table 2.6: Errington Diary Exchange Events, Showing Locations of Exchanges and Distant/Local Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Glanworth</th>
<th>Other Rural</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>St Thomas</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Local/Rural</th>
<th>Total Distant/Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>386</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>669</td>
<td>557</td>
<td>112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>481</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>422</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>579</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>465</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>615</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Glanworth</th>
<th>Other Rural</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>St Thomas</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Local/Rural</th>
<th>Total Distant/Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1856</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the tables: “Home” is Frederick’s primary place of living; “Other Rural” means locations outside of the cities of St. Thomas or London and the town of Glanworth; “Total Local/Rural” is all non-city activity (including home, Glanworth, and rural - generally ‘within the countryside’); and “Total Distant” comprises locations in London and St. Thomas.

Table 2.7: Glen Diary Exchange Events, Showing Locations of Exchanges and Distant/Local Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Glanworth</th>
<th>Other Rural</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>St. Thomas</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Local/Rural</th>
<th>Total Distant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>832</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>575</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>926</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>568</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,196</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>567</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>1,045</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentage of Total

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>Glanworth</th>
<th>Other Rural</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>St. Thomas</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Total Local/Rural</th>
<th>Total Distant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1866</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1896</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the table: “Home” is James Glen’s primary place of living; “Other Rural” means locations outside of the cities of St. Thomas or London and the town of Glanworth; “Total Local/Rural” is all non-city activity (including home, Glanworth, and rural - generally ‘within the countryside’); and “Total Distant” comprises locations in London and St. Thomas.
Figure 2.5: Showing Errington Family Seasonal Economic Activity, 1856

The ellipses shown on this and later maps measures the spatial trend of the events shown in points on the map. The ArcGIS program calculates the mean centre feature and creates an ellipses polygon covering approximately 68 per cent of the geographical features (those occurring within one standard deviation of the mean feature), which here are the "economic exchange events."
Figure 2.6: Showing Glen and Errington Mid-Century Local Exchange Networks
Figure 2.7: Showing Glen Family Seasonal Economic Activity, 1866
Figure 2.8: Showing Errington Family Seasonal Economic Activity, 1866
## Chapter 3: Appendix

### Table 3.1 Population of Canada and Ontario, 1871 to 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canada Total</td>
<td>3,689,257</td>
<td>4,324,810</td>
<td>4,833,239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual Growth Rate (percent – compound)</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario Total</td>
<td>1,620,851</td>
<td>1,926,922</td>
<td>2,114,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual Growth Rate (percent – compound)</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stats Can, Population of Canada, by Province, Census Dates. 1851 to 1976

### Table 3.2: Total Urban Population Growth, Ontario, 1871 to 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop.</td>
<td>355,997</td>
<td>575,848</td>
<td>818,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual Growth Rate (percent – compound)</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Stats Can, Population, urban and rural, by province and territory.
Stats Can, Population, Urban and Rural, by Province and Territory [online via Stats Can (http://www.statcan.gc.ca/tables-tableaux/sum-l01/cst01/demo62g-eng.htm) date accessed August, 2013].

### Table 3.3: City of London Population Growth, 1871 to 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop.</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>19,746</td>
<td>22,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avg. Annual Growth Rate (percent – compound)</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Population Tables, 1871 to 1891.

### Table 3.4: St. Thomas, Elgin County, Population Growth, 1871-1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Pop.</td>
<td>2,197</td>
<td>8,367</td>
<td>10,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Compound Growth Rate (percent)</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Population Tables, 1871 to 1891.

### Table 3.5: Total Population: Middlesex, London, and Diarists’ Townships, 1871 to 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County (Not including London)</td>
<td>66,769</td>
<td>73,335</td>
<td>80,753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London City</td>
<td>15,826</td>
<td>19,746</td>
<td>22,281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and County Combined</td>
<td>82,595</td>
<td>93,081</td>
<td>103,034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westminster Tp.</td>
<td>6,386</td>
<td>7,892</td>
<td>8,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware Tp.</td>
<td>2,523</td>
<td>2,674</td>
<td>2,549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Population Tables, 1871 to 1891.
Table 3.6: Avg. Annual Population Growth Rate (Compound): Middlesex, London, and Diarists' Townships (Percent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1851-1861</th>
<th>1861-1871</th>
<th>1871-1881</th>
<th>1881-1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Middlesex County (Not including London)</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London City</td>
<td>5.09</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Combined</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WestminsterTp.</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DelawareTp.</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Population Tables, 1851 to 1891.

Table 3.7: Occupiers of Farms by Farm Size (Acreage): Westminster Tp., 1871 to 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Occupiers</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>940</td>
<td>1,538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Acres and under</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 50</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 100</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 200</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 201</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Aggregate Statistics, 1871, 1881, and 1891

Table 3.8: Occupiers of Farms by Farm Size (Acreage): Delaware Tp., 1871 to 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1881</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Occupiers</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>415</td>
<td>485</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Acres and under</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 to 50</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 to 100</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101 to 200</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 201</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Census of Canada, Aggregate Statistics, 1871, 1881, and 1891
Table 3.9: Middlesex County and Westminster Tp. Principal Agricultural Products, 1871 and 1891

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Middlesex County Agriculture</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (spring and fall)</td>
<td>437,555</td>
<td>1,696,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>486,702</td>
<td>416,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>422,045</td>
<td>486,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>1,422,797</td>
<td>2,854,253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>155,134</td>
<td>602,044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>680,994</td>
<td>635,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips and other Roots</td>
<td>446,136</td>
<td>1,026,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>3,779</td>
<td>10,178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (Tons)</td>
<td>89,302</td>
<td>197,868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and their Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (Lbs)</td>
<td>274,901</td>
<td>218,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Horned Cattle</td>
<td>44,488</td>
<td>71,121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cows</td>
<td>31,462</td>
<td>43,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>19,240</td>
<td>39,958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>82,422</td>
<td>47,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>49,291</td>
<td>57,798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (Lbs)</td>
<td>1,924,971</td>
<td>2,449,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Westminster Tp. Agriculture</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>1891</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grain Product</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheat (spring and fall)</td>
<td>39,757</td>
<td>109,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>56,850</td>
<td>18,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>32,303</td>
<td>27,657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>146,673</td>
<td>234,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corn</td>
<td>19,763</td>
<td>54,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>58,694</td>
<td>52,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips and other Roots</td>
<td>88,649</td>
<td>77,863</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clover</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay (Tons)</td>
<td>12,551</td>
<td>18,414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock and their Products</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool (Lbs)</td>
<td>Data Not Available at Township Level</td>
<td>18,701</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Horned Cattle</td>
<td>4,672</td>
<td>4,138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cows</td>
<td>3,380</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>3,195</td>
<td>3,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>232,542</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butter (Lbs)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Aggregate Census Records, 1871 and 1891
Table 3.10: Glen Family Farm Crop Production, 1871

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Acres</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Crops</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Pasture</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Wild Land</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Bushels</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>198.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckwheat</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Corn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnips</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Bushels</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clover/Tim./Other Seed</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Roots</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hops - Lbs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay - Tons</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco - Lbs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool - Lbs</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cows</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1871 Agricultural Census
Table 3.11: Errington Family Farm Crop Production, 1871

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Acres</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Occupied</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Crops</td>
<td>66.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under Pasture</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood and Wild Land</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Bushels</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wheat</td>
<td>127.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barley</td>
<td>212.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rye</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peas</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oats</td>
<td>318.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buckwheat</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Corn</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>96.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Roots</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Bushels</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clover/Tim./Other Seed</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Roots</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beans</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hops - Lbs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hay - Tons</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tobacco - Lbs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wool - Lbs</td>
<td>132.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maple Sugar Lbs</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Livestock</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Milch Cows</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Cattle</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horses</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheep</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pigs</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.1: Glen Family Economic Exchanges, 1876 to 1896
Table 3.12: Assessment Roll Values of Thomas Adams’ Real and Personal Property, 1884 to 1894

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>No. of Acres</th>
<th>Cleared Acres</th>
<th>Value of Lot</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Total Value of Real Prop and Personal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td></td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3600</td>
<td></td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3625</td>
<td></td>
<td>3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2200</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>75*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2300</td>
<td></td>
<td>2300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>3625</td>
<td></td>
<td>3625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>3625</td>
<td></td>
<td>3600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agricultural Cultivation Data, 1884-1894

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Dogs</th>
<th>No of Persons</th>
<th>Cattle</th>
<th>Sheep</th>
<th>Hogs</th>
<th>Horses</th>
<th>Acres Woodland</th>
<th>Acres Swamp/Waste</th>
<th>Acres Orchard and Garden</th>
<th>Acres Fall Wheat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1888</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1889</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1891*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1892*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1893*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data from Assessment Rolls, 1851-1894, archives and research collections centre (ARCC) Western University, London, Ontario, M91-93

*For a brief period in 1888 and 1889, the Adams’ farm was assessed differently - Thomas was listed as the owner of one half of the farm, and Frank, his son, as owner of the other half. By 1891, the farm was recorded as jointly held.

*Blank cells indicate unrecorded values

* Data includes lands shared jointly with F.C. Adams after 1891, the splitting affected the counts in the Cultivation Data section as well

Table 3.13: Adams Diary Statistics, 1884 and 1894

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total Entries</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Other Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Local/Rural</th>
<th>Distant/Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td>514</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
<td>425</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>287</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage of Total</th>
<th>Home</th>
<th>London</th>
<th>Other Rural</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Local/Rural</th>
<th>Distant/Urban</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1884</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1894</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Here, “rural” refers to all non-urban places of exchange, and Local/Rural refers to all diary exchanges taking place outside of London, Ontario, whereas Distant/Urban refers to all those occurring inside the city’s borders
Figure 3.2: Adams Family Economic Exchange Events, 1884 and 1894
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Figure 4.1: Errington Local Goods and Services Exchanges, 1876-1896
Figure 4.2: Glen Local Goods and Services Exchanges, 1876-1896
Figure 4.3: Adams Goods and Services Exchanges, 1884 and 1894
Figure 4.4: Glen Labour and Lending and Borrowing Exchanges, 1876 to 1896
Figure 4.5: Errington Labour and Lending and Borrowing Exchanges, 1876 to 1896
Figure 4.6: Adams Labour and Lending and Borrowing Exchanges, 1884 and 1894
Table 4.1: Showing Number of Diarists’ Late-Century Town Exchanges and Distances to Local Towns

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Town</th>
<th>Distance From (Km.)</th>
<th>1876</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance From (Km.)</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errington</td>
<td>Distance From (Km.)</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1876</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>Distance From (Km.)</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>5.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1884</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1894</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Distances are measured “as the crow flies”

Table 4.2: Seasonality and Town Trade: Showing Total Number of Glen Family Exchanges in the Town of Glanworth, 1876-1896

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Season</th>
<th>1876</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Winter</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The seasons are defined as follows: Winter (December 1 to February 29); Spring (March 1 to May 31), Summer (June 1 to August 31), and Fall (September 1 to November 30).
Table 4.3: Number of Glen Family Glenworth Exchanges, by Item Type and Category, 1876 to 1896

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Exchange</th>
<th>1876</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1896</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items Primarily Bought in Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Service</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcohol</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry goods</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Products</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Farm Products*</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. Goods*</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misc. House Products*</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Services*</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postal</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items Primarily Sold in Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eggs</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dairy Products</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potatoes</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Items Bought and Sold in Town</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Livestock Products</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monetary Exchanges</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash (given and received when in town)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>268</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>318</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Misc. farm products comprises items such as hardware, seeds, barrels, and racks for use on the farm.
Misc. house products comprises products such as camphor, matches, coal oil, lamp chimneys, etc.
Misc. goods include goods such as books, plaster, shoe polish, pencils, unnamed town expenses, etc. which cannot be categorized as either “for the home” or “for the farm.”
Other services include mending and repairing, particularly boots and shoes, and dinner (at hotels or inns).
Table 4.4: Number and Percentage of Diarists’ Labour Exchange Events Compared to Total Number of Recorded Exchanges, 1876 to 1896

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Labour Exchanges* (Paid and Unpaid)</th>
<th>Total Number of Diary Exchanges</th>
<th>Labour as Percentage of Total Number of Exchanges</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>1876: 561</td>
<td>1,083</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886: 611</td>
<td>1,470</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896: 628</td>
<td>1,368</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errington</td>
<td>1876: 490</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886: 549</td>
<td>725</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896: 494</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>1884: 324</td>
<td>541</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1894: 263</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Labour Exchanges here include paid and unpaid work (the latter including reciprocal labour and immediate family members).

Table 4.5: Number of Reciprocal Exchange Events, Showing Reciprocal Labour Exchange and Lending and Borrowing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Reciprocal Labour Exchange Events</th>
<th>Lending and Borrowing Equipment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>1876: 98</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886: 106</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896: 105</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errington</td>
<td>1876: 79</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1886: 74</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1896: 67</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>1884: 35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1894: 19</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I used the diarists’ terminology to discern what was a reciprocal labour exchange in order to create this table. Any exchange where the diarists clearly indicated that a farming “bee” took place or used the terms “help” or “helping” are here classified as Reciprocal Labour Exchange events.
Table 4.6: Showing Types of Equipment or Animals Lent or Borrowed, 1876 to 1896

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lending and Borrowing, 1876 to 1896</th>
<th>Items Lent or Borrowed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>Glen Errington Adams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cash</td>
<td>Cash Binder Democrat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Team Grindstone Mare</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wagon</td>
<td>Wagon Horse Sleigh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lime Box</td>
<td>Lime Box Wagon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plough</td>
<td>Plough</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rake</td>
<td>Rake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seeder</td>
<td>Seeder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team</td>
<td>Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threshing Machine</td>
<td>Threshing Machine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood Rack</td>
<td>Wood Rack</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 5.1: Post Offices in Middlesex County
Figure 5.2: Petitioned New Post Office Locations and their corresponding postal spaces
Table 5.1: Distances travelled to existing post offices for the 7,100 households in Middlesex County

Figure 5.3: Forces that help create postal communities - Delaware Centre, 1879
Figure 5.4: Influence of Railroad on creation of new postal spaces, the McMaster PO, 1890
Figure 5.5: Influence of Railroad on creation of new postal spaces, the Kilmartin PO, 1879
Figure 5.6: Maintaining a Postal Community and Neighbourhood, the Fielding PO, 1879
Figure 5.7: Maintaining a Postal Community and Neighbourhood, the Devizes PO, 1892
Figure 5.8: A Split Community, the Dorchester Station PO, 1878
Figure 5.9: A Split Community, the Muncey-Delaware Station PO, 1878
Figure 5.10: A Split Community, the Evelyn PO, 1881
Figure 6.1: Errington Family Social Networks, 1856 to 1896
Figure 6.2: Glen Family Social Networks, 1866 to 1896
Figure 6.3: Adams Family Social Networks, 1884 and 1894
Table 6.1: London and St. Thomas Social Events by Family, 1850s to 1890s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Errington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: NA stands for Not Available.
Table 6.2: Social Events By Family: Errington, Glen, and Adams Diaries, 1850s to 1890s

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Errington</th>
<th>Family Name</th>
<th>1856</th>
<th>1866</th>
<th>1876</th>
<th>1886</th>
<th>1896</th>
<th>Trade With</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bennetts</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blakie</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradish</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Errington*</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fisher</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mountford</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearce</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salter</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shore</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smith</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekes</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wright</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eidelstein</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faulkner</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flemming</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glen*</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Govenlock</td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hair</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McPherson</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnbull</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beach</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bell</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bignall</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodkin</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davis</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dingman</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibson</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howlett</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunt</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milne</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purdy</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wonnacott</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The Errington, Glen, and Adams names noted here refer to the diarists’ extended family (who shared the same last name).
Figure 6.4 The Errington Family’s Mid-Century Social Networks

* The number of events at each location have been ranked in three categories (1-5, 6-15, and 16-75) on this map and those below. However, the exact number of events at each location can be seen via the numbers immediately beside each map point.
Figure 6.5: Location of Families Belonging to Christ Church (Top) and those Attending the Errington Family’s Baptisms and Confirmations (Bottom), 1860s
Figure 6.6: South Westminster Ploughing Match, Showing Competitors’ Homes and Match Location, November 7, 1866
Figure 6.7: Forest Rose Grange, Showing Homes of Members and Location of Sourced Goods, 1880s
Figure 6.8: The Glen Family’s Social Networks and the Dominion Grange, 1876
Figure 6.9: The Errington Family’s Late-Century Social Networks
Figure 6.10: The Glen Family’s Late-Century Social Networks
Figure 6.11: People Attending Christmas at the Errington and Glen Family Homes, December 25, 1896